CONTACTS BETWEEN NATIVE AMERICANS AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS SINCE WORLD WAR II

Emanuel J. Drechsel
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This essay explores the relationship of sociocultural complementarities that Native Americans and Native Hawaiians as the only native peoples of the United States have developed through recent mutual contacts. Of special interest are references not only to military training, rest, and rehabilitation during and after World War II, but also to the search by both native peoples for traditional identities and political alternatives. Contrary to isolationist expectations, Native Americans and Native Hawaiians have found much in common because of similar experiences in their colonial and modern histories; hence, they have understood more of each other's concerns than divide-and-conquer–minded colonists and their descendants have realized. Initial investigations suggest that casual contacts have developed into formal encounters in which Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have increasingly drawn on each other for support and have proven a major source of solidarity in their struggle for cultural and political autonomy.

Preliminaries

A RECENT BOOK by the Standing Rock Sioux historian Philip J. Deloria (2004), *Indians in Unexpected Places*, examines how Native Americans have coped and contended with modernity contrary to standard stereotypical expectations of their traditional social roles. Deloria considers examples of unanticipated, even disorienting, discordance such as Geronimo sitting behind the wheel of a Cadillac, a string quartet or jazz band consisting of Native American musicians, and Indians appearing in various athletic or staged functions. The present essay similarly reviews the question of native

Pacific Studies, Vol. 31, No. 2—June 2008

peoples "out of place," specifically American Indians in the Hawaiian Islands since early World War II, and explores contacts between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians.[1] The following pages document what appears a commonplace presence of Native Americans, long thought in decline, even in the fiftieth state, and survey interactions between American Indians and Hawaiians in the past decades. Not only have Native Americans and Native Hawaiians shared many sociohistorical parallels in spite of their different origins, but their paths have crossed again and again, which raises interesting broader issues of recent Pacific history and challenge some widely held stereotypes about both peoples.[2]

Native American-Hawaiian Contacts in Historical Perspective

A hemispheric, macrohistorical overview of the United States might suggest an expansion from east to west, in which the Hawaiian Islands were little more than an extension of the West Coast en route to the Philippines (see Coffman 1998: 289–313; Drinnon 1980). By logical extension, this kind of reasoning would not be receptive to the idea of any contacts between Native Americans and Hawaiians before the arrival of U.S. Americans in the Hawaiian Islands and their westward expansion. Much less would such a reductionist east-to-west interpretation of U.S. American history favor contacts between Native Hawaiians and Native Americans before the arrival of Europeans on grounds of the mistaken assumption that the native peoples lacked the technological or navigating expertise necessary to sail long distances across high oceans.

In reality, it is reasonable now to assume that, as highly skilled sailors on double-hull canoes, Native Hawaiians did not merely voyage to other Pacific islands, but could have extended their ventures into the northeastern Pacific and western North America some 2,200 nautical miles away. These Hawaiian sailors would not have encountered empty islands as elsewhere in their first explorations of the Pacific, but would likely have arrived on inhabited territory. Short of returning to sea, any voyaging Hawaiians must have succumbed to the native population, which would have adopted and absorbed them, if it did not kill them, because the visitors were comparatively few in number (Finney 1994: 283–87). Thus, we can hardly expect seafaring Polynesians to have left many, if any, distinctive traces in North America before the arrival of the British explorer James Cook. If the absence of evidence need not indicate the absence of contact between Hawaiians and Native Americans before the Europeans' arrival, the archaeologist Terry L. Jones and the linguist Kathryn A. Klar (Jones and Klar 2005; Klar and Jones 2005) have offered some convincing arguments and data in

support of a pre-European contact by Polynesians with the Chumash Indians of southern California and the neighboring Gabrielino: sewn-plank boats among these Indians, common to Polynesians but not to Native Americans, and accompanying loanwords of apparent Polynesian origin in Southern Chumashan languages, reconstructable as proto-Southern Chumashan **tomolo'o* (sewn-plank canoe) for approximately AD 400 to 800.

Native Hawaiians, too, were among the very first newcomers to western North America in the European-American explorations of the northern Pacific from the late 1780s, as crew members. The Hawaiian Islands had not only come to serve as a wintering place for British, American, and Russian ships, soon to develop into a major way station for tall ships in the trans-Pacific trade, but within years, the islands assumed a strategic commercial role by serving as ports of call for fresh provisions, repairs of ships, recreation for crews, and new manpower in the emerging trade of fur, sandalwood, and whale oil between western North America (including Alaska) and Asia (Gibson 1992: 44–50, 187–88, 212–13, 253–58, 278–91). European and European-American sailors who had jumped ship in the islands or elsewhere in the Pacific needed replacement. Substituting for them were adventurous Hawaiians, who joined to leave untenable lives or to explore new opportunities, who quickly proved skillful sailors in dangerous endeavors, and who demonstrated dexterity, courage, and reliability as canoe men, fishermen, and whalers in rough waters (Chappell 1997).[3]

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, fur-trade companies, foremost the Hudson's Bay Company, engaged hundreds of Native Hawaiians in the fur trade of the Northwest Coast, which brought them into direct, regular contact with Native Americans. Known as *Kanakas* (< Hawaiian *kanaka* "human being, man, person, individual; subject, as of a chief; laborer, servant, helper," or *kānaka*, plural of *kanaka* [Pukui and Elbert 1986: 127]), Native Hawaiians succeeded as fur traders, lumbermen, farmers, and miners and in still other occupations. Jean Barman (1997–1998: 12) has estimated a thousand Hawaiian men, possibly more, to have moved to northwestern North America "as seamen, fur trade labourers, or adventurers," and has identified several reasons why Native Hawaiians remained in the Pacific Northwest or even returned there after a visit to the Hawaiian Islands:

> Visiting seamen likely brought news of deteriorating conditions at home, where local people were losing their autonomy and self-respect in the face of religious and economic exploitation by outsiders. Land on the west coast of North America was plentiful, unlike the Hawaiian Islands where newcomers had acquired control over the best land. William Naukana is said to have gone back sometime

> in the 1850s only to find family land appropriated for a sugar plantation, and so returned to North America. Men with families by local women had personal reasons for staying in the Pacific Northwest. (Barman 1997–1998: 13)

However, a major reason for the Hawaiians' stay in the Pacific Northwest undoubtedly was also the spread of various epidemic diseases in the Hawaiian Islands, resulting in a rapid depopulation of native Islanders (see Stannard 1989).

Still another motivation for many Hawaiians not to return, even when by contract they already had a paid passage home after having completed service with the company, was that they had sought and found companionship among Native Americans and often married into native communities (Barman 1995, Duncan 1973, Koppel 1995, Naughton 1983). According to records of the Catholic Church and other historical documentation, Hawaiian men often wedded Chinook women, or less frequently found wives among the Chehalis and Cowlitz tribes, all located on the Columbia River and close to fur-trade routes (Naughton 1983: 30–32, 39–41). Moreover, Native Hawaiians came into regular contact with Kwakiutl, Algonquian-speaking Métis, Iroquois of northeastern North America, and still other tribes of the area (Koppel 1995: 17, 18, 22, 23, 53, 57, 99–100, 140 [fn. 4]). In the second half of the nineteenth century, the association of Hawaiians with American Indians received a boost by laws forbidding marriage between whites and people of color, including Hawaiians, in Oregon and Washington but not in British Columbia (Barman 1997–1998: 14). Thus, Hawaiians settled in new homes in northwestern North America in spite of temperatures ranging lower by some 20°F than in the islands.[4]

Sadly, little substantive information is currently available about these Hawaiian-Indian relations. Still, historians have not hesitated to present Indian-Hawaiian encounters in terms of animosity and even hostility (for recent examples, see Chappell 1997: 104–05, 165; Duncan 1973: 102), just as traditional depictions attributed to Hawaiians little adaptability to new environments, especially a colder climate such as that of the Northwest Coast. However, such characterizations do not reflect so much a true historical picture as more the divide-and-conquer wishful thinking of colonists whose primary interest was to prevent any alliance between American Indians and Hawaiians and, with it, any possible rebellion by native peoples. In reality, engagement in the fur trade by outsiders such as Hawaiians required close cooperation with the indigenous population, still the primary provider of the desired goods. As was the case for instance with French traders, whether accredited *voyageurs* or unlicensed *coureurs de bois*, and their *métis* descendants, Native Hawaiians must have developed fairly

close and intimate, even symbiotic relations with Native Americans of the Northwest Coast and Inuit of Alaska with a mutual give and take, although not always without conflict.

