



H-Environment

H-Environment Roundtable Reviews

Volume 7, No. 2 (2017)
<https://networks.h-net.org/h-environment>

Publication date: June 22, 2017
Roundtable Review Editor:
Christopher F. Jones

Joshua L. Reid, *The Sea Is My Country: the Maritime World of the Makahs* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015). ISBN: 9780300209907

Contents

Introduction by Christopher F. Jones, Arizona State University	2
Comments by William Bauer, Jr. University of Nevada-Las Vegas	4
Comments by Bathsheba Demuth, Brown University	7
Comments by Edward D. Melillo, Amherst College	12
Comments by Helen M. Rozwadowski, University of Connecticut, Avery Point	17
Author's Response by Joshua L. Reid, University of Washington	21
About the Contributors	30

Copyright © 2017 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.

Introduction by Christopher F. Jones, Arizona State University

In 1999, Theron Parker of the Makah nation harpooned a gray whale in the waters of the Pacific Ocean near the United States border with Canada. Though Makahs had hunted whales for hundreds of years, this was no ordinary capture.

While Parker and seven other Makah men paddled in a canoe, helicopters circled overhead and a fleet of boats followed closely behind. For the People of the Cape, as the Makah name for themselves roughly translates into English, this was the first authorized hunt of a gray whale in decades. Many members of other indigenous groups joined to support the Makah whalers while numerous others, such as animal rights groups, decried the practice as an act of cruelty.

Joshua L. Reid opens and closes *The Sea Is My Country*, a fascinating history of the Makah people, by demonstrating how contemporary debates over the 1999 hunt misrepresented both the past and the present. The hunt was not simply about restoring traditional practices and returning to a past that no longer exists, as some critics argued. It was, instead, an act of sovereignty that celebrated the renewed recognition of treaty rights the Makah nation had fought for and won in 1855. Moreover, depictions of Makahs as “traditional” fail to account for the complexity of their actual history. Reid demonstrates that the Makah were never a static people; instead, they regularly engaged with outsiders and selectively changed their economic and technological practices when it suited their interests. Finally, the location of the hunt mattered greatly. For Makahs, the sea, not land, was their true homeland. Mastery of its valuable trade routes and abundant resources lay at the heart of their considerable power, which enabled them to maintain independence long after the arrival of Europeans.

Covering over two hundred years of Makah history, *The Sea Is My Country* offers rich fodder for environmental historians of all times and places. Reid pushes us to consider our assumptions of territoriality and to investigate the ways the sea as a country shapes cultural identity, economic opportunity, and practices of sovereignty. Further, his account compellingly illustrates the power and agency Makah people have exerted throughout their history, arguing that their careful adoption of modern technologies reveals a hybrid ‘moditional’ economy that blended modern and traditional elements.

The breadth of a book is often revealed by the range of academic interests among its reviewers. I was delighted by the quick agreement to participate in this forum from scholars from a wide variety of backgrounds, including Native American history, Pacific Worlds, and maritime studies. And their rich comments certainly do not exhaust the potential discussions; instead, they make it clear that those interested in borderlands, the American West, capitalism, settler colonialism, and more will find much of value in *The Sea Is My Country*.

I invited **William Bauer, Jr.** to join the roundtable because of his expertise in Native American history. He has researched and taught widely on Native Americans in California, with a focus on labor, memory, and oral traditions. His comments explore topics including the intersections between treaty rights and environmental protections as well as how concepts of maritime sovereignty compare to claims based on land.

Bathsheba Demuth studies the environmental history of the Bering Strait, examining how interactions between indigenous groups, Americans, and Russians for the region's resources reshaped environments, economies, and cultures. Her discussion raises questions about alternative visions of capitalism and the role of ecological change in shaping human history.

Edward "Ted" Melillo is a scholar of Pacific Worlds who has written on the intersections between California and Chile and is currently investigating Hawaiian mariners that came to New England aboard whaling vessels in the early 1800s. Among other topics, his contribution asks how China can better be incorporated into the study of indigenous groups in the Pacific World.

Helen Rozwadowski completes our roundtable, bringing her extensive focus on oceans, maritime science, and environmental history to bear on the conversation. Her remarks point to the opportunities to rethink whether the oceans have always been considered commons and to examine more systematically the differences and commonalities between groups across the globe that orient themselves more to water than land.

Before turning to the first set of comments, I would like to pause here and thank all the roundtable participants for taking part. In addition, I would like to remind readers that as an open-access forum, *H-Environment Roundtable Reviews* is available to scholars and non-scholars alike, around the world, free of charge. Please circulate.

 Comments by William Bauer, Jr., University of Nevada-Las Vegas

Makah Places and American Indian History

American Indians ground their knowledge systems in specific places, which possess religious importance and provide for the people. Creator figures made a specific land for the People and, in turn, a unique People for the land. The People emerged from or were created at known locations. Cultural heroes called the People to mountains or other important sites to impart knowledge. Oral traditions, the sources by which American Indians retain and maintain their histories and cultures, tell of how the People first acquired resources, such as fire, corn or deer, from the land. In the nineteenth century, United States policies of ethnic cleansing divorced some Native people from their homelands and disrupted Indigenous knowledge systems.¹ Heretofore, scholars have emphasized Indigenous peoples' relationship to land or features on it. In *The Sea Is My Country*, historian Joshua Reid turns his attention to the social, political, economic and cultural relationship between Makahs and the Pacific Ocean. Makahs created a tribal space along the Pacific Coast and controlled that space into the twenty-first century.

The People of the Cape, also known as the Makah, occupy a terrestrial and maritime space near and on the Pacific Ocean. The name "The People of the Cape" situates Makah People in a specific place, on the tip of present-day Washington's Olympic Peninsula. The People of the Cape occupied an advantageous location in North America. They tapped into a bounteous supply of resources, such as cedar on land, salmon in rivers, and halibut and whales in the ocean. Makah society divided into three groups: elites, commoners, and slaves. Elites owned the tools necessary to fish and hunt whales – spears, canoes, etc. – and access to "outside resources," the fishing and whaling areas in the "marine spaces outside bays inlets, and rivers..."² Elites displayed their prestige by acting as good providers for their towns and outsiders. They gave away wealth in small and large-scale rituals and feasts, often called potlatches. By the mid to late eighteenth century, Makahs had created a tribal space along the Pacific Ocean and possessed greater access to marine sources than

¹ Several scholars have influenced my thinking on place and American Indian knowledge. See Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 104; Emma Battell Lowman and Adam Barker, "Indigenizing Approaches to Research," *The Sociological Imagination*, October 10, 2008, <http://sociologicalimagination.org/archives/2004> (accessed October 15, 2016); Tom Holm, J. Diane Pearson, and Ben Chavis, "Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies," *Wicazo Sa Review* 18:1 (2003): 7–24; Keith H. Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); Tiya Miles, *Ties That Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Donna L. Akers, "Removing the Heart of the Choctaw People: Indian Removal from a Native Perspective," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 23:3 (1999): 63–76.

