

Indian Gaming Law

*Carolina Academic Press
Law Casebook Series
Advisory Board*



Gary J. Simson, Chairman
Dean, Case Western Reserve University School of Law

Raj Bhala
University of Kansas School of Law

John C. Coffee, Jr.
Columbia University Law School

Randall Coyne
University of Oklahoma College of Law

John S. Dzienkowski
University of Texas School of Law

Paul Finkelman
Albany Law School

Robert M. Jarvis
*Shepard Broad Law Center
Nova Southeastern University*

Vincent R. Johnson
St. Mary's University School of Law

Michael A. Olivas
University of Houston Law Center

Kenneth Port
William Mitchell College of Law

Michael P. Scharf
Case Western Reserve University School of Law

Peter M. Shane
*Michael E. Moritz College of Law
The Ohio State University*

Emily L. Sherwin
Cornell Law School

John F. Sutton, Jr.
Emeritus, University of Texas School of Law

David B. Wexler
*John E. Rogers College of Law
University of Arizona*

Indian Gaming Law

Cases and Materials

Kathryn R.L. Rand

School of Law
University of North Dakota

Steven Andrew Light

Department of Political Science and Public Administration
University of North Dakota

Co-Directors

Institute for the Study of Tribal Gaming Law and Policy
University of North Dakota

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2008
by Kathryn R.L. Rand
and
Steven Andrew Light
All rights reserved.

ISBN 10: 1-59460-258-1
ISBN 13: 978-1-59460-258-0
LCCN: 2007940306

Carolina Academic Press
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com
Printed in the United States of America

for
Vaslav Bast
and
Sally Rand

Contents

Table of Cases	xv
Preface	xix
Copyright Acknowledgments	xxiii

Part I Indian Gaming in Context

Chapter 1 Introduction	3
A. Overview of Indian Gaming	3
Meister, Indian Gaming Industry Report (2007–2008 ed.)	5
National Indian Gaming Association 2005 Annual Report	6
Notes and Questions	7
B. History of Gambling in the U.S.	8
Schwartz, Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling	8
Findlay, People of Chance: Gambling in American Society	
from Jamestown to Las Vegas	9
National Gambling Impact Study Commission, Final Report	10
Notes and Questions	14
C. Gambling Law	14
Aronovitz, The Regulation of Commercial Gaming	14
Cabot & Csoka, The Games People Play:	
Is It Time For a New Legal Approach to Prize Games?	17
Notes and Questions	21
D. Tribal Governments and Federal Indian Law and Policy	22
Wilkins, American Indian Politics and the American Political System	22
Porter, A Proposal to the Hanodaganyas to Decolonize	
Federal Indian Control Law	25
Notes and Questions	35
Clinton, There Is No Federal Supremacy Clause for Indian Tribes	36
Notes and Questions	41
Coffey & Tsosie, Rethinking the Tribal Sovereignty Doctrine:	
Cultural Sovereignty and the Collective Future of Indian Nations	42
Notes and Questions	44
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, A Quiet Crisis:	
Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country	45
Notes and Questions	50
Problem 1: A Regulatory Model for Indian Gaming	50

Chapter 2 Pre-Statutory Law	51
A. Overview	51
B. Traditional Tribal Games	51
Pasquaretta, Gambling and Survival in Native North America	51
Notes and Questions	54
C. Modern Roots	55
Goldberg, Public Law 280: The Limits of State Jurisdiction	
Over Reservation Indians	55
Notes and Questions	58
<i>Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Butterworth</i>	59
<i>Barona Group of the Capitan Grande Band</i>	
<i>of Mission Indians v. Duffy</i>	60
Notes and Questions	62
<i>California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians</i>	63
Notes and Questions	70
Problem 2: Applying <i>Cabazon</i>	74

Part II

The Federal Regulatory Scheme

Chapter 3 The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988	77
A. Overview	77
B. Legislative History	77
Light & Rand, Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty:	
The Casino Compromise	77
Santoni, The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act:	
How Did We Get Here? Where Are We Going?	79
Notes and Questions	83
Reid, Commentary in Indian Gaming and the Law	84
Notes and Questions	86
Udall, Commentary in Indian Gaming and the Law	86
Notes and Questions	88
Senate Report No. 100-446, 100th Cong. 2d Sess., 1988 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3071	88
Notes and Questions	98
C. IGRA's Regulatory Framework	99
1. Policy Goals	99
2. Definition of "Indian Gaming"	100
a. Indian Tribes	101
Myers, Federal Recognition of Indian Tribes in the United States	101
Notes and Questions	106
b. Indian Lands	107
<i>Kansas v. United States</i>	108
Notes and Questions	111
3. Criminal Regulation	114
<i>Sycuan Band of Mission Indians v. Roache</i>	115
Notes and Questions	116
Problem 3: "Something for Everyone to Hate"	117