A few years after the first Native Hawaiians had shipped out to the Northwest Coast in support of Europeans and Americans in their explorations, the French-born poet and naturalist Adelbert von Chamisso, writing about his Pacific travels in German between 1815 and 1818, reported the presence of as many as a hundred Aleuts from Kodiak ("Kadiacker" or "Aleuten") in the Hawaiian Islands. They had come as crew on a sealing expedition of the Russian-American Company whose ship ran aground—eventually to end up as sealers on an American ship destined for California (Kotzebue 1821: II: 113–14; III: 153, 158). What happened to these Aleuts remains a mystery at this time. Whether and how other Native Americans visited the Hawaiian Islands in the nineteenth century is an open question short of other specific historical evidence and protracted research with primary documents on that topic. However, as the example of Kodiak Aleuts suggests, adventurous members of Western tribes—engaged as sealers, in some other function of the fur trade, or as whalers—made it to the Hawaiian Islands. Just as the fur trade had already brought Iroquois and Algonquians from eastern North America to the west coast, the tradition of traveling by seagoing canoes did not keep native peoples of the Pacific Northwest from globetrotting, even if they could not draw on the high-sea voyaging skills of Polynesians (Gould 1968, Neel 1995; for a general discussion, see Helms 1988).

The primary institution responsible for the transfer of Native Americans to the Hawaiian Islands likely was the Hudson's Bay Company, because it had been the principal player in the Hawaiians' relocation to the Northwest Coast. Notably, the eminent and long-standing institution of fur trade did not merely use the islands as a convenient base for its ships in commerce with Asia; but from 1829 until 1861, it maintained a store in downtown Honolulu for reducing dependence of its posts in the Pacific Northwest on imported supplies and diversifying its business beyond the fur trade to timber and salmon, agricultural and manufactured products, plus services in expanding markets in the Hawaiian Islands, western North America, and England in addition to those to Asia (Spoehr 1986: 27, 29, 46–59; 1988). Just as the company kept employing native people as hunters and agents on the North American continent, it apparently hired Native American sealers and whalers as ship crew. In spite of its expansionist goals, the company maintained "a firm policy for the conduct of the Agency—namely, that the agents support the Hawaiian government and not meddle in its affairs" (Spoehr 1986: 37). If this policy amounted to a rare enlightened approach on

the Hawaiian Islands, the Hudson's Bay Company never became an indigenous or local business, but has remained one of the dominant corporations in the European expansion of North America (Wolf 1982: 172–90).

Although there is evidence for some fairly wide-ranging Indian-Hawaiian interactions in the Pacific Northwest in the early nineteenth century, historians need better documentation to demonstrate what, on grounds of her rather limited study, E. Momilani Naughton (1983: 74) has interpreted as "a significant impact" by Native Hawaiians on the Pacific Northwest. Not only is there little information available about Hawaiians who became absorbed into Native American communities of the Northwest, but it is far from clear to what extent and in what ways Native Hawaiians, other than those adopted into native communities, kept interacting with the latter in the late nineteenth century. Native Americans and many "mainland" Hawaiians apparently parted ways with the decline of the fur trade after the mid-nineteenth century and with the California Gold Rush in 1858. When after 1860 the Hawaiian Islands ceased as intermediary station in the fur trade, and with it the Hudson's Bay Company as a local company, Hawaiians found other work as loggers, in sawmills, as longshoremen, and on subsistence farming with the renewal of their contracts (Barman 1997–1998: 15–16), whence there existed much less of an obvious incentive for Hawaiians to visit Native Americans in numbers or vice versa. Significantly, some of the Native American sources whom Naughton (1983: 38) could still consult for her research on Hawaiians in the fur trade did no longer appear aware of their Hawaiian forefathers, and others preferred not to claim any Hawaiian ancestry, even when they apparently were aware of it.[5]

If the fur trade, whaling and sealing defined the interactions between Native Americans and Hawaiians in the nineteenth century, there appeared a silence in the records of the following decades. Does it indicate an absence of interactions or merely an absence of recorded observations? Future research will have to answer that question.

"Unexpected" Native Americans in the Hawaiians Islands for Military Service

The next major occasion for contact between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians was World War II, when after basic training in the continental United States, Native Americans came to the Hawaiian Islands for final training "in the bush," as was true especially for code talkers. Not only did Native Americans make a disproportionately large contribution to the war efforts, with motives ranging from adventurism to the pursuit of warrior traditions, the prospect for employment and education, and patriotism,

Native American soldiers also distinguished themselves by using their native languages as military codes, sometimes in reduced and disguised form, which neither German nor Japanese intelligence ever broke. In World War II, the U.S. armed forces in the Pacific made use of at least six different Native American languages as military codes among no less than fourteen different ones (Meadows 2002: 68, 70–71, 241–42): Assiniboine (Siouan), Hopi (Uto-Aztecan), Kiowa (Kiowa-Tanoan), Lakota and Dakota (Siouan), Muskogee and Seminole (Muskogean), and Navajo (Athapaskan).[6] Their reason for selection had in part been highly distinct phonologies, lexica, and grammars with few published data accessible to the enemy; the other major justification was large, viable speech communities from which the armed forces could draw sufficient bilingual men for military and specialized training. Except for the Muskogee-Seminole Indians, who served in the Aleutian Campaign and who never had any need to leave North America, these Native American servicemen fought in the South or western Pacific, and passed through the Hawaiian Islands for stopovers, "jungle training," instruction, and recovery.

Specifics of the Native American code talkers' visits have remained rather obscure other than for Navajo Indians serving with the Marine Corps in the Pacific. However, the Hawaiian Islands came to serve as the final training grounds, where Navajo Marines took part in military exercises in which they practiced taking small islands from ships. For four weeks, Parker Ranch on the Big Island of Hawai'i also was the location of field training, including gruesome multiple-day maneuvers.[7] Many Navajo returned to Pearl Harbor on O'ahu, the only location of the Navajo code books other than Camp Pendleton in California, for retraining with a revised code before the impending invasion of Okinawa and Japan to inhibit any decoding by the enemy. Some Navajo visited the Hawaiian Islands again on rest and rehabilitation before going home. By a recent estimate, there were some 400 Navajo participants in the project, whose existence remained classified until 1968 because of the extra secret nature of their assignment and of whom 150 were still alive in 2001. Socially, the code talkers occupied a tenuous position within the military. They frequently faced prejudices against people of color prevalent at the time; moreover, non-Indian American servicemen regularly mistook them as Japanese, jammed their telephone and radio messages, and threatened to kill them. Some code talkers received non-Indian "body guards" assigned to them. Officially, these guards were said to protect the Navajo soldiers from Japanese, but in reality had to shelter them also from fellow servicemen (Bixler 1992: 73–74; McClain 2001: 99, 114–15, 120, 125, 145, 154–55, 171–72, 192–93, 203, 205; Paul 1973: 61–63, 85, 87).[8]

Even less information is available on how Native American code talkers adapted in the civilian domains of the Hawaiian Islands. Still, after completing their duties, Navajo Marines occasionally enjoyed a game of horseshoes, which provided "a strange sight . . . in the backwoods of Hawaii" (McClain 2001: 157–58). Navajo soldiers also participated enthusiastically—and apparently with some success—in rodeos in competition with local cowboys (Bixler 1992: 73), known as *paniolos* (< Hawaiian "Spaniard, Spanish" [Pukui and Elbert 1986: 315]). Still, at least during their training in the Hawaiian Islands, Navajo Marines probably did not have extended contacts with the local population for reasons of military security, until they returned for rest and rehabilitation on their way home from the South Pacific or Asia, and even then they did not have permission to recount their war experiences.

For the period after World War II, there exists a similar gap of information about the presence of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands.[9] This conclusion does not necessarily mean that they disappeared from the islands. Some Native American soldiers on rest and rehabilitation in Hawai'i during the Korean and Vietnam Wars apparently found a home and settled in the Islands on their return. Unfortunately, the first census to take account of Native Americans in the islands did not appear until 1960, after which the numbers have been rising steadily (Table 1).

TABLE 1. **U.S. Bureau of the Census Figures for Native Americans and Part-Native Americans Living in the Hawaiian Islands.**

	Census Year[a]					
	1960	1970	1980[10]	1990	2000[11]	Classification of ancestry
American Indian	472	1216				not available
			2210	4738	3535	with single or without other ancestry
			11728	14835	24882	with at least one or other ancestry
Eskimo and Aleut			675	361		with single or without other ancestry
			881	323		with at least one or other ancestry
Total Native American and Part-Native American	472	1216				not available
			2885	5099	3535	with single or without other ancestry
			12609	15158	24882	with at least one or other ancestry

[a]U.S. Bureau of the Census data for 1960 appeared in 1963; for 1970, in 1973; for 1980, in 1983; for 1990, in 1992 and 1993; and for 2000, in 2002.