² Joshua L. Reid, *The Sea Is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 10.

their neighbors, which enhanced their relative position. The term “Makah” comes from a S’klallam word, which means “generous with food.”³

Makahs continued to control their spaces after encountering Europeans and Americans. Reid highlights the activities of three coastal leaders: Maquinna, Wickaninnish, and Tatoosh. First, Makahs manipulated the Americans and Europeans who invaded their space. Spanish, British, and American ships that wanted access to the Strait of Juan de Fuca or to sail up and down the Pacific Coast needed to ask Makah permission to pass. Native leaders would not allow Europeans to anchor off the coast until the newcomers performed appropriate diplomatic protocols. In some instances, Makahs and other Native people attacked English ships and enslaved the crew. Second, Makahs jockeyed for position with other Indigenous people on the coast. Makah leaders attempted to prevent European and American ships from trading with other Indigenous groups. Reid suggests that coastal People interpreted ships as whales “that had died at sea and drifted ashore.”⁴ The first person to acquire this resource – whether a beached whale or anchored ship – owned it. Native leaders also attacked neighboring Native groups to ensure a primary economic role along the coast.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the People of the Cape continued to maintain connections to their marine places, despite settler colonial policies. In 1855, the Makah and the United States negotiated the Treaty of Neah Bay. “Tsu-kah-wihtl,” a Makah leader from Ozette, informed United States treaty commissioners that he desired access to the land, and “I want the sea. That is my country.”⁵ Treaty negotiations were but one example of how Makahs made the ocean their place. They named the Sound’s “harbors, river mouths, islands, passages and other marine features.”⁶ Place names inscribe meaning on the landscape and indicated ownership of places. Makahs also needed to maintain proper relationships with the animals that live in the ocean. Cedakanim, a Clayoquot man married to a Makah woman, told of a time when sea otters drowned the son of a chief. The people responded by killing sea otters and feeding their hearts to dogs. Seeing this affront, sea otters left the coast.⁷ Makahs interpreted the disappearance of sea otter from the perspective of their relationship with their maritime places. Sea otters and the People of the Cape had violated their relationship with the other – sea otters by killing the son of a chief, and the people by feeding sea otter hearts to dogs – and the consequences were harmful for the people and the ocean.

In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Makahs continued to claim access to the ocean. In 1892, Makahs requested ten-acre allotments, each with frontage to the marine spaces on Neah Bay, the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the Pacific Ocean or the

³ Ibid., 24.

⁴ Ibid., 25.

⁵ Ibid., 126.

⁶ Ibid., 141.

⁷ Ibid., 149.

regions' many rivers.⁸ In the twentieth century, commercial fishing and international laws attempted to limit Makahs' ability to fish and whale on the Pacific. Makahs created a "moditional" (part modern, part traditional) economy that effectively took whales, halibut and seals from the Pacific.⁹ Non-Indian conservationists put forward laws and policies, without Makah input, that limited Makah access to the ocean. Makahs, though, have continued to fight for the ocean. They participated in fish-ins in the 1960s and whale hunts in the 1990s. These whale hunts, Reid concludes, were not a backward-looking effort to regain traditional ways; rather, Makahs reestablished long-standing relationships with the sea and the animals in it.

Reid opens the pathway to understanding a broader and deeper relationship between Indigenous people and the places around them. We need to understand American Indian relationships to the land to interpret Indigenous histories and the history and structure of settler colonialism, but land was not the only source of knowledge and economic resources. Reid pushes scholars to consider the relationships between American Indians and their water ways, including rivers, lakes and other bodies of water. The current protest in North Dakota concerning the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) serves as a contemporary example of the long-lasting relationship between Indigenous people and water ways. But is water simply an extension of the land or do its specific features suggest new configurations? Furthermore, the No DAPL movement has shown how American Indians and environmental movements have aligned, but at other times, American Indians and environmentalists have clashed over water, land and animals, such as when Makahs hunt whales. Under which circumstances do treaty rights clash with environmental movements?

The Sea Is My Country reimagines Native relationships with the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and other water ways. Makahs created a tribal space on land and the ocean and they have controlled this space after encountering American and European invaders. The relationship between the Makah and the ocean is not purely a political or economic one; it is situated within specific Makah ways of knowing. They worked on the ocean; they named its features; they developed and maintained relationships with the water and the animals that reside in it. In light of those protests concerning water in North Dakota, we would do well to follow Reid's lead and explore the multifaceted relationships between Indigenous people and their water ways and the contested history of those relations under settler colonialism.

⁸ Ibid., 206.

⁹ Ibid., 17.

Comments by Bathsheba Demuth, Brown University

Well over a decade ago I went on my first caribou hunt, in the traditional territory of the Vuntut Gwitchin, north of the Arctic Circle on in the Canadian Yukon. A rumor was going around the village of a herd crossing downstream on the Porcupine River. We took an open wooden boat. Motoring round the looping bends, the shores just crusting with ice, we were fifteen miles downriver before making camp on a pebbly beach. A few hours later, a line of white-ruffed caribou began threading down the far bank. My host father sprang into action. It seemed that only seconds later we were across the river, bent over butchering a steaming carcass while the rest of the animals swam away. It was quite a moment for someone raised in Iowan cornfields, so I pulled out my camera. Only half in jest, my host father exclaimed, if memory and my journal serve, “For the love of God just don’t let any other white people see the [boat] motor and the guns. They all think real Indians should still hunt with arrows.”

Joshua Reid’s *The Sea is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* is a precise, forceful rejoinder to the idea that “real Indians” are those stuck in traditional amber, their authenticity determined by the present condition of living in a technological and cultural past. Such standards of “realness” have current political and cultural consequence, as Reid makes clear. The book opens and ends with contemporary debates over Makah whaling, rights still judged by notions of cultural purity or denigrated “for being motivated by a naive and antimodern desire to live in the past” (18). It is a deeply a-historical standard. *The Sea is My Country* undoes it through history.

That history begins long before Europeans. Reid gives us over two hundred years in the lives of the Q^widičča?a·tǵ (“kwi-dihch-chuh-aht”), a group of Makah living on Cape Flattery with the Pacific Ocean on one side, the Strait of Juan de Fuca on the other, and the Olympic Mountains behind them. The People of the Cape, as Q^widičča?a·tǵ, roughly translates, had homes on land but drew sustenance, political power, and cultural meaning from the sea, that aquatic liminal from which most historians retreat. But the sea, as a Makah chief told treaty negotiators in 1855, and as Reid titles the book, “is my country” (12). To tell actual Makah history requires the ocean. By taking this lead from his historical subjects and turning away from *terra firma*, Reid expands the history of the American West into the ocean, makes the ocean a borderland, turns the waters into part of a settler-colonial process, and transforms the Makah past into the origin story of a tribal nation “living in the present and moving into the future while retaining what is best about its traditions” (18).

The country of the sea was multifaceted political and economic space, crossed by lines of kinship and contestation. It was this world that the British ship *Felice Adventurer* sailed into in 1788. The balance of power in this early encounter did not favor the Europeans. Few in number, politically naïve, and needing indigenous

hunters to access the rich furs of the coast, they relied on Makah leaders like Tatoosh, a Qʷidiččaʔa·tš, chief, for trade success and peaceful passage. For Tatoosh, European goods were a useful addition to the networks of trade and political fealty in the ča·di· (cha-dee) borderland, which stretched from the Columbia River to Vancouver Island and deep into Puget Sound. But local politics, sometimes violent, always rooted in conditions that predated Europeans, sometimes altered relations between the Makah and newcomers, and frustrated imperial designs. By the nineteenth century, Makah were enthusiastic and choosy consumers of products made in Europe and China, but resisted forts, settlements, and colonial mapping projects. Even after a destabilizing wave of epidemics in the 1850s, Makah made themselves indispensable to non-Native settlers by using the resources of their maritime country, where “indigenous networks of trade, kinship, and violence endured” (127).

In these chapters, Reid joins scholars like Pekka Hämäläinen, John Wunder and Jack Forbes by arguing that “borderlands” describe indigenous political realities that predate imperial expansion.¹⁰ The long history and complexity of the Makah marine space entrapped imperial designs, rather than emerging as their product; indeed the political force and savvy the Makah carried from their long borderland experience made them able to frustrate European plans. Point taken – and it’s a useful one. But I found *The Sea is My Country* was at its best when not confining its analysis to the nuance of historiographical terms. This is particularly apparent in the chapters Reid devotes to maritime creatures, their harvesters, and their uses. It is here that the “real Indian” is truly pushed aside for Indian reality.

