

UNITED STATES

African Americans

Activity: 1968-1973

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The Republic of New Africa (RNA), an African American separatist group, was founded in 1968, hence the start date of the movement. The RNA called for an independent black nation to be carved out of the states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina and Mississippi. In 1971, 150 members of the group purchased twenty acres of farmland in Mississippi and declared it the capital of the Republic of New Africa (Brown University; Davenport n.d.; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 48).
- The 1971 raid of the RNA offices effectively ended the movement's momentum but Davenport, who has researched and written about the RNA, cites 1973 as the end of the involvement of the original RNA cohort (Davenport, n.d.). [start date: 1968; end date: 1973]

Dominant claim

- Separatist activity started with the foundation of the Republic of New Africa (RNA) in 1968. The RNA called for an independent black nation to be carved out of the states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina and Mississippi (Kimble, 2004). [1968-1973: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1968; end date: 1973]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The territory claimed by the RNA followed current administrative divisions and consisted of the states of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Mississippi (Kimble, 2004). We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

- On 31 March, 1968, at a black nationalist conference in Detroit, Michigan organised by two of the leaders of the RNA, 100 participants signed a declaration of independence of the RNA. This declaration also asserted the republic's aims: "to free black people in the United States from oppression; to promote the personal dignity and integrity of the individual and to protect his

natural rights; and to support co-operative economics and community self-sufficiency” (Kimble 2004). This is confirmed by Davenport, who states that: “50 years ago a group of African Americans declared themselves sovereign and established their government - the Republic of New Africa or RNA.” [1968: independence declaration]

Separatist armed conflict

- The Africans Americans’ MAR quinquennial rebellion score is 3 from 1965-1969. According to the MAR group notes: “[p]olitical protests by the group began in the 1950s (PROT50X = 3), escalated during the civil rights debates, and eventually lead to more militant activity during the late 1960s and early 1970s by groups such as the Black Panthers (REBEL65X = 3).” Violence from the Black Panthers was separatist-motivated and case study evidence suggests that while RNA members were involved in a series of shootouts with police and FBI agents, the violence does not appear to qualify as LVIOLSD.
- The RNA-established government office in Jackson, Mississippi, was targeted in an armed raid by the FBI and police in August 1971 with one policeman being killed in the process (Kimble, 2004). Most of the RNA’s leaders were arrested including President Obadele, and they received long prison terms. This marked the beginning of the end of the RNA (Roth, 481: 2015). The violence in 1971 does not meet our threshold for LVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Many black Americans can trace their lineages to Africa and the Caribbean and the slave trade that brought them to the United States (MAR). While slavery was abolished in 1863 after the American civil war in which the slave-holding states attempted to retain their right to own slaves, segregation and punitive discriminatory laws, policy and social relations continued. Such discrimination was institutionalised in the ‘Jim Crow Laws.’ (MRGI)
- Aspirations of a black nation-state in the US were influenced after the Haitian Revolution of 1804 in which former slaves overthrew French rule, and the founding of the country of Liberia in West Africa in 1847 by freed slaves (Roth, 2018: 480).
- Starting in the early 20th century with figures such as Marcus Garvey, who founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association and advocated for unity among black people in the US and Africa and for an “amicable separation” of black and white populations, black nationalism started to foment. (Roth 2015: 480).
- After World War 2, significant migration from the South to northern cities in Illinois, Michigan, and New York resulted in a concentration of black people in racially concentrated neighbourhoods. This in turn led to increased organization around political and civil rights, including support for a separate black nation (Hewitt and Cheetham, 2000: 48).
- The 1954 Supreme Court ruling in the Brown vs Topeka Board of Education which ruled that segregation at schools was unconstitutional paved the way for the civil rights movement and more gains in the 1960s (MRGI). The civil rights movement gained momentum in the 1960s, in which various strands of black peoples’ movements organized and made claims on the US government. This includes Martin Luther King’s civil rights marches, Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam, and the militant group, the Black Panthers (MRGI).
- The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed after pressure from the civil rights movement. This law prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Provisions of this civil rights act forbade discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as, race in hiring, promoting, and firing” (US Department of Labor). The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was another significant concession in that it’s aim was to ensure “that no federal, state, or local government could in any way impede people from voting because of their race or ethnicity.” In particular, this did away with some of the more restrictive measures that southern States used to disenfranchise black voters (NACCP). While these are significant concessions, civil rights legislation does not constitute a cultural rights concession as defined here.

Concessions and restrictions

- The US government passed the Fair Housing Act in 1968, which prohibits discrimination based on race or color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status or disability by those such as landlords, banks, real estate companies and others involved in the provision of housing (US Department of Justice). While a significant concession, civil rights legislation does not constitute a cultural rights concession as defined here.

Regional autonomy

NA

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	African Americans
<i>Scenario</i>	1:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	African Americans
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	203000

Power access

- We follow EPR and code the African Americans as powerless throughout. [1968-1984: powerless]

Group size

- We use the EPR estimate (12.4%). [0.124]

Regional concentration

- EPR codes African Americans as regionally concentrated, but EPR applies a lower bar. MAR, which applies a higher bar more similar to our criteria, does not code African Americans as regionally concentrated. [not regionally concentrated]

Kin

- The question here is whether Blacks in other countries in North and South America should count as ethnic kin. According to MAR's newest release, the answer is no, i.e., no transborder ethnic kin. According to earlier MAR releases, the answer is yes and Blacks in Bahamas and Cuba are

explicitly mentioned. Meanwhile, EPR's answer is inconsistent as EPR codes ethnic kin in Costa Rica (Afro-Costa Ricans) but not in any other country. Following MAR's newest release, we do not code transborder ethnic kin b/c ethnic ties with Blacks in other countries are overall not that close; however, we note that this decision is ambiguous. [no kin]

Sources

- Brown University. "Republic of New Africa."
<http://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/FreedomNow/themes/blkpower/> [January 25, 2014].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Christian Davenport's Radical Information Page (n.d.) *The Republic of New Africa vs. the U.S. Government in Space and Time, 1968-1973*. <https://christiandavenportphd.weebly.com/republic-of-new-africa.html> [April 4, 2022].
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO. pp. 47-48.
- Kimble, Nicholas, D. (2004). "Republic of New Africa." *Brown University*
<http://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/FreedomNow/themes/blkpower/> [April 4, 2022].
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*.
<http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 4, 2022].
- NAACP (n.d.) *Voting Rights Act of 1965*. <https://naacp.org/find-resources/history-explained/legislative-milestones/voting-rights-act-1965> [April 4, 2022]
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- U.S. Department of Justice (2022, January, 13) *The Fair Housing Act* <https://www.justice.gov/crt/fair-housing-act-1> [April 4, 2022].
- U.S. Department of Labor (n.d.) *Legal Highlight: The Civil Rights Act of 1964*.
<https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasam/civil-rights-center/statutes/civil-rights-act-of-1964#:~:text=In%201964%2C%20Congress%20passed%20Public,hiring%2C%20promoting%2C%20and%20firing.> [April 4, 2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Alaskans

Activity: 1974-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The Alaskan Independence Party was established in 1974 (Alaskan Independence Party Introduction; Minahan 2002: 76; Roth 2015: 535).
- In 1984, the Alaska Independence Party was officially recognized as an “official party” by the State of Alaska (Alaskan Independence Party Introduction).
- The Alaskan Independence Party’s goal is to have what they claim is the vote Alaskans were entitled to in 1958, a choice from among the following four alternatives: remain a territory, become a separate and independent nation, accept commonwealth status, or become a state. While some separatist movements in US states are not *political* organizations, in 1990 Alaskans elected a governor who campaigned on a secessionist platform. The party has become less and less relevant over time and its popularity has waned; however, it still exists as of 2020 (AKIP).
- In 1980 the Alaskans voted for a commission to assess the benefits of continuing statehood within the US, the first time a state has seriously questioned its ties to Washington D.C. While the options of commonwealth, free association, territorial status, and partition or full independence were considered, continuing statehood remained the most popular option (Minahan 2002: 77).
- The Alaska Independence Party has mostly had a socially conservative outlook. It held its most recent annual convention in 2022 (AKIP 2022). While public support has declined over the years, the movement is therefore ongoing as of 2020. [start date: 1974; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The Alaskan Independence Party was formed in 1974 to vote on the future of the Alaskans as already intended in 1958. Their dominant demand was a call for independence (Minahan 2002: 74ff).
- The party continues to make claims for independence, but has also demanded a multi-option status referendum including independence as an option but also other options, such as commonwealth status (AKIP, n.d.). [1974-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1974; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Alaskan demands for independence concern the current U.S. state of Alaska (Roth 2015: 535). We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Alaska was originally populated by people from Asia who crossed the then-land bridge that connected the two continents 30,000 years ago (Minahan 2002: 75).
- The Russians colonized Alaska and claimed the region in 1741, with furs being the main draw (Minahan 2016: 17). The local population suffered terribly at the hands of the Russians, with the population reduced by 90% from 30,000 people to just 3,000 by the end of Russian rule (Minahan 2016: 17).
- The U.S. bought Alaska from the Russians in 1866 for \$7,200,000, which was ratified by treaty in 1867 (Minahan 2002: 75). The US imposed restrictions on the indigenous, Aleut populations' religious, education and voting rights, in a similar manner to native groups across the US (MRGI).
- Gold was discovered in the late 19th century and the population grew, leading to demands for statehood. President Warren Harding proposed a new state in the more populated southern Alaska in 1923, and this was overwhelmingly approved in a referendum on the Territory of South Alaska, but was rejected by Congress (Roth 2015: 533).
- Statehood became a reality in 1959 after a referendum, and in 1968, oil was found off the coast of Prudhoe Bay, transforming the economy of Alaska (Roth 2015: 533).
- The discovery of oil also had significant political implications. Many indigenous peoples of Alaska felt that they should benefit from the economic boom, and in response the Government set up the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in which native Alaskans gave up their land claims in exchange for a role in management of natural resources and financial benefit from the oil through 'native corporations' (Roth 2015: 533). On the other hand, Alaskans who rejected any kind of federal interference in the control and management, and sale of oil exploitation, including the involvement of the ANCSA, agitated against the state, forming the Alaskans for Independence Party in 1974 and competing in local elections (Minahan 2002: 77).

Concessions and restrictions

- In 2006, the Alaskan Supreme Court ruled that secession was illegal and a question on such at an upcoming ballot would not be permitted (Robillard 2012). We do not code a restriction because the Alaskans did not previously have the right to secede.

Regional autonomy

- Alaska is a U.S. state and therefore equipped with significant autonomy. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Alaskans
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Whites; American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	201000; 205000

Power access

- The Alaskans are a regional grouping and as such are not coded in EPR. According to Minahan (2002: 74-75), the group includes 75% whites, 16% native Alaskans, 3% Asian or Pacific Islander, and 3% Hispanic. As the Alaskans are not coded in EPR, power access and group size need to be hand-coded. While indigenous people not been meaningfully represented in the U.S. government throughout the movement's history, Whites dominated the national executive. Of course, white Alaskans constitute only a tiny share of all Whites in the U.S. and their representation in the national executive was much more limited. In fact, the only evidence for Alaskan representation in the national cabinet is Wally Hickel, who twice served as governor of Alaska was also Secretary of the Interior in 1969-70, and therefore before the start of this movement. Famously, the former Alaskan governor Sarah Palin was the Republican nominee for Vice President in 2008, but Republicans lost the 2008 election. As we found no evidence for representation in the national executive during the movement's duration, we code the movement as powerless. [1974-2020: powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 74), there were 482,000 Alaskans living in the US in 2002. The WB pegs the U.S. population at 287.6 mio in 2002. [0.0017]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 74), Alaskans made up 81% of the state of Alaska in 2002, where almost all Alaskans resided in that year. [regional concentration]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder ethnic kin. [no kin]

Sources

Alaskan Independence Party (n.d.) *Alaskan Independence Party Introduction*. <https://www.ikip.org/introduction.html> [April 4, 2022].

Alaskan Independence Party (n.d.). *Alaskan Independence Party Goals*. <https://www.ikip.org/goals.html> [August 7, 2022].

- Alaskan Independence Party (n.d.). *Alaskan Independence Party History*. <https://www.akip.org/history.html> [April 4, 2022].
- Alaskan Independence Party (n.d.). *Alaskan Independence Party Home*. <https://www.akip.org/> [July 9, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Enriquez, Juan (1999). "Too Many Flags?" *Foreign Policy* 116 (Fall): 30-49, p. 38.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 74-78.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Robillard, Keven. (2012). "10 Facts about Secession from the U.S." *Politico*. November 14. <https://www.politico.com/story/2012/11/10-facts-about-secession-from-us-083856> [April 4, 2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

American Virgin Islanders

Activity: 1972-2020

General notes

- The Virgin Islands consists of two administrations – British and American. The American Virgin Islands today consists of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John as well as around 50 smaller islets. The native population of both administrations are sometimes called Crucians (Minahan 2002: 506).

Movement start and end dates

- The U.S. bought the American Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1917. In 1927 the American Virgin Islanders gained U.S. citizenship. In 1948 American Virgin Islanders voted on a range of constitutional changes, including the introduction of a locally elected executive (which was rejected). In 1953 American Virgin Islanders again voted on a series of constitutional changes, including the introduction of a locally elected executive and a non-voting delegate to Congress (this time both proposals passed). In 1954 the American Virgin Islands were granted some more autonomy (Minahan 2002: 508), however, local gubernatorial elections were introduced only in 1968. In 1972 they were granted a non-voting delegate to Congress.
- The American Virgin Islands have one of the region's highest per capita incomes, stemming mainly from tourism and off-shore banking. According to Minahan (2002: 509), this has effectively precluded wide-spread support for independence or any other change in the islands' status due to the higher tax rates this would entail and potential negative knock-on effects on the local tourism industry. However, even if a majority rejects any change to the status quo there is a small self-determination movement in the American Virgin Islands (Minahan 2002: 509).
- The first evidence for organized activity we found is in 1968, when the Independent Citizens Movement was formed, a party calling for increased autonomy for the American Virgin Islanders. Minahan (2002: 509) reports that approximately a third of voters opted for the Independent Citizens Movement in the 1986 elections, "which questioned present ties to the U.S. government and tapped into black discontent at not sharing in the prosperity of the white and mulatto populations." The Independent Citizens Movement has remained active to date; from 1975-1987 the movement supplied the Islands' governor, from 1995-1997 it supplied the Islands' delegate to Congress and in the 2014 regional parliamentary elections it won one of fifteen seats. Based on this we code the start date in 1968.
- The Independent Citizens Movement party celebrated 50 years of its existence in 2018. At the time, it was represented in the local legislature (1 member), and in an interview with local newspaper, the Vice-Chairperson of the party outlined that the party still stood for "self-determination," modification of its territorial status, and "greater leeway when it comes to maintaining relationships and conducting business with neighboring Caribbean nations" (Knight 2018).
- Note that the movement is coded only from 1972 in the data set as 1972 is the year the American Virgin Islands gained a non-voting delegate to Congress and thus ceased to be a colony according to our definition. We note prior non-violent activity. [start date: 1968; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The most important organization associated with this movement is the Independent Citizens Movement, which according to Minahan (2002: 509) "questioned present ties to the U.S. government. Other sources clarify that this should not be understood as a claim for outright secession, but a claim for greater autonomy within the context of the U.S. (e.g., Caribbean

Elections 2021). The claim for increased autonomy was reiterated in 2018 (Knight 2018). [1972-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The claim for autonomy concerns the American Virgin Islands. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no separatist violence and thus code the entire movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The original inhabitants were the Arawaks who were replaced by the Caribs, the group living there when Christopher Columbus first arrived in 1493 (Minahan 2002: 507). He named the islands St. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virigns, hence their name – the Virgin Islands.
- By the late 16th century most of the Caribs were gone after violent incursions by the Spanish. The British took control of some of the islands, as did the Spanish, Dutch and French in the 17th century. Slaves from Africa were introduced to the islands in 1673, and the majority of the population of the Virgin Islands today are black or mulattos, descendants of the African slaves and the white sugar plantation owners that occupied the islands from the 17th century (Minahan 2002: 507).
- The Danes took control of St. Thomas in 1666, occupied St. Croix in 1684, and bought St. John from the French in 1733. The Danish West India Company set up sugar plantations from 1672. The Danish Crown bought the island of St. John in 1754-55. The islands were a central hub of trade in the Caribbean and the largest slave market in the western hemisphere. (Minahan 2002: 508). However, after the slave trade was banned in Denmark in 1848, the sugar plantations declined.
- In 1917 the U.S. bought the three islands from Denmark for \$17 million. They were seen as strategically important to control the main passage through the Caribbean to the Panama Canal (Minahan 2002: 508). The U.S. Navy administered the American Virgin Islands until 1931, when administration was transferred to the Interior Department (Boyer 1982: 36).
- In 1927 the U.S. granted citizenship to most Crucians and in 1932 a bill was passed to allow citizenship rights for Crucians' descendants living in the US mainland the rest of the Caribbean. (Minahan 2002: 508).
- In 1936, the 1936 Organic Act was passed, creating local municipal councils and the right to vote for those who could read and write English (Boyer, 1982: 38).

- The Revised Organic Act of 1954, while expanding the right to vote for local government to everyone on the islands, retained Washingtonian control of the appointment of the Governor of the islands and other fiscal and administrative matters. (Boyer, 1982: 38)
- In the late 1950s, fueled by increasing momentum of the independence movement from Britain of other Caribbean islands, Virgin Islanders “renewed their long-time demands for the right to elect their own governor, to be represented in Congress by a resident commissioner, and to legislate on internal matters” (Boyer, 1982: 38).
- In 1968 the US Congress passed the Elective Governor Act and in 1970, for the first time, American Virgin Islands elected their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor (Boyer, 1982: 39). [1968: autonomy concession]
- Another piece of legislation meant that the Virgin Islanders could elect their own non-voting delegate to Congress in 1972 (Boyer, 1982: 39).

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1976, the US Congress passed enabling legislation that would allow the governor of the American Virgin Islands to submit a proposed constitution to the President’s Office to replace the Revised Organic Act of 1954. This would then need to be approved by the US President, Congress, and sent back for approval by referendum in the American Virgin Islands. However, constitutional drafts were rejected in two local referendums held in 1979 and 1981 (Boyer 1982: 40). We do not code a concession.
- Between 1988 and 1993, the U.S. Congress amended the American Virgin Islands’ Organic Act’ so that the regional authorities can organize a vote on the Islands’ future status. Originally scheduled for 1989, the vote was postponed several times and finally held in 1993. The vote offered the following options: complete integration with the U.S. (statehood or incorporated territory), continued (i.e. status quo) or enhanced territorial status with the United States, and independence (free association or independence). More than 80% opted for continued or enhanced territorial status and only 5% for independence or free association upon a low turnout. In order for the vote to be binding, more than 50% would have needed to turn out. Thus, the vote remained without direct consequences. Also, a planned run-off between the two winning options became obsolete (c2d 2011). [1993: autonomy concession; independence concession]
- In 2009, the American Virgin Islands’ 5th constitutional convention submitted a constitution draft to President Obama, who raised several concerns based on analysis by the Justice Department on presenting it to Congress (156 Cong. Rec. H.975, 2010). Based on this analysis by the Justice Department, the constitution was sent back to the constitution convention in the American Virgin Islands. They failed to revise and redraft (Mattei, 2012). Thus, while there exists legislation that allows for a local constitution (see below), it has yet to be fully utilized. We do not code an autonomy concession.