Tracing the numbers of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands does not permit easy comparisons from 1960 through 2000. Not only did the censuses of 1960 and 1970 make no distinction about ancestry, and that category has in turn undergone redefinition through the subsequent decades, but for 2000, even the classification of "American Indian" has endured undue narrowing to Native Americans of the lower forty-eight states. Nonetheless, the census figures for Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands have shown increases for three decades after 1960, ranging from 82% to 158% as applied to people with no other ancestry (single ancestry). In contrast, the 2000 census reflects a decline of 31% if one considers Native American residents in the same category, yet another burst of 64% if one includes residents of Native American *and* other ancestries (Hawaiian, European, Asian, etc.). Whereas the decline in the single-ancestry category may reflect a growing intermingling with other ethnic groups (as it has happened throughout the Hawaiian Islands and the continental United States at large), the total of almost 25,000 Native Americans appears suspect and probably includes people who marked "American Indian" or "Alaskan Native" as part of their ancestry without regularly identifying themselves as such, participating in Indian community affairs, or otherwise distinguishing themselves as Native American.[12] However, although the census data for 1960 and 1970 seem unduly low, those for 1980 and 1990 probably reflect actual population figures quite closely if one includes Native Americans with other ancestry. Already in 1988, Janthina Morris, Executive Director of the Indian Health Service and Counseling Service and Referral Project at the American Indian Services Corporation in Honolulu, counted 11,728 members in Hawai'i who qualified for her services (Dixon 1988: A8). Similarly, in response to the 1990 census, the Vice-President and Secretary of the American Indian Service Center of Honolulu, A. Hank Raymond, estimated Hawai'i's Native American population as three times as big as the official figure: "I think 5,099 could jump to 15,000 . . . The census is just a snap-shot . . . Our biggest problem is that the turnover rate is so high" (Tanahara 1992). The comparatively low figures in the first two censuses for which data on Native Americans living in the Hawaiian Islands are available may reflect a lack of official recognition as much as other issues such as problems of demography.[13]

Most Native Americans living in the Hawaiian Islands have come from Alaska, the West Coast, or other western states, with only few originating from tribes east of the Mississippi River. However, Native Americans of Hawai'i have had diverse prior homes in western North America, among them the Inuit and the Gwich'in of Alaska, the Colville Confederated Tribe of eastern Washington, the Lakota of South Dakota, the Cherokee of Oklahoma, the Southern Ute of Colorado, the Hopi of Arizona, and the Navajo of New Mexico and Arizona as a few representative communities. As

in the past, most Native Americans have probably come to the State of Hawai'i with the armed forces and, as a result, have lived on O'ahu, the island with most military installations and only in smaller numbers on the outer islands.[14]

Like most military communities, local Native Americans have formed an open, fluid population with a high turnover that in part answered the demands of the military and in part reflected its members' isolation from their home communities. These facts have also defined many of the key social issues of returning veterans: health problems, including alcoholism and drug abuse; employment; questions of cultural identity; and the maintenance of native traditions. Over the years, some Native Americans have married locally and have usually blended in easily into the community. Many have found life in the Islands attractive relative to blatantly racist environments that they had experienced in their home states; indeed, some apparently escaped prejudice and racial discrimination in the continental United States, which they have regularly discovered to be more conspicuous than in the Hawaiian Islands. However, Native Americans of Hawai'i have also found themselves in a dilemma. As they have often acknowledged publicly, living in the Hawaiian Islands has usually meant losing or even breaking ties with their home communities, if for no other reason than the interfering great distance, making travel across the hurdle of the Pacific Ocean expensive. A member who joined the military already was likely to maintain loose ties with his or her home community's elders in hold of the traditions, and ran the danger to acquire or maintain less tribal knowledge than home-bound, culturally more conservative members, unless the community resocialized him or her with appropriate rituals. Living in the fiftieth state has made maintaining tradition even more challenging. The diverse heritages represented by the Native American community in Hawai'i and its open character have not made it any easier for its members to establish conventions or traditions of their own.

By 1971, Native Americans of Hawai'i began organizing as the Hawaii Council of American Indian Nations, initially raising funds by car washes and the sale of fried bread for a yearly *powwow* (< Eastern Algonquian "dance or noisy festivity proceeding a council, a warlike expedition, or a hunt" among other meanings [Friederici 1960: 484–85]); but then they pursued federal funds to help Native American soldiers on leave or returning from duty in Vietnam. The Council established the American Indian Service Center in 1974 to assist local Native American residents and especially veterans with health counseling and referral plus job training as well as traditional support. In 1983, the center became incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the name of American Indian Services Corporation, and received partial

sponsorship by the Indian Health Service and the U.S. Department of Labor. In subsequent years, the center also acquired funds to develop a program to assist Native American adolescents in Hawai'i, in recognition that this age group required increased attention. Moreover, the center became a hub for cultural activities and spiritual renewal, ranging from craft and language classes to traditional religious practices and gatherings of the American Indian Powwow Association for hosting annual intertribal dances. In early 1992, a new organization by the name of Native American Center came about with the principal goal of helping to preserve Native American culture and by seeking private funds. Federal grants no longer sustained the American Indian Service Center, which closed its doors in 1993. Four years later, Wendy Schofield-Ching, who herself cannot claim Native American ancestry, began picking up some of the former center's community services through her Native Winds Gift Gallery and Craft Supply in Honolulu by offering craft classes, promoting powwows, and cosponsoring educational events at schools, museums, and universities, including the Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (Dela Cruz 2005, Ramirez 1990, Tanahara 1992).

Yearly intertribal powwows at Thomas Square Park in Honolulu have since become a tradition, indeed an institution. Since the early 1990s, another organization by the name of the Intertribal Council of Hawaii has sponsored the Annual Warrior Society Powwow at Kapi'olani Park in March. In recent years, Hawai'i's American Indians have occasionally organized other powwows, with the one at Thomas Square Park in October remaining the most prominent. These events have highlighted native songs, drumming, and dances, and have often sponsored prominent guest musicians or dancers from various tribes of the continental United States aside from featuring native food and craft for sale. Sometimes local powwows have also included religious ceremonies such as spiritual retreats and sweat lodges, usually in characteristic Plains Indians tradition with some West Coast variations. As such, these events have not only accommodated considerable cultural diversity among Native Americans in Pan-Indian fashion, but have also permitted innovation by participants and representation by Native Hawaiians, who have often provided various supportive functions as friends, spouses, or family members.

These events have had a great entertainment value for Native Americans as well as the public, and have regularly received considerable attention in the media. However, one of their prime functions has been to recognize Indian veterans of Pacific and Asian wars. Among the most recently honored soldiers were three Navajo Marines, Teddy Draper, Keith Little, and Sam Tso, who had served as code talkers in the Pacific during World War II

(Hoover 2007). These events have also provided their participants with important spiritual functions that have allowed them to regain strength as individuals, to build community solidarity, and to reinforce their identity as Americans Indians—with positive effects on their growth and health (Dixon 1988, Mager 1999, Simon 1993). Moreover, the October powwow has become an occasion for Native American groups of continental North America to visit the Islands to seek support from Hawai'i's senatorial delegation, foremost Senator Daniel Inouye, Vice-Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, for or against specific federal legislation or to learn about the Hawaiian language immersion schools from 'Aha Pūnana Leo.

As unexpected or "out of place" powwows in Hawai'i may appear at first sight, they come to be ordinary on closer inspection, especially when one considers their origin and social functions: Powwows arose from a rich tradition of intertribal celebrations by the Plains Indians, attested already in the earliest colonial documents, and developed in the 1950s and 1960s "out of early intertribal movements and men's societies . . . reminiscent of intertribal movements of the nineteenth century that had spread across the Plains" (Young and Gooding 2001: 1011). Although multiple sociohistorical factors have contributed to the development of modern powwows, a significant one apparently was the military service by Native Americans during World War II and subsequent wars, which provided opportunities to servicemen of different tribal origins with recent opportunities for intertribal camaraderie and which explains the close link of veterans to powwows. Another factor was the increasing urbanization by which Native Americans moved from reservations to major cities after World War II and which likewise fostered pan-Indian developments (Young and Gooding 2001: 1015–20).[15]

By their association with Plains traditions and the military, powwows have unintentionally reinforced among nonparticipants the unfortunate cliché that Native Americans must all have descended from horse-riding bison hunters of the Plains, who by the adoption of the horse themselves reflected a major adaptation to European contact. Stereotypes of Plains Indians may have inadvertently widened some imagined differences between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians that had not existed originally and have also focused on unfavorable representations of American Indians, as may still be present in the popular images that older generations of Hawaiians have of Native Americans. Moreover, Native Hawaiians possibly associate with western Native Americans images, justified or unjustified, of reservations with which they wish no connection, but that sociologically and economically may differ little from their own life on Hawaiian Home Lands—property rights held by some state or federal government agency, a

location on land of marginal quality, and a poor infrastructure with inadequate access to resources for education, employment, and business (Parker 1989: 154–56). What has distinguished Hawaiian Homes from American Indian reservations is merely the issue of political control, including police and judicial powers, which federally recognized tribes usually possess over their communities unlike Native Hawaiians. However, stereotypes about American Indians, such as their Plains image, have made many Native Hawaiians overlook sociohistorical parallels with Indians other than Plains tribes, especially the complex chiefdoms of southeastern North America. By this omission, Hawaiians, as descendents of chiefdoms and a kingdom, have inadvertently introduced some unnecessary social distancing from American Indians and from any identification with them or in terms of a tribe (for further discussion, see E. J. Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, but . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript).