Chapter 4	Bingo and Other Forms of Class II Gaming	119
A.	Overview	119
B.	Conducting Class II Gaming	119
1.	Statutory Requirements	119
	Notes and Questions	121
2.	Tribal “Self-Regulation”	123
	Notes and Questions	124
C.	Defining Class II Gaming	125
	<i>Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community v. Hope</i>	126
	Notes and Questions	128
	<i>United States v. 103 Electronic Gambling Devices</i>	128
	Notes and Questions	131
D.	Class II Technologic Aids and Class III Facsimiles	132
	<i>Cabazon Band of Mission Indians v. NIGC</i>	133
	Notes and Questions	134
	<i>Diamond Game Enterprises, Inc. v. Reno</i>	136
	Notes and Questions	139
	<i>United States v. Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska</i>	141
	Notes and Questions	143
	<i>Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma v. NIGC</i>	144
	Notes and Questions	147
	Problem 4: Class II Technologic Aid or Class III Electronic Facsimile?	152
Chapter 5	Casino-Style or Class III Gaming	155
A.	Overview	155
B.	Statutory Requirements for Conducting Class III Gaming	155
C.	Tribal-State Compacts	157
	Notes and Questions	160
	California Model Tribal-State Compact	161
	North Dakota Model Tribal-State Compact	188
	Notes and Questions	211
	<i>Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida</i>	212
	Notes and Questions	217
D.	Post- <i>Seminole</i> Environment	219
1.	Severability	220
	Skibine, Gaming on Indian Reservations:	
	Defining the Trustee’s Duty in the Wake of <i>Seminole Tribe v. Florida</i>	220
	<i>United States v. Spokane Tribe of Indians</i>	224
	Notes and Questions	227
2.	Administrative “Compacts”	230
	Class III Gaming Procedures, 25 C.F.R. pt. 291	230
	Notes and Questions	235
3.	Law, Politics, and Negotiation	238
	Tsosie, Negotiating Economic Survival:	
	The Consent Principle and Tribal-State Compacts	
	Under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act	238
	Notes and Questions	241
	Problem 5.1: Compacting Post- <i>Seminole Tribe</i>	242
E.	State Public Policy and the Scope of Class III Gaming	242

1. Expansive Approaches	243
<i>United States v. Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe</i>	243
<i>Mashantucket Pequot Tribe v. Connecticut</i>	245
<i>Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians v. Wisconsin</i>	247
Notes and Questions	249
2. Restrictive Approaches	251
<i>Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. South Dakota</i>	251
<i>Coeur d'Alene Tribe v. Idaho</i>	252
<i>Panzer v. Doyle</i>	254
<i>Rumsey Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians v. Wilson</i>	260
Notes and Questions	265
3. Alternative Approaches	268
Skibine, Scope of Gaming, Good Faith Negotiations and the Secretary of Interior's Class III Gaming Procedures:	
Is I.G.R.A. Still a Workable Framework After <i>Seminole</i> ?	268
Notes and Questions	269
Problem 5.2: IGRA's "Permits Such Gaming" Requirement	270

Part III

Government Authority over Indian Gaming

Chapter 6 Federal Authority	277
A. Overview	277
B. National Indian Gaming Commission	277
1. Overview of NIGC Powers	277
<i>Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma v. NIGC</i>	280
2. Defining Class II and Class III Gaming	282
National Indian Gaming Commission, Cadillac Jack "Triple Threat Bingo" Advisory Game Classification Opinion	284
Notes and Questions	287
3. Approval of Tribal Ordinances	288
4. Approval of Management Contracts	289
Washburn, The Mechanics of Indian Gaming Management	
Contract Approval	290
Notes and Questions	294
Staudenmaier, Negotiating Enforceable Tribal Gaming Management Agreements	295
Notes and Questions	297
5. Investigative and Enforcement Powers	299
Notes and Questions	301
6. Minimum Internal Control Standards and NIGC Authority Over Class III Gaming	302
<i>Colorado River Indian Tribes v. NIGC</i>	304
Notes and Questions	308
C. Secretary of the Interior	308
D. Other Federal Agencies	309
Problem 6: The Federal Regulatory Role	309

Chapter 7 Tribal Authority	311
A. Overview	311
B. Tribal Gaming Commissions	311
Deloria & Lytle, American Indians, American Justice	311
Wilkins, American Indian Politics and the American Political System	314
Notes and Questions	317
Rand & Light, How Congress Can and Should “Fix” the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act: Recommendations for Law and Policy Reform	320
Notes and Questions	321
C. Tribal Law	322
1. Gaming Ordinances	322
NIGC Model Tribal Gaming Ordinance	322
Notes and Questions	341
2. Tribal Court Decisions	342
<i>Kalantari v. Spirit Mountain Gaming, Inc.</i>	342
<i>In re Eldridge</i>	346
<i>Long v. Mohegan Tribal Gaming Authority</i>	349
Notes and Questions	353
Problem 7: The NIGC Model Tribal Gaming Ordinance	354
Chapter 8 State Authority	355
A. Overview	355
B. State Gaming Commissions	355
McGuinness, They Call It Gaming ... and You Can Bet It’s Changed a Lot	355
Notes and Questions	358
C. State Law	358
Rand, Caught in the Middle: How State Politics, State Law, and State Courts Constrain Tribal Influence Over Indian Gaming	358
1. State Public Policy	359
<i>Panzer v. Doyle</i>	360
<i>Dairyland Greyhound Park, Inc. v. Doyle</i>	364
Notes and Questions	369
2. State Separation of Powers	372
<i>New Mexico ex rel. Clark v. Johnson</i>	372
<i>Kansas ex rel. Stephan v. Finney</i>	376
<i>Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce, Inc. v. Pataki</i>	378
<i>Taxpayers of Michigan Against Casinos v. Michigan</i>	380
Notes and Questions	381
Problem 8: “Undoing” Compacts	383

Part IV
Policy Implications

Chapter 9 Socioeconomic Impacts of Indian Gaming	389
A. Overview	389
B. Economic Impacts	390
1. Methodology	390