Regional autonomy

- The Revised 1954 Organic Act and the Elective Governor Act of 1970 have given a substantial degree of autonomy to the US Virgin Islands. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	American Virgin Islanders
<i>Scenario</i>	No match
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	-
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	-

Power access

- The American Virgin Islands constitute an US overseas territory and overseas territories are not explicitly coded in EPR. However, American Virgin Islanders/Crucians are either black or mulatto, and EPR codes African Americans as excluded until after the election of Obama in 2008, suggesting that any (generally minimal) representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. cabinet had been “token” until then. Indeed, we did not find any evidence for any cabinet minister from American Virgin Islands during the duration of this movement. [powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 506), the Crucians (Virgin Islanders, under which he subsumes both West Indian blacks and mulattos) made up around 74% of the American Virgin Island's population in 2002. Minahan estimates the AVI's total population at 151,000, suggesting a Crucian population of 112,000. This appears to be a mistake. The 2010 census pegged the AVI's population at only 106,000 (while confirming that Blacks or Afro-Caribbeans make up around three quarters of the local population). Minahan himself pegs the total population of Crucians (including the British part of the Virgin Islands) at only 85,000, and thus less than the 112,000 mentioned above. Based on the 2010 census, we get an estimate of 81,000 Crucians. We did not find an estimate that also includes Crucians in other parts of the US, but Minahan reports sizable Crucian populations in Puerto Rico and the mainland US, so we round the figure to 90,000. The WB pegs the US population at 309.3m in 2010. [0.0003]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 506), the Crucians (Virgin Islanders, under which he subsumes both West Indian blacks and mulattos) made up around 74% of the American Virgin Island's population in 2002, as does the 2010 census. While Minahan reports sizable Crucian populations in Puerto Rico and the mainland US, there is no indication that a majority of the Crucians resides elsewhere. Thus, we code the Crucians as concentrated. [regionally concentrated]

Kin

- American Virgin Islanders (Crucians) have close kindred in the British Virgin Islands; however, the British Virgin Island have a population of just 30,000, which is below the 100,000 threshold. In keeping with general practice (see “Africans”), we do not code Blacks in other parts of North and South America as ethnic kin. [no kin]

Sources

156 Cong. Rec. H.975, (2010) (Message from the President of the United States)
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-2010-03-02/html/CREC-2010-03-02-pt1-PgH975.htm> [April 6, 2022]

- Boyer, W. W. (1984). The United States Virgin Islands and Decolonization of the Eastern Caribbean. *Review of Regional Studies*, 14(3), 34-46.
- Caribbean Elections (2021). "Independent Citizens Movement (ICM)." http://caribbeanelections.com/knowledge/parties/vi_parties/icm.asp [November 25, 2021].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Independent Citizens Movement. <http://www.icmparty.org/> [February 5, 2015].
- Knight, April (2018). 'Homegrown Independent Citizens Movement Celebrates 50 Years.' *The St. Thomas Source*. October 22. <https://stthomassource.com/content/2018/10/22/homegrown-independent-citizens-movement-celebrates-50-years/> [July 9, 2022].
- Mattei Lou (2012). "Constitutional Convention marred by arguments, technical snarls." *Virgin Islands Daily News*. October 29. <https://web.archive.org/web/20150402112421/http://virginislandsdailynews.com/news/constitutional-convention-meeting-marred-by-arguments-technical-snarls-1.1395403?localLinksEnabled=false> [April 6, 2022]
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 506-509.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Chamorros

Activity: 1972-2020

General notes

- The Chamorros live in two administrative entities. The island of Guam is a non-incorporated overseas territory of the US and the string of islands northwards, the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), have commonwealth status within the US (Roth 2015: 491).
- Guam became part of the U.S. in 1898 and the Northern Mariana Islands after the Second World War, initially as a UN-mandated territory and, as of 1978, as a U.S. Commonwealth.
- There are sometimes conflicting aims and dynamics between the two territories vis-à-vis self-determination.

Movement start and end dates

- Minahan (2002: 422) suggests that the Chamorros self-determination movement emerged only in the 1970s when he notes that the Chamorros were affected “by the nationalism sweeping the Pacific in the 1970s and 1980s” and thus “began a concerted effort to revive their flagging culture and began to demand greater self-government, including political and economic autonomy.” While this suggests a start date in the 1970s, there are grounds to code the start date already in the 1940s. The status question has been looming in the Marianas for a long time. Until about the 1970s, the main motive of Chamorros activity was closer association and integration into the U.S. – which we do not code. However, gaining a higher extent of autonomy has also played a role. Guampedia, a relatively rich source, notes that Guam’s status has been an issue ever since the 1898 annexation. Already in the early 20th century, Guam leaders according to this source had petitioned the U.S. government for increased autonomy and civil rights. According to Guampedia, these efforts were again taken up after the Second World War, when in the late 1940s the reopened Guam Congress petitioned the U.S. Congress for an Organic Act, which would give Guamians limited self-government and U.S. citizenship.
- In 1950, the U.S. indeed granted Guam an Organic Act. In the 1950s, the Northern Marianians also petitioned for an Organic Act. In 1958, the Northern Marianians voted on unification with Guam, implying incorporation into the U.S. and a higher extent of self-government, in what was an unofficial referendum. Similar unofficial referendums were held in 1961, 1963, and 1969. The Northern Marianians’ demand was rejected.
 - o Note: In 1969 Guam also voted on reunification. However, the Guamians rejected reunification. Given Guam’s rejection, the Northern Marianians now aimed at a separate status with maximal self-government, though keeping the aim of a close association with the U.S.
- In 1972, the Northern Marianians created a status commission tasked to negotiate with the U.S. In 1973 also Guam established a status commission; Guamians were unhappy that the Northern Marianians were offered a better political status that involved both a higher extent of integration with the U.S. and more autonomy. In 1976 Northern Marianians was offered Commonwealth status; implementation followed in 1978.
- Despite multiple attempts at finding a solution, Guam’s status question has remained unresolved to this date. In 1973 the United Nations had called on the United States to organize a vote on Guam’s future status. A majority voted for an “improved status quo”, which appears to mean increased autonomy but continued union with the U.S. In a 1982 referendum, a majority of Guamians opted for Commonwealth status as well and thus for a status similar to Puerto Rico or the Northern Marianians (Minahan 2002: 422).
- According to Minahan (2002: 423) the Guamians repeated their pledge for commonwealth status when President Clinton visited the island in 1998. In 2001 nationalists again reiterated their demands for the return of traditional islands. Furthermore, he notes that demands for commonwealth status, possibly in union with the Northern Marianians, are gaining support in the

early 2000s. In 2007, “[r]epresentatives from the group, Nation Chamorro, and other activists appeared before the UN Committee on Decolonisation last week pushing for the U.S. to address Guam's self-determination aspirations” (Radionz.co.nz 2007).

- In 1997, the Guam Commission on Decolonization was established. It remains active as of 2020, working with the Unrepresented People’s Organization (UNPO 2022). In 2017, it had lobbied the UN in New York for their cause of greater self-determination vis-a-vis the US (Verán 2017).
- In sum, there is activity that can be interpreted as (partially) involving self-determination since the late 1940s. In the initial years, the focus was more on closer ties with the U.S., though increased self-government also played a role. In recent years, self-determination claims appear to originate mainly from the Chamorros in Guam, though Minahan (2002: 423) reports that the Chamorros in the Northern Mariana Islands have also protested for increased autonomy. Based on this, we code the start date in 1948 (we lack a clearer indication but the above narrative suggests an onset after WWII and in the late 1940s).
- Note: we consider Guam a colony until 1972 and the Northern Mariana Islands until 1978 (or possibly 1986): i) the Guamians gained citizenship in 1950 and a (non-voting) delegate to congress in 1972 (Minahan 2002: 422) while ii) the Northern Marianas, formerly a mandated territory, gained a status similar to Puerto Rico in 1978 and are thus an integral part of the U.S. beyond that (though Minahan 2002: 422 reports that the Northern Marianas gained citizenship only in 1986). Since we do not include anti-colonial movements in our data set, we only code the movement from 1972. It is pegged as ongoing. [start date: 1948; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- Claims have been focused on increased autonomy within the context of the U.S. (Gelardi and Perez 2019; Guampedia; Minahan 2002: 418ff). Since the 2000s there has also been a resurgence in indigenous Chamorro claims centered around objections to the presence of nuclear weapons, privatization of water, and access to military land (MRGI). [1972-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

- Roth (2015: 391) notes that there are independence movements in both Guam and the Northern Marianas. However, according to Roth, the independence movements are small. UNPO also does not highlight an organized claim for independence, emphasizing calls for greater autonomy by change of status within the USA. A further search identified one group advocating independence, Independent Guåhan, established in 2016 (Independent Guåhan: Online). The group has a Facebook page with a few thousand followers, but beyond this, we could find very little information on this organization. This is an ambiguous case, but given the limited support, we decided not to code an independence movement. [no independence claims]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The claim for autonomy concerns the Guam island as well as the Northern Mariana Islands. Note: the Northern Mariana Islands are included only from 1978 because they are considered a colony until 1977 and SDM does not include anti-colonial movements. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of separatist violence, and thus classify the entire movement as NVIOLSD and note prior non-violent activity. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Not a huge amount is known in the west about the Chamorros' island culture before the Portuguese navigator, Ferdinand Magellan, serving Spain, landed on the island on 1521 and claimed them for Spain (West 2009: 154). The Spanish claimed the islands formally in 1565 although there was no European presence on the islands until the next century (Minahan 2002: 420).
- In 1668 the archipelago was renamed the Mariana Islands after the then Spanish regent, and they were formally colonised. However, islanders rebelled, and following bloody wars with the Spanish, forced relocation to the larger island of Guam from Saipan and Tinian, segregation into villages, and particularly disease, in just 50 years of Spanish colonisation, by the start of the 1700s, the Chamorros population had been reduced from around 150,000 pre-Spanish rule, to just 4,000. (West 2009: 155)
- After the Spanish lost the Spanish-American War the US took over Guam in 1898 while the Northern Mariana Islands were sold by the Spanish to Germany (Roth 2015: 389). This marks the beginning of the division between Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands as separately administered units.
- During World War I, Japan took over the Northern Mariana Islands from Germany, and ruled them as a mandated Japanese territory, confirmed by a League of Nations ruling (Minahan 2002: 420). A large military based was built there and Japanese and Korean migration to the islands was encouraged. The Chamorros maintained ties between the US-administered Guam and the Japanese administered Northern Mariana Islands through family links during this period. (Minahan 2002: 420).
- In December 1941 the Japanese invaded and took control of Guam and in June 1944 the Americans invaded the Northern Mariana Islands, followed by retaking of Guam in August 1944. These islands were used as forward bases for US attacks on Japan, including the first use of nuclear weapons, the bombing of Hiroshima (Minahan 2002: 420-421).
- Upon the end of WWII, the Northern Mariana Islands became part of UN-organized Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) (Roth 2015: 389), which was in charge of formerly Japanese controlled Micronesian islands in the Pacific, including the Marshall Islands and Caroline islands.
- In 1950 the Guam Organic Act established Guam as an unincorporated territory of the US, and thus transitioned from a military to a civilian government (Danver 2015: 197). This also gave them greater say in the laws and governance of their own affairs, although the Governor, appointed by the US President, could still veto laws (Farrell, n.d.). The Chamorros of Guam were also able to become US citizens but were not entitled to vote (Minahan 2002: 422).
- Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, efforts were made to reunify all the Marianas islands, notably for the Northern Mariana Islands to join Guam as a territory of the US and its inhabitants to gain US citizenship. This would mean breaking free of the UN-established trusteeship that it had been placed under upon the end of WWII with other Pacific islands of Micronesia. Unofficial referendums on the Northern Mariana islands voted in favour of this in 1958, 1961, 1963 and 1969 (Farrell, n.d.) while the Mariana legislature passed resolutions and submitted referendum results to the UN and the US, which were rejected as the Marianas remained under the TTPI with other Micronesian territories. However, a referendum in Guam on the reunification of all the territories as an American Territory was also rejected in 1969 (Farrell, n.d.).

- In 1968 Congress passed the Elective Governor Act, and thus the people of Guam, not the US President, would elect the positions of Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of Guam. The first election was held in November 1970. (Clement Jr. n.d.). [1968: autonomy concession]
- In 1976, following a referendum in the Northern Mariana Islands, the US Congress voted in favour of the NMI becoming a commonwealth, coming into partial effect in 1978, they thus achieved a high-level of self-government (Farrell, n.d.). In 1986, the NMI came fully under the commonwealth US sovereignty as the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands ending its UN trusteeship status, while its inhabitants were granted citizenship ((Minahan 2002: 422, CIA World Factbook). We code the concession in 1975, when the referendum was held. [1975: autonomy concession]
 - o This is coded as a prior concession since the Northern Marianas were a colony under our definition until 1978.

Concessions and restrictions

- Guam gained the right to a non-voting delegate at the House of Representatives in 1972 (Minahan 2002: 422).
- Guam was allowed to vote on its status in both 1976 and 1982. Options included U.S. statehood, independence, free association with the U.S., and commonwealth status (implying a large degree of autonomy). Guam gained commonwealth status in 1986. We code concessions in the years of the referendums (Farrell, n.d.). [1976: autonomy concession, independence concession; 1982: autonomy concession, independence concession]
- The 1982 referendum resulted in a majority voting in favor of commonwealth status. While a draft Commonwealth Act was drawn up by the Commission on Self-Determination in 1986, it languished in Congress for several years. The last attempt died in the Committee in the U.S. House in 1997. We code this as a restriction because it stopped implementation of the 1982 referendum. [1997: autonomy restriction]
- In 2008, President Bush signed into law a bill which allows the NMI to have a non-voting delegate in the House of Representatives. (U.S. Department of the Interior, n.d.)
- In 2019, a US appeals court ruled that a planned native inhabitants-only plebiscite, organized by the Decolonization Commission of Guam, was unconstitutional as it was based on race. The plebiscite was to be on the political status of Guam (Gelardi and Perez, 2019). While this was certainly a blow for the Chamorros SDM, it did not change their-then level of autonomy, nor add further restrictions, so it is not coded as an autonomy restriction.

Regional autonomy

- NMI is a commonwealth and as such has substantial autonomy; Guam's autonomy is more limited but still meaningful. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

- NMI achieved commonwealth status in 1978, but had limited self-government as a UN Trust Territory already before that. We do not code a major change.

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Chamorros
<i>Scenario</i>	No match
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	-
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	-

Power access

- The Chamorros live mainly in Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands, two US overseas territories. Overseas territories are not coded in EPR. However, EPR coding notes suggest that any (generally minimal) representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. cabinet had been “token” until Obama’s presidency. Indeed, we did not find any evidence for any cabinet minister from Guam or the Northern Marianas during the duration of this movement. [powerless]

Group size

- Minahan (2002: 418) estimates the Chamorros' total population at 120,000. The WB pegs the US population at 287.6m in 2002. [1978-2012: 0.0004]
- We consider the Northern Mariana islands a colony until 1977 and the SDM there therefore an anti-colonial movement. Due to this, only Chamorros in Guam are associated with this movement between 1972 and 1977, leading to a smaller group size. Minahan (2002: 1418) estimates that there were approx. 79,000 Chamorros in Guam in 2002. We combine this estimate with the WB’s estimate of the U.S. population in 2002 (287.6m). [1972-1977: 0.0003]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 1418), more than 50% of all Chamorros live in Guam or the Northern Marianas, but the Chamorros make up minorities in both Guam (48%) and the Northern Marianas (35%), so regional concentration is not given. [no regional concentration]

Kin

- We found no evidence for close kindred. [no kin]

Sources

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

Central Intelligence Agency. (2022). Northern Mariana Islands. *The World Factbook*. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/northern-mariana-islands/#government> [April 10, 2022].

Clement Jr. Michael R. (n.d.) *Elective Governor Act 1968*. Guampedia <https://www.guampedia.com/the-elective-governor-act-1968/> [April 10, 2022].

Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Farrell, Don (n.d.) *History of Efforts to Re-Unify the Mariana Islands*. Guampedia. <https://www.guampedia.com/history-of-efforts-to-reunify-the-mariana-islands/> [April 10, 2022].

- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Gelardi, Chris & Perez, Sophia. (2019). ‘‘Biba Guåhan!’: How Guam’s Indigenous Activists Are Confronting Military Colonialism.’ *The Nation*. October 21. <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/guam-colonialism/> [July 9, 2022].
- Guampedia. <http://www.guampedia.com/commission-on-self-determination/> & <http://www.guampedia.com/history-of-efforts-to-reunify-the-mariana-islands/> [April 28, 2015].
- Independent Guahan (2016) <https://independentguahan.org/> [April 1, 2023].
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 418-423.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 10, 2021].
- Radionz.co.nz (2007). ‘‘Guam Indigenous Movement Denies It Is Undermining Self-Determination Bid.’’ <http://www.radionz.co.nz/international/pacific-news/170883/guam-indigenous-movement-denies-it-is-undermining-self-determination-bid> [February 4, 2015].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let’s Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- U.S. Department of the Interior (n.d.) *Former Governors of Guam*. <https://www.doi.gov/oia/islands/guamformergov> [April 10, 2022].
- U.S. Department of the Interior (n.d.) *Former Governors of the CNMI*. <https://www.doi.gov/oia/islands/cnmiformergov> [April 10, 2022].
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Insular Affairs (n.d.) *Former Representatives of Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to the United States House of Representatives*. <https://www.doi.gov/oia/islands/cnmiformerre> [April 10, 2022].
- Unrepresented Nations & Peoples Organization. (2022) ‘‘Guam: Commission on Decolonization Creates a Self-Determination Study for the Chamoru Self-Determination Movement.’’ February 22. <https://unpo.org/article/22188> [July 15, 2022].
- Verán, Cristina, (2017). ‘‘Self-Determined Nation: Chamorros Seek Justice Under the UN Mandate for Decolonization.’’ *Cultural Survival*. December. <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/self-determined-nation-chamorros-seek-justice-under-un> [July 15, 2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). ‘‘Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family.’’ *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Cherokee

Activity: 1948-2020

General notes

- Most of the Cherokee today live in Oklahoma, where they were forcibly relocated to in the 19th century, while a substantial number migrated to California. There also remains a pocket in their ancestral lands, east of the Mississippi River. The seat of the Cherokee Nation tribal government is in Tahlequah, Oklahoma (Danver 2015: 417).
- There are three federally recognized Cherokee tribes. The Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, which is the largest federally recognized tribe in the US (Cherokee Nation, n.d.), the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, who are descendants of those who managed to remain in North Carolina when most Cherokee were forcibly relocated to Oklahoma, and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians who moved out west before the forced relocation and are also in Oklahoma (Minahan, 2002: 454).

Movement start and end dates

- Cherokee Nation, the main organization representing the Cherokee SDM, was formed in 1948 under the Indian Reorganization Act (Danver 2015: 416). Cherokee Nation made “growing demands for self-government and for justice for the suffering of the past” (Minahan 2002: 454). Thus, we peg the start date to 1948.
- In 2019, Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation appointed their first delegate to Congress as a step towards exercising their treaty rights and strengthening their sovereignty (Anadisgoi 2019).
- Given evidence of continued separatist activity we code the movement as ongoing as of 2020 (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Lexis Nexis; Minahan 2002). [start date: 1948; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- In 1948, the first Cherokee organization with separatist goals was founded. According to Minahan (2002: 454), the Cherokees claimed former tribal lands and demanded self-government. [1948-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The Cherokee’s claims are primarily tied the Cherokee Nation, a territory situated in northeastern Oklahoma, which consists of a 14-county jurisdictional area (Minahan 2002: 449). We code this territory based on a map published by the Cherokee Nation (2021).