Reaching-Out by Hawaiians to Native Americans

If military service dominated postwar Native American-Hawaiian relations as late as the Vietnam War, it has since declined in significance for political alliances and cultural exchanges in recognition of native peoples' common issues. In one defining instance, the Hawaiian activist Haunani-Kay Trask found much inspiration for her political engagement from the American Indian Movement (AIM), especially the Lakota Russell Means, in the 1970s. In the first portion of her essay, Trask (1984: 101–07) recognized several parallels in the colonial histories of Native Hawaiians, Native Americans, as well as other peoples of color. She did not develop a point-for-point contrastive comparison, but acknowledged Means for conceiving "a radical alternative to Western imperialism," and cited him as a critical voice from the perspective of a Native American in "the first step toward psychological de-colonization" (Trask 1984: 106).

Activist Hawaiians have received "a heightened consciousness about their status as indigenous people" (Trask 1984: 127) from interactions with Native Americans, whom Trask also credited with the nation-within-the-nation model for Hawaiian sovereignty. Occasions for contact came about when Means and another cofounder of AIM, the Ojibwe Dennis Banks, visited the Hawaiian Islands in 1973 and when Hawaiian activists called on their Native American counterparts in the continental United States after the occupation of the island of Kaho'olawe in 1976 and on later occasions (Trask 1984: 126, 127; Wong-Wilson 2005: 145). Yet Trask likely embraced many of these ideas during her graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in the

1970s when Native Americans of Wisconsin, foremost the Menomini, were struggling to regain control over their land (Shames 1972) and when discussions on these topics embroiled the campus, as I can attest from personal experience.

Many of these issues eventually bore fruit in new Native Hawaiian political organizations. In one instance, a Hawaiian nonprofit corporation by the name of Ho'āla Kānāwai ("to awaken the law") "proposed legislation for the creation of a Hawaiian corporation, fashioned after the Alaska Native situation" in the late 1970s (Wong-Wilson 2005: 144). Alas, with Alaska Native communities as models, Native Hawaiians have been able to hope for no more than a reduced independence with even less political autonomy than federally recognized tribes in the lower forty-eight states. "Like Hawai'i, Alaska became part of the United States *after* the period of signing treaties with Indians [had] ended" (Van Dyke 1998: 126 [emphasis added]), which left no more than the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in 1971. Unlike their southern relatives, Alaskan Natives have not only been short of their own tribal laws, law enforcement, and judicial bodies, but they have also remained subject to Alaska state laws, and do not enjoy any authority to assess taxes of their own (Kauanui 2005: 14–15).

On the other hand, the year of 1987 saw the native initiative for Hawaiian sovereignty *Ka Lāhui Hawai'i* (the Hawaiian Nation), in whose foundation Trask and her sister Mililani Trask, an attorney, played a key role. Although some of its representatives have espoused a nation-within-a-nation model similar to federally recognized Indian reservations, Ka Lāhui Hawai'i has always demanded more for Hawaiians to the point of full sovereignty and international recognition through the United Nations, and as a result has rejected attempts at recognition by the federal government, foremost later, scaled-down versions of the Akaka Bill, as poor compromises (Wong-Wilson 2005: 146–49; for further discussion of federal recognition, see below).

From May 14 through July 15, 1995, Hawaiians paid a historic visit to the West Coast with the double-hull canoes *Hōkūle'a* and *Hawai'iloa*, which shared the pride and excitement of Polynesian voyaging traditions with Native Americans as well as emigrant Hawaiians under the aegis of the Bishop Museum, the Hawai'i Maritime Center, and the Polynesian Voyaging Society. While *Hawai'iloa* was on display at the Center for Wooden Boats at Seattle's Maritime Heritage Museum, *Hōkūle'a* called on the Puyallup Indians in Tacoma. Both canoes then visited the Suquamish Reservation on Bainbridge Island, the Lummi Reservation near Bellingham, and the

Swimnosh Reservation Long House in the State of Washington, plus the Musqueam Indians of Vancouver before parting ways. *Hōkūle'a* turned south with stops in Portland, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Long Beach, and San Diego, calling on "transplanted" Hawaiians (some of whom had never been to their homeland) and Native Americans (who had fewer cultural and financial resources farther south than northern groups). In the meantime, *Hawai'iloa* continued its passage to the Kwaguitl (Kwakiutl), Heiltsuk, Tsimshian, Haida, Nisga'a, and Tlingit Indians (see Polynesian Voyaging Society, n.d.b). The purposes of this journey were to:

- Participate in cultural exchanges with native peoples, particularly with those who depended on ocean and forest resources and canoes for survival. Events [included] the traditional welcoming of the canoe at each village; potlatches; and singing and dancing performances.
- Share information and educational materials on the values, practices, and arts (including canoe building) that enabled the first peoples of the Pacific and the Pacific Northwest to survive successfully in their environments for centuries and to insure the health and productivity of their lands and seas for future generations. Slide shows and canoe tours [were] conducted by crew members.
- Document the journey to educate students and the public in Hawai'i and nationwide about how native peoples in different part[s] of the world are facing similar cultural and environmental challenges and what steps they are taking to meet these challenges. (Polynesian Voyaging Society, n.d.a)

The canoes and their crews did not only inspire Hawaiians on the West Coast with pride by helping to confirm their ethnic identity and to regenerate an interest in their home culture, but they also intrigued Native Americans to the point where they could ignore traditional differences among themselves, and the crews received a warm welcome (Anonymous 1995). The crew of *Hawai'iloa* felt especially emotional on their visit to the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian Indians of western Canada and southwestern Alaska, who gave them a true sense of homecoming as documented on videotape (Williams 1995). These Indians had donated two 400-year-old Sitka spruce logs for the construction of the canoe, for which large enough trees were no longer available in Hawai'i's forests. For Hawaiians to draw on these resources symbolized a bond of native peoples across oceans and did not violate local convention; already before Cook's arrival, they had relied on drift logs from the Pacific Northwest such as fir, known not to grow in the

islands, for the construction of large canoes, as the British explorer George Vancouver (1967 [1798]: 218–19) had witnessed in the early 1790s.

The most distinct item linking Hawaiians and Native Americans in recent years has been the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act or the so-called Akaka Bill, directly modeled after legislation for Native American federal recognition. "The Committee on Hawaiian Affairs which [in 1978 had] formulated OHA [the Office of Hawaiian Affairs] at the Constitutional Convention [had] closely examined the rights of mainland Indian groups who have traditionally enjoyed self-determination and self-government in internal matters even though, like Native Hawaiians, they no longer possess the full attributes of sovereignty" (Houghton 1989: 46). As Native Hawaiians sought greater self-determination, a joint committee of the U.S. Senate on Indian Affairs and of the House of Representatives on Resources received testimony in Honolulu from August 28 through September 1, 2000 (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001). Among numerous local witnesses, most of whom could claim Hawaiian ancestry, a few Native Americans also spoke, who had traveled to the Hawaiian Islands for this purpose and several of whom testified in official capacity: Bob Anderson, a Minnesota Chippewa (Ojibwe) and Counselor to the Secretary, Department of the Interior; Jacqueline Agtuca, Acting Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice; Julie Kitka, a Chugach Eskimo and President of the Alaska Federation of Natives in Anchorage; Edward Thomas, President of the Tlingit Haida Central Council; Susan Masten, a Yurok and President of the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and largest Native American organization, representing some 550 tribes; and Marc C. Van Norman, a Cheyenne River Sioux and former director of the Office of Tribal Justice (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: I. 81–101; II. 79–86; III. 100–05). All encouraged federal recognition as a means of strengthening self-determination, native rights, and cultural traditions without limiting access to international organizations, even if they offered a few friendly amendments to the Akaka Bill or other recommendations on how to deal with the federal government. In addition, strong support came from a Hawaiian woman by the name of Robin J. Puanani Danner, who expressed appreciation of the benefits of federal recognition from having lived thirty-five years among Inupiaq Eskimo of Alaska and on reservations with the Navajo, Hopi, and Apache (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: I.101). The primary critical voices by Native Americans were Russell Means, Oglala Lakota, and Glen Morris, Shawnee, of the American Indian Movement (AIM) of Colorado, read by the Hawaiian activist Roy

Dahlin. Means and Morris questioned any jurisdiction by the United States over native peoples, and argued against federal recognition on grounds that it had led to apartheid with genocidal policies by the government, extensive corruption in the Department of the Interior, and destructive effects on the survival of Native Americans. In Means' and Morris' minds, Native Hawaiians had an extraordinarily strong case for regaining their sovereignty on grounds of international law, whereas accepting federal recognition would mean "a diminished political status" (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: IV.115–17).