Indian reality remained tied to the sea, but in new and dynamic ways. Makah sold whale oil commercially in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, only suspending the hunt when the toll of market killing – the majority of it conducted by non-Native whaling ships – made gray whales scarce. Makah hired on as fur seal hunters, or bought their own schooners and outfitted their own crews. Killing fur seals made some Makah wealthy, able to support their Cape home by “expanding Makah marine space” north into the Bering Sea – until federal conservation efforts prohibited pelagic hunting (187). In the early twentieth century, Makah made good incomes from salmon and halibut, and continued to press for access even as technological changes in the industry and asserting the right to fish required increasingly sophisticated legal and political maneuvering. In other words, rather than being overtaken and erased by growing commercial interest in Pacific resources, the Makah found participating in capitalist enterprises in their maritime space a way to marry traditional values and contemporary realities.

¹⁰ Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); Jack Forbes, *Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994); John Wunder, “*Retained by the People*”: *A History of American Indians and the Bill of Rights* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

It is also in these chapters that Reid shows how state, federal, and international policies in various combinations, at various times, with varying degrees of contradiction, attempted to disenfranchise Makah use of the ocean. From seals to whales to fish, the People of the Cape thrashed with a Hydra-headed mass of overharvesting competitors and regulations that all too often doled out rights to large, non-Native corporations. While some in the Indian service “contradictorily believed that the federal government should support customary marine practices to help [the Makah] progress,” Reid shows how tangible support was rare (164). Instead, laws and perception regarded Indians as outside the market, requiring only subsistence access to maritime resources. With this image in mind, across the triad of Indians, markets, and governments, the latter two sided almost always against the former. Reid keeps a cool tone and takes the fair measure of the various men who roll out these policies. Yet it would be impossible to finish this book without feeling the cumulative injustice, framed by the Makah’s frustrated desire to continue the culturally meaningful practice of whaling. It is equally impossible to not close this volume impressed by the social will and resourcefulness displayed by the People of the Cape in the face of such layered discrimination. As a portrait of the tenacity of customs and values – and from the 1930s on, the ability to scrap with political systems foreign and domestic – *The Sea is My Country* liberates the Makah from the traditional frontier narrative in which Native peoples inevitably fade in the face of a settler nation and settler’s markets.

In the critique of U.S. and international policy, and in the descriptions of the lives and livelihoods Makah worked to shape for themselves, *The Sea is My Country* gestures toward a past not taken. In the shadow of the text is, essentially, an alternative vision of capitalism: one connected to the global market through trade, to the nation through politics, to the region by supporting terrestrial settlers with maritime wealth, but rooted in the concerns of a particular space and to the needs and meanings of a particular community. What would Makah life look like if crony capitalism and the mistaken stereotype of indigenous subsistence had not foreclosed on their ability to hunt seals? If they had more command of fishing? What if commerce originating in the country of the sea remained in Makah control? Reid gives us hints at the answer, noting that late nineteenth century sealing offered the “ability to bring benefits and gains to their people while abiding by Makah expectations”; fishing for halibut and salmon were “lucrative livelihoods” and even the contentious issue of contemporary whaling is a way of articulating Makah connection with the sea (202, 270). And this, to me, is the most revolutionary point of the book. Even James Brooks, sensitive to the creative potential of borderlands, sees the market as stealing away the alternative systems of value and valuation developed in the Southwest.¹¹ For Reid, the Makah have far more power. They created an alternative vision of market participation; they tried, did, failed only when forced, and then managed once more, to domesticate capitalism and its legal apparatus to fit the needs of their community.

¹¹ James Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

But the redemptive possibilities of market production also left me with a question. I will assign this book to any and every student I can because it is excellent Native American history, because it is a constant reminder to look past the convenient limits of nation and land, and because it is a provocative history of capitalism, if read a bit subversively. To say that the Makah were entrepreneurial yet able to tie their market participation back to the values of their community is empirically valid and historically critical. It banishes the ecological Indian from the country of the sea. Good riddance. But while I did not miss the sainted environmentalist indigene, I did miss ecology. To write a history full of environmental detail is not necessarily Reid's responsibility, but I am reviewing *The Sea is My Country* for environmental historians, so I will pause here for a moment. The period Reid chronicles was not just momentous for the People of the Cape. These two-hundred-odd years saw an encounter between non-human species and spaces and the invasive, increasingly pervasive, ever-hungry logic of capitalism. The result was a revolution in North Pacific ecosystems. The near collapse of successive species – fur seals, gray whales, halibut, salmon – drastically altered the People of the Cape's Pacific, and the ocean beyond. The global market created a new world under the waves.

Yet beyond an account of successive declines in whales, seals, and fish, that new world is invisible. Some of this is a rhetorical choice; throughout the book, Reid describes Makah borderland ecology in the past tense, "to emphasize that past environments were in many cases different from those today," a move that makes a certain narrative sense (xvi). But it also relieves the text of dealing with how the ocean of the past was not just different than today, it was actively changing throughout. Overfishing does not just alter the fish: it unleashes a cascade of erasures. And then there are the shocks that have nothing to with people. Confined to the permanent past tense, Cape hydrology, geology, and species become things only ever acted *upon*, not dynamic parts of the marine country. The revolution in oceanic lives that were not human comes across as only ever a human problem, a waltz of harvesting and overharvesting and regulation. Somehow, in highlighting Makah entrepreneurship, in making space for capitalism to work for Native communities, the ecosystems that are the base of this and any extractive economy are narratively subsumed to logic of treating animals as commodities. I closed the book knowing why the sea was Makah country, but not quite knowing the country of the sea. It is not so much a fault of this book, which as few, as a larger tension in environmental history. So I am left pondering, for myself and for our discipline, the challenge of writing about Indians and ecology without falling back into clichés of the ecological Indian.

The Sea is My Country is a formidable work of scholarship, not least because of the moving endorsement from the Makah Tribal Council that opens the book. It is rare that a work of history is so responsible to the fates of a present community, not just the past. I called my host father in the Arctic just a few days after closing the book's covers, and we talked about it; down the phone line from the Arctic he expressed relief that a Native person is writing Native history that makes sense to Native

people. If everyone would but read it, we could put aside image of the “real Indian” for good.

 Comments by Edward D. Melillo, Amherst College

American Indian history has taken a “maritime turn.” Nancy Shoemaker’s *Native American Whalers and the World* (2015), Andrew Lipman’s *The Saltwater Frontier* (2015), and Jace Weaver’s *The Red Atlantic* (2014) have challenged perceptions of North America’s indigenous inhabitants as land-locked peoples. Historian Joshua Reid’s *The Sea Is My Country* amplifies this spirited new wave of scholarship. However, Reid’s book does more than simply follow a trend and augment its collective power. *The Sea Is My Country* offers an invigorating model of historical research that engages with a community across three centuries, while simultaneously challenging widely held assumptions in American Indian Studies.¹²

Tracing a 225-year-long arc from 1774 to 1999, Reid explores the fluctuating maritime world of the Q^widičča?a·t̄x. This group, also known as Makahs or “People of the Cape,” has long inhabited the region that is now the northwestern-most point of the contiguous United States. Engaging the “maritime turn,” Reid asserts that for many generations, the Makahs have formed their economic, sociocultural, and spiritual lives around ča·di (“cha-dee”), a marine space that, “in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries...stretched nearly five hundred miles, as a canoe might travel, from the mouth of the Columbia River to the northern tip of Vancouver Island and east into Puget Sound” (14). Radiating outward from the Olympic Peninsula, this “indigenous borderland” was neither contingent upon the limits of *terra firma*, nor was it the inexorable outcome of European imperialism or the subsequent colonial incursions of the United States government. In fact, hybridizations of enduring traditions and imported innovations—what Reid calls a *moditional economy*—“allowed Makahs to mitigate some of the worst assimilation efforts while expanding access to marine space” (17).