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We find no evidence of violent activity, and thus we code the movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The Cherokee are a group whose ancestral home is in the southeast of the USA, around what is now the North and South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee (Minahan 2002: 451). They were mostly isolated until the English colonisers came and settled in Virginia in 1609 where they began incursions onto Cherokee land and decimated the population by bringing disease. Between 1650 and 1755, epidemics killed 75% of the Cherokee population (Minahan 2002: 451).
- Treaties with the English and the French, despite often being broken, meant that relations were relatively manageable until the bloody Cherokee war with the English of 1759-1761. The result was that the Cherokee conceded most of their eastern land in the Carolinas (Minahan 2002: 451).
- After the American Revolutionary War, new treaties between 1780 and 1785 confirmed previous land concessions and ceded more territory in Alabama, Kentucky, and Tennessee (Minahan 2002: 451).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823's *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that "Indians had the right to occupy their land, but the land itself was owned by the government." (Danver 2015: 395) Secondly, in 1831's *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the court "defined Indian tribes as "domestic dependent nations," establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes' interests and Native American people as wards of the government" (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832,) the "Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government" (Danver 2015: 395).
- When gold was discovered in Georgia in 1828, miners settled on Cherokee land. The Treaty of New Echota, which ceded these last Cherokee lands in exchange for land in Oklahoma (Danver 2015: 414), was signed by a minority of Cherokee. Most Cherokee did not support the treaty, seeing it as a betrayal, and took the case to the Supreme Court (Minahan 2002: 452). Despite winning several Supreme Court rulings in the 1820s and 1830s, President Jackson refused to enforce them, and passed the 1930 Indian Removal Act, which facilitated the forced relocation of the entire Cherokee tribe out west to Oklahoma, where most still reside today (Library of Congress, 2019). The journey westwards, known as the Trail of Tears, was treacherous, and an estimated 25% of the Cherokee population died from malnutrition, disease, and exhaustion (Danver 2015: 416).
- In 1846 the various Cherokee groups in the territory assigned for them in Oklahoma cooperated to form the Cherokee Nation which was recognized by the federal government (Minahan 2002: 453).
- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has "the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens." (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium., n.d.)
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title and the 1895 Curtis Act dissolved Indian tribal governments and forced land to be assigned individually, thus "diminishing the land base held by the Cherokee and many other Indian tribes." (Danver 2015: 416). In 1906, US Congress passed a law that merged Indian and Oklahoma territory, ending tribal sovereignty and dissolving the Cherokee Nation. When Oklahoma was admitted as a State in 1907, most of the individual land titles on Cherokee land were opened up to white settlers (Minahan 2002: 453-454).

- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 “recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations” as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI). Under this act, the Cherokee Nation reestablished itself in 1948 (Danver 2015: 416).

Concessions and restrictions

- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the ‘termination’ policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153). [1953: autonomy restriction]
- In 1961, the Cherokee Nation was awarded \$15 million by the US Claims Commission for land taken from them in 1893 (Danver 2015: 416). No concession is coded as this does not concede a new measure of autonomy.
- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed. The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- In 1970, Congress passed the Principal Chief’s Act, which “paved the way for certain tribes including the Cherokee Nation to take back their government and popularly elect tribal officials once again.” A subsequent election was held in 1971 and the Cherokee Nation Constitution ratified in 1975 and enacted in 1976. A 1999-drafted Constitution replaced this in 2003 after ratification (Cherokee Nation n.d.). The Principal Chief’s Act applied specifically to five tribes – the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Seminole, and the Creek. [1970: autonomy concession]
 - o Related to this (we do not code a separate concession): The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples’ autonomy and land rights protection.
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to “have greater autonomy and to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements” (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]
- The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 established Native American colleges and grants for native students (MRGI). This is not a concession as defined here.
- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic 2020) [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally-funded programs (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). In 1990, the Cherokee Nation participated in this program, signing an agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, giving it direct control of millions of dollars of federal money (L.A. Times, 1990). This was further institutionalized and expanded as a permanent program by the Tribal Self-Governance Act in 1994 (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 34). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that “tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land” (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and

partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.

- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations' authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). The Cherokee Nation were the first tribe to participate (Anadisgoi, 2021). [2015: autonomy concession]
- A Supreme Court ruling in 2020 ruled that certain crimes committed on native land were under the jurisdiction of Oklahoma's tribal authority, not the state (Hurley 2022). However, this was overturned in a subsequent Supreme Court ruling in 2022 (Hurley 2022). We judged this change too limited to code a concession or restriction.

Regional autonomy

- We code regional autonomy from 1971 (1972 with 1 January rule) because this is when the Cherokee could elect their own chief following the Principal Chief's Act of 1970. This reestablished a degree of self-government, which was expanded over time (see above). [1972-2020 regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

- [1971: establishment of regional autonomy]

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Cherokee
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Cherokee are an indigenous people (Minahan 2002: 449ff) and thus form part of EPR's American Indians group, which is coded as powerless throughout. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1948-2020: powerless]

Group size

- There were 533,000 Cherokees in the US in 2002 according to Minahan (2002: 449). The WB pegs the US population at 287.6 mio in 2002. [0.0019]

Regional concentration

- We found no precise demographic data, but the account in Minahan (2002: 449) suggests that the Cherokee are spread over 14 counties in northeastern Oklahoma and that many Cherokee “live in small towns or dispersed among the other population groups in the region”. Moreover, there are also many Cherokee communities in states other than Oklahoma including North Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and Tennessee. [no regional concentration]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transnational kin. [no kin]

Sources

- Anadisgoi (2021). “Cherokee Nation Becomes First Tribe to Self-Govern Transport.” *Anadisgoi* <https://anadisgoi.com/index.php/government-stories/617-cherokee-nation-becomes-first-tribe-to-self-govern-tribal-transportation> [April 15, 2022]
- Anadisoi (2019). “Chief Hoskin Announces the appointment of a Cherokee Nation Delegate to Congress.” *Anadisgoi*. August 22nd. <https://www.anadisgoi.com/index.php/government-stories/143-chief-hoskin-announces-the-appointment-of-a-cherokee-nation-delegate-to-congress> [July 15, 2022].
- BBC News (2021). “Deb Haaland: America’s First Native Cabinet Secretary.” *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior. <https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cherokee Nation (2021). “About the Nation.” <https://www.cherokee.org/about-the-nation/maps/> [June 16, 2021].
- Cherokee Nation (2021). “Our Government.” <https://www.cherokee.org/our-government/> <https://www.cherokee.org/about-the-nation/maps/> [April 15, 2022].
- Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greenhouse, Linda. (1989) “Court Splits Over Tribal Control of Land.” *The New York Times*. June 30. <https://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/30/us/court-splits-over-tribal-control-of-land.html> [July 9, 2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, p. 203.
- Hurley, Lawrence (2022). “U.S. Supreme Court expands state power over native tribes.” *Reuters*. June 30. <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-supreme-court-expands-state-power-over-tribes-win-oklahoma-2022-06-29/> [July 9, 2022].
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [March 8, 2014].
- Library of Congress (2019) *Indian Removal Act: Primary Documents in American History*. <https://guides.loc.gov/indian-removal-act#:~:text=The%20Indian%20Removal%20Act%20was,many%20resisted%20the%20relocation%20policy>. [April 17, 2022].

- Los Angeles Times. (1990) "Cherokees to Get Control of U.S. Finds. *L.A. Times*.
<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1990-07-05-mn-168-story.html> [April 17, 2022].
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 449-455.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*.
<http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 15, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*.
<https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), "The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act." *39 Am. Indian L. Rev. 1*.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) "The Evolution of the Termination Policy." *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Chicanos

Activity: 1963-1978

General notes

- According to Hewitt & Cheetham (2000: 65f), the term Chicano refers to Mexican-Americans.

Movement start and end dates

- La Alianza Federal de Mercedes (later renamed to Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres was established in 1963, hence the start date. This organization made claims regarding land that was lost after the end of the Mexican-American War in 1848. The Alianza pursued these claims via the courts and other kinds of actions including. In 1966, the Alianza completed a 3-day march from Albuquerque to Santa Fe in New Mexico calling for the investigation of land grants (Nittle 2020). They also occupied a natural amphitheater in 1966, declaring it the “Republic of San Joaquin del Rio Chama” (Wright 2022). In 1967, armed Alianza members occupied a courthouse in New Mexico (Schultz et al, 2000: 417, Gutiérrez 2010: 26). The group staged several further occupations of federal land (Gutiérrez 2010: 26; Wright 2022).
- At a 1969 Chicano Youth Liberation Conference attended by more than 1,500 Chicano militants, the demand was made that most of the southwestern United States become the independent country of “Aztlán”. This is the first time the term ‘Chicano’ became a significant political identity (Nittle 2020). The document defined Aztlán to include most of the territory lost to Mexico through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 and before (i.e. Colorado, New Mexico, California, Arizona and parts of Texas).
- The Chicano organizations abandoned the territorial claims in the late 1970s (Gómez-Quíñones & Vásquez 2014: xx). The 1977 Immigrant Rights Conference marked the end of the previous, more militant ethos and a turn to the issue of immigrant rights (Gómez-Quíñones & Vásquez, 2014: 6). One of the main organizations that had made territorial claims, La Raza Unida, disbanded in 1978, hence the end date (Acosta 2019; Nittle 2020). This is supported by Hewitt and Cheetham (2000: 67), who argue that there has been “an increased emphasis on realizing Chicano goals through electoral processes. Rather than an independent state, Chicano leaders now advocate that the United States become a bicultural society with Spanish being recognized as a second language.” [start date: 1963; end date: 1978]

Dominant claim

- La Alianza Federal de Mercedes, which was founded in 1963, claimed the land lost in The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and wanted the treaty to be investigated, suggesting it was illegal (Nittle 2020). Roth (2015: 507) states that the La Alianza Federal de Mercedes' aimed to have these lands declared as the independent nation of 'Aztlán'.
- The Chicano Youth Liberation Conference was organized in 1969. The conference made the demand that most of the southwestern United States (i.e. Colorado, New Mexico, California, Arizona and parts of Texas) become the independent country of “Aztlán”. [1963-1978: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1963; end date: 1978]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The territory claimed by the Chicanos consists of parts of "the territory lost to Mexico through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 and before (i.e., Colorado, New Mexico, California, Arizona and parts of Texas)" (Roth 2015: 506). Roth notes that the proclaimed nation of Aztlan was composed of scattered areas south of the 1848 border, but it seems that the precise borders of this territory remained undefined. We therefore flag this claim as ambiguous and code it based on all areas south of the 1848 border as an approximation, using a map shown in Roth (2015: 496).

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The Spanish invaded and conquered Aztec Mexico in 1521 (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 65), establishing New Spain, the Spanish Empire. Starting in the 16th century, and continuing over the next three centuries, mestizo and other Mexican settlers moved north, into what is now the American Southwest (MRGI).
- In 1821, the Mexican rebellion against the Spanish succeeded, and Mexico became an independent country, including the portion of what is now the American southwest, which Chicanos claim as part of their SDM (MRGI).
- After the US annexed what is now the state of Texas in 1845, a series of battles between an expansionist US and the Mexican Army broke out – the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). The US was largely victorious, taking nearly one third of Mexican territory. What are now the US states of California, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Nevada, and the western part of Colorado were ceded to the US as part of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (Brittanica, 2021). Thus, many Mexicans, “a Spanish-speaking Roman Catholic mestizo ethnic group whose members trace their biological and cultural heritages to both Spanish and Native American roots” (Hewitt & Cheetham, 2000: 65) were now part of an expanded USA. In 1850 there were between 88,000 to 100,000 Mexicans remaining within the borders of the expanded US (Gutiérrez, 2010: 25). While the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo de jure protected the land rights of Mexicans, in reality, over 80% of such land was lost due to “force, debt, or legal manipulation” (MRGI).
- Revolution in 1910 in Mexico resulted in nearly one million people crossing the border to the US, most whom remained in the US (Gutiérrez, 2010: 25).
- Increasing immigration from Mexico to the US, especially the southwest, meant that significant demographic change occurred, this “Hispanicisation” of the borderlands (Roth 2015: 507).
- After World War II, working conditions of Mexican-American agricultural labourers, discrimination and segregated schooling were key grievances of Hispanics, including Mexican-Americans (Chicanos) in the US (Nittle, 2020, Gutiérrez, 2010: 26).
- In 1947, the case of Mendez vs Westminster Supreme Court, the judge ruled that schools were prohibited from segregating white and Latino children (Nittle, 2020)
- In 1954, the case of Hernandez vs Texas, the Supreme Court ruled that the 14th amendment, affords equal protection to all Americans, including Latinos (Nittle, 2020).

- Faced with discrimination, the generations of the 1960s and 1970s rejected the assimilation into Anglo culture that their parents and grandparents had attempted to do, and asserted a ‘Chicano’ identity, setting out “on a nationalist strategy to become a little nation within the larger nation” (Gutiérrez, 2010: 26).

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1968, the U.S. Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act. The act made funding available for schools to educate kids in other languages, including Spanish (Gómez-Quíñones & Vásquez 2014: 6). [1968: cultural rights concession]
- In 1974 Congress passed the Equal Opportunities Act aimed at ending racial discrimination in schools and providing for more funding for bilingual educational programs (Nittle 2020). [1974: cultural rights concession]
- In 1975 Congress extended the Voting Rights Act which led to the establishment of bilingual ballots, protecting minorities from voter discrimination and other aspects of disenfranchisement (Mexican American Legal Defence Fund, n.d.). This relates to political inclusion and is hence not coded.

Regional autonomy

NA

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Chicanos
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Latinos
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	202000

Power access

- According to Hewitt & Cheetham (2000: 65f), the term Chicano refers to Mexican-Americans. EPR does not code Mexican-Americans specifically but all Latinas and Latinas/Hispanics. As of July 2015, Mexican Americans comprised 63.4% of all Hispanics and Latinos in the United States. EPR coding notes suggest that any (generally minimal) representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. cabinet had been “token” until Obama’s presidency. [1963-1978: powerless]

Group size

- The Mexican-American population in the U.S. has increased markedly since 1960. We use the figures provided by Gonzalez-Barrera and Lopez in combination with WB estimates of the US population in 1970. [0.0244]

Regional concentration

- EPR codes Latinos as regionally concentrated in the southwestern part of the U.S. However, EPR applies a low bar and MAR suggests that Hispanics do not have a regional base, defined as a spatially contiguous region that is larger than an urban area that is part of the country in which 25% or more of the minority resides and in which the minority constitutes the predominant proportion of the population. [no regional concentration]

Kin

- Chicanos (Mexican Americans) have transborder kinship ties with Mexicans in Mexico (see EPR, MAR). [kin in adjacent country]

Sources

- Acosta, Teresa Palomo, (2019). "Raza Unida Party." *Texas State Historical Association*.
<https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/entries/raza-unida-party> [July 16, 2022]
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2021, June 21). *Mexican-American War*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Mexican-American-War> [July 16, 2022].
- Brown Berets. "Chicano Nationalism." http://nationalbrownberets.com/political_stance.html [January 25, 2014].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Gómez-Quíñones, Juan & Vásquez, Irene, (2014). *Making Aztlán: Ideology and Culture of the Chicana and Chicano Movement 1966-1977*. New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, Ana, and Mark H. Lopez (2013). "A Demographic Portrait of Mexican-Origin Hispanics in the United States." *Pew Research Center*.
http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/2013/05/2013-04_Demographic-Portrait-of-Mexicans-in-the-US.pdf [February 24, 2017].
- Gutiérrez, José Ángel. (2010) "The Chicano Movement: Paths to Power," *The Social Studies*, 102(1): 25-32.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 34-35, 65-66.
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [July 19, 2003].
- Mexican American Legal Defence Fund (MALDEF). (n.d.) "Our History." <https://www.maldef.org/our-history/> [July 16, 2022]
- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*.
<http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [November 9, 2021].
- Movimiento Estudiantil Chican de Aztlán. "About Us." <http://www.nationalmecha.org/> [July, 16, 2022].
- Movimiento Estudiantil Chican de Aztlán. <http://www.nationalmecha.org/> [December 13, 2013].
- Navarro, Armando (2005). *Mexicano Political Experience in Occupied Aztlan: Struggles and Change*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

- Nittle, Nadra Kareem (2020). "History of the Chicano Movement." *Thoughtco*. December 12.
<https://www.thoughtco.com/chicano-movement-brown-and-proud-2834583> [July 16, 2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Schultz, Jeffrey D., Haynie, Kerry L., McCulloch, Anne M., Aoki, Andrew L. (2000). *Encyclopedia of Minorities in American Politics.: Hispanic Americans and Native Americans*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Trujillo, Simón Ventura. (2013). *Forgotten Pueblos: La Alianza Federal de Mercedes and the Cultural Politics of Indo-Hispano* [Doctoral Dissertation: University of Washington]
https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/23681/Trujillo_washington_0250E_11688.pdf;sequence=1 [July 16, 2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wright, A. Nathan (2022, January 15). *Reies Tijerina*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Reies-Lopez-Tijerina>. [July 16, 2022].

Hawaiians

Activity: 1974-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The origin of Hawaiian nationalist movement is in the cultural revival of the 1960s and 1970s. There are many groups representing the Hawaiians and their many demands, which range from more autonomy in certain areas to complete independence. The main groups include: The Ohana Council, Ka Lahui Hawaii, Ha Hawaii, Ka Pakaukau, and the Native Hawaiian Advisory Council. News reports indicate that the first separatist activity appears to have occurred in 1974, when there were various strikes on sugar plantations (Lexis Nexis). We therefore peg the start date of the movement at 1974.
- In 1987, two sisters argued in front of the UN that Hawaii is an illegally colonized nation (Roth 2015: 405-406). They also established a sovereignty movement that year, Ka Lahui Hawai'i (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 112). However, this groups demands have always been about gaining sovereignty rights as an indigenous group within the USA and not outright independence (Ka Lahui Hawai'i 1993).
- In 1991 nationalists asserted that the Hawaiians are citizens of a sovereign nation, subverted and annexed illegally by the US and in 1997, on the anniversary of the US annexation of Hawaii, the state governor called upon Hawaiians to "advance a plan for Hawaiian sovereignty." The Hawaiian Kingdom Government continues to claim that Hawaii is under occupation and aims for secession as of 2012 (Enriquez 1999; Hawaiian Kingdom Government; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Keesing's; Lexis Nexis; Marshall & Gurr 2003; Minahan 1996, 2002; MAR).
- Activism continued after 2012. According to MRGI, there were reports in 2017 that Native Hawai'an activists had met to discuss the development of a constitution as a legal and constitutional blueprint. Nation of Hawaii, an important organization associated with the movement that has made claims for independence, joined the United Nations Forum on Indigenous Issues in 2017 (Nation of Hawai'i, n.d.) [start date: 1974; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The main demand has always been for greater autonomy, or sovereignty defined as a status for indigenous people within the USA (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 112; Ka Lahui Hawai'i 1993). However, support for outright independence has increased over time (MAR; Roth 2015: 405-406).
- Recent moves towards a native government similar to that of Native American Nations have split the movement, with many rejecting any form of legitimation of U.S. rule (Wang 2021). Roth (2015: 406) writes that as many as half of Hawai'i'ans supported independence at the time of his writing, up from a third a few years earlier. We use 2014 as the cut-off date because there were hearings on an autonomy solution in that year which were widely rejected by native Hawaiians [1974-2014: autonomy claim; 2015-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- Roth (2015) reports that multiple groups are seeking outright secession. The first such group appears to be Nation of Hawai'i, which was active from 1993 and made a declaration of independence in 1994 (Hawaii Nation 1994).

- Roth (2015) identifies a good level of support for independence from the mid-1990s, citing a survey that found 27% of residents supported independence in 1995.
- Minahan (2002: 723-724) similarly suggests that independence claims increased in the 1990s. [start date: 1993; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Hawaiian claims concern the current U.S. State of Hawaii. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas Database.

