



| | |
|--------------|---|
| Title | パブリック・ヒストリー 第17号 英文要旨 |
| Author(s) | |
| Citation | パブリック・ヒストリー. 2020, 17, p. 108-111 |
| Version Type | VoR |
| URL | https://doi.org/10.18910/76018 |
| rights | |
| Note | |

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Indigenous People in Borderlands:

The Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians and the Lack of its Recognition in the United States of America

Yoshitaka IWASAKI

The United States has integrated indigenous people living in the U.S.–Canada Borderlands by identifying places of indigenous residence (reservations) with various rights such as sovereignty, autonomy, subsidy, and other special privileges. For this purpose, the U.S. government has “recognized” each of these groups as “domestic” tribes. However, the federal government has failed to recognize the Little Shell Tribe of the Chippewa Indians (LST), and as a result, the group members became “Landless Indians” with no reservation or privileges, suffering from severe poverty and discrimination since over a 100 years despite their identity as truly indigenous people.

During the 19th century, as one of the main groups that constituted the core of the Chippewa incorporating Métis (the mixed-blood members), and other indigenous people like the Cree, the LST was gradually moving far westward from their original homeland in the Great Lakes toward the Great Plains or Borderlands. When the U.S. Government established “Turtle Mountain Chippewa Reservation” as the tribe’s permanent residence in North Dakota at the end of 19th century, U.S. officials recognized only the part of the society mainly consisting of Métis as “Chippewa”; the LST was ousted from the reservation as a non-“American” Indian group and finally moved to Montana.

Indigenous people living in the U.S.–Canadian Borderland used to move freely without being restricted by state or territory borders, but as the United States grew and transformed its scale, tribes were subject to relocation and re-identification. The reality for many of the people of the borderlands did not fit the U.S. government’s definitions of “tribes” or domesticity. This paper discusses how the forcible definition of “national” and “tribal” borders by the United States in the late 19th century had considerable and undesirable effects on the Borderlands people, including the LST, lasting for more than a 100 years.

What is ‘Public History’?

Takao FUJIKAWA

More than 15 years have passed since the publication of *Public History*, but the meaning of the term, public history has not been explained in detail in this magazine. Taking the opportunity that interest in public history is eventually growing in Japan, as a person who was involved in the launch of the magazine, I would like to explain its meaning. Of course, as with all concepts, the meaning changes with time, and even in the same period, the meaning differs from country to country (in this paper, mostly belonging to English-speaking countries). For example, the meaning of the word ‘public’ itself is not the same in Britain and the United States. Firstly, this paper briefly explains the concept of public and the problems associated with its translation in Japan. Secondly it presents the concept

of public history developed or constructed in the United States, and thirdly discusses its historical changes and differences among other countries. Since I mainly study history of Australia, I would like to add that my paper partly reflects perspectives generated in Australia, which do not focus on the United States and are rarely covered by Japanese academia. Today, as globalization progresses, thanks to the international exchange of researchers and the communication of information through the Internet, these differences are often recognized and misunderstandings are less likely to occur. On the other hand, since this concept itself is a product of ‘political struggle’, it is necessary to recognize that various explanations are products of such background.

Military Use of Colonies: Assistance and Reward in French West Africa during WWI

Miyu TANIGAKI

France utilized her empire considerably during WWI. While other European countries such as Britain and Germany hesitated to use colonial soldiers, especially Africans, on the European front, France mobilized about 600,000 colonial soldiers from her empire. In fact, French West Africa (AOF) had recruited the second largest number of soldiers; 134,000 soldiers were sent to Europe.

Republican France had justified the colonial rule based on a republican idea; hence, French colonial rule spread the idea of republicanism that included, ‘liberté, égalité, fraternité’. However, colonial conscription revealed incompatibility between colonialism and republicanism. In the trench, the colonial soldiers had shared the same experience as the French, but they were treated unequally because they were colonial subjects.

In such an unequal condition, how could the French maintain the military service of colonies? This article discusses the question by focusing on the reward for colonial military service and assistance for colonial soldiers.