The testimonies by the visiting Native Americans did not find much of a receptive ear in the Hawaiian audience, who recognized most of these testimonies as statements of federal representatives endorsing official policy in opposition to the independence movement. The Hawaiians' primary concern was not to be identified as Native Americans, let alone as American Indians, but as *kānaka maoli Hawai'i* (native Hawaiians), who preferred to see themselves as a displaced kingdom instead of a "tribe," however loosely defined. Their disapproval has also included objections because of a missing plebiscite for Hawaiians to vote on such a political alternative as well as the recognition of gross violations of both national sovereignty and self-determination, including questions about the legitimacy of the State of Hawai'i under international law (see Kauanui 2005 and Wong-Wilson 2005: 150–55), even if such arguments have often overlooked the fact that Native Americans had been in the same or similar situations as Hawaiians.

The dissension in the Hawaiian community then attracted most of the attention in the local press, resulting in few reports on the Indians' testimony (Dayton 2000, Omandam 2000a,b). Disagreements have also distracted from a discussion of specific issues such as options to federal recognition short of full sovereignty, including alternatives to some 160 federal laws regarding health care, education, housing, land use, fishing rights, economic sufficiency, religious freedom, grave protection and repatriation, and cultural revival upon which Native Hawaiians have relied since 1974 when the amended Native American Programs Act included them as indigenous people of the United States for some of the federal assistance programs in the past reserved exclusively for Native Americans (E. J. Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, *but* . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript).[16]

On September 21, 2004, Native Hawaiians participated in the festive openings of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian on the Capitol Mall of Washington, DC, in perhaps the largest recorded gathering of some 30,000 Native Americans and other native

peoples, representing more than 500 different tribes and indigenous communities of the Western hemisphere. This event did not only host a delegation of some 400 Hawaiian participants, including "Hawaiian royal societies, representatives of the *Hōkūle'a* and *Hawai'iloa* voyaging canoes, Hālau Lōkahi Hawaiian charter school, the State Council of Hawaiian Homesteaders Association, Hui Kāko'o 'Āina Ho'opulapula [a communications and resource network for Hawaiians seeking Hawaiian Home Lands], the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, hālau hula [hula dancing schools] from the Washington area, and many others" (Boyd 2004: 1, 14); but to complement Native American celebrations, the museum also featured 70 Hawaiian items of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (including an original feather cloak, feathered capes, the oldest known Hawaiian outrigger canoe, and a kapa beater, used to pound tree bark into fabric) and various events (such as the screening of Edgy Lee's film *The Hawaiians—Reflecting Spirit*) as part of the exhibition *Nā Mea Makamae O Hawai'i* (Enduring Treatures of Hawai'i) (Risser 2004). Moreover, the museum's openings probably brought Native Hawaiians of socially more varied backgrounds into contact with a greater diversity of Native Americans than ever before and included some groups east of the Mississippi River plus representatives from Central and South America (i.e., descendants of former paramount chiefdoms [comparable to pre-contact Hawai'i] and even complex societies [or civilizations] who had not usually been among their earlier acquaintances). Now their company consisted no longer of mostly Indians of western North America, but included also Iroquois of New York, eastern Delaware, eastern Shawnee, eastern Cherokee, eastern Choctaw, Seminole of Florida, Aztecs of Mexico, and Quechua from the Andes among numerous others. In spite of all cultural differences, participants evidently felt among each other a strong sense of community as native peoples of the Western hemisphere, which has given them a new sense of empowerment in the domains of culture and identity as well as in politics and in which Native Hawaiians participated enthusiastically (Anonymous 2004, Boyd 2004, Oliveri 2004).

Hawaiians and Native Americans have further found common grounds beyond formal parallels in common cultural experiences of a substantive nature, as illustrated by the Hawaiian slack-key guitarist Keola Beamer and the Navajo-Ute flutist R. Carlos Nakai in their recent recording *Our Beloved Land* and joint concerts (Fox 2005). Nakai had learned of Beamer "while stationed at the Naval telecommunications center in Wahiawā" years earlier and had invited the Hawaiian guitarist to speak about Hawaiian culture at a workshop. An impromptu performance demonstrated "how their cultural idioms interact[ed]," which led to further collaboration and the creation of an album.

> "You don't just pick up your instrument and start blasting. We had a nice cross-cultural exploration before we even started playing a note," says Beamer by phone from Maui. "We were looking for cultural integrity, and a way to communicate. There was a beautiful commonality of nature themes, of chant, of music, of dance. There were so many things that we have in common, though we are from a half a planet away."
>
> "There is a close affinity about things cultural and philosophical between Native American and Hawaiian people," says Nakai from his Arizona home. "As we spoke about the Athapascans and our journeys through time we found (our cultures) are very much congruent with each other." (Fox 2005: 15)

Hawaiians and Native Americans have collaborated on other recent occasions of cultural exchange, such as the Sixth Annual Mary Kawena Pukui Storytelling and Performance Festival at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu on February 19, 2006, which featured alongside several prominent local storytellers and performers: Jack Dalton, professional Yup'ik storyteller, author, and teacher; Stephen Blanchett, Yup'ik singer, songwriter, dancer, and member of the internationally renowned native band Pamyua; James Patkotak, Inupiat storyteller; and Tobias J. Vanderhoop, Wampanoag educator and tribal council member, singer and drummer (Bishop Museum, n.d.).

Over the years, the Akaka Bill of federal recognition for Native Hawaiians came to lose much support in the public, and in 2006 stalled in Congress. Although its advocates struggled to maintain the backing by the Hawaiian community, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) contracted Patricia Zell, former long-time congressional staff director and chief counsel of the Senate Committee of Indian Affairs and an Arapaho-Navajo. In a major newspaper and in public talks, Zell addressed fundamental objections to the Hawaiians' federal recognition: its constitutionality; the status of Hawaiians as native people comparable to Native Americans; the irrelevance of "tribe" as a political category; concerns about racial discrimination; fears about gambling; the historical status of Queen Lili'uokalani's overthrow; sovereignty; land ownership; and future options (Zell 2005a,b). In the editorial page of the same daily a month later, Tex G. "Red Tipped Arrow" Hall, President of the National Congress of American Indians, a Mandan-Hidatsa, and apparently a frequent visitor to the islands, presented federally recognized Native

American communities as political rather than racial entities, which by self-governance succeeded in strengthening their economies, health care, and education (Hall 2005). He addressed some of the same concerns about racial discrimination and the unique political relationship of native peoples to the U.S. government as Zell had raised. Hall also reminded readers that similar counterarguments to the Akaka Bill had led to the earlier destructive policies toward American Indians, ranging from military extermination, Indian boarding schools, and land allotment to forced assimilation, termination, and relocation. However, Hawaiian self-determination with federal recognition would benefit the native language and culture, which in Hall's mind would in turn help tourism and the economy at large (Hall 2005). Because the Bush administration recently imposed further restrictive amendments about gambling, civil and criminal jurisdiction, military commitment, and federal liability about trust, land, and other claims by Hawaiians, the Akaka Bill did no longer enjoy the unanimous support of OHA. The office refrained from comment on these restrictions without having first consulted "legal scholars versed in Indian law and native rights to analyze what impact these proposed amendments [would] have on the Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian communities." (Borreca 2005: A6)

During three days in January 2006, Native Americans lent support to Hawaiians through the Native Leadership Forum sponsored by the California-based American Indian Resources Institute in conjunction with OHA's Native Hawaiian Leadership Conference in Honolulu. The theme was "Native Leadership and Challenges Ahead; Protecting Sovereignty, Culture, Homelands and Resource Rights and Achieving Economic Self-Sufficiency." Prominent Native American participants included: Richard Trudell, Santee Sioux and Executive Director of American Indian Resources Institute; John Echohawk, Pawnee and Executive Director of the Native American Rights Fund; Billy Frank Jr., Nisqually and Chair of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission; and Patricia Zell, Arapaho-Navajo under contract by OHA. "In 30 years, I've never seen the outpouring of support other native peoples have for Native Hawaiians," Zell reportedly said. "What we want to accomplish, we cannot, unless we see ourselves (indigenous peoples) as one" (Boyd 2006). Alan Parker, Ojibwe-Cree and Director of the Northwest Indian Applied Research Institute at Evergreen State College, has since taken the argument a step further: The National Congress of American Indians and with it the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians have supported Hawaiians in their search for federal recognition not only out of solidarity but also for self-protection of their tribal rights, because they realize that undermining the Hawaiians' rights ultimately means a direct attack on their own sovereignty (2007). Many Native Hawaiians have

likewise come to recognize a need to expand common grounds with Native Americans—not only in public affairs but also in the domain of culture (Hoover 2006). Reintroduced in 2007, a revised, but emaciated Akaka Bill (U.S. Congress, Senate 2007) has since received approval from the House of Representatives, still awaiting endorsement by the Senate and the President at the time of this writing.

Hawaiians in search of more radical solutions than the Akaka Bill (i.e., full sovereignty) have similarly continued drawing on prominent Native American leaders for cultural and political inspiration in one form or another. In early 2006, the Mohawk activist Taiaiake Alfred spoke on the colonial experience, native answers to it, and leadership in a talk sponsored in part by the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. The center was also the site for a public showing and discussion of Robert Redford's documentary *Incident at Oglala*. The film addresses the fate of the AIM activist Leonard Peltier, an Ojibwe-Lakota, whose conviction to two consecutive life sentences for the murder of two FBI agents on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota, in 1975 has raised substantial controversy about justice in his trial and about his guilt.