One of the many contributions of Reid’s magnificent book is to give us a more aquamarine, intertidal version of historian Richard White’s “middle ground,” an unstable space of syncretic accommodation and creative misunderstandings between Europeans and American Indians. Comments that historian Philip Deloria made in 2006 about the manifold legacies of White’s *The Middle Ground* could effortlessly be applied to *The Sea Is My Country*: “The book forces us to see that our efforts to understand the imposition of (and resistance to) colonial order are always doomed to insufficiency if they fail to take complex account, not of cultural decline or preservation, but of new cultural production within the frame of encounter.”¹³

¹² Nancy Shoemaker, *Native American Whalers and the World: Indigenous Encounters and the Contingency of Race* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015); Andrew Lipman, *The Saltwater Frontier: Indians and the Contest for the American Coast* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015); and Jace Weaver, *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

¹³ Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Philip J. Deloria, “What Is the Middle Ground, Anyway?” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 63, no. 1 (January 2006): 22.

In the spirit of expanding how historians frame cross-cultural encounters between Native Americans and newcomers, I propose two areas where Reid's book could widen the horizons of an emerging field of study, Pacific World history.

I. An opportunity:

Over the past decade, a growing number of scholars have explored the concept of the Pacific World, a unit of historical analysis centered on the peoples and ecosystems in and around the world's largest ocean. My *Strangers on Familiar Soil* (2015), John Ryan Fisher's *Cattle Colonialism* (2015), Ryan Tucker Jones's *Empire of Extinction* (2014), David Iglar's *The Great Ocean* (2013), Gregory Cushman's *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World* (2013), Matt Matsuda's *Pacific Worlds* (2012), Kornel Chang's *Pacific Connections* (2012), Nicholas Thomas' *Islanders* (2010), Stuart Banner's *Possessing the Pacific* (2007), and Paul D'Arcy's *The People of the Sea* (2005) are but ten of the recent histories that have introduced readers to the field of Pacific World history.¹⁴

Despite the novel viewpoints offered by this Pacific renaissance, certain anachronistic elements persist. For example, attempts to connect the more conventional, terracentric North American West to the Pacific Northwest, Alaska, Hawai'i, and beyond still harbor outmoded features of colonial historiography. As Reid convincingly asserts, "A few scholars have begun to look at the extension of the US West into and across the Pacific Ocean and the reciprocal role of Pacific peoples, places, and industries on the development of the nation. But these narratives present a traditional story of non-Native commercial interests overwhelming and replacing indigenous economies" (12).

¹⁴ Edward D. Melillo, *Strangers on Familiar Soil: Rediscovering the Chile-California Connection* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015); John Ryan Fisher, *Cattle Colonialism: An Environmental History of the Conquest of California and Hawai'i* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015); Ryan Tucker Jones, *Empire of Extinction: Russians and the North Pacific's Strange Beasts of the Sea, 1741-1867* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); David Iglar, *The Great Ocean: Pacific Worlds from Captain Cook to the Gold Rush* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); Gregory T. Cushman, *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World: A Global Ecological History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Matt Matsuda, *Pacific Worlds: A History of Seas, Peoples, and Cultures* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Kornel Chang, *Pacific Connections: The Making of the US-Canadian Borderlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012); Nicholas Thomas, *Islanders: The Pacific in the Age of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Stuart Banner, *Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); and Paul D'Arcy, *The People of the Sea: Environment, Identity, and History in Oceania* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005). Much deeper roots of this concept can be traced to the anachronistic, but pioneering, works of Oscar Spate. O.H.K. Spate, *The Pacific since Magellan*, 3 vols. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979-1988). For a comprehensive, and far more detailed, account of the genealogy of "Pacific History," see Damon I. Salesa, "The World from Oceania," in Douglas Northrop, ed., *A Companion to World History* (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2012), 391-404.

Conversely, the analytical framework of a Pacific World offers tremendous potential for centering Native spaces and anti-colonial struggles. Projecting both from the continental edges inwards, as Reid's book does, and emanating from its archipelagic epicenters outwards, the study of indigenous agency throughout the Pacific World can destabilize and reinvent many seemingly well-rehearsed narratives.¹⁵ This is a crucial opportunity presented by Reid's book.

The many nations and territories in and around the Pacific are stunningly diverse in both cultural and ecological terms. Home to nearly one quarter of the world's languages, the Pacific region features approximately 25,000 islands (exceeding the total number in the rest of the world's oceans combined) and hosts some of the planet's most species-rich ecosystems. In 2001, Native studies scholars Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui summarized the dialectic of creation and destruction that suffuses the Pacific World. Introducing a special issue of *The Contemporary Pacific* titled "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," Diaz and Kauanui remark, "At the dawn of a new millennium, Pacific Islanders continue a history of production and destruction through active participation in and resistance to a tide of forces that have swept our shores: colonialism, patriarchy, militarism, Christianity, nationhood, development, tourism, literacy, athletics, other forceful modes of modernity, and for us especially, scholarship."¹⁶ A new generation of scholars, including Ryan Tucker Jones, Gregory Rosenthal, and Katerina Martina Teaiwa, has enriched our understanding of how Pacific Islanders and indigenous peoples along the Pacific Rim have dramatically shaped the environmental history of this transoceanic space.¹⁷ Reid's "marine-oriented approach, a different historical perspective on American Indians and the North American West" (12) fits this historiographical itinerary quite aptly. Paired with his commitment to telling the stories of people who have fought tenaciously "in maintaining access to tribal waters and in making a living from the sea" (270), Reid's book offers multiple zones of engagement with the Pacific World.

¹⁵ David Armitage and Alison Bashford make a related point in "Introduction: The Pacific and Its Histories," in *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land, People*, eds. David Armitage and Alison Bashford (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 13. My language here suggests transpacific extensions of concepts offered by Native literary scholar Lisa Brooks in her superb book *The Common Pot: "What happens when we put Native space at the center of America rather than merely striving for inclusion of minority viewpoints or viewing Native Americans as part of or on the periphery of America?"* Lisa Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), xx.

¹⁶ Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 316.

¹⁷ Ryan Tucker Jones, "Kelp Highways, Siberian Girls in Maui, and Nuclear Walruses: The North Pacific in a Sea of Islands," *The Journal of Pacific History* 49, no. 4 (November 2014): 373-95; Gregory Rosenthal, "Life and Labor in a Seabird Colony: Hawaiian Guano Workers, 1857-1870," *Environmental History* 17, no. 4 (October 2012): 744-82; and Katerina Martina Teaiwa, *Consuming Ocean Island: Stories of People and Phosphate from Banaba* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014).

II. A challenge:

China makes recurrent appearances in *The Sea Is My Country*, most frequently as a destination for the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Pacific maritime fur trade. Reid, like so many of us whose work flows along transpacific circuits, is challenged to portray Late Imperial China as more than an opaque vortex, swallowing up vast amounts of Spanish silver, sandalwood, bêche-de-mer, sea otter pelts, and beaver fur and churning out silk, tea, porcelain, and ornate wooden furniture in return.

Reid writes eloquently of nineteenth-century “Northwest Coast chiefs” who “were savvy consumers of Asian and European goods” including “Chinese-made sandalwood and camphor boxes” (97). Were these simply fetishized commodities, exchanged goods whose social and environmental relations of production had vanished behind the illusion of intrinsic value?¹⁸ What place did China occupy in the expansive and nuanced worldview of the Makahs that Reid so painstakingly assembles in *The Sea Is My Country*? Conversely, how might historians further explore Chinese notions of a non-European world across the Pacific?¹⁹

These are, by no means, simple questions for historians to answer. Acquiring reading proficiencies across vastly divergent language families and learning to navigate unfamiliar archives in multiple cultures remain formidable obstacles for historians trained in the United States. Likewise, the entrenched area-studies divisions of our discipline tend to frustrate such boundary crossings.²⁰

Models have begun to emerge, however, to suggest how historians might integrate studies of indigenous peoples in the Americas with the expansive transpacific networks in which so many of them participated. David A. Chang’s 2011 *Journal of American History* article, “Borderlands in a World at Sea: Concow Indians, Native

¹⁸ Wood from the *zhang shu*, or camphor tree (*Cinnamomum camphora*), was a highly valued cash crop grown domestically in China’s Fujian Province and on Taiwan, another borderlands where indigenous peoples and agents of empire negotiated the met in the realm of resource extraction. Likewise, rapacious harvests of sandalwood (*Santalum* sp.), or *tan xiang mu*, from Hawai’i and Fiji had severe consequences for the ecosystems and indigenous residents both of these Pacific archipelagoes during the early 1800s.