Sovereignty declarations

- Independence declaration in 1994 (Minahan 2002: 724). [1994: independence declaration]

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of separatist violence, hence a Nviolsd classification. [Nviolsd]

Historical context

- The Hawaiian islands were settled by people from the Polynesian Marquesas Islands around the 5th and 6th century (West 2009: 270), with more migration from Tahiti between 1100 and 1400 (Minahan 2016: 171). The separate islands had separate kingdoms and were often at war with each other. (Minahan 2016, 171).
- In 1778, Captain Cook of the British Navy arrived and subsequent years saw disease, modern weaponry and new avenues of trade. In 1810, King Kamehameha united the islands as the Kingdom of Hawaii (Danver, 2015: 206). The impact of disease meant that the indigenous population decreased from 300,000 when Cook arrived, to 40,000 by 1900. (Danver, 2015: 206)
- In the mid-1800s Hawaiians had “an independent, centralized government, recognized as sovereign by virtue of multiple treaties and diplomatic relationships with European states and the United States” (MAR).
- In 1843 the British forcibly took control of Hawaii which lasted for six months. The Hawaiians were helped by the US, which gradually began to take more interest in the archipelago. The Americans won control of Pearl Harbour in an 1875 treaty and started sugar plantations on the islands (Roth 2015: 403) Eventually after a period of conflict and attempted annexation by US settlers the US government was formally annexed in 1898 by the US Government. (Roth 2015: 403)
- Hawaii became a US state in 1959, but this should not be seen as a concession to the native Hawaiians given White dominance.
- We found no concession or restriction in the ten years before the start date.

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1978, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs was established. It is a semi-autonomous self-government device and many believe that as a state agency, there is an inherent conflict of interest (Minority Rights Group International 1997: 47; OHA). We code this as a cultural rights

concession as the Office's main mission is to support native Hawaiians economically and support Hawaiian culture (OHA). [1978: cultural rights concession]

- Furthermore, the US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship. This included the Hawaiians (National Geographic, 2020) and constitutes a second reason to code a cultural rights concession in that year.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. This included the Hawaiians (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- The Apology Resolution of 1993, in which the United States formally “acknowledges that the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii occurred with the active participation of agents and citizens of the United States...” It acknowledges that the Native Hawaiians had never relinquished their sovereignty to the United States also. Secessionists and autonomists have used the Apology Resolution to prove Hawaii's sovereignty. However, the U.S. Congress in 2009 ruled that the Apology Resolution does not give Native Hawaiians legal rights to public lands. Thus, we do not code this as a concession.
- “In 1995, Clinton signed into law the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act, which established a way of compensating Native Hawaiians for land originally assigned under the 1921 Hawaiian Commission Act but illegally confiscated by the United States [...]” (Minorities at Risk Project). While a concession of some sort, the 1995 act involved only financial compensation and not autonomy/cultural rights.
- In 1996, a referendum on Hawaiian sovereignty was organized. The vote was supported by the State of Hawaii, which appropriated two million dollars for the vote (Goldberg 1996; Minorities at Risk Project). However, the vote appears to have been informal and did not have immediate consequences; hence, we do not code a concession.
- In 2009, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act (also known as the Akaka Bill) was introduced to Congress. The purpose of the bill was “to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity”. This would recognize Hawaii as a political entity, and establish a relationship similar to that the federal government has with Native American tribes. However, the bill was never passed (GovTrack.us 2009). The Obama administration tried to resurrect the bill, and a series of hearings were held on the issue in Hawaii. The initiative stalled during the Trump administration, but Biden has restarted efforts (Wang 2021).

Regional autonomy

- The Office of Hawaiian Affairs is a semi-autonomous government agency overseeing native Hawaiian affairs, but not a regional government as we define it (see above; also see Minorities at Risk Project). Hence no regional autonomy. [no autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Hawaiians
<i>Scenario</i>	No match
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	-
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	-

Power access

- EPR does not code the native Hawaiians since Hawaii is a US overseas entity. There is no evidence that native Hawaiians would have played a significant role in the national executive (which according to EPR was dominated by Whites until 2009, when Blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans attained junior partner status). But at least during the movement's activity, we have not come across evidence that native Hawaiians were actively discriminated against, either. Native Hawaiians have American citizenship and can vote in both national and regional elections. Daniel Akaka, a native Hawaiian politician, got elected to the House of Representatives in 1976, and in 1990 he became the first Native Hawaiian delegate to the US senate. Thus, we code the native Hawaiians powerless throughout. [1974-2020: powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 719) there are about 350,000 Hawaiians in the United States in 2002. Minorities at Risk estimates the Hawaiian population at 330,000 in 1998. With 180,000 the estimate from the World Directory of Minorities is significantly lower, but this estimate presumably disregards Hawaiians living on the mainland. Basing on Minahan and in combination with the 287.6 million living in the US in 2002 according to the World Bank, we get a group size estimate of about .0012. [0.0012]

Regional concentration

- According to MAR, the native Hawaiians have a regional base, the Hawaiian Islands, yet they do not form a majority there. According to the MAR coding notes, "[w]hile [the native Hawaiians] are indigenous to the islands, they are now interspersed with non-Hawaiians." According to Minahan (2002: 718), the Hawaiians make up but 20% of the local population. [not concentrated]

Kin

- We could not find evidence suggesting that there are numerically significant populations of native Hawaiians outside the United States (see e.g. MAR). [no kin]

Sources

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

Enriquez, Juan (1999). "Too Many Flags?" *Foreign Policy* 116 (Fall): 30-49, p. 42.

GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].

- Goldberg, Carey (1996). "Native Hawaiian Vote Favors Sovereignty." *New York Times*. September 14. <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/09/14/us/native-hawaiian-vote-favors-sovereignty.html> [July 11, 2014].
- GovTrack.us (2009). "Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2009 (2009S. 1011)." May 7. <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/111/s1011> [March 23, 2014].
- Hawaii Nation (1994) Proclamation of Restoration of the Independence of the Sovereign Nation-State of Hawai'i. <https://www.hawaii-nation.org/proclamsum.html> [April 4, 2023].
- Hawaii Nation (1997). "Sovereignty Council Expires." February 2. <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/expires.html> [March 23, 2014].
- Hawaiian Kingdom Government. <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/> [December 13, 2013].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, p. 122.
- Ka Lahui Hawai'i (1993) Ka Lahui Hawaii Constitution. <https://kalahuihawaii.com/ka-lahui-hawaii-constitution/> [April 4, 2023].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [April 25, 2002].
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [December 10, 2013].
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- Miliani, Trask (2000). "Hawaiian Sovereignty." *CSQ* 24(1). <http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csq/article/hawaiian-sovereignty>.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 226-228.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 719-725.
- Minorities at Risk Project (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International (1997). *World Directory of Minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group International.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*. <http://www.minorityrights.org/2616/united-states-of-america/native-hawaiians.html> [August 28, 2014].
- Nation of Hawaii (n.d.) "Timeline." *Nation of Hawaii*. <https://www.nationofhawaii.org/timeline/> [July 16, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA). "About." <http://www.oha.org/about/> [April 21, 2015].
- Omandam, Pat (1998). "Case's Hawaiian Autonomy Bill to Die." *Hawaii Nation*. February 3. <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/case-billtodie.html> [March 23, 2014].
- Public Law 103-150 (1998). 103rd Congress. November 23. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-107/pdf/STATUTE-107-Pg1510.pdf> [March 23, 2014].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rügger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wang, Claire, (2021). "Covid Spike Reignites Sovereignty Debate Among Native Hawaiians." *NBC News*. August 30. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/covid-spike-reignites-sovereignty-debate-native-hawaiians-rcna1761> [July 16, 2022].

Iroquois

Activity: 1977-2020

General notes

- Iroquois is a French word. The indigenous word for the Iroquois Confederacy is the Haudenosaunee, and the confederacy is comprised of six tribes – the Mohawk (biggest), Cayuga, Oneida, Onondaga, Seneca, and the Tuscarora (Danver 2015: 468). Throughout this section, we use Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Iroquois Confederacy interchangeably as the overarching umbrella term for the alliance of the six aforementioned tribes.

Movement start and end dates

- The first evidence for separatist mobilization we could find is in 1977, when Iroquois representatives presented a petition seeking that the Iroquois Confederacy, a political unit that predates both Canada and the US, be recognized as a sovereign nation. We therefore peg the start date of the movement at 1977. The movement remained ongoing over the next decades (Keesing's; Marshall & Gurr 2003; Minahan 1996, 2002; Haudenosaunee – Kahnawake Branch Of The Mohawk Nation Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Lexis Nexis).
- Somewhat unusually, the SD claim is sometimes manifested through a sports team. Lacrosse is a sport invented by the Iroquois hundreds of years ago and played the world over. It is a source of cultural pride among the Iroquois and also a vehicle to assert their self-determination claims. The Iroquois Nationals represent the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and in 2015 hosted the World Indoor Lacrosse Championships in Onondaga Nation. They asserted their sovereignty by stamping the passports of the competing nations who arrived (Kron 2022).
- The movement is ongoing as of 2020. A 2021 Foreign Policy Article stated that according to Haudenosaunee leaders, the Confederacy will “revisit its application for U.N. membership” (Kron 2021). [start date: 1977; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- Iroquois representatives demanded in 1977 in a petition that the Iroquois Confederacy should be recognized as a sovereign nation. In 1977 they also sent a delegation to a major conference of indigenous peoples at the *Palais des Nations* in Geneva, as the Haudenosaunee Confederacy using Haudenosaunee passports. This was an assertion of their right as a sovereign, independent nation (Lightfoot 2021: 982). [1977-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1977; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- It is unclear exactly to what territory these claims are tied, but they appear to be derived from the historic Iroquois Confederacy. We flag this claim as ambiguous and code it based on a historical map of the native American population by Sturtevant (1967).

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of deaths resulting from separatist violence, hence a NVIOLSD classification. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Settled in what is now New York State, the tribes of the Iroquois had advanced fortified settlements, and were often at war with each other. They came to unify between 1350 and 1600, although this is disputed and some historians say they were unified a thousand years prior to this (Minahan 2002: 801).
- With the arrival of the French, and their arming of the Iroquois rivals, the Huron and Algonquin, war became a constant, with French-Huron attacks on the Iroquois and vice-versa. The Iroquois wiped out the Huron Confederacy in 1648-50 and attacked settlements in New France with arms gained from the newly arrived Dutch and English (Minahan 2002: 801). Disease from the English and war had halved the Iroquois population by the mid-17th century.
- Incorporation of defeated tribe members, expansion north, south and westward in the ‘Beaver Wars’, meant that by 1680, the Iroquois confederacy had reached its territorial zenith. By the 1750s, they had subdued or incorporated most of the tribes of the Great Lakes area. A 6th tribe, the Tuscarora, was added in 1722 (Danver 2015: 468), while the confederacy also played an important role in the British defeat of the French in 1762 (Minahan 2002: 801). Until the American Revolutionary War, the Iroquois enjoyed sovereignty. They remained enemies of the French and had largely good relations with the English (Minahan 2002: 802).
- In 1768, the first Treaty of Fort Stanwix was signed with the British which ceded some Iroquois land while also confirming their sovereignty on the remaining lands (Danver 2015: 490).
- The American Revolutionary War was damaging for the Iroquois Confederacy, as some tribes supported the British and some supported the Americans. When the pro-British Mohawk tribe defeated American forces at Niagara, the Americans attacked and decimated the Iroquois heartland of Onondaga, destroying crops and burning towns. However, due to the lack of unity among the tribes, at the end of the war, there was weak resistance when much of Confederacy land was ceded to the Americans as part of the second Treaty of Fort Stanwix in 1784 (Danver 2015: 457).
- After the war, many Mohawks and Onandaga, who supported the British, migrated to British Canada, settling in the Six Nations Reserve, Ontario (Danver 2015: 470).
- Two more treaties, the Treaty of Fort Harmar 1789 and the Treaty of Canandaigua (otherwise known as the Treaty of Pickering) 1794 were signed that ostensibly confirmed the sovereignty of the Confederacy and right of the six nations to control much of today’s New York State. However, the Treaty of Canandaigua was soon violated by US settlers and was ultimately ignored (Minahan 2002: 802).
- After the late 18th century, the Confederacy was considerably weakened, with loss of land, and being forced into reservations on either side of the US-Canada border (Minahan 2002: 802).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823’s *Johnson v. M’Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that “Indians had the right to occupy their

land, but the land itself was owned by the government” (Danver 2015: 395). Secondly, in 1831’s *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the court “defined Indian tribes as “domestic dependent nations,” establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes’ interests and Native American people as wards of the government” (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832,) the “Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government” (Danver 2015: 395).

- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has “the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens” (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium., n.d.).
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title and the 1895 Curtis Act dissolved Indian tribal governments and forced land to be assigned individually (Danver 2015: 416).
- The US offered Native Americans citizenship in 1924, but the Haudenosaunee Confederacy rejected this (Lightfoot, 2021: 980).
- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 “recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations” as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI). However, Iroquois nations continued with their own traditional council of chiefs governance structure (Danver 2015: 501).
- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the ‘termination’ policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153).
- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed (MRGI). The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples’ autonomy and land rights protection. [1971: autonomy concession]
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to “have greater autonomy and to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements” (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1974, a small Mohawk community called the Ganienkeh established itself as a self-governing sovereign nation in the corner of New York State. After a three-year standoff, the New York State came to an agreement with them that left it operating outside both state and federal jurisdiction. According to Roth, “Iroquois traditionalists and jurists regard it as the one scrap of land that is fully under League of Iroquois jurisdiction in the traditional sense” (Roth 2015: 466) We code a concession in 1977 as this is when the State of New York conceded to leave Ganienkeh alone. Note: it is not clear whether the concession was made before or after the movement’s start date. [1977: autonomy concession]

- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic, 2020) [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally-funded programs (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). In 1990, the Cherokee Nation participated in this program, signing an agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, giving it direct control of millions of dollars of federal money (L.A. Times, 1990). This was further institutionalised and expanded as a permanent programme by the Tribal Self-Governance Act in 1994 (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 34). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that “tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land” (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- In 2010, after the intervention of Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, the Haudenosaunee were allowed to travel to the World Lacrosse Championship in England with their own, Haudenosaunee-issued passports (Kron 2021). This is difficult to see as a concession as defined here.
- The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations’ authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]

Regional autonomy

- The different nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy have their own Tribal Council of Chiefs. These Councils of Chiefs have power within their nations, or reservations to make laws (Haudenosaunee Confederacy, n.d.). For example, the Onondaga Nation is outside the jurisdiction of the State of New York, and does not pay federal or state taxes (Onondaga Nation, n.d.). The Cayuga Nation has its own Police Force and housing and education departments. (Cayuga Nation, n.d.). Together, these 50 chiefs of the six nations meet at the Grand Council of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. [1977-2020: regional autonomy]

De facto independence

- The above establishment of Ganienkeh would be coded as de facto independence if it was much larger. However, it was only a tiny corner of land, and a small proportion of Iroquois territory (Roth 2015: 466).

Major territorial changes

- Similarly, the above reestablishment of Ganienkeh was not a *major* territorial change.

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Iroquois
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Iroquois are an indigenous people (Minahan 2002: 799) and thus form part of EPR's American Indians group, which is coded as powerless throughout. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1977-2020: powerless]

Group size

- Minahan (2002: 799) only provides a combined population estimate for the US and Canada. According to the 2010 US census, there were 80,000 Iroquois in the US, suggesting a group size estimate of 0.03%. Minahan argues that official figures underestimate the ethnic population because not all self-identified Iroquois are officially affiliated with the tribal governments, so we round the estimate to 0.05%. [0.0005]

Regional concentration

- The Iroquois are scattered on the fringes of their original homeland and are “concentrated in about 20 towns and eight reservations in New York, Ontario, and Quebec” (Minahan 2002: 799). Given the non-contiguous Iroquois settlement, we code them as not regionally concentrated. [not concentrated]

Kin

- According to Minahan (2002: 799), there are Iroquois in Canada; however, they number below 100,000 (see Iroquois in Canada). [no kin]

Sources

BBC News (2021). “Deb Haaland: America’s First Native Cabinet Secretary.” *BBC News*.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].

Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior.
<https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].

Cayuga Nation. (n.d.) *Cayuga Nation Government*. <https://www.onondaganation.org/government/> [May 8, 2022]

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

- Greenhouse, Linda. (1989) "Court Splits Over Tribal Control of Land." *The New York Times*. June 30. <https://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/30/us/court-splits-over-tribal-control-of-land.html> [July 9, 2022].
- Haudenosaunee – Kahnawake Branch Of The Mohawk Nation Six Nation Iroquois Confederacy. <http://www.kahnawakelonghouse.com/index.php?mid=1> [December 13, 2013].
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy (n.d.) *Government*. <https://www.haudenosauneeconfederacy.com/government/> [May 8, 2022]
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 203.
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [February 24, 2002].
- Kron, Josh. (2021). "Gaming the State System." *Foreign Policy*. August, 22. https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/08/22/iroquois-nationals-haudenosaunee-confederacy-lacrosse-los-angeles-olympics-2028-indigenous-sovereignty-canada-united-states/?fbclid=IwAR068_S5zDFIn_Bvfm--W_qcb4T99kTd87XSVG8HKY2K5FoQwXZRUSOp4yQ [July 22, 2022].
- Lexis Nexis. <http://www.lexis-nexis.com> [July 2, 2003].
- Lightfoot, S. R. (2021). Decolonizing Self-Determination: Haudenosaunee Passports and Negotiated Sovereignty. *European Journal of International Relations*, 27(4), 971–994.
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 220-222.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 799-805.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 30, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- Onondaga Nation. (n.d.) *Government*. <https://www.onondaganation.org/government/> [May 8, 2022]
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), "The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act." *39 Am. Indian L. Rev. 1*.
- Sturtevant, W. (1967). "Historical Map of the United States - Early Indian Tribes, Culture Areas, and Linguistic Stocks." Smithsonian Institution.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) "The Evolution of the Termination Policy." *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Lakota (Sioux)

Activity: 1964-2020

General notes

- The Lakota Nation is also called the Sioux Nation and is comprised of seven bands, or Council Fires, each with several tribes. These seven Council Fires comprise a political confederacy. (Danver 2015: 494). The three main subdivisions, based on language of the Sioux are Lakota, Dakota, and Nakota. Lakota has one band (Tetons), Dakota has four (Mdewakantunwan, Sissetonwan, Wahpetunwan and the Wahpekute) and Nakota has two (Yanktons and Yanktonais). There are also several tribes under each band, especially the Tetons. All of these groups fall under the umbrella 'Sioux,' a name given to them by the French. By the mid-19th century, the Lakota-speaking band and sub-tribes had become the most populous and powerful band of all the Sioux bands. (Gibbon, 2011) The rest of this coding refers to the overall umbrella term – Sioux, rather than the main group of the Sioux, the Lakota (Teton).
- Because of the nature of the confederacy, there are several self governance entities of the various bands, which together fall under the Great Sioux Nation. For example, the Standing Rock Reservation has its own tribal council based on the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act, as do several other Sioux bands (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d).

