

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

“The Utes Must Go!”: American Expansion and the Removal of a People.
By Peter R. Decker.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/63t2f8mt>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Voggesser, Garrit

Publication Date

2005

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The answer may lie in Shoemaker's characterizations of the earliest Native and European perceptions of sameness. Seventeenth-century and early-eighteenth-century encounters may have contained more difference and less harmonious agreement on sameness than she allows for. To give an extended example, Shoemaker finds evidence of sameness in Native and European views about land possession by a sovereign political entity, noting difference only in form rather than function. "Europeans also memorialized events and individuals by artificially marking the land; they just adhered to a different aesthetic" (15), she observes. Such characterizations are accurate as far as they go, but they ignore the fundamental reality at the heart of the Native-European experience in eastern North America. Europeans were coming to North America from elsewhere, from lands they were already in sovereign possession of, to lands they recognized as possessed by other sovereign peoples. This was murky terrain legally and ethically, and Europeans knew it. At the heart of the Native-European encounter in eastern North America was the nature of their differing relationships to the land. That Native and European relationships to the land differed should not be viewed as the romanticized construct incapable of scholarly analysis and so rightly critiqued by Shoemaker. Rather, it should be seen for what it was: the cold political fact of territorial possession and dispossession. Here was surely the most self-evident and insurmountable difference of all. The many European observations of similarities were each, on some level, filtered through their uneasy recognition that they were dispossessing lawful sovereigns of their land. Thus difference, rather than similarity, underlay the colonial venture from its inception.

Shoemaker has raised a compelling series of issues in this slim volume (there are only 143 pages of text). Each begs for further sustained analysis; each should generate insightful scholarly debate. Scholars of Native history should consider seriously whether our existing theoretical understandings of Native peoples and Europeans adequately describe the complex relationships they developed. Likewise, we should evaluate to what degree and with what safeguards we should utilize European-derived sources. Gender analysis, leadership and the uses of literacy, too, are topics that can be productively examined in more depth. Nancy Shoemaker has offered important initial thoughts on these and other subjects; it is to be hoped she will continue to contribute her insights to the ongoing discussion.

Rebecca Kugel

University of California, Riverside

"The Utes Must Go!": American Expansion and the Removal of a People. By Peter R. Decker. Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 2004. 236 pages. \$17.95 paper.

This book examines how westward expansion and national economic development dictated the dispossession of the Utes and their forced removal from Colorado to Utah. Peter Decker focuses on the relationship between the Utes and the federal government from the mid-nineteenth century until the tribe's

relocation in the early 1880s. What unfolds is a tragic story of misunderstanding. It is a tale of two cultures driven to conflict by unfamiliarity with each others' values and beliefs and fear of the unknown.

Decker begins his book with the premise that the Utes and their culture have largely disappeared from the contemporary "human landscape" of Colorado. He aims to discover how and why a powerful Indian people gave up their "traditional homeland," including vast natural-resource wealth in land, water, timber, and minerals, for a diminutive reservation farther west. The sad result was anything but inevitable. Decker eschews a preordained outcome for the Utes, highlighting instead the Utes' active role in resisting dispossession and removal. Despite the merits of American nationalism, Decker points out, our past has many "darker, less virtuous layers" (xv). Bureau of Indian Affairs officials, the US military, and many Americans capitalized on Ute territory and resources and justified those acquisitions with racist ideology. Nonetheless, Decker explains, the Utes were also to blame for conflict, specifically for violent crimes such as raiding white homesteads, stealing livestock, and kidnapping for ransom. Decker is no apologist for the Utes, yet he concludes that it was the greed and hostility of whites that "drives" the story of Ute removal.

"The Utes Must Go!" focuses largely on three major themes: racism, Manifest Destiny, and the failures of Indian policy. Decker explains Manifest Destiny as a "sense of entitlement to the American continent" on the part of whites. Accordingly, Indian "savages" had to make way for Thomas "Jefferson's hero," the yeoman farmer, who would reap bounty from the soil, spread democratic ideals, and create civilization out of the wilderness. Decker is quite blunt about the impetus behind this typical story of Western settlement and development. Manifest Destiny was imbued with a pervasive, harsh, and violent racism that forecast the "extinction" of Indians. In fact, Decker labels Ute removal as an "American experiment at ethnic cleansing" (12). The improvement and development of the American continent by whites required Indian "euthanasia." The Utes had no choice but resistance and warfare.

To describe this campaign of dispossession and extermination, Decker begins by contrasting white American and Spanish relationships with the Utes. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Spanish built their international empire on the territory and resources of the Americas. Despite their missionary and commercial interests, the Spanish ultimately chose "paternal pacification" of tribes such as the Utes rather than military subjugation. Spanish commercial interests and the military might of the Utes dictated accommodation and adaptation on both sides. As a result, according to Decker, Utes and Spaniards built a "peaceful coexistence" buttressed by trade.

In 1848, with victory in the Mexican-American War, however, the United States replaced accommodation with less-benign policies. Indians were no longer partners, or even humans, but "savages." Decker argues that the federal government, gold seekers, settlers, and other Americans used the "savage" stereotype as the rationalization for pushing the Utes to the fringe of the frontier. Building an American empire meant the Utes had to go; civilization and progress demanded it.