Light & Rand, Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise	390
Notes and Questions	392
2. Impacts	393
Taylor, Krepps, & Wang, The National Evidence on the Socioeconomic Impacts of American Indian Gaming on Non-Indian Communities	394
Meister, Indian Gaming Industry Report (2007–2008 ed.)	396
Notes and Questions	397
C. Social Impacts	398
1. Methodology	398
Light & Rand, Indian Gaming and Tribal Sovereignty: The Casino Compromise	398
Taylor, Krepps, & Wang, The National Evidence on the Socioeconomic Impacts of American Indian Gaming on Non-Indian Communities	399
Notes and Questions	401
2. Impacts	404
Gerstein et al., Gambling Impact and Behavior Study: Report to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission	404
Notes and Questions	407
Taylor, Krepps, & Wang, The National Evidence on the Socioeconomic Impacts of American Indian Gaming on Non-Indian Communities	408
Notes and Questions	409
National Gambling Impact Study Commission, Final Report	410
D. Indian Gaming and Reservation Economic Development	412
Gips, Current Trends in Tribal Economic Development	412
Notes and Questions	415
Jorgensen & Taylor, What Determines Indian Economic Success?	416
Notes and Questions	417
Miller, Economic Development in Indian Country: Will Capitalism or Socialism Succeed?	418
Notes and Questions	422
Problem 9: Research Design	425
Chapter 10 Recurring Legal and Political Issues	427
A. Overview	427
B. Gaming on Newly Acquired Lands	427
1. Overview	427
2. Exceptions to IGRA's General Prohibition Against Gaming on Newly Acquired Land	433
a. The "Best Interests" Exception	433
Staudenmaier, Off-Reservation Native American Gaming: An Examination of the Legal and Political Hurdles	433
Notes and Questions	435
Skibine, Statement Before the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs Concerning Taking Land into Trust	436
Notes and Questions	437
<i>Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin v. United States</i>	438
Notes and Questions	442

b. Other Exceptions	443
<i>City of Roseville v. Norton</i>	444
<i>Wyandotte Nation v. NIGC</i>	449
Notes and Questions	458
Problem 10.1: Gaming on Newly Acquired Lands	459
C. Tribal-State Revenue-Sharing Agreements	460
1. Interior Secretary's Interpretation of IGRA	460
Martin, Statement Before the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act	460
Notes and Questions	461
2. Revenue-Sharing Agreements	462
Light, Rand, & Meister, Spreading the Wealth: Indian Gaming and Revenue-Sharing Agreements	462
Notes and Questions	466
<i>In re Indian Gaming Related Cases</i>	467
Notes and Questions	478
Problem 10.2: Negotiating a Revenue-Sharing Agreement	480
D. Federal Tribal Recognition	481
1. The Federal Tribal Recognition Process	481
2. Indian Gaming and Recognition	485
Kendall, Statement Before the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on Federal Recognition of Indian Tribes	485
Notes and Questions	487
Cramer, Cash, Color, and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgment	488
Notes and Questions	490
Problem 10.3: Tribal Recognition	491
E. Tribal Casinos as Employers	492
<i>San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino v. NLRB</i>	492
McClatchey, Tribally-Owned Businesses Are Not "Employers": Economic Effects, Tribal Sovereignty, and <i>NLRB v. San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</i>	498
Notes and Questions	501
Problem 10.4: The <i>San Manuel Case</i>	504
Appendix The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988	505
Index	529

Table of Cases

A

Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. Brock, 480 U.S. 678 (1987), 220

Alden v. Maine, 527 U.S. 706 (1999), 219

B

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians v. Duffy, 694 F.2d 1185 (9th Cir. 1982), **60-62**, 64, 70

Board of Trustees of the University of Alabama v. Garrett, 531 U.S. 356 (2001), 219

Bryan v. Itasca County, 426 U.S. 373 (1976), 59, 63, 70

C

Cabazon Band of Mission Indians v. NIGC, 14 F.3d 633 (D.C. Cir. 1994), **133-34**, 135-36, 267-68

California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, 480 U.S. 202 (1987), 51, **63-70**, 71, 73-74, 77, 89, 96, 244, 248, 250-51

Casino Magic Corp., United States v., 293 F.3d 419 (8th Cir. 2002), 384 F.3d 510 (8th Cir. 2004), 296, 298

Catskill v. Parkplace (*Catskill I*), 144 F. Supp. 2d (S.D.N.Y. 2001), 298-99

Catskill v. Parkplace (*Catskill II*), 154 F.2d 696 (S.D.N.Y. 2001), 296

Catskill v. Parkplace (*Catskill III*), 217 F. Supp. 2d 423 (S.D.N.Y. 2002), 297-98

Chemehuevi Indian Tribe v. Wilson, 987 F. Supp. 804 (N.D. Cal. 1997), **228-30**

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831), 27, 28, 38

Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837 (1984), 279-80

Cheyenne Arapaho Gaming Commission v. NIGC, 214 F. Supp. 2d 1155 (N.D. Okla. 2002), 280

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. South Dakota, 3 F.3d 273 (8th Cir. 1993), 830 F. Supp. 523 (D.S.D. 1993), 112, 212-13, 219, **251-52**, 302

Choate v. Trapp, 224 U.S. 665 (1912), 63

Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe v. Green, 995 F.2d 179 (10th Cir. 1993), 117

City of Roseville v. Norton, 348 F.3d 1020 (D.C. Cir. 2003), **444-49**

City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation, 544 U.S. 197 (2005), 112