Movement start and end dates

- In 1964 a small group of Sioux demonstrated on Alcatraz, demanding that the island be returned to the Sioux. This is the first incidence of organized separatist activity we found, thus 1964 is coded as the movement's start date.
- In 1969 a larger group of Sioux occupied Alcatraz. The occupation lasted for 19 months and was forcibly ended by the U.S. government, though without casualties.
- In 1973 hundreds of Lakota activists occupied Wounded Knee and held out for seventy days.
- In 1991 the Lakota Sioux Nation declared its independence from the United States and in 1994 it became part of the Unrepresented Peoples and Nations Organization.
- In 2007, the Lakota Sioux Nation declared its independence from the United States once again (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Independent Journal Review; Keesing's; Marshall & Gurr 2003; Minahan 1996, 2002; Newscorp Australian Papers 2007). In recent years, claims have focused on land rights protection in the context of the Dakota Access Pipeline project (National Museum of the American Indian n.d.). [start date: 1964; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- In 1964, a small number of Lakota (Sioux) occupied the island of Alcatraz, demanding its return to the Native people who once occupied it. In subsequent years the Lakota continued to raise awareness for their land rights and to receive autonomy for their traditional lands. For example, In 1973, protesters occupied Wounded Knee, located within the former Great Sioux Reservation. The Lakota Sioux Nation also declared its independence from the United States for the first time in 1991, later also in 2007 and 2012. They joined in 1994 the Unrepresented Peoples and Nations Organization (Minahan 2002; Roth 2012: 492-494). [1964-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1964; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Lakota (Sioux) territorial claims are not clearly defined but are generally based on the group's traditional lands. It also appears that the group's territorial claims have evolved over time, but we could not find a precise definition of areas claimed in earlier periods. The most recent dominant claim concerns the republic of Lakota, which is located in South and North Dakota as well as in Wyoming, Nebraska and Montana (Roth 2015: 492-494). The Republic of Lakotah is based on the boundaries which came into existence in the 1851 First Treaty of Fort Laramie. For an alternative map, which broadly matches the map in Roth (2015), see Sack (2017). We code this territory based on Roth (2015: 488), but flag the territorial claim as ambiguous.

Sovereignty declarations

- In 1973, Lakotas declared a small territory at Wounded Knee independent as the Independent Oglala Nation (Roth 2015: 494). [1973: independence declaration]
- Both Roth (2015: 494) and Minahan (2002: 1744) report that in 1991, the Lakota, with the northern Cheyenne and the Arapahoe declared the 'Confederacy of the Black Hills.' According to Minahan, the declaration attempted to terminate colonial occupation and rejected U.S. sovereignty. [1991: independence declaration]
- The Lakota again declared independence in 2007 (Roth 2015: 494). [2007: independence declaration]

Separatist armed conflict

- The MAR quinquennial rebellion score of the Native Americans is 3 in 1970-1974. From the MAR coding notes it is not clear to which group(s) this should be attributed: "[t]he group [i.e., the Native Americans] began protesting their condition in the late 1940s (PROT45X = 1). During the 1970s the protests took on militant tones (REBEL70X = 3), but recently this type of protest has not been seen (REB01-06 = 0)."
- MAR may refer to the 1973 Wounded Knee incident (a protest joined mostly by Sioux) and some of its follow-ups. Both sides were armed in the Wounded Knee incident and it involved frequent shootings, but violence was too limited to warrant a LVIOLSD code. Two persons, a Lakota and a Cherokee were killed. In addition, a civil rights activists has gone missing. After the incident, more than 60 opponents of the local tribal government's were reportedly murdered, but this is not violence over self-determination.
- Furthermore, in 1975 Pine Ridge (the site of the 1973 incident) became the site of a shootout in which two FBI officers and one Indian rights activist were killed. Again, this is too limited to warrant a LVIOLSD code.
- We find no other evidence of violent activity, and thus the entire movement is coded as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The seven bands of the Sioux make up the Greater Sioux Nation which formed a loose confederacy in the 17th and 18th centuries whose territory was on the Great Plains of the US, (Danver 2015: 519) with their spiritual center being the Black Hills (Minahan 2002: 1741).

- The US bought the northern plains from France as part of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. Treaties were signed with the Sioux in 1815, 1825, and 1851, but these were repeatedly reneged on by the US. The 1851 treaty, The First Treaty of Fort Laramie, recognised the Sioux as an independent sovereign nation who were entitled to large tracts of land (Minahan 2002: 1741).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823's *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that "Indians had the right to occupy their land, but the land itself was owned by the government." (Danver 2015: 395) Secondly, in 1831's *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the court "defined Indian tribes as "domestic dependent nations," establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes' interests and Native American people as wards of the government" (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832,) the "Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government" (Danver 2015: 395).
- The Mdewakanton band of the Sioux were relocated to a reservation in Minnesota as part of the First Laramie Treaty in 1851 but an uprising in 1862 resulted in them being moved to South Dakota. In December 1862, President Abraham Lincoln imprisoned over 1,000 Eastern Sioux and executed 38 who were held responsible for the 1862 uprising. (Danver 2015: 497). Violence continued, however, after encroachments on Sioux land and destruction of buffalo herds. In 1866, Red Cloud of the Western Sioux, the Lakota, joined the war. (Minahan 2002: 1741; Danver 2015: 494) and forced the US Government to the negotiating table.
- The 1868 2nd Fort Laramie Treaty ended the war meant that large tracts of land were ceded to the US government, and created the Great Sioux Reservation which included all of the land in South Dakota west of the Mississippi River (Roth 2015: 493). The treaty also granted them the right to the Black Hills (Hewitt & Cheetham, 2000: 168).
- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has "the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens" (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.).
- Gold was discovered in the Black Hills in 1874, provoking a goldrush and renewed war. General Custer of the US Army was killed alongside 200-300 soldiers by Sitting Bull's Lakota forces in the battle of Little Bighorn in 1876 (Hewitt & Cheetham, 2000: 168). By 1877, the Sioux were forced off the Black Hills, and this area of the reservation was ceded to the US Government and gold prospectors. Sioux land was thus fragmented into smaller reservations.
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title (Danver 2015: 416). The application of this Act resulted in many Sioux being cheated off their lands (Minahan 2002: 1743)
- By 1890, centered around the 'Ghost Dance,' a movement spread around Sioux communities, creating fear for the US government. They subsequently arrested Sioux leaders, bringing them to Wounded Knee. The feared uprising ended with the massacre of 300 men, women and children at Wounded Knee, effectively ending any Sioux resistance. Their remaining land was partitioned again, with the Sioux now living in small reservations on poor quality land, and tiny compared to their rights under the 2nd Treaty of Fort Laramie (Roth 2015: 493).
- The Sioux were granted citizenship from 1924 (Minahan 2002: 1743).
- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 "recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations" as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI). Roth notes that this type of council was not part of Sioux tradition, and was an imposition of an alien system (Roth 2015: 493).
- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the 'termination' policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153).

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed (MRGI). The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples' autonomy and land rights protection. [1971: autonomy concession]
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to "have greater autonomy and to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements" (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]
- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic, 2020) [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1980 the Supreme Court ruled that the Government had broken the 1868 2nd Treaty of Fort Laramie, and that the Sioux should be paid \$100 million dollars (Cutlip, 2018). The Sioux rejected this, however, as the ruling also stated that the Black Hills would never be ceded back to the Sioux control, they would have to renounce their claims on the land, and that accepting the money would be legitimizing an illegal land grab (Roth 2015: 494 and (Hewitt & Cheetham, 2000: 168).
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally-funded programs (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that "tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land" (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]
- One of the most pressing issues facing the Sioux in the 2010s is the Dakota Access Pipeline which was announced in 2014 and approved in 2016. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, with its allies, has staged a strong resistance, through various camps and protest actions, as well as litigation, citing the risk this project causes to the survival of the tribe, its violation of treaty rights, and its cultural impacts (National Museum of the American Indian n.d.). They claim that the pipeline, which goes through their tribal lands, is in violation of federal legislation as well as the Treaty of Fort Laramie. In 2016 President Obama, signed an order to review the Dakota Access Pipeline that the Sioux tribes deem a cultural and existential threat to their land (Hurley 2022). Trump overturned this decision in 2017, and the pipeline was subsequently finished (Hurley 2022). [2016: autonomy restriction]

Regional autonomy

- The Greater Sioux Nation is fragmented among several reservations and many of these have their own tribal councils with autonomy over local affairs. There is thus no overall Sioux regional autonomy, but rather, local level autonomy in individual reservations. For example, the Cheyenne River Reservation, Standing Rock Reservation, or Rosebud Reservation (The United States Attorney's Office District of South Dakota, n.d.). Within these reservations, tribal governments exercise limited regional autonomy, for example in taxation, some local court cases, or managing tribal property and lands. [1964-2020: regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Lakota (Sioux)
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Lakota (Sioux) are an indigenous people (Minahan 2002: 1739) and thus form part of EPR's American Indians group, which is coded as powerless throughout. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1964-2020: powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 1739), there were 205,000 Lakotas in the US in 2002. The WB pegs the US population at 287.6 mio in 2002. [0.0007]

Regional concentration

- We found no precise demographic data; however, the account in Minahan (2002: 1739) the traditional lands of the Lakota (Sioux) have now been lost and the remaining lands constitute small reservations spread over a large area spanning several U.S. states including South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, and Minnesota. Accordingly, the criterion of a single, spatially contiguous ethnic settlement area is not given. [no regional concentration]

Kin

- Minahan (2002: 1739) suggests that there are ca. 10,000 Lakota (Sioux) in Canada, which is below the numeric threshold. We found no other evidence for transborder ethnic kind. [no kin]

Sources

- BBC News (2021). "Deb Haaland: America's First Native Cabinet Secretary." *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior. <https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe (n.d.) *Tribal Government* <https://www.cheyenneriversiouxtribe.org/culture-1> [May 3, 2022]
- Cutlip, Kinbra (2018). "In 1868, Two Nations Made a Treaty, the U.S. Broke It, and Plains Indians are Still Seeking Justice." *Smithsonian Magazine*. November 7. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/1868-two-nations-made-treaty-us-broke-it-and-plains-indian-tribes-are-still-seeking-justice-180970741/> [May 3, 2022]
- Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gibbon, Guy, (2011). Sioux. *Encyclopedia of the Great Plains* <http://plainshumanities.unl.edu/encyclopedia/doc/egp.na.107> [May 3, 2022]
- Greenhouse, Linda. (1989) "Court Splits Over Tribal Control of Land." *The New York Times*. June 30. <https://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/30/us/court-splits-over-tribal-control-of-land.html> [July 9, 2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 167, 203.
- Hurley, Lawrence (2022). "Dakota Access Pipeline suffers U.S. Supreme Court setback." *Reuters*. February 22. <https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/us-supreme-court-turns-away-dakota-pipeline-operators-appeal-2022-02-22/> [July 9, 2022].
- Independent Journal Review (2012). "Lakota Sioux Nation Secedes from the US." *Independent Journal Review*. September 30. <http://www.ijreview.com/2012/09/17695-lakota-sioux-nation-secedes-from-the-us/> [June 24, 2014].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [April 25, 2002].
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 325-327.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 1739-1745.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 30, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- National Museum of the American Indian. (n.d.) *Treaties Still Matter: The Dakota Access Pipeline*. <https://americanindian.si.edu/nk360/plains-treaties/dapl> [July 9, 2022].

- Newscorp Australian Papers (2007). "Lakota Indians Withdraw Treaties Signed With U.S. 150 Years Ago." December 20. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2007/12/20/lakota-indians-withdraw-treaties-signed-with-us-150-years-ago> [June 24, 2014].
- Rosebud Sioux Tribe (n.d.) *Tribal Government*. <https://www.rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov/tribal-government> [May 3, 2022]
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Sack, Carl. (2017). Invisible Nation: Mapping Treaty Boundaries. *Northlandia* <https://northlandia.wordpress.com/2017/02/18/invisible-nation-mapping-sioux-treaty-boundaries/> [May 3, 2022]
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. (n.d.) *History*. <https://www.standingrock.org/about/history/> [May 3, 2022]
- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), "The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act." *39 Am. Indian L. Rev. 1*.
- The United States Attorney's Office District of South Dakota, (n.d.) *Indian Country*. United States Department of Justice. <https://www.justice.gov/usao-sd/indian-country> [May 3, 2022]
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) "The Evolution of the Termination Policy." *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Navajo (Dine)

Activity: 1977-2020

General notes

- The Navajo are sometimes called the Dine, which means people. Their homeland is called Diné Bikéyah, which means 'Navajoland' (Danver 2015: 462).

Movement start and end dates

- The Coalition for Dine Liberation was formed in 1977, hence the start date of the movement. Based on Minahan (2002), the Navajo lost legal appeals to retain lands in 2001. There have been subsequent protests over land rights and water rights almost every year (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Keesing's; Marshall & Gurr 2003; McPherson 2003; Minahan 1996, 2002; Minard 2012; Sheppard 2006). According to Minahan (2016: 316), "in 2014, Navajo leaders reiterated their determination to reinstate the full self-governance that is a traditional part of Navajo culture." Thus, the movement is coded as ongoing. [start date: 1977; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The Coalition for Dine Liberation was founded in 1977 and demanded increased autonomy for the Dine (Navajo). [1977-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The territory claimed by the Coalition for Dine Liberation is the Navajo reservation, which lies in Arizona and also extends into New Mexico and Utah (Roth 2015: 497). We code this claim based on Roth (2015: 496).

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We have not found evidence for any fatalities, and thus the movement is coded NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The Navajo arrived in what is their homeland in Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico around 1000 CE, descendants of the Athapaskan nomads from Alaska. They split into different tribes, the most significant being the Navajo and the Apache, taking on customs and cultural traditions of the pueblo people of the American southwest (Minahan 2002: 1335).
- The Spanish arrived in 1539 but were unable to subdue the Navajo. However, the introduction of sheep changed their lifestyle, and they became a seminomadic people, herding livestock, replacing previous raiding patterns (Minahan 2002: 1335). This lifestyle endured until the beginning of the 19th century, and the Navajo were relatively prosperous and left alone (Danver 2015: 462).
- In 1821 the Navajo land came nominally under Mexican rule, although this was tenuous. Their lands were ceded to the US Government in 1848 (Minahan 2002: 1336). For two decades after this, their situation remained largely the same (Danver 2015: 463).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823's *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that "Indians had the right to occupy their land, but the land itself was owned by the government." (Danver 2015: 395) Secondly, in 1831's *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the court "defined Indian tribes as "domestic dependent nations," establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes' interests and Native American people as wards of the government" (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832,) the "Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government" (Danver 2015: 395).
- In 1864 a military campaign led by Kit Carson of the US Government decimated Navajo lands, killed off their sheep herds, burned their homes and captured thousands of people. Following this, over the next few years, 8,500 Navajo were forced on the 'Long Walk,' a 350 mile trek where they left their homeland on a forced march to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. Many died on the forced march and the conditions upon arrival were dire (Danver 2015: 463).
- In 1868 the Navajo negotiated their return to their homeland and a treaty recognised the Navajo Nation, however this was in return for the ceding of significant parts of their homeland (Minahan 2016: 316).
- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has "the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens" (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium., n.d.).
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title and the 1895 Curtis Act dissolved Indian tribal governments and forced land to be assigned individually" (Danver 2015: 416).
- Oil was discovered on Navajo land in the early 1920s, and speculators started to encroach and enquire after Navajo land. Leases were given out and in 1923 the Navajo established the Navajo Tribal Council in 1923 to deal with this, which essentially leased land for oil extraction to US corporations (Minahan 2002: 1337).
- The Navajo received US citizenship in 1924 (Minahan 2016: 316).
- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 "recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations" as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI). However, the Navajo Tribal Council rejected the opportunity to form a constitutional form of government that the act provided for (Wilkins 2002: 105).
- In 1938, new 'Rules for the Navajo Tribal Council' which constitute the basis of Navajo Government, were adopted by the council, but several aspects of governance remained in the hands of the US Government Department of the Interior (Wilkins 2002: 107).
- Since 1945, extraction of uranium, oil, gas and coal has become the main resource that has filled the coffers of the Navajo economy, but at environmental costs (Power and Curleyo, 2008: 30, 114).
- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the 'termination' policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal

government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153).

- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed. (MRGI). The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples' autonomy and land rights protection. [1971: autonomy concession]
- Minahan (p.1337: 2002) states that on 25 July, 1972, the Navajo were granted self-government and "for the first time in their history, were free from outside political control." We have not found confirming evidence.
- In 1974, the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act was passed to demarcate Hopi and Navajo boundaries, and thus relocate the Navajo from Hopi land. This land was traditionally shared between the two tribes and it sparked a resurgence in Navajo nationalism (Minahan 2002: 1337). [1974: autonomy restriction]
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to "have greater autonomy and to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements" (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]

Concessions and restrictions

- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic, 2020). [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally-funded programmes (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). This was further institutionalised and expanded as a permanent programme by the Tribal Self-Governance Act in 1994 (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 34). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that "tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land" (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations' authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]

Regional autonomy

- The Navajo have their own government with executive, judicial and legislative branches (Navajo Nation, n.d.). According to Roth (2015: 497) “the Navajo Nation is at least as self-governing as any US state: state laws do not apply on the reservation, the Navajo make their own laws (subject to review by the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs), and, at least nominally, the Navajo are a “sovereign nation” on an equal footing with the US (although not always in actual political practice).” [1977-2020: regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Dine (Navajo)
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Dine (Navajo) are an indigenous people (Minahan 2002: 1334) and thus form part of EPR's American Indians group, which is coded as powerless throughout. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1977-2020: powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 1334), there were 305,000 Dine in the US in 2002. The WB pegs the US population at 287.6 mio in 2002. [0.0011]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 1334), the Dine (Navajo) made up 97% of the population of their homeland in 2002, where >65% of all Dine (Navajo) in the U.S. resided. [regional concentration]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder ethnic kin. [no kin]

Sources

- BBC News (2021). "Deb Haaland: America's First Native Cabinet Secretary." *BBC News*.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior.
<https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greenhouse, Linda. (1989) "Court Splits Over Tribal Control of Land." *The New York Times*. June 30.
<https://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/30/us/court-splits-over-tribal-control-of-land.html> [July 9, 2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 203.
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [April 25, 2002].
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- McPherson, Robert S. (2003). *Navajo Land, Navajo Culture: The Utah Experience in the Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 150-152.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 1334-1339.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minard, Anne (2012). "Little Colorado Water Rights Bill Met With Protests From Navajo and Hopi Communities." *Indian Country*. April 14.
<http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2012/04/14/little-colorado-water-rights-bill-met-protests-navajo-and-hopi-communities-108320> [June 24, 2014].
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*.
<http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 24, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*.
<https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- Navajo Nation. (n.d.) *History*. <https://www.navajo-nsn.gov/history.htm> [April 24, 2022]
- Powell, Dana, E. & Curleyo, Andrew. (2008). "K'e, Hozhó, and Non-governmental Politics on the Navajo Nation: Ontologies of Difference Manifest in Environmental Activism." *Anthropological Quarterly*. 81(30).
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Sheppard, Kate (2006). "Navajo Protest Third Coal-Fired Plant on Reservation Land." *Grist*. December 23. <http://grist.org/article/reserving-the-right-the-navajo-protest-at-desert-rock/> [June 24, 2014].

- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), "The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act." *39 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 1.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Wilkins, David E. (2002). "Governance within the Navajo Nation: Have Democratic Traditions Taken Hold?" *Wicazo Sa Review* 17(1): 91-129.
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) "The Evolution of the Termination Policy." *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Other Native American Groups

Activity: 1961-2020

General notes

- Many indigenous groups have made claims for increased self-determination. We code the most politically significant claims separately (Cherokee, Iroquois, Lakota, Navajo, and Pueblo). This movement includes claims made by all other indigenous groups. Furthermore, this movement includes claims made by the Red Power movement, a pan-indigenous self-rule movement.