A reservation became the “holding pen” or “prison” to contain and isolate the tribe. Once the government had penned up the Utes on the White River Agency in northwestern Colorado, it could begin to civilize them. The Utes would be recast as yeoman farmers, taught lessons of self-support, and given instruction on “progressive” and Christian values. The assimilation process promoted by US reformers, as Decker points out, ignored tribal culture, beliefs, and desires. Most Utes had little interest in the plow and the hoe, preferring horses and the hunt.

In 1878 the Bureau of Indian Affairs hired Nathan Meeker, indebted president of the Greeley (Colorado) Colony and only a modestly successful journalist, to serve as the agent at White River. Meeker would be charged with carrying out the civilization and agricultural project among the Utes. “Father Meeker,” as Decker refers to him, frequently lectured the Utes on morality, religion, self-sufficiency, and capitalism. However, hunting and horses were the traditional measure of status in Ute society, and bartering was the means for sustenance and economic survival. Few Utes saw anything in Meeker’s sermonizing on agriculture and other topics but “foolish” and “risky” propositions. Meeker made little progress with the Utes. His suggestions about becoming diligent farmers simply did not mesh with Ute culture or beliefs.

The lack of success with the Utes incited uproar throughout Colorado and the nation. State officials, newspapers, and white residents had no patience for Indian “idleness.” Allowing the Utes to remain in the state was not only a “wanton waste of property” but a reflection of a “paternal and idiotic Indian Bureau” that encouraged Indians to live on the dole (114–15). Idle Indians were not only a hindrance to Colorado’s economic development but a physical threat to the state’s non-Indian citizens. In fact, by the fall of 1879 Meeker had so lost control of the White River Agency and the Utes that he requested large-scale military support. If the Utes would not farm, they would suffer military force.

Misunderstanding and miscommunication ultimately led to the battle of Mill Creek. Neither the US Army nor the Utes were certain about the other’s intentions. Would the army negotiate? Would the Utes attack? Army officials received conflicting signals from Meeker and tribal members, while the Utes had difficulty deciphering information from Meeker and the army. In a desperate and “stubborn” ploy to consolidate his own power over the agency, Meeker withheld information that would have allayed armed conflict. For his obstinacy and obstruction Meeker received death at the hands of the Utes. In the fall of 1881, for their hindrance to American “progress,” 1,458 Utes were marched by force out of Colorado and onto a new reservation in Utah.

Although Decker’s book is short on primary research, he provides a fresh perspective on familiar material. The story of the Utes focuses on many common themes in American Indian history: progress, self-support, civilization, and assimilation. Despite this common storyline, Decker’s study raises a vital point: cultural naiveté was the root of conflict between the Utes and non-Indians. Decker could explore this topic in much greater detail. However, the fact that the theme of cultural misunderstanding emerges makes the book an important contribution to the field of Indian history. Moreover, because it is

well written, the book is easily accessible for nonacademic audiences. Finally, “*The Utes Must Go!*” is a good story, and that is what history should be.

Garrit Voggeser

University of Oklahoma

National Wildlife Federation

Waccamaw Legacy: Contemporary Indians Fight for Survival. By Patricia Barker Lerch. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004. 184 pages. \$29.95 paper.

The University of Alabama Press is on the vanguard of research and writing about modern, contemporary southeastern Native America with the press's Contemporary American Indian Studies series. For a long time academicians treated southern Indians as relics of the past. Enterprising realists recognized the academy's shortcomings as “Indian” communities gradually emerged from the woods and swamps throughout the twentieth century, becoming evermore vocal and public with their claims. The press's latest installment in this series, Patricia Barker Lerch's *Waccamaw Legacy*, promises to leave a legacy of its own.

Lerch is a pioneer scholar, having worked closely with the Waccamaw-Siouan Indians of southeastern North Carolina since 1981. This relationship allows Lerch to speak authoritatively on the history of the overlooked Waccamaw Indian community. In particular, this story seems to be one of persistence, a familiar theme to those working in the field of southeastern Indian studies.

Lerch opens *Waccamaw Legacy* with an adept synthesis of the colonial records, placing the historic Waccamaws in context. Lerch provides fascinating forays into obscure historical sources and comments on the various ponderings of early ethnographers. Particularly intriguing, especially for those unfamiliar with the vagaries of southeastern Indian history, is the discussion, in chapters 3 and 4, of the strategies employed by peoples of Indian descent to maintain their Indian identity—and their *communities*—in a predominating society generally acknowledging but two races—white and “colored.” In all of these efforts Lerch is successful in educating the reader, illuminating a heretofore relatively unknown Native American nation, and carrying southeastern Indian history into the late twentieth century.

Less convincing, however, is Lerch's demonstration of solid connections between the “historic” or aboriginal Waccamaws and the modern community claiming descent from this indigenous people. For instance, in the first chapter, “The Eastern Siouans,” Lerch tries to convince readers that the Spanish Guacaya of 1521 and the English Woccon of 1701 are references to the same people and that both are synonymous with Waccamaw. In asserting that the Waccamaw tribal name is used in 1670, the only credible source cited is John R. Swanton's classic *Indians of the Southeastern United States*, a massive ethnographic tome emanating from the hallowed old halls of the Smithsonian