Clark, New Mexico ex rel. v. Johnson, 904 P.2d 11 (N.M. 1995), **372-76**

Cobell v. Kempthorne, 435

Coeur d'Alene Tribe v. Idaho, 842 F. Supp. 1268 (D. Id. 1994), **252-54**, 265-66

Colorado River Indian Tribes v. NIGC, 466 F.3d 134 (D.C. Cir. 2006), **304-08**

Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians v. United States, 110 F.3d 688 (9th Cir. 1997), 429

County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation, 470 U.S. 226 (1985), 112

Crow Dog, Ex parte, 109 U.S. 556 (1883), 33

D

Dairyland Greyhound Park, Inc. v. Doyle, 719 N.W.2d 408 (Wis. 2006), **364-69**, **369-70**, 370-72

- deBary v. Harrah's Operating Co., 465 F. Supp. 2d 250 (S.D.N.Y. 2006), 298
- Diamond Game Enterprises, Inc. v. Reno, 230 F.3d 365 (D.C. Cir. 2000), **136-39**, 150
- E**
- Eldridge, Licensee, In re [the Class III-A Gaming License of Marc Joseph], Tribal Court in and for the Puyallup Tribe (Washington) (2000), **346-48**
- Ex parte Crow Dog, 109 U.S. 556 (1883), 33
- Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), 218
- F**
- Finney; Kansas ex rel. v. Stephan, 1993 WL 192809 (D. Kan. 1993), 836 P.2d 1169 (Kan. 1992), **376-78**, 382
- G**
- Gaming Corp. of America v. Dorsey & Whitney, 88 F.3d 536 (8th Cir. 1996), 382
- H**
- Hein v. Capitan Grande Band of Diegueno Mission Indians, 201 F.3d 1256 (9th Cir. 2000), 123
- I**
- In re Indian Gaming Related Cases, 331 F.3d 1094 (9th Cir. 2003), **467-78**, 479
- In re [the Class III-A Gaming License of Marc Joseph] Eldridge, Licensee, Tribal Court in and for the Puyallup Tribe (Washington) (2000), **346-48**
- J**
- Johnson v. M'Intosh, 21 U.S. (8 Wheat.) 543 (1823), 27
- Johnson; New Mexico ex rel. Clark v., 904 P.2d 11 (N.M. 1995), **372-76**
- K**
- Kagama, United States v., 118 U.S. 375 (1886), 24, 33
- Kalantari v. Spirit Mountain Gaming, Inc., Tribal Court for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (2003), **342-46**
- Kansas ex rel. Stephan v. Finney, 1993 WL 192809 (D. Kan. 1993), 836 P.2d 1169 (Kan. 1992), **376-78**, 382
- Kansas v. United States, 249 F.3d 1213 (10th Cir. 2001), **108-11**, 113
- Kimel v. Florida Board of Regents, 528 U.S. 62 (2000), 219
- L**
- Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin v. United States, 367 F.3d 650 (7th Cir. 2004), 429, **438-42**, 442-43
- Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians v. Wisconsin, 770 F. Supp. 480 (W.D. Wis. 1992), **247-49**, 250-51, 265-67
- Lincoln v. Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, 967 F. Supp. 966 (E.D. Mich 1997), 123
- Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock, 187 U.S. 553 (1903), 33
- Long v. Mohegan Tribal Gaming Authority, Mohegan Gaming Disputes Tribal Court of Appeals (1997), **349-53**
- Lopez, United States v., 514 U.S. 549 (1995), 40, 41, 219
- M**
- Mashantucket Pequot Tribe v. Connecticut, 913 F.2d 1024 (2d Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 499 U.S. 975 (1991), **245-47**, 249-50, 266-68, 467, 490
- Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians v. Engler, 304 F.3d 616 (6th Cir. 2002), 112, 160
- Maxam v. Lower Sioux Indian Community, 829 F. Supp. 277 (D. Minn. 1993), 123
- McClanahan v. Arizona State Tax Comm'n, 411 U.S. 164 (1973), 63