In late October 2007, the National Indian Education Association (2007a: 2), which had admitted Native Hawaiians as voting members already in 2000, held its first annual convention in the Hawaiian Islands, at Honolulu's Convention Center. The oldest and largest education organization aiming for the educational equity by and quality of Native Americans congregated some 2,300 educators from North America and about 1,000 local contributors with the theme of *E Ho'i I Ka Piko Aloha* (Return to Cultural Honor and Caring). Most of the participants, either Native Americans or Native Hawaiians, met "to discuss problems facing indigenous students and possible ways to raise the bar of achievement" and to address specific topics such as "high dropout rates of native students, [use of the] indigenous language in the classroom, literacy rates, the federal No Child Left Behind law [,] and college enrollment rates" (Moreno 2007). Particular sessions examined language revitalization, English as a second language, the use of modern technology, cultural integrity, generational and gender differences, economic poverty, and health problems such as diabetes among others. In addition, the convention provided opportunities for Native American visitors to learn about local issues and Hawaiian traditions, and in return hosted a powwow featuring several prominent performers (National Indian Education Association 2007a, 2007b).

Conclusions

This essay presents an annotated chronology of contacts between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians with particular attention to the period since early World War II. Although the above discussion makes no claims to being comprehensive or exhaustive in an attempt at filling a dearth of historical information, it reveals certain emergent patterns.

Contrary to isolationist expectations, Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have not been strangers to each other's communities during the past two centuries. After intermittent contacts since at least the early explorations of the Northwest Coast of North America by Europeans in the late eighteenth century, members of both communities interacted with each other by fur trading, whaling, and sealing through much of the nineteenth century. If there was a low season of interchange after whaling, World War II brought Native Americans to the Hawaiian Islands—as soldiers, who were the forerunners of today's veteran community of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands, principally on Oʻahu. Both populations crossed the Pacific Ocean, perhaps committed to some higher authority, leaving untenable lives, tracking new opportunities, out of a sense of adventure, or for other reasons; but their pursuits were not unique. Although the initial long-term encounters by Native Americans and Native Hawaiians were clearly economic and military in nature, subsequent relations took on an explicitly political and cultural character. Not only did Native Hawaiians and Native Americans reach out to each other for political inspiration, leadership, and support, be it in the form of the Akaka Bill of federal recognition or alternative political solutions; but they increasingly came to appreciate the other's cultural institutions, ranging from double-hull canoe voyaging to music, dance, and storytelling, as well as other arts and extending to issues of education.

By mere proximity and for historical reasons, most Native Americans whom Native Hawaiians have met have come from western North America, including the greater Northwest Coast, California, the Southwest, and the Plains—largely at the exclusion of groups from eastern North America. This geographic-ethnographic concentration, together with the fact that most Native Americans in Hawaiʻi came to the islands with the military, helps to explain the wide popularity of an institution of distinctly Western and specifically Plains origin—the powwow. However, attention to western North America and specifically the Plains perhaps has also distorted Native Hawaiians' views regarding historical parallels between traditional Hawaiian society and Native American chiefdoms, especially those of southeastern North America. They at times envisage more differences than exist at closer inspection.

As Native Americans and Native Hawaiians have visited each other's communities during the past two centuries, they have shared much in common because of similar experiences in their colonial and recent histories, whence they have understood more of each other's concerns than divide-and-conquer–minded colonists and their descendants have realized or liked to admit. First, casual encounters have developed into formal meetings in which Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have increasingly drawn on each other for comparable experiences in how to deal with dominant Europeans and Americans, for mutual political support in legislatures, and for political independence notwithstanding their cultural differences. By no means have Native Americans been any more "out of place" in the Hawaiian Islands than Hawaiians had been "strange" among Northwest Coast Indians a century and half earlier. In spite of their Polynesian origin, Hawaiians may come to recognize Native Americans as prime allies in their struggle for cultural and political autonomy, just as Native Americans have discovered Native Hawaiians as significant partners in developing stronger political coalitions.

Still few details are available about historical interactions between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians, and specifics of exchanges remain vague; but the documentation for such reliable examples as Hawaiian loanwords in Chinook Jargon and lomilomi salmon in the Hawaiian diet suggests a give-and-take relationship. The evidence also presents pictures of Native Hawaiians assimilating with Native Americans on the Northwest Coast in the nineteenth century as part of the fur trade and of Native Americans intermingling with the local population in the Hawaiian Islands, especially Hawaiians, in the twentieth century. By all superficial indications, both communities have blended in with each other remarkably well, if only for reasons of a common colonial experience and similar histories. However, further research will have to show how in individual cases Native Americans merged into the local community and specifically with Hawaiians. Indeed, the present review points to the need for an in-depth sociological study of modern Native American-Hawaiian families.

Sociohistorical commonalities and actual community links ultimately cannot hide potential sources of conflict between Native Americans and Hawaiians. Although often struggling with issues of political unity themselves, Native Americans have sometimes expressed surprise at the great divisiveness among Native Hawaiians about community issues, advocating unification. On the other hand, Hawaiians, fully aware of the need to speak with one voice, have legitimately resisted what some may even consider as no more than patronizing by outsiders. These differences might provoke further arguments among Hawaiians to distance themselves from any association with Native Americans rather than finding some solidarity with them. When

one remembers the cultural differences between Native Americans and Polynesians, these conflicts seem minor in perspective, because they have not surpassed conflicts in their own communities. Thus, little seems gained by overemphasizing any such potential conflicts except to encourage age-old divide-and-conquer sentiments by those objecting to any political alliance by native peoples.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank James Caron, Director of the Honors Program at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM), and Peter T. Manicas, Director of UHM Interdisciplinary Studies, for encouraging me to pursue this topic, and also express my appreciation to the students for their interest and bearing with me. Moreover, I recognize Herbert R. Barringer, my wife Teresa H. Makuakāne-Drechsel, Manicas, Eugene Ogan, and three anonymous reviewers for valuable criticisms and editorial suggestions as well as Ernest Sickey for supplementary information. As a matter of course, I take sole responsibility for all contents and the format of the present essay, and dedicate it to the memory of Herbert Barringer (1931–2007), who had roots in the Native American community of Montana just as he was committed to the Native Hawaiian community.

NOTES

1. The use of "Native Hawaiian(s)" draws a deliberate analogy to "Native American(s)," just as it leaves no doubt that this reference applies to the indigenous people of the Hawaiian Islands at the exclusion of immigrants and their descendants. Such usage need not preclude "Hawaiian(s)" or "(American) Indians" for conciseness and stylistic variation. In either case, these terms are broad ethnological categories for the purpose of a historical discussion, which bypass questions of quantum of biological ancestry ("blood") here.

2. This essay emerged together with a review of Native American-Native Hawaiian parallels (E. J Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, *but* . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript) from an Honors proseminar at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in Fall 1993, Fall 1995, and Spring 2003, which has since developed into a separate course, Native Americans and Native Hawaiians.

3. My current historical-sociolinguistic research on Maritime Polynesian Pidgin, a Polynesian-based pidgin including Pidgin Hawaiian from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth or late nineteenth century, indeed, suggests that the fur trade and—with it—contacts with Native Americans were of greater significance to Native Hawaiians than most historians have recognized.

4. From what we know, Native Hawaiians contributed place names to the Pacific Northwest such as "Kanaka," "Owyhee," and "Kalama" (Naughton 1983: 51–59, 67). They also furnished single loanwords to two Native American pidgins, which at the time served as interlingual media in multilingual contexts such as trade: *kanaka*, "Hawaiian" (noun and adjective) and something like *o*^{w}*aihi* (?), "Hawai'i" (referring to the Island of Hawai'i and the entire archipelago) and "Hawaiian" (noun) in Chinook Jargon; *make*, "dead, to die,

broken," *pau*, "not," *panipani*, "sexual intercourse," *'anā'anā*, "sick, sickness, cause of pain," *wahine*, "woman," and *hanahana*, "to work, to sew, sewing" plus the loanwords *kaukau*, "food, to eat, to bite" (< Chinese) and *pikanene*, "small, little, child" (< Portuguese) in Eskimo Jargon (Drechsel and Makuakāne 1982).

Conversely, the Northwest Coast and Native Americans probably were the source of *lomilomi* salmon, a dish often thought to be traditionally Hawaiian but consisting of imported salmon, massaged by hand (< reduplication of Hawaiian *lomi* "to rub, to press, to squeeze, to crush, to mash fine") and mixed with tomatoes and green onions. The primary vehicle of transmission was the Hudson's Bay Company, which introduced lomilomi salmon to the Hawaiian Islands in the 1830s (see Chappell 1997: 103, 167; Naughton 1983: 46; Spoehr 1986: 50).

