

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Native American Estate: The Struggle over Indian and Hawaiian Lands.
By Linda Parker.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9sv5x9p4>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 16(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Trask, Haunani-Kay

Publication Date

1992

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/>

this data, including the questions of tribal enrollment, dispersement of the population, and the implications of these statistics. However, he handles the material in a masterful manner, writing an authoritative study that will be of use to scholars, general readers, and Indian people. This is an important book which should be read by anyone interested in Native American history and culture.

Clifford E. Trafzer
University of California, Riverside

Native American Estate: The Struggle over Indian and Hawaiian Lands. By Linda Parker. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989. 260 pages. \$24.00 cloth.

On 28 August 1807, President Thomas Jefferson wrote to Secretary of War Henry Dearborn, instructing him to prepare for war with Indians who refused to submit to their removal. In brutal terms, Jefferson said the Indians should be told plainly that "if ever we are constrained to lift the hatchet against any tribe, we will never lay it down till that tribe is exterminated, or driven beyond the Mississippi" (Richard Drinnon, *Facing West*, p. 96).

Some forty years later, seventy thousand southern Indians had been killed or removed from their homes, leaving only a few thousand in the mountains and swamps. Among these tribes, the Cherokee suffered the liquidation of over half their nation: forty-five hundred died in the last large-scale removal under President Martin Van Buren. The Creek, like many of their brethren, succumbed to starvation, disease, and exposure. They, too, died by the thousands in both war and forced marches. And the Seminole suffered a fierce but losing war to genocidal American designs (Michael Rogin, *Fathers and Children*, p. 206).

According to Michael Rogin, chronicler of Andrew Jackson's lifelong campaigns of extermination against the Indians, "Violent rage marked Jackson's prepresidential Indian relations . . ." But removal, those agonizing journeys west, characterized his presidential Indian policy. More prolonged and cruel than war, removal allowed the Jacksonians special opportunities: Indians were given contaminated rations, including bad drinking water and rancid meat; they were ill-clothed through freezing winters; they were forced through areas where diseases like cholera and measles were raging; they were preyed upon by local settlers, sheriffs, and

other agents along the way. The desired result was that by 1844, "removal and resettlement had killed one-quarter to one-third of the southern Indians" (Rogin, *Fathers and Children*, p. 24).

Whether murdered in war or forced to die by starvation and disease, the indigenous peoples of North America were systematically eliminated as white Americans, like white South Africans on another continent, conquered the "promised land." Jackson, quintessential frontiersman, represented best the American religious and cultural conviction that "to be a man meant to participate . . . in a genocide" (Rogin, *Fathers and Children*, p. 248).

And genocide, that systematic, official policy of physical extermination of whole peoples and nations, is an exact description of the intention and practice of the United States government regarding the Indians of North America. Reflecting American culture, this practice was not confined to one civilian or military leader. Driven mad by their hunger for lands and profit, settlers, industrialists, and entrepreneurs encouraged, indeed clamored for, Indian extermination throughout the several centuries of white colonization.

Despite a storehouse of scholarly works on this history, including primary documents like newspapers and diaries, one will search in vain for the merest mention of white American genocide in Linda Parker's published dissertation, *Native American Estate: The Struggle over Indian and Hawaiian Lands*. Neither the word nor its meaning appear anywhere in her work. Nor, sadly, does a sense of sorrow or outrage come through her sterile prose.

There are only chapters on the "appropriation" of Indian and Hawaiian lands, and a dehumanized language that distances the horrendous treatment of Indians, misrepresenting both American policy and its murderous effects. Thus we learn, for example, that the United States military "escorted to Indian Territory most of the Seminoles, Creeks, and Cherokees" who remained after the southern campaigns (Parker, p. 36). These escorts, moreover, rarely waged war but rather participated in "military engagements" that were forced on the American government by "settlers' hostility and intrusion on Indian lands" (Parker, p. 39).

Indeed, for Parker, the federal government is more often an unwilling arbitrator between frontiersmen, local officials, and nascent capitalists (the "aggressors") and reluctant, recalcitrant Indians (the doomed prey). Indians who fought government actions were "insurgents," while those who did not only "offered no military resistance." Meanwhile, the villainy and treachery of federal officials who promised certain lands in perpetuity while

continuously renege on their assurances are described as having simply “countermanded” agreements and treaties (Parker, p. 43).

This kind of bloodless description of what amounts to centuries of genocide is all the more shocking since Parker, an attorney, identifies as a Cherokee Indian. Apart from wondering what her ancestors would think of her book, I am troubled that her identification has not managed to imbue her work with any moral outrage, thereby creating a moving statement of conscience.

In lieu of this, Parker has managed only a dry-as-dust catalog of the theft of Indian lands through policies of removal, land cessions, allotment, and termination. In the twentieth century, she tells us, the Department of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers have been the “primary government adversaries of the Indian.” Within the Department of the Interior, conflict between the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Mines, the National Park Service, and others has meant that “Indian interests are often not adequately served” (Parker, p. 55). This inadequacy is illustrated through the “erosion” of land and water rights of various Indian nations. Finally, by the 1980s, many Indians still had “failed to exploit their land resources” because of “adversities” (Parker, p. 86).