The enforcement of conscription in 1918 was accompanied by a series of decrees which made room for some improvement in the status of colonial soldiers from AOF in return for military service. The idea of reward for service spread throughout Sub-Saharan Africa by Braïe Diagne’s conscription campaign.

With respect to assistance, the author deals with the *Comité d’assistance aux troupes noires* (CATN), an association which provided African soldiers with moral and material aid and helped the French retain the colonial military service.

The NAACP’s Legal Strategy in 1960: The Case of the NAACP in Florida

Genki KOMORI

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has not been fully studied in contrast to the burgeoning body of literature on the Civil Rights Movement, especially one on the NAACP in 1960s, when the American society was changing drastically by the Movement. Therefore, this article insists that the NAACP was one of the most crucial actors of the Movement

in the decade and that members of the NAACP were participating in direct actions including sit-ins, wade-ins and so forth. Moreover, the article claims that these facts reflected the NAACP's profound and historical change as a legal strategist. To achieve the aim, the article briefly summarizes the history of NAACP's legal strategies in the first half of the 20th century and then focuses on the activities of the NAACP in Florida in 1960.

In Chapter 1, the author reveals that until *Brown v. Board of Education*, the legal strategies of the NAACP were not combined with direct actions. It did not create legal conflicts through its activism, but carried out its plan for legal racial reform by taking part in the already-existing legal strife in the society. In the second half of the 1950s, the southern whites severely attacked the NAACP by creating the so-called Massive Resistance, which led the legal strategies in deadlock by making the NAACP consume a variety of its resources.

In Chapter 2 and 3, the author outlines direct actions in Florida, choosing Jacksonville and Tampa as significant examples, and traced what the elder members of the NAACP did for the younger participants in the sit-ins. By doing so, it is found that young members of the NAACP in Florida actively participated in direct actions. The article also reveals how the elder members of the NAACP supported its younger members' involvement with them, and suggests that the NAACP used direct actions to create test cases, meaning that it now started to combine the street activism with its legal strategies in contrast to its previous lawsuits.

Japanese Chamber of Commerce in the Northeast China after WWI: An Example in Fengtian Erzhuang MENG

This paper mainly analyzes the characteristics of Japanese economic groups in Northeast China by examining the activities of the Japanese chamber of commerce in Fengtian after the First World War. After the chamber was reorganized in 1917, it held close ties with the Japanese consulate general in Fengtian, the Kanto Hall and other foreign ministries of Japan. In the face of the problems of Fengtian ticket, improper taxation, and the growing anti-Japanese movements in the Northeast China, the Japanese government had gradually adopted an aggressive policy toward the Zhang Zuolin government. Behind this decision, the Japanese economic groups, centering on the Japanese chamber of commerce, advocated a more aggressive policy to Zhang Zuolin's political power. Even though the chamber was a private group, it actively cooperated with the Japanese government in the implementation of aggressive policies.

Ceterum censeo populares et optimates esse delendos

Mutsuro WASHIDA

In this paper, I set out the reasons for opposing the use of *populares* and *optimates* as historical terms. At one point, these were considered to be the reflection of the modern two-party system. Although it had been demonstrated that there were no party politics in any sense in the Roman Republic, these terms have been used in historical narratives. Recently, M. A. Robb re-examined this problem. Based on his argument, I have found that the old theory related to this topic persists. Therefore, in this paper, I reconfirm that 1) these were not political parties, 2) *nobiles* was never a monolithic group, *optimates*, 3) in addition to *populares*, all political elites required popular political support, 4) there was a group of politically optimistic elites who were making popularistic speeches, and 5) while popularistic politicians made substantial changes to political issues, optimistic politicians did, as well. Based on these points, I argued that these words are superfluous and harmful for the proper understanding of the history of the Roman Republic, because, in current academic fields, recent historical studies do not use other antiquated terms such as *latifundium*. In Japan, high school history education has recently been the topic of discussion. In this context, I think that such problematical words should never be used. Furthermore, I suggest that *populares* and *optimates* should be eliminated as historical terms.