5. One person who illustrates these social changes was Maria Mahoi, born on Vancouver Island in the 1850s to an unidentified "Aboriginal" woman and a Hawaiian man who had worked in the fur trade (Barman 2004: 5, 6). Maria did not hide her Native American ancestry, as was evident in her wearing of Cree moccasins, her fluent use of Chinook Jargon (notwithstanding any Hawaiian loans suggested by other Hawaiians), her consumption of Native American foods, her expertise in medicinal plants, her role as midwife, and her traditional ways of thinking (Barman 2004: 49, 55, 57, 73–74). Related to the long-established Hawaiian family of Mahoe [*sic*], "[s]he herself drew far more on her Hawaiian inheritance than she ever did on her aboriginality" (Barman 2004: 6) and thrived in the island world off Vancouver as if it had been Hawai'i's very own (Barman 2004: 50, 54–55). As Maria remained suspicious of the Indians, "[s]he embodied her heritage as a woman of the Hawaiian Islands in her surname, physicality, and strength of character" according to her biographer Jean Barman (2004: 75, 86). Although Maria could have equally represented a Native American woman, she had good sociological reasons for her preference: Her vicinity was the home to other families of Native American-Hawaiian ancestry with whom she associated regularly, and she took advantage of "the somewhat greater social acceptance of Hawaiians than Aboriginals. It was not that Hawaiians were wanted, though they possessed all the rights of newcomers [in British Columbia], but rather that Aboriginal people were so much more disparaged and demeaned" (Barman 2004: 89). As a person of dark skin, she also had to worry about losing her civil rights (voting and owning land) that as a Hawaiian she had in British Columbia, but that she had never enjoyed in the United States (Barman 2004: 17, 41, 71–72). Several of Maria's lighter-skinned children, however, redefined themselves as both "non-Aboriginal" and non-Hawaiian (Barman 2004: 6, 89); they increasingly blended in with the larger population rather than maintaining a separate identity. Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest are the subject of a major recent history (Barman and Watson 2006), which integrates many of the earlier findings by the primary author.

6. Other Native American languages that we now know to have been used as military codes during World War II were: Cherokee (Iroquoian), Choctaw (Muskogean), Comanche (Uto-Aztecan), Fox and Sauk (Algonquian), Menomini (Algonquian), Ojibwe (Algonquian), Oneida (Iroquoian), and Pawnee (Caddoan), which by all indications came into operation in Europe and possibly northern Africa (see Meadows 2002: 35–72, 241–42, with the names of language families added above to indicate some of the linguistic diversity of the Native American languages in use).

7. Navajo tell how on such occasions they outwitted a non-Indian lieutenant in a fierce two-day maneuver crossing the desert with only one canteen of water. He had warned

them against drawing on Hawai'i's prickly pear cactus as potentially hazardous; but they recognized it as a safe source of liquid, from which they drew at its top behind the lieutenant's back. Thus, Navajo could easily survive in the desert without relying on their canteens, whereas their non-Indian companions depleted their canteens and almost died from thirst (Paul 1973: 62–63).

8. These observations undermine the earlier claim by Doris A. Paul (1973: 18) that "the white Marines marveled at the skills of the Indians and accepted them readily. Race friction was unknown."

9. As far as I can determine, there are no academic publications on the presence of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands since World War II. The following paragraphs draw on newspaper articles (duly noted where applicable) and on observations of my own (with no further references given).

10. The *1980 Census of Population*, Volume 1: Characteristics of the Population, Part 13: Hawaii (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1982: table 15), however, listed 2,655 American Indians, 68 Eskimos, and 45 Aleuts with a total of only 2,768 Native Americans for Hawai'i in 1980 without giving further information about single or multiple ancestry. For comparability with the census figures for 1990 and 2000, I have chosen the figures of the more specific "Supplementary Report," which distinguishes "Persons Who Reported a Single Ancestry Group" from "Persons Who Reported at Least One Specific Ancestry Group" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1983: tables 3 and 3a.)

11. The 2000 census includes figures only for the categories of "American Indian" and "American Indian and Alaskan Native," from which one cannot simply deduct the number of the first to arrive at that of the Inuit ("Eskimos") and Aleut; the category of "Alaska Native," reflecting particularities of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1971 and a purely legal distinction of little anthropological consequence, includes Northwest Coast and Athapaskan Indians of Alaska. Under these circumstances, I have taken the liberty of listing the total figure for "American Indian and Alaskan Native" in the first row under "American Indian" rather than entering the corresponding numbers for "American Indian," which are only 2,335 and 24,398, respectively. The 2000 census differs from earlier censuses in other ways that make a comparison difficult. Although the category of "alone" matches that of single or no other ancestry in earlier censuses, the 2000 census—unlike earlier demographic surveys—includes people of single native descent also in the category of "American Indian (and Alaska Native) alone or in combination with one or more other races."

12. In other words, this category inadvertently includes some individuals who might recognize a distant Native American ancestor (such as the proverbial "Cherokee grandmother"), but otherwise have no actual ties, biological or sociocultural, to a Native American community.

13. There remain major problems with the 2000 census in the Native American population, including "big, ever-changing households, frequent moves, mistrust of government officials and differing definitions of who is an Indian. The tabulations of Indians had some of the highest error rates for any minority" (New York Times, November 28, 2003). On grounds of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996,

more than 100 tribes have begun challenging the 2000 census results in the hope of gaining additional federal support for health care and housing; thirty-nine of seventy-eight tribes that have completed their recounts have succeeded in contesting official figures (ibid.).

14. A Native American who did not fit into this pattern was the prominent Navajo healer and doctor by the name of O. H. McKinley, MD, who in 1993 attended the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa for a master's degree in public health. On this occasion, he demonstrated healing practices based on traditional approaches (such as the Talking Circle Ceremony, in which participants sat in a circle around an altar and shared their personal thoughts with each other when a single eagle feather reached them).

15. This observation points to a sociological characteristic of Native Americans living on the Island of O'ahu: All in all, they have shared more with Indians in major urban centers than reservation Indians, although some may reside on military bases or in suburban or rural areas rather than in truly urban amalgamations in and around Honolulu.

16. A reviewer has suggested that this essay address the sociopolitical situation of other Pacific Islanders because of their status as native peoples within territories under the United States' control. While culturally similar to Hawaiians, these peoples differ politically from both Hawaiians and Native Americans (including Native Alaskans) in that their homeland is not within one of the fifty states. Although Pacific Islanders living in U.S. territories can reasonably expect to achieve full independence and sovereignty if not always without difficulties (as realized by the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Belau; see Kauanui 2005: 17–18), it is far less certain that native peoples within the United States, namely Native Americans and Hawaiians, can hope for the same (i.e., an arrangement beyond a nation-within-a-nation model, notwithstanding all injustices that these native peoples have experienced). Not only has the United States largely ignored international law as applicable to native peoples, but any unilateral secession is officially unconstitutional and would require congressional approval. Moreover, to release the State of Hawai'i or portions of it from the federal union, the United States will take into consideration the Islands' strategic significance in the Pacific today and in the future. Any such action would open this opportunity to Native Americans in similar sociopolitical circumstances and would challenge the federal union's very foundation. Despite the unexpected recent demise of another modern superpower, that of the Soviet Union in 1991, such a political option would currently seem inconceivable to most Americans and many residents of the Hawaiian Islands, including numerous Native Hawaiians, all of whom would likewise have to approve it in some plebiscite (for a differing perspective, see Kauanui 2005: 14–19). These historical-political circumstances, too, indicate to Native Hawaiians a common path with Native Americans, whether via federal recognition or some alternative political strategies.

REFERENCES

Anonymous

1995 Historic West Coast canoe tour draws to an end. *Ka 'Elele* 22 (5): 2.

Anwar, Yasmin

2000 Protests don't deter bill's supporters. *Honolulu Advertiser*, August 30: A1, A2.

Barman, Jean
1995 New land, new lives: Hawaiian settlement in British Columbia. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 29:1–32.
1997–1998 Whatever happened to the Kanakas? *Beaver* 77 (6): 12–19.
2004 *Maria Mahoi of the islands*. (Transmontanus 13.) Vancouver: New Star Books.

Barman, Jean, and Bruce McIntyre Watson
2006 *Leaving paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787–1898*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Bishop Museum
n.d. The Sixth Annual Mary Kawena Pukui Storytelling and Performance Festival. http://www.bishopmuseum.org/calendar/events/feb19.html.

Bixler, Margaret T.
1992 *Winds of freedom. The story of the Navajo code talkers of World War II*. Darien, CT: Two Bytes Publishing Company.

Borreca, Richard
2005 Revamped Akaka Bill awaiting attention. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, September 17: A1, A6.

Boyd, Manu
2004 Native nations gather in DC: Tribes converge at inauguration of American Indian Museum. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 21 (10): 1, 14.
2006 Common ground: Native Alaskans, American Indians and Native Hawaiians share differences and similarities at a pair of leadership conferences. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 23 (2): 5.

Chappell, David A.
1997 *Double ghosts. Oceanian voyagers on Euroamerican ships*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Coffman, Tom
1998 *Nation within. The story of America's annexation of the nation of Hawai'i*. Kāne'ohe, HI: Tom Coffman/EPI Center.