¹⁹ One starting point for such an inquiry would be Henry Yu, “The Intermittent Rhythms of the Cantonese Pacific,” in *Connecting Seas and Connected Ocean Rims: Indian, Atlantic, and Pacific Oceans and China Seas Migrations from the 1830s to the 1930s*, ed. Donna R. Gabaccia and Dirk Hoerder (Boston: Brill, 2011), 393-414.

²⁰ Environmental historians have contributed much to our understanding of the results of global maritime trade links during the Ming (1368-1644) and Qing (1644-1911) Dynasties. Asia’s analogue to the “Columbian Exchange,” the arrival of four cultivars from the Americas—corn, the sweet potato, peanuts, and tobacco—transformed the Chinese countryside. The transmission of these New World crops to China by Spanish and Portuguese traders has not escaped an array of perceptive scholars. See: Ping-ti Ho, *Studies on the Population of China, 1368-1953* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959), 186-89; Dennis O. Flynn and Arturo Giráldez, “Cycles of Silver: Global Economic Unity through the Mid-Eighteenth Century,” *Journal of World History* 13, no. 2 (Fall 2002): 391-427; and Charles C. Mann, *1493: Uncovering the New World Columbus Created* (New York: Knopf, 2011).

Hawaiians, and South Chinese in Indigenous, Global, and National Spaces,” is exemplary in this respect.²¹

Conclusion

A concept as capacious and slippery as the Pacific World can mask crucial differences under the illusion of geographical determinism. To quote historian Arif Dirlik, “In a fundamental sense, there is no Pacific region that is an ‘objective’ given, but only a competing set of ideational constructs that project upon a certain location on the globe the imperatives of interest, power, or vision of these historically produced relationships.”²²

Yet discourses matter, especially to the stories that people tell about their place in the local, regional, global, or cosmological order. Such narratives can be overwhelmingly oppressive or they can underwrite redemptive acts of what the Fijian-Tongan scholar Epeli Hau’ofa called “world enlargement.”²³ These cognitive and literal expansions of indigenous space occupy the very heart of *The Sea Is My Country*.

²¹ David A. Chang, “Borderlands in a World at Sea: Concow Indians, Native Hawaiians, and South Chinese in Indigenous, Global, and National Spaces,” *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 384-403.

²² Arif Dirlik, “The Asia-Pacific Idea: Reality and Representation in the Invention of a Regional Structure,” *Journal of World History* 3, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 56.

²³ Epeli Hau’ofa, “Our Sea of Islands,” in *We Are the Ocean: Selected Works* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008), 30.

Comments by Helen M. Rozwadowski, University of Connecticut, Avery Point

Joshua Reid's *The Sea is My Country*, in the words of the Makah Tribal Council, chronicles the "calculated and heroic measures to protect our water, land, and resources that provide for our way of life." Reid's comprehensive and well-researched history of the Makah nation reveals marine space at the center of its culture. One important outcome of his study emerges from the contrast between the history of the Makahs and that of many other indigenous peoples who have been tied to land rather than the sea. For the Makah, marine resource use provided the basis for wealth and power before the arrival of Euro-Americans and continuing thereafter. As power dynamics shifted to favor Euro-Americans, especially when they settled the land-based area that had been Makah territory, reliance on marine resources and ocean space for transportation and trade equipped the Makah to subsist and, at times, prosper and resist assimilation. Reid's work makes a seminal contribution to understanding the Makah and their world by recognizing how far it expanded beyond the terrestrial realm.

The book opens with the resumption of whale hunting in 1999, an effort years in the making and supported by numerous indigenous peoples. The hunt culminated with the welcome of the first whale, a three-year-old female gray whale, to the Makah nation in seventy years. Reid seizes upon criticism of the hunt, based on "a deep lack of understanding about the issue," (p. 3) as an opportunity to explore the historical and cultural connections of the Makah people to the ocean.

Over thousands of years the sea became the sovereign space of the Makah through customary practices and spiritual beliefs that revolved around whaling, sealing and fishing. With the arrival of British fur traders starting with John Meares, and later agents of the Hudson Bay Company as well as Euro-American settlers, the Makah continued to employ customary practices to exert power, control space and frustrate imperial processes.

Reid argues for re-orienting the history of the northwestern Pacific region to recognize that patterns of exploitation of fur seals, whales and fish resembled those for mining and timber in other areas of the continental North American west. Such recognition acknowledges that Natives operated far outside of the traditional boundaries assumed in histories of American Indians and by many western historians. The Makah and other coastal Native groups moved fluidly throughout a region across which the boundary between the United States and Canada was subsequently inscribed. Despite the assertion of the political boundary, the Makah continued to trade, travel and harvest areas throughout their traditional borderlands. Chiefs maintained their control by acting across political borders, and also across the land-sea boundary, but their engagement with new opportunities offered by settler communities accommodated and incorporated non-Natives into northwest coast societies and thus also contributed to making colonialism possible.

The occasion of the 1855 treaty between the Makah and the territorial governor of Washington provided the articulation of cultural self-definition that inspired the book's title. A Makah chief informed treaty negotiators, "I want the sea. That is my country." The resulting Treaty of Neah punctuated the period during which the Makah reacted to the arrival of non-Natives to their territory. Even in the throes of a terrible smallpox epidemic that decimated their community—a situation which American negotiators counted upon in choosing this time to approach the formidable Makahs about a treaty—leaders protected their control over customary sea space and ocean resources. They insisted upon recognition in the treaty that local waters were sovereign tribal space, challenging the emerging Euro-American view of coasts as boundaries and coastal waters as resource commons.

Reid's work contributes a striking re-examination of the long-held assumption that the oceans were always commons. Garret Hardin's famous 1968 essay, "The Tragedy of the Commons," uses fish and whales as examples of his argument about inevitable overuse of common resources.²⁴ Since then, scholars have treated oceans, especially fisheries, as classic commons. Recently, scholars of colonial and early America have documented treatment of fish as community resources rather than common resources, and Carmel Finley has pointed out that twentieth century fisheries were categorically not commons by virtue of the extent of government intervention in the form of economic protection and subvention as well as regulation.²⁵ Reid adds a new dimension to this discussion with his example of a tribal nation that considered ocean space as sovereign territory and its resources as owned by its powerful chiefs.

Among the most unexpected results of Reid's research is the story of Makah engagement with the fur seal fishery during the second half of the 19th century. Using an entrepreneurial combination of customary marine practices and modern technology, specifically schooners that enabled sealing as far from home territory as the Bering Sea, Makahs developed what Reid calls a "moditional" (combination of modern and traditional) industry. By contrast, many terrestrially bound Native American communities lacked opportunities to develop similarly profitable enterprises. Makah economic success, based on expanding its access to marine space and embracing modern technology, mitigated some of the worst effects of assimilation efforts. Profits from sealing supported cultural practices and enabled investment in tertiary industries—very much as capital from 19th-century Yankee whaling had done for its entrepreneurs and eastern port cities. This means of support for the Makah nation to sustain itself was abruptly removed when the international treaty to conserve fur seal populations was created exclusively among

²⁴ Garrett Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Commons," *Science* 162(1968): 1243-1248.

²⁵ W. Jeffrey Bolster, *The Moral Sea: Fishing the Atlantic in the Age of Sail* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012). Carmel Finley, *All the Fish in the Sea: Maximum Sustainable Yield and the Failure of Fisheries Management* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2011).

nation states, cutting the Makah entirely out of commercial exploitation of the North Atlantic.