- Montana v. Blackfeet Tribe of Indians, 471 U.S. 759, 766 (1985), 62, 63
- Morrison, United States v., 529 U.S. 62 (2000), 219
- Morton v. Ruiz, 415 U.S. 199 (1974), 279
- Mourning v. Family Publications Service, Inc., 411 U.S. 356 (1973), 307-08
- N
- New Mexico ex rel. Clark v. Johnson, 904 P.2d 11 (N.M. 1995), 372-76
- New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144 (1992), 40, 41, 219
- O
- 162 MegaMania Gambling Devices, United States v., 231 F.3d 713 (10th Cir. 2000), 131, 136, 140, 147, 149
- 103 Electronic Gambling Devices, United States v., 223 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 2000), 128-31, 135-36, 140, 147-48, 279
- Oneida County v. Oneida Indian Nation, 470 U.S. 226 (1985), 63
- Oneida Tribe of Indians v. Wisconsin, 518 F. Supp. 712 (W.D. Wis. 1981), 63
- P
- Panzer v. Doyle, 680 N.W.2d 666 (Wis. 2004), 157, 254-60, 360-64, 370-72
- Park Place Entm't v. Arquette, 113 F. Supp. 2d 322 (N.D.N.Y. 2000), 299
- Ponca Tribe v. Oklahoma, 37 F.3d 1422 (10th Cir. 1994), *vacated*, 517 U.S. 1129 (1996), *rev'd on other grounds*, 89 F.3d 690 (10th Cir. 1996), 219
- Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997), 219
- R
- Rhode Island v. Narragansett Indian Tribe, 19 F.3d 685 (1st Cir. 1994), 111-12
- Roseville, City of v. Norton, 348 F.3d 1020 (D.C. Cir. 2003), 444-49
- Ross v. Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe, 809 F. Supp. 738 (D.S.D. 1992), 123
- Rumsey Indian Rancheria of Wintun Indians v. Wilson, 64 F.3d 1250 (9th Cir. 1996), 260-65, 267
- S
- Sac & Fox Nation v. Norton, 240 F.3d 1250 (10th Cir. 2001), 458
- San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino v. NLRB, 475 F.3d 1306 (D.C. Cir. 2007), 492-98
- Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez, 436 U.S. 49 (1978), 123
- Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, United States v. (*Santee I*), 135 F.3d 558 (8th Cir. 1998), 141, 301
- Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, United States v. (*Santee II*), 324 F.3d 607 (8th Cir. 2003), 141-43, 149-50, 212, 309
- Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce v. Pataki, 798 N.E.2d 1047 (N.Y. 2003), 157-58, 378-79, 383
- Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, United States v., 321 F.3d 939 (10th Cir. 2002), 301
- Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Butterworth, 658 F.2d 310 (5th Cir. 1981), 59-60
- Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 517 U.S. 44 (1996), 11 F.3d 1016 (11th Cir. 1994), 155, 160, 212-17, 219, 220-24, 236, 259, 301, 427, 461, 466-467
- Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma v. NIGC, 327 F.3d 1019 (10th Cir. 2003), 144-46, 147-48, 150, 280-82
- Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community v. Hope, 16 F.3d 261 (8th Cir. 1994), 126-27, 279
- Sherrill, City of v. Oneida Indian Nation, 544 U.S. 197 (2005), 112
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes v. Reno, 56 F.3d 1476 (D.C. Cir. 1995), 228-29
- Sioux, United States v., 448 U.S. 371 (1980), 443
- Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, United States v., 897 F.2d 358 (8th Cir. 1990), 243-44, 249-50, 246
- Skidmore v. Swift & Co., 323 U.S. 134 (1944), 280

- Smith v. Babbitt, 875 F. Supp. 1353 (D. Minn. 1995), *aff'd*, 100 F.3d 556 (8th Cir. 1996), 123
- Spokane Tribe of Indians, United States v., 972 F.2d 1090 (9th Cir. 1992), 139 F.3d 1297 (9th Cir. 1998), 135, **224-28**
- Stephan, Kansas ex rel. v. Finney, 1993 WL 192809 (D. Kan. 1993), 836 P.2d 1169 (Kan. 1992), **376-78**, 382
- Sycuan Band of Mission Indians v. Roache, 54 F.3d 535 (9th Cir. 1995), 115, 134-35, 250, 265-66, 479

T

- Taxpayers of Michigan Against Casinos v. Michigan, 685 N.W.2d 221 (Mich. 2004), **380-81**
- Texas v. United States, 362 F. Supp. 2d 765 (W.D. Tex. 2004), *rev'd*, 497 F.3d 491 (5th Cir. 2007), 236-38, 308

U

- United States v. [defendant]. *See* [defendant], United States v.

W

- Washington v. Confederated Tribes of Colville Indian Reservation, 447 U.S. 134 (1980), 72
- Wheeler, United States v., 435 U.S. 313 (1978), 24
- Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832), 27, 29
- Wyandotte Nation v. NIGC, 437 F. Supp. 2d 1193 (D. Kan. 2006), **449-58**
- Wyandotte Nation v. Sebelius, 443 F.3d 1247 (10th Cir. 2006), 458-59

Y

- Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe v. Arizona, 796 F. Supp. 1292 (D. Ariz. 1992), 267
- Young, *Ex parte*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908), 218

Preface

Although this is a legal casebook, it reflects an interdisciplinary approach to studying and understanding the law. Our collaboration on Indian gaming issues began more than a decade ago when we realized that tribal gaming gave rise to complex issues of law and public policy that crossed our respective disciplines of law and political science and public administration. At the University of North Dakota, we founded the Institute for the Study of Tribal Gaming Law and Policy in 2002 to foster research on Indian gaming and to understand its impact on intergovernmental relations and the lives of real people—Indian and non-Indian—across the U.S.

We strongly believe in the importance of informing our pedagogy with our research, and vice versa. Several years ago, one of us (Rand) taught one of the first Indian gaming law courses offered in a law school curriculum. She was amazed at how difficult it was to design the course, develop an easily understandable framework, and find appropriate readings. When the other of us (Light) sought to teach a short unit on the public administration of Indian gaming to graduate students, he was stymied by having to edit long law review articles or case law, and to guard against student reliance on inaccurate or incomplete information found on the Internet. Still today, instructors in this rapidly expanding area of interest and practice must adopt a do-it-yourself approach to assembling course materials—a difficult, time-consuming and resource-intensive task, even for an expert on federal Indian, tribal, or gambling law. Fortunately, this no longer needs to be the case.

Indian gaming is a particularly complicated and highly specialized topic for instructors, students, and practitioners alike to master. To meet the teaching and learning demands of the field, *INDIAN GAMING LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS* provides a clear, comprehensive, and accessible platform designed specifically for Indian gaming law and similar courses.