Movement start and end dates

- We code the start date in 1961, the year the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) was formed. The NIYC made claims for tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, self-determination, and cultural preservation (Shreve 2011: 3). The NIYC became part of the Red Power movement. Indeed, it was NIYC members who first started using the term 'Red Power' (Kýrová & Tóth 2020: 109).
- The American Indian Movement (AIM) was formed in 1968 with an initial focus on civil rights. Soon thereafter, the AIM also started to make claims for greater autonomy (Nittle 2019).
- In 1969, Red Power activists occupied the decommissioned prison island of Alcatraz, an event that brought widespread public attention to the Red Power movement's claims.
- The last major event of the Red Power movement was the 1978 Longest Walk protest, a five-month, 3,000-mile march by Native American activists in opposition to a series of proposed bills that would threaten native land and water rights (Blakemore 2020). The movement continued to exist thereafter, but seems to have lost momentum. According to Nittle (2019), the AIM remains in existence, but its support has clearly declined. Meanwhile, the NIYC is now more locally focused (National Indian Youth Council, n.d.).
- In addition to the pan-indigenous movements, several native American groups also mobilized themselves. This includes the Western Shoshone, which have been engaged in legal battles related to the protection of their ancestral lands (Earthworks n.d.; Native Web; Roth 2015; Rusco 1992). An organization called the Western Shoshone Defense Project was formed in 1992, which has aimed at "regaining control of traditional Western Shoshone treaty lands" (Western Shoshone Defense Project, n.d.). Other indigenous groups which have made claims for increased self-rule include the Haidas and Tlingits, native Alaskans more broadly, and the Ojibwe, members of which played a leading role in the Red Power Movement (Minahan 2002: 711; Roth 2015: 535; MRGI; Milwaukee Public Museum n.d.). [start date: 1961; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The pan-indigenous Red Power movement has made claims for autonomy and land rights. In particular, the AIM's calls were for "autonomy over tribal areas and the restoration of lands that they believed had been illegally seized" (Britannica) while the initial goals of the NIYC were based on the "the principles of self-determination, sovereignty, treaty rights, and cultural preservation" (Shreve 2011: 12). The NIYC were particularly active in protecting fishing rights in the Pacific Northwest in the 1960s.
- In addition, several of the individual groups associated with this movement have made claims for land rights and autonomy (see above). [1961-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- This is an umbrella movement which consists of all indigenous groups in the U.S. minus those that are separately coded. As such, the territory claimed consists of a patchwork of many separate tribal lands across the U.S. We use the GeoEPR polygon as an approximation, with the following modifications:
 - o Land claimed by the Cherokee and the Pueblos, which are separately coded and whose SDMs were active by the time the umbrella movement emerged, is subtracted.
 - o Land claimed by the Dine (Navajo), Iroquois, and Lakota (Sioux) is included until the respective points in time that their separate movements emerged (i.e., 1977 for Dine and Iroquois, and 1964 for Lakota).

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- The MAR quinquennial rebellion score of the Native Americans is 3 in 1970-1974 based on the following account: “[t]he group [i.e., the Native Americans] began protesting their condition in the late 1940s (PROT45X = 1). During the 1970s the protests took on militant tones (REBEL70X = 3), but recently this type of protest has not been seen (REB01-06 = 0).”
 - o MAR may refer to the 1973 Wounded Knee incident (a protest joined mostly by Sioux but led by the AIM) and some of its follow-ups. Both sides were armed in the Wounded Knee incident and it involved frequent shootings, but violence was too limited to warrant an LVIOLSD code. Two persons, a Lakota and a Cherokee were killed. In addition, a civil rights activist has gone missing. After the incident, more than 60 opponents of the local tribal government’s were reportedly murdered, but this is not violence over self-determination.
 - o Furthermore, in 1975 Pine Ridge (the site of the 1973 incident) became the site of a shootout in which two FBI officers and one Indian rights activist were killed. AIM members were implicated in the shootings and one, Leonard Peltier, was convicted (Nittle 2019). Again, this is too limited to warrant a LVIOLSD code.
- We find no other evidence of violent activity, and thus the entire movement is coded as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Native Americans are the original inhabitants of America, and numbered between 3 and 12 million people living in around 600 different societies before colonization (MRGI). The Spanish, followed by the Dutch, French, and British, began to colonize the U.S. from the 15th century. Initially, settlers had largely peaceful relations with indigenous communities, but this shifted as hunger for more land, resources, and the spread of European disease decimated native populations. Successive military incursions and a series of treaties reduced the indigenous groups’ autonomy (MRGI).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823’s *Johnson v. M’Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that “Indians had the right to occupy their land, but the land itself was owned by the government.” (Danver 2015: 395). Secondly, in 1831’s

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, the court “defined Indian tribes as “domestic dependent nations,” establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes’ interests and Native American people as wards of the government” (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832,) the “Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government” (Danver 2015: 395).

- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has “the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens” (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium., n.d.).
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title and the 1895 Curtis Act dissolved Indian tribal governments and forced land to be assigned individually” (Danver 2015: 416).
- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 “recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations” as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI).
- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the ‘termination’ policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153). [1953: autonomy restriction]

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed. The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples’ autonomy and land rights protection. [1971: autonomy concession]
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to “have greater autonomy and to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements” (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]
- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic, 2020) [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally funded programs (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). This was further institutionalized and expanded as a permanent program by the Tribal Self-Governance Act in 1994 (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 34). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that “tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land” (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]

- The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]

Regional autonomy

- Various separate tribal governments existed during the period this movement was active and these had a degree of regional autonomy. [1961-2020: regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Other Native American Groups
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Native Americans are coded as powerless throughout 1961-2020. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1961-2020: powerless]

Group size

- This is an umbrella movement which consists of all indigenous groups in the U.S. minus those that are separately coded. As such, the group size is coded as the total of all indigenous groups minus those that are separately coded. EPR pegs the Native Americans' population share at 0.78%, but this seems rather low. According to the 2010 census, the total native population was 1.7%. From this, we subtract:
 - o The population shares of the Cherokee (0.19%) and the Pueblos (0.04%), which are separately coded and whose SDMs were active by the time the umbrella movement emerged.
 - o The population shares of the Dine (0.11%), Iroquois (0.05%), and Lakota (0.07%) are included until the respective points in time that their separate movements emerged (i.e., 1977 for Dine and Iroquois, and 1964 for Lakota).
- [1961-1964: 0.0147; 1965-1977: 0.0140; 1978-2020: 0.0124]

Regional concentration

- Both EPR and MAR code Native Americans as regionally concentrated. However, this group combines a variety of individual groups which live in different parts of the U.S. Therefore, the criterion of a spatially contiguous regional base is clearly not given. [no regional concentration]

Kin

- Both EPR and MAR code First Nations in Canada as transborder ethnic kin. First Nations make up more than 100,000 people (Statistics Canada 2022). [kin in adjacent country]

Sources

- BBC News (2021). "Deb Haaland: America's First Native Cabinet Secretary." *BBC News*.
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].
- Blakemore, Erin. (2020). "The Radical History of the Red Power Movement's fight for Native American Sovereignty." *National Geographic*. November 25.
<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/red-power-movement-radical-fight-native-american-sovereignty> [July 27, 2022].
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior.
<https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Earthworks, (n.d.) *Westerns Shoshone Nation*. https://earthworks.org/stories/western_shoshone_nation/ [May 15, 2022]
- Federal User Community (2021). "American Indian Reservations / Federally Recognized Tribal Entities." <https://hub.arcgis.com/datasets/fedmaps::american-indian-reservations-federally-recognized-tribal-entities/explore?location=35.191821%7C-106.559638%7C8.00> [June 16, 2021].
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Greenhouse, Linda. (1989) "Court Splits Over Tribal Control of Land." *The New York Times*. June 30.
<https://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/30/us/court-splits-over-tribal-control-of-land.html> [July 9, 2022].
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 203.
- Kiel, Doug. (2013). "Rebuilding Indigenous Nations." *Expedition Magazine* 55.3 (2013): n. pag. *Expedition Magazine*. Penn Museum, 2013 Web. 23 Jul 2022
<http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/?p=18871> [July 23, 2022].
- Kýrová, Lucie, & Tóth, György Ferenc. (2020) Red Power at 50: Re-Evaluations and Memory Introduction," *Comparative American Studies An International Journal*, 17(2,): 107-116.
- Milwaukee Public Museum. (n.d.) "Spearfishing Controversy." <https://www.mpm.edu/educators/wirp/nations/ojibwe/spearfishing-controversy> [May 13, 2022]
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.

- Minorities at Risk Project (MAR) (2009). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 30, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- National Indian Youth Council (n.d.) *History*. <https://niyc-alb.com/history/> [July 23, 2022].
- Native Web. “How to Kill a Nation” U.S. Policy in *Western Shoshone Country Since 1863*. <https://www.nativeweb.org/pages/legal/shoshone/pamphlet.html> [May 15, 2022].
- Nittle, Nadra Kareem. (2019) “The History of the American Indian Movement (AIM),” *Thoughtco*. March 8. <https://www.thoughtco.com/american-indian-movement-profile-2834765> [July 23, 2022].
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Rusco, E. R. (1992). Historic Change in Western Shoshone Country: The Establishment of the Western Shoshone National Council and Traditionalist Land Claims. *American Indian Quarterly*, 16(3), 337–360. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1185796> [May 15, 2022].
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Shreve, B. G. 2011. *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Statistics Canada (2022). *Statistics on Indigenous People*. https://www.statcan.gc.ca/en/subjects-start/indigenous_peoples [July 23].
- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), “The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.” *39 Am. Indian L. Rev. 1*.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). “Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Western Shoshone Defense Project Records. Series 3: Western Shoshone National Council. Western Shoshone Defense Project Records, 2013-10. University of Nevada, Reno. Special Collections Department. https://archive.library.unr.edu/public/repositories/2/archival_objects/150292 [May 15, 2022].
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) “The Evolution of the Termination Policy.” *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Pueblo

Activity: 1945-2020

General notes

- Pueblo is an umbrella term for several sedentary tribes, mostly in the New Mexico area. The word Pueblo comes from the Spanish for village. Thus, in the rest of this section, Pueblo with a capital 'P' refers to the people, and pueblo with a small 'p' refers to a town that the Pueblo live in.

Movement start and end dates

- The first evidence of the All Indian Pueblo Council (AIPC) dates back to 1598, when there were still more than seventy-five Pueblo villages, inhabited by around 248,000 people, occupying 87,000 square miles in New Mexico and Arizona. In the twentieth century, the AIPC (called All Pueblo Council APC before 1965) pushed for land rights and managed to get the favorable Pueblo Land Act passed in 1924.
- According to Walden (2011: 6), "there are many moments that can be pointed to as the beginning of the AIPC" but it was only in the 1920s when the APC "formalized itself as the official representative confederate council of all of the New Mexico Pueblos" (Walden 2011: 17). A formative moment was the struggle against the Bursum Bill of 1922 which would have authorized the acquisition of Pueblo lands. Based on this, we code 1922 as the start date of the movement. Since our data set starts only in 1945, we code the movement from 1945. We found no separatist violence before 1945, and thus code prior non-violent activity.
- Land rights continued to be the primary purpose of the organization. The autonomous pueblos, which have shrunk to nineteen, adopted a formal constitution in 1970 (Sandercock 1998: 213). In addition to land rights and in the light of a resurgence of Pueblo culture and religion in the 1980s and 1990s, the pueblos also demanded "greater autonomy and the recognition of their historical sovereignty" (Minahan 2002: 1528). This demand is confirmed by Walden (2011: 78), who also states that the Pueblos push for more self-determination. The AIPC continues to be active, thus we code the movement as ongoing. [start date: 1922; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- Since the 1940s, the All Indian Pueblo Council (AIPC, called All Pueblo Council APC before 1965) has pushed for land rights and later (in the 1980s and 1990s) also demanded "greater autonomy and the recognition of their historical sovereignty" (Minahan 2002: 1528). Walden (2011: 78), who also states that the Pueblos push for more self-determination within the United States, confirms this demand. The AIPC is now called the All Pueblo Council of Governors (APCG) (APCG 2022) [1945-2020: autonomy claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Throughout most of the post-war period, the AIPC has made demands for autonomy on behalf of 19 autonomous pueblos in New Mexico. A comprehensive list of these pueblos is found on the webpage of the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center (2021). We did not find evidence that the boundaries of these areas changed during the relevant period. We code the different pueblos' boundaries based on a shapefile of Tribal lands published by the Federal User Community (2021) through the ArcGIS Hub.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- No separatist violence was found; hence the entire movement is coded with NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The Pueblo, as well as the closely related Zuni and Hopi, are the descendants of the ancient Ansazi, who have lived in the southwest of what is now the US for thousands of years. They settled in what is now northern New Mexico and northeastern Arizona, establishing towns, pueblos, with distinctive adobe architecture by the 1100s. They were an agricultural civilization (Minahan 2002: 1525).
- The Spanish arrived in the area in 1539 to find around 80 separate Pueblo nations. They were given the name Pueblo to describe each of the towns. The Spanish were looking for the fabled Seven Cities of Cibola, a legend regarding the supposed existence of extremely rich cities that were waiting to be found. The Spanish attacked the local Zuni pueblos in the 1540s, believing that they were hiding such riches (Minahan 2002: 1526). In 1620 the Spanish Governor presented the Pueblo with the Cane of Authority which recognizes their sovereignty (Minahan 2002: 1526). Throughout the 1600s, the Spanish began to impose their religion, administration, and governance on the various pueblos, reducing their number from 81 to 31, while the population of the Pueblo people shrank by 68% (Danver 2015: 482). Eventually, the Spanish treatment of the Pueblo sparked a rebellion.
- In 1680, the Pueblo united for the first time to drive the Spanish out of their lands and resumed their traditional practices, albeit with Spanish cultural influences such as the use of horses. (Minahan 2002: 1526) The Spanish came back, and reconquered Pueblo lands, eventually bringing all the Pueblo under Spanish administration and by the end of the 17th century, had largely pacified the Pueblo people, who subsequently lived relatively independently, and with peaceful relations with the Spanish. (Danver 2015: 482).
- When Mexico declared independence from Spain in 1821, it claimed the Pueblo lands although acknowledged their historical sovereignty by presenting the Pueblo governors with Canes of Authority (APCG, 2022). They thus left them to govern themselves in exchange for taxes (Minahan 2002: 1526).
- After the US-Mexico War of 1846-1848, the US gained control of Pueblo territory, and through the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hildago, recognized Pueblo land titles (Minahan 2002: 1526).
- Three US Supreme Court cases drastically reduced the sovereignty of all Native Americans. First, in 1823's *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), the court ruled that "Indians had the right to occupy their land, but the land itself was owned by the government." (Danver 2015: 395) Secondly, in 1831's *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, the court "defined Indian tribes as "domestic dependent nations," establishing the federal government as the sole body in charge of the tribes' interests and Native American people as wards of the government" (Danver 2015: 395). In the last case, *Worcester v.*

Georgia (1832,) the “Court stated that tribes were the undisputed possessors of the soil, but as a weak state under the protection of the federal government” (Danver 2015: 395). Despite this, in 1876, the case of *United States vs Joseph* determines that as the Pueblo were a settled people, they were not ‘wards’ of the US Government and therefore didn’t qualify for the minimal protection afforded to other, ‘nomadic’ tribes. This catalysed significant amounts of non-indigenous settlers moving to Pueblo land. (APCG, 2022)

- In 1871, Congress passed the Appropriations Act which ended the ratification of treaties between the US government and various tribes, and declared that Congress has “the sole governing power to make laws controlling the lives of Tribal governments and their citizens” (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.).
- The Dawes Act of 1887 abolished communal property of the native tribes in an attempt to impose individual land title and the 1895 Curtis Act dissolved Indian tribal governments and forced land to be assigned individually (Danver 2015: 416).
- In 1921, New Mexico Senator, Holm O. Bursum, tried to pass a bill to settle land dispute claims on Pueblo land. The bill would, in effect, have transferred huge tracts of Pueblo land to settler ownership. However, Pueblo leaders, with white allies, managed to defeat the bill in 1922 (Danver 2015: 483).
- In 1924 the Snyder Act allowed for Native American citizenship, but this was rejected by Pueblo leaders as a tool for assimilation (ACPG, 2022).
- In 1924 the Pueblo Lands Act was passed which established the Pueblo Lands Board to hear Pueblo land claims and establish Pueblo boundaries. It put the onus of proof of land ownership on non-Pueblo settlers, provided means for compensation for Pueblos who had lost land, and effectively ended the encroachment of land (Walden 2011: 36-37). This thus addressed the disputes that had been ongoing since the *United States vs Joseph* case (ACPG, 2022).
- The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 “recognised limited sovereignty for Native American tribes, and mandated elected councils to assume partial control over reservations” as well as economic support and more healthcare and education provision on reservations (MRGI).

Concessions and restrictions

- In the 1950s, the U.S. government instituted the ‘termination’ policy, which aimed to assimilate Native Americans and encourage migration to urban areas from reservations. Under the termination policy, civil and criminal jurisdiction was transferred from the tribes and federal government to the state level, tax exemptions were ended, state judicial and legislative authority was imposed, federal assistance was discontinued, and the selling of native land to the highest bidder was facilitated. Overall, the termination policy effectively ended tribal sovereignty. The termination policy was gradually enacted over several years, but a key catalyst was the Concurrent Resolution No. 108, which was passed by the U.S. government in 1953 (Wilkinson and Briggs 1977: 150-153). [1953: autonomy restriction]
- In 1965, the All Indian Pueblo Council, representing 19 pueblos in New Mexico, adopted a constitution, as mandated under the Indian Reorganization Act 1934. The concession in the form of the actual act was more than ten years before the start date, hence no concession is coded.
- In 1968, the Indian Civil Rights Act was passed (MRGI). The Indian Civil Rights act was focused on individual-level instead of collective rights; therefore, we do not code a concession.
- In 1970, the Taos Pueblo won title to the Blue Lake. In 1908 this land been designated as part of the Taos Forest Reserve, thus moving thousands of acres of Taos Reservation land into federal hands. The 1970 Resolution settled “an Indian claim by awarding land rather than cash for the first time in the history of United States-Indian relations” (Graybill 2001: 126). [1970: autonomy concession]
- The termination policy (see above) was gradually weakened over the course of the 1960s and officially ended in 1971 through the Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium n.d.). This increased indigenous peoples’ autonomy and land rights protection. [1971: autonomy concession]
- Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, Public Law 93-638 (ISDEAA) in 1975 which allows for Native American tribes to “have greater autonomy and

to have the opportunity to assume the responsibility for programs and services administered to them on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior through contractual agreements” (Bureau of Indian Affairs n.d.). This gave American indigenous groups the power to directly manage and oversee federal funds, to implement their own projects and programs, rather than them being implemented by the federal government itself (Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.). [1975: autonomy concession]

- The US Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978, which permitted access to sacred sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom of worship (National Geographic, 2020) [1978: cultural rights concession]
- In 1988, the ISDEAA was amended to strengthen the original law and to establish the Tribal Self Governance Demonstration Project, an experiment which allowed greater Native American control and flexibility over federally-funded programs (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 31-32). In 1990, the Cherokee Nation participated in this program, signing an agreement with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, giving it direct control of millions of dollars of federal money (L.A. Times, 1990). This was further institutionalized and expanded as a permanent program by the Tribal Self-Governance Act in 1994 (Strommer and Osborne 2014: 34). [1988: autonomy concession]
- In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that “tribal councils could not limit land uses by non-Natives on reservation land” (MRGI) that was deemed open, i.e. already under mixed ownership and partially developed by non-Natives (Greenhouse, 1989). It is not clear whether indigenous groups had had that right before this, so we do not code a restriction.
- In 1990, the US passed the Native American Languages Act regarding the protection of indigenous languages and in 1992 authorized a grant program to actuate this protection. (MRGI). [1990: cultural rights concession]
- The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act was passed in 2015, which established the Tribal Transportation Self-Governance Program. This expanded tribal nations authority, control, and flexibility over federal funding for tribal transportation programs such as road construction (Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium, n.d.). [2015: autonomy concession]

Regional autonomy

- Regional autonomy was established when in 1965, when the All Indian Pueblo Council adopted its constitution (Walden 2011: 101). Given the January 1st rule, regional autonomy is coded from 1966. [1966-2020: regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

- Regional autonomy was established when in 1965, when the All Indian Pueblo Council adopted its constitution (Walden 2011: 101). [1965: establishment of regional autonomy]

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Pueblo
<i>Scenario</i>	No match/n: 1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	American Indians
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	205000

Power access

- The Pueblos are an indigenous people (Minahan 2002: 1523f) and thus form part of EPR's American Indians group, which is coded as powerless throughout. Native Americans remained without representation in the U.S. cabinet until 2021, when Deb Haaland (a Pueblo) became Interior Secretary (BBC News 2021). [1945-2020: powerless]

Group size

- According to Minahan (2002: 1523), there were 102,000 Pueblos in the US in 2002. The WB pegs the US population at 287.6 mio in that same year. [0.0004]

Regional concentration

- We could not find sufficiently precise demographic data, but the account in Minahan (2002: 1523) suggests that the Pueblo homeland consists of 21 separate entities, most of which along the Rio Grande but with some also in other areas. Furthermore, Minahan also suggests that many Pueblo live outside their reservataions in cities such as Albuquerque, Santa Fe, or Taos. Other sources confirm that the criterion of a single spatially contiguous settlement area seems not met (e.g., <http://www.kstrom.net/isk/maps/nm/nmmap.html>). [not regionally concentrated]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder kin. [no kin]

Sources

- All Pueblo Council of Governors (APCG). (2022). *Our Journey*. <https://www.apcg.org/journey/> [April 4, 2022].
- BBC News (2021). "Deb Haaland: America's First Native Cabinet Secretary." *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-56421097> [March 2, 2022].
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (n.d.) *Self-Determination*. U.S. Department of the Interior. <https://www.bia.gov/regional-offices/great-plains/self-determination#:~:text=Great%20Plains&text=The%20Act%20allowed%20for%20Indian,the%20Interior%20through%20contractual%20agreements>. [April 17, 2022].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Danver, Steven L. (ed.) (2015). *Native Peoples of the World: An Encyclopedia of Groups, Cultures and Contemporary Issues*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Federal User Community (2021). "American Indian Reservations / Federally Recognized Tribal Entities." <https://hub.arcgis.com/datasets/fedmaps::american-indian-reservations-federally-recognized-tribal-entities/explore?location=35.191821%7C-106.559638%7C8.00> [June 16, 2021].
- Graybill, Andrew. (2001). "Strong on the Merits and Powerfully Symbolic: The Return of Blue Lake to Taos Pueblo." *New Mexico Historical Review* 76 (2).
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 20-22, 203.
- Indian Pueblo Cultural Center (2021). "Gateway to the 19 Pueblos of New Mexico." <https://indianpueblo.org/> [June 16, 2021].

- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 1523-1529.
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Minority Rights Group International. *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Groups*. <http://minorityrights.org/directory/> [April 30, 2022].
- National Geographic. (2020, April 27) *Native Americans and Freedom of Religion*. <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/article/native-americans-and-freedom-religion/> [April 17, 2022].
- Sandercock, Leonie (1998). *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*. University of California Press.
- Self Governance Communication and Education Tribal Consortium. (n.d.) *Tribal Self-Governance Timeline*. <https://www.tribalselfgov.org/resources/milestones-tribal-self-governance/#:~:text=An%20Act%20to%20provide%20maximum,Indian%20people%3B%20to%20establish%20a> [April 17, 2022].
- Strommer Geoffrey D. & Osborne, Stephen D. (2014), “The History, Status, and Future of Tribal Self-Governance Under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.” *39 Am. Indian L. Rev. 1*.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). “Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Walden, Robin S. (2011). *The Pueblo Confederation's Political Wing: The All Indian Pueblo Council, 1920–1975*. Master Thesis, University of New Mexico. <http://dspace.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/12812/finaldraftsubmittedPDF.pdf?sequence=1> [August 25, 2017].
- Wilkinson, Charles F. & Biggs, Eric R (1977) “The Evolution of the Termination Policy.” *5 Am. Indian L. Rev.* 139.

Puerto Ricans

Activity: 1952-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- Puerto Rico was a Spanish colony until 1898, when it was ceded to the U.S. In the early 19th century, independence movements mushroomed across Latin America; Puerto Rico, where no independence movement (yet) developed, was the exception to the rule (Encyclopedia Britannica). The first stirrings of an independence movement came only somewhat later.
- The first evidence of organized activity we found is in 1867, when the Revolutionary Committee was formed, a group committed to Puerto Rican and Cuban independence. In 1868 the Committee declared the independence of Puerto Rico. The poorly planned revolt was quickly suppressed (Encyclopedia Britannica).
- The movement re-emerged in the 1880s and has since been active more or less constantly: Encyclopedia Britannica reports that Román Baldorioty de Castro led a movement for Puerto Rican autonomy during the 1880s. In 1887 de Castro co-founded the Autonomist Party, which supported autonomy from the Spanish government (the party's date of formation is 1897 according to Encyclopedia Britannica, but this appears to be wrong; most other sources note 1887; moreover, de Castro died in 1889 and he is said to have co-founded the party according to multiple sources, including Britannica). As this is the earliest evidence for (continued and uninterrupted) organized separatist activity we found (that carried over to the post-WWII phase), 1887 is coded as start date.
- The movement has continued to be active since. Independence for Puerto Rico ranged among the aims of the insurgents in the 1895-1898 Cuban War of Independence, though we found no evidence that the Puerto Ricans also participated in the Cuban War (see Sarkees & Wayman 2010: 270-271). In 1898 the Federal Party was formed, which supported greater autonomy from the U.S. In 1904, the Union Party was formed, an advocate of greater self-government for the island. Shortly before the turnover, there had been a local uprising against Spanish rule.
- The 1900 Foraker Act gave Puerto Rico a certain degree of autonomy, including a popularly elected House of Representatives. In 1914 the Puerto Rican parliament voted unanimously for independence, but this was rejected.
- In 1917 Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship.
- In 1922 the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party was formed (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 20). A number of other pro-independence or pro-autonomy parties were formed in subsequent years, including the Liberal Party of Puerto Rico (founded in 1932). Among the most notable is the Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP), which was founded in 1946 with the purpose of seeking and obtaining independence for Puerto Rico (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 240). The PIP is committed to achieving Puerto Rico's national freedom and laying the foundation for a sound, responsible transition from the present-day "colonial" government to full-fledged independence.
- In our data set, we begin to code the Puerto Ricans in 1952, when the Puerto Ricans were given a delegate to Congress (who can vote in committees but not in the House). Before, we consider the Puerto Rican movement a decolonization movement. UCDP/PRIO notes a low-level armed conflict between the U.S. government and the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party in 1950. However, we found no violence in 1951 and thus note that immediate prior activity was non-violent.
- The PIP continued to be active as of 2020 (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Keesing's; Marshall & Gurr 2003, 2005; Minahan 1996, 2002; Partido Independentista Puertorriqueño). [start date: 1887; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- Different organizations have made claims for increased autonomy or outright independence, with the most notable being the Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP), which was founded in 1946 and demanded independence for Puerto Rico (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 240; Minahan 2002: 1530ff). [1952-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- SDM activity dates to 1887 when Puerto Rico was a colony of Spain. Initially, the claim was for internal autonomy. As noted above, independence claims existed during the Cuban War of Independence, but it is not clear whether the claim had local backing (Sarkees & Wayman 2010: 270-271). We could, however, find several local parties which have made claims for outright independence from 1904 onwards.
 - o The Federal Party was founded in 1898. The main aims for the Federal Party appear to be greater autonomy.
 - o In 1904, the Federal Party became the Union Party. It made claims for any autonomy up to and including independence.
 - o The Union Party abandoned the claim for potential independence in 1922 spurring the creation of the Nationalist Party. The Nationalist Party, founded in 1922, supported complete cultural and political independence (House of Representatives n.d.).
 - o The Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP) was founded in 1946 and demanded independence for Puerto Rico (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 240; Minahan 2002: 1530ff).
- The question is whether the start date of the independence movement should be pegged to 1904 (formation of Union Party) or 1922 (formation of Nationalist Party). Hewitt and Cheetham (2000: 240) begin with the creation of the Nationalist Party whilst other sources like Minahan (2002: 1533) suggest that independence sentiment only increased significantly in the 1930s while earlier claims were mostly around autonomy.
- However, the Library of Congress entry on Luis Muñoz Rivera, one of the Union Party's founders, was told by Woodrow Wilson to drop the independence claim in return for amending the Foraker Act (LoC n.d.). This clearly suggests political significance. [start date: 1904; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Puerto Ricans have demanded independence for the current U.S. territory of Puerto Rico. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- There was a Puerto Rican terrorist group called the Macheteros which in 1979 killed two U.S. sailors and staged a number of bombing attacks (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 179-180), but the

LVIOLSD threshold was not crossed in any year. Hence a NVIOLSD classification for the entire movement. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- Puerto Rico, an island, was controlled by the Arawaks before Spanish colonization in 1509. After decimating the local population through forced labor, disease and mistreatment, the Spanish began to import slaves to meet labor needs in 1513 (Minahan 2002: 1532). The island was a plantation economy until the 1800s when discontent at Spanish rule began to surface.
- Slavery was abolished in 1873 but discontent with Spanish rule increased. In early 1898, the Spanish granted Puerto Rico autonomy. A few months later, the US occupied Puerto Rico and took control of the island after defeating the Spanish in the US-American war. It remained under US military occupation until 1900 when a civil administration took control (Minahan 2002: 1532).
- The 1900 Puerto Rico Organic Act established a Puerto Rico Government, including a house of delegates, an executive council and a governor, all appointed by the US President (Office of the Historian and Office of the Clerk 2013: 746).
- In 1917 Puerto Rico was designated a US territory and Puerto Ricans were granted US citizenship (Office of the Historian and Office of the Clerk 2013: 746).
- In the early part of the 20th century, Puerto Rico saw social, economic and demographic changes. The US administration brought in education, health and sanitation developments, the population increased, and inequality grew. Thousands also moved to the US mainland, where they faced discrimination, catalyzing nationalist sentiment (Minahan 2002: 1533).
- In 1947, the Puerto Rico Organic Act was amended so Puerto Ricans could elect their own governor (Office of the Historian and Office of the Clerk 2013: 746). [1947: autonomy concession]
- In 1948, the U.S-appointed governor passed Law 53, La Ley de la Mordaza, otherwise known as the Gag law, which prohibited the singing of the Puerto Rican national anthem, to fly the national flag, or to mobilize for independence (Díaz 2022). [1948: cultural rights restriction]
- In 1950 President Truman passed the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, which granted a plebiscite on the island's relationship with the US (Office of the Historian and Office of the Clerk, 2013: 746). In 1951 the plebiscite was held. Puerto Ricans voted for the proposed commonwealth status (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000: 241). Henceforth, Puerto Rico could elect its own local government and representatives to the House and Senate (Minahan 2002: 1533). [1951: autonomy concession]

Concessions and restrictions

- In 1957 the Gag Law, which effectively outlawed expressions of Puerto Rican nationalism, was repealed by the government of Puerto Rico (Díaz 2022). We do not code this as the legislation was adopted by Puerto Rico itself, suggesting they would have been free to do this already before 1957.
- Throughout the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, inspired and supported by the communist revolution in Cuba, the Puerto Rican nationalist movement became more radical, left wing, and militant. In response, the US government cracked down through persecution of activists, which only stoked further nationalist sentiment (Roth 2015: 434).
- A plebiscite was held in 1967 which gave the Puerto Ricans three choices: independence, statehood, or continuation of the status quo. The status quo received 60% of the vote, 39% for statehood and less than 1% for independence. Five similar referendums were held 1993, 1998, 2012, 2017 and 2020. None of these referendums resulted in a significant majority for independence and in recent years, preference for statehood has in fact grown. These referendums were all consultative and initiated by the Puerto Rican government; however, they were held with the explicit approval by the central government. According to Peters (1995: 206) Puerto Rico has the right to hold non-binding referendums on its status in accordance with a 1960 law that was

approved by the US government in 1962. In line with the codebook, we code the central government agreeing to status referendums in 1960 as a concession. [1960: independence concession]

- In the context of an economic crisis in Puerto Rico, President Obama signed into law the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) in 2016, which gave the US central government substantial budgetary and financial control over the island (Díaz 2022). [2016: autonomy restriction].

Regional autonomy

- Puerto Rico has commonwealth status and as such has substantial autonomy. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Puerto Ricans
<i>Scenario</i>	No match
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	-
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	-

Power access

- Puerto Rico is an US overseas territory. Overseas territories are not coded by EPR; however, EPR does include Latinos and Latinas on the mainland, which it codes as powerless until and including 2008. We found evidence for one cabinet member with Puerto Rican origin, Aida Alvarez, who served as Administrator of the Small Business Administration between 1997 and 2001; however, the EPR coding notes suggest that any (generally minimal) representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. cabinet had been largely “token” until Obama’s presidency. From 2009-2012, EPR codes the Latinos and Latinas as included because Hilda Solis became Secretary of Labor in 2009. However, Solis is Mexican-American. We code the Puerto Ricans as powerless on this basis while noting a slight ambiguity due to the one-time representation in the 1990s. [1952-2020: powerless]

Group size

- Minahan (2002: 1530) suggests that there were ca. 5.75 mio Puerto Ricans in the U.S in 2002. The WB pegs the US population at 287.6 million in that same year. [0.02]

Regional concentration

- Minahan (2002: 1530) suggests that Puerto Ricans made up 88% of the population of Puerto Rico in 2002, where ca. 60% if all Puerto Ricans in the U.S. lived at the time. [regional concentration]

Kin

- Both EPR and MAR code ethnic kinship ties between Spanish-speakers in the U.S. and Spanish-speaking nations in the Caribbean (specifically Cuba) and Mexico. Puerto Ricans also have close ties to people in the neighboring Dominican Republic. [kin in adjacent country]

Sources

- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Díaz, Jaquira, (2022). Let Puerto Rico Be Free. *The Atlantic*. September 20.
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2022/11/puerto-rico-independence-not-statehood/671482/> [October 22, 2022].
- Encyclopedia Britannica. "Puerto Rico." <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/482879/Puerto-Rico/54552/Movements-toward-self-government> [April 27, 2015].
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Håvard Strand (2002). "Armed Conflict 1946-2001: A New Dataset." *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5): 615-637.
- Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, pp. 19-20, 106-107, 179-180, 240-241.
- House of Representatives (n.d.) Political Parties of Puerto Rico, *History, Art and Archives*.
<https://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/HAIC/Historical-Data/Political-Parties-of-Puerto-Rico/> [April 4, 2023].
- Keesing's Record of World Events. <http://www.keesings.com> [April 25, 2002].
- Library of Congress (n.d.) "Luis Muñoz Rivera", *Hispanic Americans in Congress, 1922-1995*.
<https://www.loc.gov/rr/hispanic/congress/munozrivera.html> [April 4, 2023].
- Marshall, Monty G., and Ted R. Gurr (2003). *Peace and Conflict 2003: A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements and Democracy*. College Park, MD: Center for International Development and Conflict Management, p. 63.
- Minahan, James (1996). *Nations without States: A Historical Dictionary of Contemporary National Movements*. London: Greenwood Press, pp. 447-449.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 1530-1535.
- Office of the Historian and Office of the Clerk (2013). *Hispanic Americans in Congress 1822-2012*. United States House of Representatives. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-CDOC-108hdoc225/pdf/GPO-CDOC-108hdoc225.pdf> [October 22, 2022].
- Partido Independentista Puertorriqueño. <http://www.independencia.net/index.php?lang=es> [June 24, 2014].
- Peters, A. (1995). *Das Gebietsreferendum im Völkerrecht: Seine Bedeutung im Licht der Staatenpraxis nach 1989*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- Petersson, Therese, Shawn Davis, Amber Deniz, Garoun Engström, Nanar Hawach, Stina Högladh, Margareta Sollenberg, and Magnus Öberg (2021). "Organized Violence 1989-2020, with a Special Emphasis on Syria." *Journal of Peace Research* 58(4): 809-825.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Frank Wayman (2010). *Resort to War: 1816 - 2007*. Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Southerners

Activity: 1994-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The League of the South is a separatist organization with chapters in all states of the ex-Confederacy and a membership of over 6,000. It was founded in 1994, hence the start of the movement. The League wants to secede from the United States and in its “New Dixie Manifesto” claims that “America is only a geographical expression.” The movement continues to be active as of 2020 (Hewitt & Cheatham 2000; Southern Poverty Law Center, 2017; League of the South Homepage). [start date: 1994; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The League of the South’s goal is to secede from the U.S. and restore the former Confederacy (Hewitt & Cheatham 2000: 170; Roth 2015: 473). [1994-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1994; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Claims vary, but according to Roth (2015: 473), the most serious claim is the one by the League of the South. The League of the South claims the 11 states of the Confederation of Southern States (CSS), but without Texas, and with Oklahoma and Kentucky added. In total, this corresponds to 12 of today’s 50 U.S. states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. A less significant group also makes claims to Texas, but per Roth we treat the CSS claim as dominant. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no reports of separatist violence. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- What is known as the South was originally inhabited by several Native American Tribes. Since 1607, when the town of Jamestown was established in Virginia, the area began to be settled by the British (Minahan 2002: 1793).
- The slave trade massively impacted the demographics of the South. By the end of the 18th century, Blacks constituted a third of the population and almost the entire workforce (Minahan 2002: 1794).
- An industrializing North versus a slave-dependent, agricultural south meant that divisions, politically, culturally, and economically, grew in the 19th century. Northern States increasingly criticized the southern plantation system – the system of slavery - while the South wanted to extend slavery to the western states, which many northern states rejected (Minahan 2002: 1794).
- Southern states unilaterally seceded in 1860-1, which led to the American Civil War (Minahan 2002: 1794). After the withdrawal of Union troops in 1877, a political, legal and cultural system of racism, marginalization, and discrimination against black people characterized the South. Segregation was enforced through the Jim Crow laws (Minahan 2002: 1795).
- The collapse of the cotton industry in the 1930s and increasing migration to cities changed the demographics of the South and after World War II the South began to industrialize (Minahan, 2002: 1795).
- The 1954 Supreme Court Decision that segregated schooling was unconstitutional was the start of several gains for black people in the South, including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and a greater number of black people voting and participating in political life (Minahan, 2002: 1796). White nationalist groups such as the KKK and racist extremism, continued to operate, inflicting violence and fear among black populations.

Concessions and restrictions

NA

Regional autonomy

- All southern states have substantial autonomy. [regional autonomy].

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Southerners
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Whites
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	201000

Power access

- The Southerners are a movement of Whites in the former Confederate states (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 170). EPR codes Whites as dominant or senior partner throughout the movement's history and Whites from southern states were well represented during that time as well, starting with the presidency (Clinton was from Arkansas and Bush from Texas). There were also many cabinet members from southern states during that time, including but not limited to: Lloyd Bentsen (Treasury Secretary 1993-4, Texas), Erskine Bowles (Administrator of the Small Business Administration 1993-4, North Carolina), Henry Gabriel Cisneros (Housing 1993-7, Texas), Henry Paulson (Treasury 2006-9, Florida), Donald Evans (Commerce 2001-5, Texas), William J. Burns (Deputy Secretary of State 2011-14, North Carolina), and Austan Goolsbee (Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers 2010-11, Texas). Overall, Southerner representation is somewhat more limited compared to the east and west coast, hence we use a junior partner code. [1994-2020: junior partner]

Group size

- Minahan (2002: 1792) pegs the Southerners' population at 46 mio (2002e). The U.S. population was 287.6 mio in that year according to the WB. [0.1599]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 1792), Southerners made up 60% of their homeland in 2002, where >90% of all Southerners in the U.S. resided. [regionally concentrated]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder kin. [no kin]

Sources

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].

Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, p. 170.

League of the South Homepage. <http://www.dixienet.org> [June 24, 2014].

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.

Southern Poverty Law Center (2017). *Meet the League: State Chairmen and Organizers of the League of the South*. August 9. <https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2017/08/09/meet-league-state-chairmen-and-organizers-league-south> [August 7, 2022]

Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

St. Croix Islanders

Activity: 2003-2018

General notes

- St. Croix is one of the three main American Virgin Islands. As the SDM for St. Croix specifically only emerged in the 21st century, the history of St. Croix is much the same as the history of the American Virgin Islands. Hence the historical context presented below relates to the American Virgin Islands as a whole.