The assumption that indigenous peoples hunted only for subsistence purposes became codified into law, removing the Makah's ability to benefit economically from fur seals and, soon thereafter, from other marine species as well. Successful Makah fisheries for halibut and salmon were challenged by overfishing by non-Native operators. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, to pay for vessels and fuel, Makah fishers were forced to sell their catches instead of providing them as food for the community. Only when non-Native forces eliminated the resource foundation for the Makah did they become more susceptible to assimilation efforts. Only when they were excluded from the ocean spaces that had generated wealth and power did the Makahs' significant economic and cultural achievements, won through participating in modern exploitation of marine resources, vanish from sight.

Despite the enormous setbacks, the Makah continued in the 20th century to assert their right to marine space. A newly formed tribal council actively pursued this agenda starting in the 1930s even as the Makah chose to suspend whaling in 1928 in recognition of the scarcity of whales off Cape Flattery. The hiatus in whaling did not end its cultural importance; whaling implements remained central to social events and performances, while drift whales were harvested in secret to maintain traditions. Reid's history shows that the Makah nation has continuously exploited marine space and borderlands networks to strive to create for itself a future in the modern world that remains tied to tradition and cultural identity. The return to whaling is not an effort to re-create a lost moment in time but to forge a path forward that animates tradition. In doing so, the Makah and other indigenous peoples face challenges posed by assumptions that tie them to nostalgic pasts rather than dynamic futures.

Reid's work provides an impressively comprehensive account of Makah cultural connections to the ocean and contributes importantly to Native American history and environmental history as well. I would argue that it also helps recover what might be called ocean history, that is, the history of human relationships with the sea. His work alerts historians to the likelihood that, far beyond the experiences of one tribal nation, many groups of people around the globe and throughout deep time may have had culturally distinct ties to the ocean. The experience of the Makah tribal nation provides a detailed historical case study that supports Philip Steinberg's argument that economic and political uses of the sea by different cultures forged unique perceptions and constructions of the ocean. John Gillis has alerted us of the importance of the littoral, but Reid demonstrates that some coastal peoples were quite oceanic.²⁶

²⁶ Philip E. Steinberg, *The Social Construction of the Ocean* (Cambridge University Press, 2001). John R. Gillis, *The Human Shore: Seacoasts in History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

Future histories may explicate how coastal peoples in North America and elsewhere developed economies and cultures as oceanic as they were terrestrial (or perhaps even more so). Hopefully one day it will be possible to understand how the Makah resembled, and differed from, other coastal groups, both in the Pacific Northwest region that was their home as well as elsewhere in North America. Epeli Hau'ofa's articulation of Pacific island peoples who conceive of their world as "seas of islands" rather than tiny specks of land lost in a vast ocean prompts questions about whether experience of and with the sea created cultural commonalities.²⁷ Did groups like the Makah share more in common with peoples much farther away, such as across the wide Pacific Ocean, compared to inland tribes on their own continent? If there turns out to be resemblances, did they emerge from similarities of experience, from exchanges through trade or migration, or from some other source? Did most coastal peoples understand ocean space as sovereign territory, or did that happen only along certain shores and, if so, did such a construction of the ocean depend on physical geography, history, or something else? Such queries lay far beyond the scope of this impressive book, but the fact that Reid's work inspires questions whose articulation challenges the terrestrial bias of so much history and anthropology suggests its promise to re-shape the way we understand people, land, sea and history.

²⁷ Epeli Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands," pp. 2-16 in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, ed. by Eric Waddell, Vijay Naidu, and Epeli Hau'ofa (Suva, Fiji: The University of the South Pacific School of Social and Economic Development, 1993).

Response by Joshua L. Reid, University of Washington

The People of the Cape, Pacific Worlds, and Indigenous Knowledge

Many genealogical threads, both academic and familial, brought me into Pacific Worlds and Makah marine space. While growing up in Washington State, my maternal grandparents often took my sister and me out to Kalaloch, a stretch of one of the most beautiful beaches in North America. As the sun sank into the Pacific Ocean's horizon, my Snohomish grandfather would light a driftwood fire and tell stories about his mother and grandmother fishing in the sea. My favorite part of his tales—at least that which I remember today—was about the trails of smoke from his grandmother's corncob pipe. They floated behind the canoe, like an ethereal mirror to the fishing lines trailing in the water. More importantly, these stories taught me at a young age that the sea was a fundamental part of Indian Country. In fact, as a registered member of the Snohomish Tribe of Indians—a people who lack federal recognition—I found the sea more a part of my Indian Country than the land because we have no reservation.

Around the same time in the late-1970s, my parents took me on my first backpacking trip, down a winding boardwalk trail to Cape Alava while the Ozette dig was under way. On that first hike, I had no appreciation for the fact that this was one of the most significant Pacific Northwest archaeological sites.²⁸ Nor did I understand that the artifacts and material items carefully excavated from the mud would prove to the rest of the world what the Makah Nation had long known: they were whalers, with a history of whaling that stretched back thousands of years. But I did appreciate seeing Native peoples—Makahs—working shoulder-to-shoulder with the archaeologists and graduate students in the coastal muck. This taught me that our people could literally uncover our own histories.

Finally, during my fifth year of teaching middle school in Seattle, the 1999 Makah whale hunt unfolded in my Washington State history class as a teachable moment, especially because we had just learned about the treaties that Washington's tribal nations had signed with Territorial Governor Isaac Stevens from 1854 to 1856. Similar to what I emphasize today when I discuss American Indian treaties, I had taught the students one of the key characteristics of treaties about which most non-Natives seem ignorant: indigenous negotiators reserved for themselves and their descendants specific rights that they expected to exercise in perpetuity. Reflecting this understanding, my students asked important questions, such as "Don't people understand that this is what the Makahs insisted upon in the treaty?" and "Don't people understand why this is important to the Makahs?" At that point, I realized that these were big questions that I could explore in graduate school. The answer became *The Sea Is My Country*.

²⁸ Ruth Kirk, *Ozette: Excavating a Makah Whaling Village* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2015).

Building on the lessons from these earlier experiences, I sought to identify and read everything I could about American Indians and marine space when I first got to graduate school... only to find that there was very little to read. The “maritime turn,” as Ted Melillo calls it in his review, had not hit American Indian history yet. So I broadened my scope to include indigenous peoples of the Pacific, whom I knew scholars clearly saw as marine-oriented. This led me to foundational works by Epeli Hau’ofa, Greg Dening, and Paul D’Arcy and mentorship by Pacific Studies scholars, especially Vince Diaz.²⁹ I read about Torres Strait Islanders of Australia and the foreshore and seabed controversy in Aotearoa New Zealand.³⁰ I even considered a much different dissertation that compared Makah marine space to that of one or more Māori iwi (people) or hapū (clans).³¹ From these Pacific readings, I walked away with an interesting set of questions about the multifaceted ways that indigenous peoples have created, understood, and exploited marine spaces. And I found answers when I applied these questions to the People of the Cape (Makahs) of the most northwestern point of the contiguous United States. I appreciate that these findings resonate so strongly with the four reviewers in this roundtable.

I relate this lengthy genealogy of what brought me to *The Sea Is My Country* because I think it illustrates not only how I approach Pacific Worlds and indigenous maritime histories, but it also mirrors some of the interesting connections and networks that start to emerge when we do intellectual work within a Pacific frame of analysis. I deliberately deploy the term *genealogy* because indigenous peoples in the Pacific use webs of kinship relationships to position themselves and their knowledge and to articulate their place across and within communities both historically and in the present.³² But genealogy also invokes a Foucaultian research

²⁹ Epeli Hau’ofa, “Our Sea of Islands,” in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, ed. Epeli Hau’ofa, Eric Waddell, and Vijay Naidu (Suva, Fiji: The University of the South Pacific School of Social and Economic Development, 1993); Greg Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas, 1774-1880* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980); Dening, “Deep Times, Deep Spaces,” in *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean*, ed. Bernhard Klein and Gesa Mackenthun (New York: Routledge, 2004); Paul D’Arcy, *The People of the Sea: Environment, Identity and History in Oceania* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2006).