This casebook is one-stop resource for understanding Indian gaming law and the regulations and public policy that flow from it. This in large part is because our approach to the subject is informed by our sense that Indian gaming law and policy have evolved through political compromise as much as through litigation and law reform. Attention only to “black letter” law would be misleading as to the type and relative influence of extralegal variables that shape Indian gaming law. Similarly, discussion of the politics surrounding Indian gaming without grounding in the law would untether tribal gaming from its key legal context.

The focus of most existing casebooks that incorporate some discussion of Indian gaming is either as a form of gambling regulation or as an example of the application of federal Indian law. Our own work has emphasized that understanding Indian gaming requires explanation and exploration of both of these contexts. In this casebook, we fuse the necessary background on federal Indian law and the status of American In-

dian tribes in the American political system with legal approaches to regulating gambling, and provide a useful and usable overarching theoretical approach grounded in law and governance.

Students and other readers will hear from the legal, judicial, and political experts, American Indian and non-Indian alike, who shape Indian gaming today and will determine its future. We present excerpts from relevant case law, statutes, and regulations alongside excerpts from congressional testimony by noted public officials and scholarly journal articles and books written by key authorities in the fields of law, Indian studies, political science, economics, gambling studies, and more. To assist readers in working through such complex issues, we introduce teaching problems and notes and questions throughout. Accompanying the casebook is our *INSTRUCTOR'S RESOURCE MANUAL FOR INDIAN GAMING LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS*, in which we draw on our own experiences in the classroom to offer numerous suggestions to stimulate an engaging and exciting classroom environment.

A course in Indian gaming law has legal and political currency and thus can easily “connect” with students. But more than simply learning about current events, students should come away from such a course with a critical understanding of perhaps the most important legal and policy issues facing tribes today, and with a deeper sense of how tribal governments—the “third sovereign”—interact with the federal government as well as state and local governments in the American political system.

It is our sincere wish that students who use this casebook in a course on Indian gaming law will have the tools to enter the field as practicing attorneys, regulators, or policymakers and face with confidence the day-to-day complexities and nuances of Indian gaming law and policy. We also recognize that one of the primary functions of a law school education is to foster in students a sense of the interactions between law and society. We hope to further that important goal through this casebook's approach.

* * *

INDIAN GAMING LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS begins with Part I, Indian Gaming in Context. In this Part, we cover the necessary historical, legal, and political contexts for understanding the modern law of Indian gaming. In Chapter 1, we provide an overview of Indian gaming through multiple lenses. We discuss the growth and scope of tribal gaming and the legalized gambling industry in the U.S. before turning to an overview of how and why gambling is regulated. We then provide necessary background on the complicated area of federal Indian law and policy, and its historical and contemporary relationship to tribal sovereignty and tribal governments.

Chapter 2's focus is on the pre-statutory law that created the foundations for Indian gaming. We discuss traditional tribal games and Indian gaming's modern roots as a tool of reservation economic development, illustrated through case law arising out of state attempts to regulate tribal bingo operations in the 1970s and 1980s. The U.S. Supreme Court recognized the limits of state regulation in its landmark 1987 decision in *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*.

Part II, The Federal Regulatory Scheme, covers in detail the complex and comprehensive legal framework governing Indian gaming. In Chapter 3, we describe how *Cabazon* and the political activity it generated resulted in Congress's passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA). IGRA's regulatory framework codified several key policy goals for Indian gaming while creating the basis for extensive civil and criminal regulation of tribal gaming at the tribal, state, and federal levels. IGRA also created a classification scheme for Indian gaming regulation.

Chapter 4 describes the statutory requirements for conducting bingo and other forms of Class II gaming. The definition of Class II gaming has generated considerable litigation and controversy, as new technology has blurred the distinction between Class II and casino-style gaming.

In Chapter 5 we focus on Class III, or casino-style, gaming. IGRA requires the negotiation in good faith of tribal-state compacts before a tribe can operate Class III games. In 1996, however, the Supreme Court in *Seminole Tribe v. Florida* held that tribes could not sue states without their consent to enforce IGRA's good-faith requirement. We examine how the post-*Seminole* environment has become increasingly politicized. IGRA limits tribal gaming to the types of games that are allowed under state public policy. The question of the scope of Class III gaming under IGRA's definitions has been extensively litigated.

Part III, Government Authority Over Indian Gaming, explores in more detail the various government officials, agencies, and institutions that exercise power over Indian gaming at the federal, tribal, and state levels. Chapter 6 discusses the scope and extent of federal authority concerning tribal gaming. IGRA delegates to the National Indian Gaming Commission extensive powers to issue opinions and approve tribal gaming ordinances, management contracts, and consulting agreements, as well as to promulgate regulations and investigate and enforce various investigation and compliance provisions. The U.S. Secretary of the Interior and other federal agencies play key roles in determinations concerning tribal-state compacts, per capita payments, and other regulations.

In Chapter 7, we consider the extent of tribal authority to formulate, implement, enforce, and interpret tribes' own gaming regulations and ordinances. Indian gaming has created many new challenges and opportunities for tribal governments to build effective and responsive governmental institutions.

Chapter 8 turns to state authority regarding tribal gaming. IGRA's tribal-state compacting requirement allowed state gaming commissions and other agencies to become involved in the implementation and enforcement of tribal gaming regulation. State courts have interpreted IGRA's provisions related to state public policy and the scope of gaming, as well as decided which state actors are authorized to negotiate compacts. In state court litigation over Indian gaming, tribes may be forced to sit on the sidelines.