But why are Indian land and water problems framed as “adversities” when they are the result of planned theft by everyone from local ranchers to the president of the United States?

Parker’s rendering of the “appropriation of the Hawaiian landed estate” is not much better. Apart from egregious errors—Captain Cook’s “discovery” of the Hawaiian Islands; the role of mass depopulation from introduced diseases as incidental rather than determinative in the Hawaiians’ decision to institute private property land tenure; the statement that “most” Hawaiians opposed the American military-backed overthrow of their government in 1893 when, in fact, every single Hawaiian in and out of government opposed the takeover by *haole* (white) people and the loss of Hawaiian sovereignty—the section on Hawaiian lands is not only wrong but wrong-headed.

As in the Indian section, Parker continues to write from some far remove, as if such a posture guarantees truth. But historical truth is distorted to the point of falsehood when forces like racism, genocide, and capitalism are studiously avoided. Thus, in describing the most hateful practices by *haole*, especially *haole* missionaries, Parker relies on understatement, omission, and fabrication. The predicted result is a view of the “appropriation” of Hawaiian

lands that, like the current *haole* ideology operating in Hawaii, blames Hawaiian dispossession on some vague clash of cultures.

A few examples: Parker refuses to acknowledge the *haole* belief in Hawaiian "native laziness" as part of a fundamental racism that has always animated American policy toward indigenous control of lands. This failure to confront and analyze racism results in obligatory defenses of those most responsible for the theft of Hawaiian land, including Gerrit P. Judd, notorious missionary adviser to Kamehameha III who engineered the land division of 1848–50 that established private property, sealing the rapid transfer of Hawaiian lands to foreign owners. In defense of Judd, Parker reiterates what Hawaiians call the "missionary history" of Hawaii, claiming that Judd and others were "sincerely concerned with the welfare of the Hawaiian nation" and thus supported "individual ownership by commoners" of lands held and used collectively. The missionary justification was the familiar Calvinist notion that private ownership leads to productive, industrious character.

But Parker omits, whether by design or ignorance, that Judd gained over six thousand acres of Hawaiian land as a direct result of the policy he pressed on the Hawaiian chiefs. And none of his lands went to commoners. Today, while the large majority of Hawaiians are still landless, Judd's descendants are among the wealthiest individuals in Hawaii, owning ranches, fishponds, and sugar plantations.

Parker's defense of the missionary class in Hawaii continues in her concluding chapter, where she asserts, wrongly, that "a majority of the *haoles*, excluding many of the missionaries, wanted land for agricultural, commercial or private use" (Parker, p. 190). In truth, missionaries wanted land for the same reasons, which is why they eventually acquired more land than all Hawaiian commoners together. By the late 1880s, missionary businesses controlled nearly four-fifths of all arable land in Hawaii. In 1893, missionary descendants joined other *haoles* to overthrow the Hawaiian government and lobby for immediate annexation to the United States. During the territorial (1900–1959) and post-statehood periods (1959–present), four of the five largest landholding corporations in Hawaii have been owned by missionary descendants.

The significance of this detail rests not only in its historical accuracy but in its lessons for the current failure of Hawaiian efforts to reclaim lands and protect cultural practices, which Parker touches upon. Such efforts are not primarily understand-

able in the context of legal maneuvers, as Parker suggests. Rather they are more clearly analyzed as the result of political power wielded by landowners and political powerlessness suffered by Hawaiians in modern Hawaii.

The vacuum within which Parker seeks to explain the "struggle over Indian and Hawaiian lands" is thus a result of both an excessive legalism and a deep refusal to address characteristic American practices, like genocide and racism, which I have already mentioned. If Parker were more interested in justice and truth and less concerned with an image of objectivity, she would have written a better book. But she has steadfastly avoided issues of culpability (and therefore accuracy) in her telling of one of the greatest evils ever to befall the Indian and Hawaiian peoples.

For those who want more honesty and moral outrage, Parker's book needs to be supplemented by Richard Drinnon's masterpiece, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building*, recently reissued by Schocken, and a pathbreaking work by Hawaiian professor Lilikalā Kame'eiehiwa on *haole* theft of Hawaiian land. Titled *Native Land and Foreign Desires*, Kame'eiehiwa's book will be published by Bishop Museum Press of Honolulu, Hawaii, in fall 1991.

Haunani-Kay Trask
University of Hawaii

Cultural Encounters: The Impact of the Inquisition in Spain and the New World. Edited by Mary Elizabeth Perry and Anne J. Cruz. Publications of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, No. 24. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991. 288 pages. \$34.95 cloth.

During the course of its prolonged struggle with the Moorish (Islamic) powers, the Spanish Crown had become master of a formidable military and naval technology. Alongside of its armies marched the Church Triumphant, for the Roman Catholic faith was a powerful auxiliary in the process of unifying the Spanish Empire.

In 1492, this formidable set of instruments began to be directed against the native peoples of the Americas. Armed with military technology, the conquistadores devastated the countryside. Although small in number, these ruthless and ambitious men were able to topple the rulers of the great civilized states of middle and