Dela Cruz, Linda
2005 Promoting Native American culture. *Mid-Week*, December 14.

Deloria, Philip J.
2004 *Indians in unexpected places*. Lawrence: Univ. Press of Kansas.

Dixon, Sue
1988 Janthina Morris. Sustaining Hawaii's Indians. *MidWeek*, November 23: A8, B5.

Drechsel, Emanuel J., and T. Haunani Makuakāne
1982 Hawaiian loanwords in two Native American pidgins. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48:460–67.

Drinnon, Richard
1980 *Facing West. The meta-physics of Indian-hating and empire building.* Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Duncan, Janice K.
1973 Kanaka world travelers and fur company employees, 1785–1860. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 7:93–111.

Finney, Ben
1994 *Voyage of rediscovery. A cultural odyssey through Polynesia.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Fox, Stephen
2005 Native blend. R. Carlos Nakai and Keola Beamer connect. *Honolulu Weekly*, October 26: 15.

Friederici, Georg
1960 *Amerikanistisches Wörterbuch und Hilfswörterbuch für den Amerikanisten.* Deutsch, Spanish, English. (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde, Vol. 53, Series B: Völkerkunde, Kulturgeschichte und Sprachen, Vol. 29.) Hamburg, Germany: Cram, De Gruyter and Co.

Gibson, James R.
1992 *Otter skins, Boston ships, and China goods. The maritime fur trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785–1841.* Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

Gould, Richard A.
1968 Seagoing canoes among the Indians of northwestern California. *Ethnohistory* 15: 11–42.

Hall, Tex G.
2005 Economy, Hawaiian culture would gain from Akaka Bill. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, September 13: A12.

Helms, Mary W.
1988 *Ulysses' sail. An ethnographic odyssey of power, knowledge, and geographical distance.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin
2004 Native tribes celebrate museum's opening. Hawaiians attend the opening of the facility in the nation's capital. September 22: A11.

Hoover, Will
2006 Conference helps soften opposition to Akaka Bill. *Honolulu Advertiser*, January 12: A1, A8.

2007 Code talkers steal show at pow wow. *Honolulu Advertiser*, October 7: A33, A41.

Houghton, Richard H., III
1989 An argument for Indian status for Native Hawaiians—The discovery of a lost tribe. *American Indian Law Review* 14:1–55.

Jones, Terry L., and Kathryn A. Klar
2005 Diffusionism reconsidered: Linguistic and archaeological evidence for prehistoric Polynesian contact with southern California. *American Antiquity* 70: 457–84.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani
2005 Precarious positions: Native Hawaiians and US federal recognition. *Contemporary Pacific* 17:1–27.

Klar, Kathryn A., and Terry L. Jones
2005 Linguistic evidence for a prehistoric Polynesia–southern California contact event. *Anthropological Linguistics* 47:369–400.

Koppel, Tom
1995 *Kanaka. The untold story of Hawaiian pioneers in British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest*. Vancouver: Whitecap Books.

Kotzebue, Otto von
1821 *Entdeckungs-Reise in die Süd-See und nach der Berings-Strasse zur Erforschung einer nordöstlichen Durchfahrt*. Unternommen in den Jahren 1815, 1816, 1817 und 1818, auf Kosten Sr. Erlaucht des Herrn Reichs-Kanzlers Grafen Rumanzoff auf dem Schiffe Rurick unter dem Befehle des Lieutenants der Russisch-Kaiserlichen Marine Otto von Kotzebue. Enthält die Bemerkungen und Ansichten von dem Naturforscher der Expedition, Adelbert von Chamisso, nebst Beiträgen von anderen Gelehrten. Weimar, Germany: Gebrüder Hoffmann.

Mager, Marcia Z.
1999 Preparing for the powwow. *MidWeek*, May 19: 22, 35.

McClain, Sally
2001 *Navajo weapon. The Navajo code talkers*. Tuscon, AZ: Rio Nuevo Publishers.

Meadows, William C.
2002 *The Comanche code talkers of World War II*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Moreno, Loren
2007 Native student issues assessed. *Honolulu Advertiser*, October 27: B3, B5.

National Indian Education Association
2007a *E Ho'i I Ka Piko Aloha: Return to cultural honor and caring. Schedule of the 38th annual convention, National Indian Education Association, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 25–28 October 2007*. Washington, DC: NIEA.

2007b Native language immersion schools, culture preservation programs and unification of indigenous peoples of the United States are main points at 2007 NIEA Annual Convention. http://www.niea.org/sa/uploads/postconvention/55.57.NIEAPressRelease11052007.pdf.

Naughton, E. Momilani
1983 Hawaiians in the fur trade: Cultural influences on the Northwest Coast, 1811–1875. Master's thesis, Western Washington Univ.

Neel, David
1995 *The great canoes. Reviving a Northwest Coast tradition*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

Oliveri, Frank
2004 "First People" celebrate. Native Hawaiians feel kinship honored by role in procession. *Honolulu Advertiser*, September 22: A1, A2.

Omandam, Pat
2000a Alaska Natives praise federal recognition. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, August 29: A1, A8.
2000b Trask: Hawaiian kids would benefit from recognition bill. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, August 21: A3.

Parker, Alan
2007 Attacks against Native Hawaiian recognition aimed at all tribal rights. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 24 (3): 8.

Parker, Linda S.
1989 *Native American estate. The struggle over Indian and Hawaiian lands*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Paul, Doris A.
1973. *The Navajo code talkers*. Pittsburgh, PA: Dorrance Publishing Company.

Polynesian Voyaging Society
n.d.a Hawai'iloa's Northwest-Alaska journey / May-July 1995. http://pvs.kcc.hawaii.edu/alaskabackground.html.
n.d.b The Northwest-Alaska and West Coast tours. http://pvs.kcc.hawaii.edu/alaskawestcoast.html.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert
1986 *Hawaiian dictionary. Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Rev. exp. ed. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Ramirez, Tino
1990 Tribal ties unite, far from home. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, October 8: B1.

Risser, William
2004 Hawai'i treasures on display. *Honolulu Advertiser*, September 23: A1, A10.

Shames, Deborah
1972 *Freedom with reservation. The Menomini struggle to save their land and people.* Madison, WI: National Committee to Save the Menomini People and Forests .

Simon, Liza
1993 Call of the drums. *Honolulu Weekly*, October 6: 15.

Spoehr, Alexander
1986 Fur traders in Hawai'i. The Hudson's Bay Company in Honolulu, 1829–1861. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 20:27–66.
1988 A 19th century chapter in Hawai'i's maritime history: Hudson's Bay Company merchant shipping, 1829–1859. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 22:70–100.

Stannard, David E.
1989 *Before the horror. The population of Hawai'i on the eve of western contact.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, Social Science Research Institute.

Tanahara, Kris M.
1992 Native Americans are carving out their niche in Hawaii. *Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser*, February 23: A23.

Trask, Haunani-Kay
1984 Hawaiians, American colonization, and the quest for independence. *Social Process in Hawaii* 31:101–36.

U.S. Bureau of the Census
1963 *Census of population: 1960. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1973 *1970 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1982 *1980 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1983 *1980 census of population. Ancestry of the population by state*. Supplementary Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1992 *1990 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1993 *1990 census of population. Detailed ancestry Groups for states*. Supplementary Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
2002 *2000 census of population and housing. Summary population and housing characteristics, Hawaii: 2000, PHC-1-13*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress, Senate
2001 *Native Hawaiian federal recognition. Joint hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, and the Committee on Resources, United*

States House of Representatives. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 2899 . . . and H.R. 4904 . . . . Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

2003 *Native Hawaiian Recognition Act of 2003.* 108th Congress, 1st Session, S. 344 [Report No.108–85]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

2007 *Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007.* 110th Congress, 1st Session, S. 310 [. . .]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Dyke, Jon M.

1998 The political status of the Native Hawaiian people. *Yale Law & Policy Review* 17: 95–147.

Vancouver, George

1967 *A voyage of discovery to the north Pacific Ocean and round the world, ...* [1798] Vol. 2 (Bibliotheca Australiana, No. 31.) New York: Da Capo Press.

Williams, Karin

1995 *The voyage home. Hawai'iloa's Northwest journey.* Seattle, WA: Williams Communication Production [videorecording].

Wolf, Eric R

1982 *Europe and the people without history.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Wong-Wilson, Noe Noe

2005 A conversation with Mililani Trask. *Contemporary Pacific* 17:142–56.

Young, Gloria A., and Erik D. Gooding

2001 Celebrations and giveaways. In *Handbook of North American Indians: Vol. 13, Plains, Part II,* ed. Raymond J. DeMallie, 1011–25. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Zell, Patricia

2005a Roots of freedom. The U.S. Constitution provides for recognition of native rights. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin,* August 14: F9, F12.

2005b Akaka Bill—What are the facts? Kamehameha Schools Alumni Association, O'ahu Region, and the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs, Honolulu, August 25.