In the casebook's final chapters in Part IV, Policy Implications, we bring public policy and politics to the forefront. Chapter 9 focuses on tribal gaming's socioeconomic impacts. Indian gaming has both economic and social costs and benefits that may accrue to Indian and non-Indian communities. One of the keys to developing effective Indian gaming law and public policy is using methodologically sound research to identify and weigh these effects.

Chapter 10 explores in some detail four recurring legal and political issues in Indian gaming: "off-reservation" gaming, tribal-state revenue sharing agreements, federal tribal recognition, and tribal employment issues. All four issues continue to generate legal and political controversy throughout the U.S. Overall, there is little doubt that Indian gaming is changing the calculus of intergovernmental relations as well as the meaning of tribal sovereignty.

* * *

INDIAN GAMING LAW: CASES AND MATERIALS has benefited from numerous conversations and interactions we have had with academics, practitioners, regulators, public officials, and students. All mistakes, of course, are our own. We very much would appreciate

hearing from those of you who use this book. Please feel free to contact us at the Institute for the Study of Tribal Gaming Law and Policy at the University of North Dakota through our Web site, *Indian Gaming Today*, at indiangamingtoday.com or by e-mail at rand@law.und.edu or steven_light@und.nodak.edu.

As always, we are grateful for the support of our colleagues at the University of North Dakota School of Law and the Department of Political Science and Public Administration in the University of North Dakota College of Business and Public Administration. Special thanks to Kelly Jordet, Elizabeth Puthoff, and Karen Bowles for their administrative assistance, Lesley Foss and Matthew Myrick for their research assistance, and Jared Rigby for his assistance in proofreading. We are indebted to Meg Daniel, who prepared the Index and Table of Cases on short notice and with aplomb. At Carolina Academic Press, thanks to Keith Sipe for his continued enthusiasm about our work, Bob Conrow for guiding us through the publication process, Karen Clayton for her production assistance, and everyone else at the Press for their help along the way.

Kathryn R.L. Rand
Steven Andrew Light

Grand Forks, North Dakota
November 2007

Copyright Acknowledgments

We are indebted to those whose noteworthy scholarship and commentary on Indian gaming and myriad related topics inform this casebook. We gratefully acknowledge the permission granted by authors, law reviews and journals, publishers, and other organizations to reprint excerpts from the following materials.

Ansson, Richard J., & Ladine Oravetz, *Tribal Economic Development: What Challenges Lie Ahead for Tribal Nations as They Continue to Strive for Economic Diversity?*, 11 KANSAS JOURNAL OF LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY 441 (2002). Reprinted by permission.

Aronovitz, Cory, *The Regulation of Commercial Gaming*, 5 CHAPMAN LAW REVIEW 181 (2002). Reprinted by permission.

Burris, Tracy, *How Tribal Gaming Commissions Are Evolving*, 8 GAMING LAW REVIEW 243 (2004). Reprinted by permission.

Cabot, Anthony N., & Louis V. Csoka, *The Games People Play: Is It Time For a New Legal Approach to Prize Games?* 4 NEVADA LAW JOURNAL 197 (2004). Reprinted by permission.

Clinton, Robert N., *There Is No Federal Supremacy Clause for Indian Tribes*, 34 ARIZONA STATE LAW JOURNAL 113 (2002). Copyright © 2002 by Robert N. Clinton. Reprinted by permission of author.

Coffey, Wallace & Rebecca Tsosie, *Rethinking the Tribal Sovereignty Doctrine: Cultural Sovereignty and the Collective Future of Indian Nations*, 12 STANFORD LAW & POLICY REVIEW 191 (2001). Copyright © 2002 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Reprinted by permission.

CRAMER, RENEE ANN, CASH, COLOR, AND COLONIALISM: THE POLITICS OF TRIBAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT (2005). Copyright © 2005 by the University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Publishing Division of the University. All rights reserved. Reprinted by permission.

DELORIA, VINE JR., & CLIFFORD M. LYTLE, AMERICAN INDIANS, AMERICAN JUSTICE (1983). Copyright © 1983. Reprinted by permission of the University of Texas Press.

FINDLAY, JOHN M., PEOPLE OF CHANCE: GAMBLING IN AMERICAN SOCIETY FROM JAMESTOWN TO LAS VEGAS 3-4 (1986). Reprinted by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc.

Fletcher, Matthew L.M., *Tribal Employment Separation: Tribal Law Enigma, Tribal Governance Paradox, and Tribal Court Conundrum*, 38 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN JOURNAL OF LAW REFORM 273 (2005). Reprinted by permission.

Gerstein, Dean, et al., *Gambling Impact and Behavior Study: Report to the National Gambling Impact Study Commission* (1999). Reprinted by permission.

Gips, Robert L., *Current Trends in Tribal Economic Development*, 37 NEW ENGLAND LAW REVIEW 517 (2003). Reprinted by permission.