³⁰ Bernard Nietschmann, “Traditional Sea Territories, Resources and Rights in Torres Strait,” in *A Sea of Small Boats*, ed. John Cordell (Cambridge: Cultural Survival, Inc., 1989); Peter H. Russell, *Recognizing Aboriginal Title: The Mabo Case and Indigenous Resistance to English-Settler Colonialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); Tom Bennion, Malcolm Birdling, and Rebecca Paton, *Making Sense of the Foreshore and Seabed* (Wellington: Maori Law Review, 2005); Waitangi Tribunal, “Report on the Crown’s Foreshore and Seabed Policy (Wai 1071),” (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 2004).

³¹ Some of the research I did for this is currently under review in an edited volume, with a piece tentatively titled “Indigenous-Anglo Interactions over Indigenous Marine Space: Makahs, Māori, and the Settler Revolution in the Pacific.” I am using Angela Ballara’s definition of *iwi* (people—persons composing a community, tribe, race, or nation) and *hapu* (clan—group with a common ancestor). See Angela Ballara, *Iwi: The Dynamics of Māori Tribal Organisation from C.1769 to C.1945* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 1998), 17.

³² David Welchman Gegeo and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, “‘How We Know’: Kwara’ae Rural Villagers Doing Indigenous Epistemology,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 1 (2001): 68-69; Alice Te Punga Somerville, *Once Were Pacific: Māori Connections to Oceania* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 198-204.

approach that I have always thought of as casting a wide net (pun intended), especially when interrogating the genealogies and legacies of colonialism and its concomitant practices involving lands, waters, and resources of Natives in spaces such as the Pacific.³³ Moreover, from the perspective of Northwest Coast peoples such as the Makahs, genealogy extends beyond human relationships into the non-human world and the environment in ways that overlap with ecology. More on that in a moment.

In the context of Pacific Worlds scholarship, genealogy also works as an indigenous epistemology to counter colonial framings of this region's history. According to Māori literary scholar Alice Te Punga Somerville, indigenous peoples in the Pacific mobilize "whakapapa [genealogy] relationships to recognize and subvert the context of colonialism."³⁴ For me, this resonates with Melillo's point that histories of Pacific Worlds have great "potential for centering Native spaces and anti-colonial struggles," while "destabiliz[ing] and reinvent[ing] many seemingly well-rehearsed narratives." This is precisely what the 1999 Makah whale hunt did. It highlighted the way that the sea remains critical to Makah identity today and destabilized the stereotype of simple ecological Indians, revealing a different way that this particular tribal nation interacts with and conceives of their relationship with the natural world. Other similar contemporary indigenous maritime issues across the Pacific, such as those examined in *Mabo v. Queensland* (1992), which dealt with Australia's Murray Islands and related fisheries, have deep historical roots and dimensions yet also have the power to shape larger frameworks beyond the water. In *Mabo*, the High Court of Australia struck down the legal and historical assumption of *terra nullius*, a decision that reverberated in Aboriginal communities across Australia.³⁵

A marine orientation and indigenous epistemologies emerging from the sea also counter the terrestrial framings of settler colonial historical narratives. In his review, William Bauer asks if "water [is] simply an extension of the land or do its specific features suggest new configurations." Scholarship by and about Pacific indigenous peoples reveals common patterns tied to the maritime nature of their worlds. For example, Makahs share with indigenous peoples of the Pacific a place-based knowledge of the marine environment, suggesting an answer to Helen Rozwadowski's question about cultural commonalities. Although indigenous knowledge is not unique to Pacific Native peoples, some particular common categories of types of knowledge are, especially those pertaining to weather,

³³ Foucault describes this as depending on "a vast accumulation of knowledge." See Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 76-77 (quote); Paige Raibmon, "Unmaking Native Space: A Genealogy of Indian Policy, Settler Practice, and the Microtechniques of Dispossession," in *The Power of Promises: Rethinking Indian Treaties in the Pacific Northwest*, ed. Alexandra Harmon (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

³⁴ Te Punga Somerville, *Once Were Pacific*, 74.

³⁵ *Mabo and Others v. Queensland (No. 2) [1992] HCA 23; (1992) 175 CLR 1* (3 June 1992). See also Bryan Keon-Cohen, "The Mabo Litigation: A Personal and Procedural Account," *Melbourne University Law Review* 24, no. 3 (2000).

currents, tides, navigation, sea life, and characteristics deep below the water's surface.³⁶

Similarly, as Paul D'Arcy argues, Pacific Islanders were enmeshed in larger and beneficial networks of trade, communication, kinship, politics, and violence that spanned vast distances of the ocean, "creat[ing] a wider sense of community and belonging," like an indigenous form of cosmopolitanism.³⁷ By their nature as coastal residents, where the beaches of Pacific islands and continental edges, such as at Cape Flattery, operated as literal and metaphorical spaces of encounter, peoples of the indigenous Pacific became masters of cultural change and adaptation long before the arrival of Europeans.³⁸ Literally, Makahs and other marine-oriented indigenous peoples had to cross the beach to encounter and interact with others, and vice versa. This meant surmounting language and cultural barriers—metaphorical beaches—through actions that demonstrated both the respective power of those involved in these encounters and their willingness to benefit from these exchanges.³⁹ Encounters such as these happened in the historical indigenous Pacific prior to the first sightings of European sails in these marine waters. So for coastal Native peoples, Bauer's question is perhaps the wrong one to ask: instead, why not ask how land is an extension of water?

Recent American Indian historiography confirms similar patterns of adaptability among terrestrial communities far removed from the sea. For example, as historian Pekka Hämäläinen convincingly argues, Comanches' rise to dominance in the Southern Plains of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries lay in their adaptive culture and ability to harness Euro-American resources to their own advantage.⁴⁰ Similarly, some indigenous communities in North America embraced new technologies and opportunities, such as firearms and education, to spectacular advantage in the past.⁴¹ As historian Philip Deloria demonstrates in *Indians in Unexpected Places*, adaptability also marked early twentieth-century American Indians as successful participants in modernity in the film and music recording industries, professional sports, and automotive world.⁴² Most importantly, whether they were at land or at sea, these adaptations did not render these communities any less Makah, or Comanche, or indigenous. Instead, particular cultural priorities

³⁶ For more on the comparative nature of indigenous knowledges, see David Gordon and Shepard Krech III, eds., *Indigenous Knowledge and the Environment in Africa and North America* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012), 1-24.

³⁷ D'Arcy, *The People of the Sea*, 7.

³⁸ Denning, *Islands and Beaches*.

³⁹ John S. Lutz, *Myth and Memory: Stories of Indigenous-European Contact* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 1-14.

⁴⁰ Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 346.

⁴¹ David J. Silverman, *Thundersticks: Firearms and the Violent Transformation of Native America* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

⁴² Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

framed these adaptations and became ways for these peoples to continue being Native.