Movement start and end dates

- A movement has emerged in recent years in St. Croix that aims to separate the island from the rest of the American Virgin Islands and gain a separate status. According to Roopnarine (2011), the movement emerged after the turn of the millennium. In 2003 a local newspaper launched a petition drive for St. Croix to separate from American Virgin Islands. This is the earliest evidence for organized separatist activity we found, thus 2003 is coded as the start date. 7,000 of the 27,000 eligible voters on St. Croix signed the petition (Roopnarine 2011: 49). The American Virgin Island government was opposed to St. Croix's proposed separate status. The local governor said that the petition is "divisive and will not get off the ground anyway", but that he would support a constitutional reform that would give St. Croix limited self-governance within the framework of American Virgin Islands (Cole 2003; Associated Press State & Local Wire 2003). In 2005 activists presented their proposal to Washington D.C. officials. The American Virgin Islanders' delegate to Congress, Donna Christian-Christensen, supported the move, while the local governor, Charles Turnbull, was opposed (Buchanan 2005). In 2008 a round table was organized in Puerto Rico on St. Croix's secession movement. We found no reports of organized separatist claims after 2008 and so, based on the ten-years inactivity rule, we code the end date as 2018. [start date: 2003; end date: 2018]

Dominant claim

- The movement aims to separate the island from American Virgin Islands and gain a separate status. In 2003 a local newspaper launched a petition drive for St. Croix to separate from American Virgin Islands. Within a few days, more than 260 people had signed the petition, according to the organizers. In 2005 activists presented their proposal to Washington D.C. officials. The American Virgin Islanders' delegate to Congress, Donna Christian-Christensen, supported the move, while the local governor, Charles Turnbull, was opposed (Buchanan 2005; Cole 2003; Roopnarine 2011). [2003-2018: sub-state secession claim]

Independence claims

NA

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The territory claimed by the St. Croix Islanders is the St. Croix island, which is one of the three American Virgin Islands besides St. John and St. Thomas. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

NA

Separatist armed conflict

- We found no separatist violence and thus code the entire movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The original inhabitants were the Arawaks who were replaced by the Caribs, the group living there when Christopher Columbus first arrived in 1493 (Minahan 2002: 507). He named the islands St. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins, hence their name – the Virgin Islands.
- By the late 16th century most of the Caribs were gone after violent incursions by the Spanish. The British took control of some of the islands, as did the Spanish, Dutch and French in the 17th century. Slaves from Africa were introduced to the islands in 1673, and the majority of the population of the Virgin Islands today are black or mulattos, descendants of the African slaves and the white sugar plantation owners that occupied the islands from the 17th century (Minahan 2002: 507).
- The Danes took control of St. Thomas in 1666, occupied St. Croix in 1684, and bought St. John from the French in 1733. The Danish West India Company set up sugar plantations from 1672. The Danish Crown bought the island of St. John in 1754-55. The islands were a central hub of trade in the Caribbean and the largest slave market in the western hemisphere. (Minahan 2002: 508). However, after the slave trade was banned in Denmark in 1848, the sugar plantations declined.
- In 1917 the U.S. bought the three islands from Denmark for \$17 million. They were seen as strategically important to control the main passage through the Caribbean to the Panama Canal (Minahan 2002: 508). The U.S. Navy administered the American Virgin Islands until 1931, when administration was transferred to the Interior Department (Boyer 1982: 36).
- In 1927 the U.S. granted citizenship to most Crucians and in 1932 a bill was passed to allow citizenship rights for Crucians' descendants living in the US mainland the rest of the Caribbean. (Minahan 2002: 508).
- In 1936, the 1936 Organic Act was passed, creating local municipal councils and the right to vote for those who could read and write English (Boyer, 1982: 38).
- The Revised Organic Act of 1954, while expanding the right to vote for local government to everyone on the islands, retained Washingtonian control of the appointment of the Governor of the islands and other fiscal and administrative matters (Boyer, 1982: 38).
- In the late 1950s, fueled by increasing momentum of the independence movement from Britain of other Caribbean islands, Virgin Islanders “renewed their long-time demands for the right to elect their own governor, to be represented in Congress by a resident commissioner, and to legislate on internal matters” (Boyer, 1982: 38).
- In 1968 the US Congress passed the Elective Governor Act and in 1970, for the first time, American Virgin Islands elected their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor (Boyer, 1982: 39). This was a concession, but for American Virgin Islanders more generally.
- Another piece of legislation meant that the Virgin Islanders could elect their own non-voting delegate to Congress in 1972 (Boyer, 1982: 39).

- In 1976, the US Congress passed enabling legislation that would allow the governor of the American Virgin Islands to submit a proposed constitution to the President's Office to replace the Revised Organic Act of 1954. This would then need to be approved by the US President, Congress, and sent back for approval by referendum in the American Virgin Islands. However, two local referendums held in 1979 and 1981 on constitutions drafted *before* being sent to the President by the 3rd and 4th constitutional conventions respectively, were rejected by voters. (Boyer 1982: 40).
- A referendum was granted on the status of the territory which was held in 1993, but the low voter turnout meant that it did not cross the threshold needed for the result to be valid (Roth 2015: 433-434).
- No concessions or restrictions specific to St. Croix were found in the ten years before the first year we cover in the dataset.

Concessions and restrictions

- In 2009, the American Virgin Islands' 5th constitutional convention submitted a constitution draft to President Obama, who raised several concerns based by analysis by the Justice Department on presenting it to Congress (156 Cong. Rec. H.975, 2010). Based on this analysis by the Justice Department, the constitution was sent back to the constitution convention in the American Virgin Islands. They failed to revise and redraft (Mattei, 2012). Thus while there exists legislation that allows for a local constitution (see below) it has yet to be fully utilized. We do not code an autonomy concession. Furthermore, this was in relation to the AVI as a whole, i.e. the three islands, rather than St. Croix specifically.
- No concessions or restrictions are coded in this period.

Regional autonomy

NA

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	St. Croix
<i>Scenario</i>	No match
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	-
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	-

Power access

- St. Croix forms part of the American Virgin Islands, an US overseas territory. Overseas territories are not coded in EPR. However, American Virgin Islanders/Crucians are either black or mulatto, and EPR codes African Americans as excluded until after the election of Obama in

2008, suggesting that any (generally minimal) representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. cabinet had been “token” until then. Indeed, we did not find any evidence for any cabinet minister from St. Croix during the duration of this movement. [2003-2018: powerless]

Group size

- We found no good estimate of self-identified Crucians (American Virgin Islanders) from St. Croix, but St. Croix makes up about half of the AVI's population. We estimated the relative group size of the American Virgin Islanders at 0.0003 (see American Virgin Islanders). [0.00015]

Regional concentration

- We found no good data on self-identified St. Croix Crucians, but Crucians as a whole can be considered concentrated in the AVI, which makes it likely that also the St. Croix Crucians can be considered concentrated. [regionally concentrated]

Kin

- American Virgin Islanders as a whole have close kindred in the British Virgin Islands; however, the British Virgin Island have a population of just 30,000, which is below the 100,000 threshold. In keeping with general practice (see “Africans”), we do not code Blacks in other parts of North and South America as ethnic kin. [no kin]

Sources

- 156 Cong. Rec. H.975, (2010) (Message from the President of the United States)
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CREC-2010-03-02/html/CREC-2010-03-02-pt1-PgH975.htm> [April 6, 2022]
- Boyer, W. W. (1984). The United States Virgin Islands and Decolonization of the Eastern Caribbean. *Review of Regional Studies*, 14(3), 34-46.
- Buchanan, Don (2005). “St. Croix Secession Effort Drawing Attention.”
<http://stcroixsource.com/content/news/local-news/2005/02/18/st-croix-secession-effort-drawing-attention-0> [February 5, 2015].
- Caribbean Elections (2021). “Independent Citizens Movement (ICM).”
http://caribbeanelections.com/knowledge/parties/vi_parties/icm.asp [November 25, 2021].
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis.” *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- Cole, Nancy (2003). “Push for St. Croix Secession from V.I. Spotlights Frustration but Lacks Support.” *Virgin Islands Daily News*. March 19. <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-27407735.html> [February 5, 2015].
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Institute of Caribbean Studies, University of Puerto-Rico-Río Piedras (2008). “Round Table: “St. Croix Secession Movement in the U.S. Virgin Islands”.” <https://www.h-net.org/announce/show.cgi?ID=164371> [February 5, 2015].
- Mattei Lou (2012). “Constitutional Convention marred by arguments, technical snarls.” *Virgin Islands Daily News*. October 29.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20150402112421/http://virginislandsdailynews.com/news/>

constitutional-convention-meeting-marred-by-arguments-technical-snarls-1.1395403?
localLinksEnabled=false [April 6, 2022]

- Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Roopnarine, Lommarsh (2011). "St. Croix's Secession Movement in the United States Virgin Islands: Sentimental or Serious." *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies* 36(1): 43-65.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- The Associated Press State & Local Wire (2003). "A Package of News Briefs from the Caribbean." March 20.
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Texans

Activity: 1995-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The Republic of Texas Interim Government was established in 1995, hence the start date of the movement. Subsequently, the Texas Nationalist Movement (TNM) evolved from the Republic of Texas Interim Government. TNP makes claims for Texan independence and also claims that Texas was illegally annexed by the United States in 1845. TNM remains active in 2020 (Hewitt & Cheetham 2000; Keesing's; Texas Nationalist Movement). Thus, the movement is coded as ongoing. [start date: 1995; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The movement's goal is an independent Texas. The website of the Texan Nationalist Movement states its mission is "to secure and protect the political, cultural and economic independence of the nation of Texas and to restore and protect a constitutional Republic and the inherent rights of the People of Texas." (Texan Nationalist Movement, n.d.). [1995-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 1995; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- Texas nationalist claims concern the present U.S. state of Texas (Roth 2015: 475). We code this territory based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

- According to both Roth (2015: 475) and Minahan (2002: 1887) the organization, Republic of Texas, declared the independence of Texas in December 1995, but according to Roth, "it has never attempted to actually govern" (Roth 2015: 475). It is therefore (too) ambiguous whether this should be counted.

Separatist armed conflict

- The Republic of Texas Movement was involved shootout between state police and members of the group occurred in 1997 when the group took two hostages and demanded that arrested

members of the group be released. One person was killed in the shootout, but as that does not meet our criteria of LVIOLSD, we classify the entire movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- What is now Texas was originally inhabited by indigenous tribes. The Spanish gave the area the name 'Tejas' which was derived from an indigenous word for the 'friends' or 'allies' (Minahan 2002: 1883).
- Europeans arrived in the early 1500s and the area became part of 'New Spain.' French and Spanish settlements were established in the late 17th century and in the early 18th century, a series of Catholic missions were established. Vast ranches were demarcated in the 18th century (Minahan 2002: 1883).
- When Mexico gained independence from Spain in 1821, Texas, became part of Mexico. It was relatively autonomous politically at this point and Americans were incentivized to settle. By 1835, Americans outnumbered Mexicans by 10 to one (Minahan 2002: 1884).
- Resentment against Mexican rule, especially after Mexico outlawed slavery, led to tensions with the American settlers. In 1833, Mexican dictator Santa Ana abolished federalism. The Texans rebelled and war between Santa Ana's forces and Mexican rebels resulted in the siege of Alamo, during which Texas declared independence in March 1836. The war resulted in the eventual capture of Santa Ana himself where he promised Texan independence in return for his release (Minahan 2002: 1884).
- Between 1836 and 1846 the Republic of Texas was independent, or at least something close to an independent state. Texas had diplomatic relations with the USA, France, Belgium, and the Russian Empire (Roth 2015: 475).
- Due to threats by Mexico, Texans started to support integration with the U.S. In 1845, Texas voted for U.S. annexation. part of the US and in 1845 voted for annexation. Annexation occurred in February 1846, which triggered the US-Mexico war of 1846-1848 (Minahan 2002: 1885).
- The Republic of Texas seceded from the Union in February 1861 and allied with the southern states during the American civil war of 1861-1865 (Minahan 2002: 1885). After the south lost in 1865, slavery was outlawed and Texas was occupied by the northern military during the period of 'Reconstruction.' It was readmitted to the Union in 1870 (Minahan 2002: 1885).
- The Texas vs White ruling by the Supreme court in 1868 meant that Texas does not have the right to voluntarily secede, contrary to claims put forth by Texan nationalists in the late 20th century (Stahl 2016).
- Many Europeans settled in Texas in the late 19th century and Texan culture based on dialect, food, and tradition cemented the state's identity. Oil was discovered in 1901 and became significant element in the Texan economy. During the 20th century, immigration increased further, as did urbanization (Minahan 2002: 1886).
- No concessions or restrictions were found in the ten years before the first year we cover in the dataset.

Concessions and restrictions

NA

Regional autonomy

- Texas is a U.S. state and therefore equipped with significant autonomy. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Texans
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Whites
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	201000

Power access

- Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 320f suggest that the movement refers to Whites in Texas only while Minahan (2002: 1882) also includes Texans from Latinx and Black background while stating that an absolute majority of Texans are white. EPR codes Whites as dominant or senior partner throughout the movement's history and Whites from Texas states were well represented during that time as well, starting with the presidency (Bush was from Texas). There were also several cabinet members from Texas during that time, including but not limited to: Henry Gabriel Cisneros (Housing 1993-7, Texas), Donald Evans (Commerce 2001-5, Texas), and Austan Goolsbee (Chair of the Council of Economic Advisers 2010-11, Texas). Overall, Texan representation is somewhat more limited compared to the east and west coast, hence we use a junior partner code. [1995-2020: junior partner]

Group size

- We use the estimate from Minahan (2002: 1882) who pegs the Texans population at 15.5 mio (2002e). The U.S. population was 287.6 mio in that year according to the WB. [0.0539]

Regional concentration

- According to Minahan (2002: 1882), Texans made up 90% of their homeland (Texas) in 2002, where most Texans in the U.S. resided. [regionally concentrated]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder kin. [no kin]

Sources

Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.

GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].

Hewitt, Christopher, and Tom Cheetham (2000). *Encyclopedia of Modern Separatist Movements*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Minahan, James (2002). *Encyclopedia of the Stateless Nations*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Stahl, Jonathan (2016). "Could Texas Secede from the United States, if it wanted to?" *National Constitution Center*, May 2. <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/blog/could-texas-secede-from-the-united-states-if-it-wanted-to> [August 21, 2022].
- Texan Nationalist Movement. (n.d.) *About* <https://tnm.me/about/> [August 21, 2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rüegger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.

Vermonters

Activity: 2003-2020

General notes

NA

Movement start and end dates

- The Second Vermont Republic was founded in 2003. The movement's name harks back to the first Vermont Republic, which existed from 1777 until 1791, the year Vermont joined the union. It has termed itself a "nonviolent citizens' movement" for the independence of the state of Vermont. Based on this, the start date is pegged at 2003. The movement is not very well known outside of Vermont's borders, but at least nine candidates in the 2010 state elections spoke out in favor of Vermont's secession, and can thus be attributed to the movement. Peter Garritano, who ran for Lieutenant Governor as an independent candidate on a secession platform, garnered 8,267 votes (3.7%). The Vermont movement's monthly newspaper has a circulation of around 10,000. In 2007 a statewide poll found that 13% of Vermont's population support secession. The Washington Times calls the Vermont movement the most active and strongest secessionist movement in the US. The Second Vermont Republic held a statewide convention in 2012. The movement remains ongoing in 2020 according to its website (Vermont Independent 2022; Gidusky 2012; Grimwald 2008; Ketcham 2010). [start date: 2003; end date: ongoing]

Dominant claim

- The Second Vermont Republic was founded in 2003 and demands independence for the state of Vermont (Vermont Independent 2022). [2003-2020: independence claim]

Independence claims

- See above. [start date: 2003; end date: ongoing]

Irredentist claims

NA

Claimed territory

- The territory claimed by the Second Vermont Republic consists of the U.S. state of Vermont. We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

Sovereignty declarations

- The Middlebury Declaration of 2004 does not qualify because it is a declaration of a movement for secession rather than a sovereignty declaration per se (Sale & Naylor, 2005).

Separatist armed conflict

- We find no evidence of violent activity, and thus we code the movement as NVIOLSD. [NVIOLSD]

Historical context

- The State of Vermont was first claimed by the French in 1609, but was ceded to the British in 1763 (Minahan 2016: 450).
- In 1770, what is now Vermont was disputed between the colonial entities of New Hampshire and New York. A Vermont militia, called the Green Mountain Boys launched attacks against New York settlers. (Roth 2015: 457). The Green Mountain Boys joined the American Revolutionary War against the British. Shortly after the Declaration of Independence by the 13 colonies, Vermont declared its own independence. It was thus an independent state – the Vermont Republic – between 1777 and 1791, when it applied and joined the United States as the 14th state (Minahan 2016: 450).

Concessions and restrictions

NA

Regional autonomy

- Vermont is a U.S. state and therefore equipped with substantial autonomy. [regional autonomy]

De facto independence

NA

Major territorial changes

NA

EPR2SDM

<i>Movement</i>	Vermonters
<i>Scenario</i>	n:1
<i>EPR group(s)</i>	Whites
<i>Gwgroupid(s)</i>	201000

Power access

- While we found no evidence to suggest that Vermonters were purposefully excluded from executive positions, we could not find any cabinet member with Vermont heritage during both George W. Bush and Obama's presidencies. [powerless]

Group size

- Minahan (2016: 49) pegs the Vermonters' population at 650-850,000 (2015e) (we use 725,000). The US population was 319 mio in 2014, the most recent year available, according to the WB. [0.0023]

Regional concentration

- We could not find sufficiently precise information on the distribution of self-identified Vermonters; however, Vermont's population is predominantly white (>94% in 2015) and the regional character of this group makes regional concentration almost a given. [regionally concentrated]

Kin

- We found no evidence for transborder ethnic kin. [no kin]

Sources

- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel: New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62(1): 87-119.
- GADM (2019). Database of Global Administrative Boundaries, Version 3.6. <https://gadm.org/> [November 19, 2021].
- Gidusky, Ryan J. (2012). "Drive to Secede: Towards a Second Vermont Republic." *The Washington Times*. November 16. <http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/not-fit-print/2012/nov/16/drive-secede-towards-second-vermont-republic/> [June 24, 2014].
- Grunwald, Michael (2008). "Vermont Votes Its Own Way." *Time*. <http://content.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1718795,00.html> [June 24, 2014].
- Ketcham, Christopher (2010). The Secessionist Campaign for the Republic of Vermont. *Time*. <http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1957743,00.html> [June 24, 2014].
- Ketcham, Christopher (2013). "U.S. Out of Vermont!" *Prospect*. March 19. <https://prospect.org/power/u.s.-vermont/> [June 2, 2022].
- Minahan, James (2016). *Encyclopedia of Stateless Nations. Second Edition*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
- Roth, Christopher F. (2015). *Let's Split! A Complete Guide to Separatist Movements and Aspirant Nations, from Abkhazia to Zanzibar*. Sacramento, CA: Litwin Books.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick & Naylor, Thomas. (2005). "The Middlebury Declaration." *Counterpunch*. <https://www.counterpunch.org/2005/09/24/the-middlebury-declaration/> [June 2, 2022].
- Vermont Independent (2022). *HNY! And Happy "Vermont Independence Month"! (2 for 1)*. <https://vermontindependent.net/hny2021vermontindependencemonth/> January 15. [August 21, 2022].
- Vogt, Manuel, Nils-Christian Bormann, Seraina Rügger, Lars-Erik Cederman, Philipp Hunziker, and Luc Girardin (2015). "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.