- Goldberg, Carole E., *Public Law 280: The Limits of State Jurisdiction Over Reservation Indians*. Originally published in 22 *UCLA LAW REVIEW* 535 (1975). Reprinted by permission.
- Jorgensen, Miriam, & Jonathan B. Taylor, *What Determines Indian Economic Success? Evidence from Tribal and Individual Indian Enterprises*. Originally published in *RED INK* 45 (Spring 2000). Reprinted by permission.
- Light, Steven Andrew, *Indian Gaming and Intergovernmental Relations: State-Level Constraints on Tribal Political Influence Over Policy Outcomes*, 38 *AMERICAN REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION* (2008). Reprinted by permission of the author.
- LIGHT, STEVEN ANDREW, & KATHRYN R.L. RAND, *INDIAN GAMING AND TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY: THE CASINO COMPROMISE* (2005). Lawrence: University Press of Kansas. Reprinted by permission.
- Light, Steven Andrew, Kathryn R.L. Rand, & Alan P. Meister, *Spreading the Wealth: Indian Gaming and Revenue-Sharing Agreements*, 80 *NORTH DAKOTA LAW REVIEW* 657 (2004). Copyright © 2005 North Dakota Law Review; Steven Andrew Light; Kathryn R.L. Rand; Alan P. Meister. Reprinted by permission.
- McClatchey, Brian P., *Tribally-Owned Businesses Are Not “Employers”: Economic Effects, Tribal Sovereignty, and NLRB v. San Manuel Band of Mission Indians*, 43 *IDAHO LAW REVIEW* 127 (2006). Reprinted by permission.
- McGuinness, Sean, *They Call It Gaming ... and You Can Bet It's Changed a Lot*, 15(6) *BUSINESS LAW TODAY* (July/Aug., 2006). Copyright © 2006 by the American Bar Association. Reprinted with permission.
- MEISTER, ALAN P., *INDIAN GAMING INDUSTRY REPORT* (2007-2008 ed.). Reprinted by permission of the author and Casino City Press, at www.CasinoCityPress.com.
- Miller, Robert J., *Economic Development in Indian Country: Will Capitalism or Socialism Succeed?*, 80 *OREGON LAW REVIEW* 757 (2001). Reprinted by permission.
- Myers, Mark D., *Federal Recognition of Indian Tribes in the United States*, 12 *STANFORD LAW & POLICY REVIEW* 271 (2001). Copyright © 2002 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Reprinted by permission.
- NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING ASSOCIATION, *AN ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF INDIAN GAMING IN 2005* (2006). Reprinted by permission.
- PASQUARETTA, PAUL, *GAMBLING AND SURVIVAL IN NATIVE NORTH AMERICA* (2003). Copyright © 2003 Arizona Board of Regents. Reprinted by permission of the University of Arizona Press.
- Porter, Robert B., *A Proposal to the Hanodaganyas to Decolonize Federal Indian Control Law*, 31 *UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN JOURNAL OF LAW REFORM* 899 (1998). Reprinted by permission.
- Rand, Kathryn R.L., *Caught in the Middle: How State Politics, State Law, and State Courts Constrain Tribal Influence Over Indian Gaming*, 90 *MARQUETTE LAW REVIEW* 971 (2007). Reprinted by permission.
- Rand, Kathryn R.L., & Steven Andrew Light, *How Congress Can and Should “Fix” the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act: Recommendations for Law and Policy Reform*, 13 *VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF SOCIAL POLICY & THE LAW* 396 (2006). Reprinted by permission.

- Reid, Harry, Commentary in *INDIAN GAMING AND THE LAW* 15-20 (William R. Eadington ed., 1998). Reno: Institute for the Study of Gambling & Commercial Gaming, University of Nevada, Reno. Reprinted by permission.
- Santoni, Roland J., *The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act: How Did We Get Here? Where Are We Going?* 26 *CREIGHTON LAW REVIEW* 387 (1992-1993). Copyright © 1992-93 by Creighton University. Reprinted by permission.
- SCHWARTZ, DAVID G., *ROLL THE BONES: THE HISTORY OF GAMBLING* (2006). Copyright © 2006 by David G. Schwartz. Used by permission of Gotham Books, an imprint of Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
- Skibine, Alex Tallchief, *Gaming on Indian Reservations: Defining the Trustee's Duty in the Wake of Seminole Tribe v. Florida*, 29 *ARIZONA STATE LAW JOURNAL* 121 (1997). Reprinted by permission of the author.
- Skibine, Alex Tallchief, *Scope of Gaming, Good Faith Negotiations and the Secretary of Interior's Class III Gaming Procedures: Is I.G.R.A. Still a Workable Framework After Seminole?*, 5 *GAMING LAW REVIEW* 401 (2001). Reprinted by permission.
- Staudenmaier, Heidi McNeil, *Negotiating Enforceable Tribal Gaming Management Agreements*, 7 *GAMING LAW REVIEW* 31 (2003). Reprinted by permission.
- Staudenmaier, Heidi McNeil, *Off-Reservation Native American Gaming: An Examination of the Legal and Political Hurdles*, 4 *NEVADA LAW JOURNAL* 301 (2004). Reprinted by permission.
- Taylor, Jonathan B., Matthew B. Krepps, & Patrick Wang, *The National Evidence on the Socioeconomic Impacts of American Indian Gaming on Non-Indian Communities* (2000). Reprinted by permission.
- Tsosie, Rebecca, *Negotiating Economic Survival: The Consent Principle and Tribal-State Compacts Under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act*, 29 *ARIZONA STATE LAW JOURNAL* 25 (1997). Reprinted by permission of author.
- Udall, Stewart L., Commentary in *INDIAN GAMING AND THE LAW* 22-28 (William R. Eadington ed., 1998). Reno: Institute for the Study of Gambling & Commercial Gaming, University of Nevada, Reno. Reprinted by permission.
- Washburn, Kevin K., *The Mechanics of Indian Gaming Management Contract Approval*, 8 *GAMING LAW REVIEW* 333 (2004). Reprinted by permission.
- WILKINS, DAVID E., *AMERICAN INDIAN POLITICS AND THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM* (2002). Reprinted by permission.