Relative to Pacific Worlds as a concept, Ted Melillo raises some of the most challenging questions. What about China, or as he asks, “What place did China occupy in the expansive and nuanced worldview of the Makahs?” He correctly points to the need for historians of Pacific Worlds to engage more critically with the inclusion of Late Imperial China in our studies. There are some hints from the past that speak to this. In addition to Chinese-made products, such as the highly coveted sandalwood boxes of the early nineteenth century, Makahs and other peoples of the Northwest Coast encountered and engaged with Chinese individuals. Beginning with John Meares’s 1788 voyage to Vancouver Island and the Washington coast, Chinese people began interacting with indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest—his vessels included fifty Chinese sailors, smiths, and carpenters.⁴³ More Chinese laborers came east across the Pacific as employees of the Hudson’s Bay Company in the first half of the nineteenth century.⁴⁴

But beyond the fact that there were some Chinese laborers in the Northwest Coast from the late eighteenth century on, understanding where China fits into the indigenous Northwest Coast worldview is more difficult to achieve. This is a small part of what I am hoping to address in my next research project about indigenous explorers in the Pacific, from the 1780s to the end of the nineteenth century. One of my case studies, Comekala—a Mowachaht from Yuquot on Vancouver Island—spent nearly a year in Canton and Macao before returning home in 1788. He likely explored the trading community of Whampoa, seeing the many workshops of the narrow, flagstone-paved streets of the Canton suburb, gaining a keen sense of the range of valuable trade goods his people could demand for furs. While aboard Meares’s *Felice Adventurer*, Comekala interacted with the Chinese laborers the British captain had hired, even learning to speak some Chinese.⁴⁵ Comekala must have gained some sense of Late Imperial China, as a distant place filled with new trade goods and peoples. But so did other Native peoples at this time. Comekala was not the only indigenous explorer who spent time in Canton in the 1780s. Ka’iana, an ali’i (chief) from Kaua’i, overlapped with and shared a house with Comekala in China. Apparently more enamored with Ka’iana than the Mowachaht from Yuquot, Meares’s journal details the ali’i’s time in China. He noted, for instance, that

⁴³ John Meares, *Voyages Made in the Years 1788 and 1789, from China to the N. W. Coast of America*, Vol. 1 (London: J. Walter, 1791), 4. Another twenty-nine Chinese carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, and masons came a year later with James Colnett’s fur trading voyage to Nootka Sound. James Colnett and Frederic William Howay, *The Journal of Captain James Colnett Aboard the Argonaut from April 26, 1789 to Nov. 3, 1791* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1940), 15.

⁴⁴ Bruce McIntyre Watson, *Lives Lived West of the Divide: A Biographical Dictionary of Fur Traders Working West of the Rockies, 1793-1858* (Kelowna: Centre for Social, Spatial and Economic Justice at the University of British Columbia, Okanagan, 2010). For more on Chinese immigrants to British Columbia, see David Chuenyan Lai, “From Downtown Slums to Suburban Malls: Chinese Migration and Settlement in Canada,” in *The Chinese Diaspora: Space, Place, Mobility, and Identity*, ed. Laurence J. C. Ma and Carolyn Cartier (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003), 311-336.

⁴⁵ Meares, *Voyages Made in the Years 1788 and 1789*, 140.

“whenever [Ka‘iana] found himself amongst them, that the Chinese appeared to regard him with awe, and that, wherever he turned, the timid crowd never failed to open to him a ready passage.”⁴⁶ While this passage certainly tells us more about Meares’s stereotypical assumptions of Chinese behavior than what individual Chinese thought of Ka‘iana—or vice versa—it indicates that he did leave an impression.

In a related vein, Melillo asks how historians can integrate studies of indigenous peoples with the expansive transpacific networks in which so many of them participated. The best way to do this is to begin with indigenous agency. Many examples of this in *The Sea Is My Country* detail what Bathsheba Demuth called an “alternative vision of capitalism,” or “a path not taken.” Through customary practices such as fishing and the hunting of sea mammals (sea otters, whales, and seals), the People of the Cape participated in the global market through trade and on their own terms until the end of the nineteenth century. Throughout much of this period, they prospered and used this economic autonomy to meet Makah priorities while engaging with the emergent modern Pacific, British, and then American economies. Indigenous peoples across the Pacific engaged in settler-colonial economies in a variety of related and productive ways. For instance, in the 1840s and 1850s, Māori shipped produce they grew to California in schooners that they owned, captained, and crewed.⁴⁷ Examples such as these counter a rising trend in the field of Native American and Indigenous Studies that argues that “capitalism must die” in order for our indigenous nations to survive, much less thrive.⁴⁸

As the settler-colonial economy across the Pacific grew in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, non-Natives came to dominate indigenous spaces and resources, especially fisheries, as I chart in the last two chapters of the book. Growing numbers of increasingly larger and more expensive fishing vessels, which required substantial capital investments beyond the means of Makah fishers of the time, began to shut Natives out of profitable industries that once allowed them to hold off some of the worst excesses of assimilation and government control. Overfishing and overhunting of sea mammals not only meant that the then disadvantaged Makahs struggled to earn a living from the shrinking numbers of salmon, halibut, seals, and whales that had provided the foundation of who they were as the People of the Cape. But scarce resources also made Native fishers such as the Makahs targets of state, national, and international environmental

⁴⁶ Ibid., 11. For more on Ka‘iana’s time in China, see George Mortimer, *Observations and Remarks Made During a Voyage to the Islands of Teneriffe, Amsterdam, Maria’s Islands near Van Diemens Land; Otaheite, Sandwich Islands; Owhyhee, the Fox Islands* (London: W. Cadell, J. Robson, and J. Sewell, 1791), 51-52. For a comprehensive treatment of Ka‘iana’s time abroad, see David A. Chang, *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 39-77.

⁴⁷ Hazel Petrie, *Chiefs of Industry: Maori Tribal Enterprise in Early Colonial New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2007).

⁴⁸ Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 173.

conservation efforts that privileged white users and corporations over indigenous families, communities, and nations. These ecological changes had very real consequences for Native fishers. Lacking political leverage to shape fish and game laws, coastal American Indians such as the People of the Cape were not the only ones who were at the losing end of conservation; First Nations peoples in British Columbia found themselves increasingly shut out of their fisheries during the same period, as did Iñupiat whalers farther north in the 1970s.⁴⁹

But as Demuth notes in her review, Pacific ecologies underwent catastrophic changes at the same time as the People of the Cape. She critiques *The Sea Is My Country* for “miss[ing] ecology.” On one hand, I see her point. Overfishing and overhunting of sea mammals did transform the marine ecologies around Cape Flattery. For instance, the collapse of sea otter populations in the early nineteenth century resulted in the explosive growth of sea urchins, which, in turn possibly imperiled tidal kelp forests around the cape. Makahs valued sea urchins for the way consuming this organism helps alleviate rheumatism, and kelp forests played an important role in maintaining the marine ecology upon which many families depended.⁵⁰ In the late-nineteenth century, amateur ecologists and those interested in fisheries believed that local fur seals—which had nearly been hunted to extinction—were a distinct sub-species, and they wondered what effect their loss would have.⁵¹ As marine and fisheries biologists now know, overfishing and extinctions of numerous species in marine and coastal environments have decreased ecosystem resilience to disturbances both natural and anthropogenic.⁵² Makah whalers, sealers, and fishers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century certainly noticed these changes.

On the other hand, these better observations made by the People of the Cape reflected and advanced their specific indigenous knowledge of the local marine environment. Until recently, ecology, a subfield of the scientific discipline of biology, has undervalued and ignored the indigenous knowledges of our peoples. Privileging Western science as “the most powerful way of producing naturalistic explanations of natural phenomena,” some see indigenous knowledges (and related traditional ecological knowledge) as distinct knowledge production systems that should not be conflated with “science.” They recognize that indigenous knowledges are important, but argue that they lack the rigorous standards of scientific knowledge and often

⁴⁹ John S. Lutz, *Makúk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008); Harry Brower and Karen Brewster, *The Whales, They Give Themselves: Conversations with Harry Brower, Sr* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2004), 41.

⁵⁰ James A. Estes and John F. Palmisano, “Sea Otters: Their Role in Structuring Nearshore Communities,” *Science* 185, no. 4156 (1974); Linda Goodman and Helma Swan, *Singing the Songs of My Ancestors: The Life and Music of Helma Swan, Makah Elder* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003), 92.

⁵¹ Susan J. Crockford, S. Gay Frederick, and Rebecca J. Wigen, “The Cape Flattery Fur Seal; an Extinct Species of *Callorhinus* in the Eastern North Pacific?” *Canadian Journal of Archaeology/Journal Canadien D'Archéologie* 26 (2002).

⁵² Jeremy B. C. Jackson et al., “Historical Overfishing and the Recent Collapse of Coastal Ecosystems,” *Science* 293, no. 5530 (2001).

include spiritual components.⁵³ Some continue to believe this, despite the efforts of indigenous foresters, fisheries biologists, ecologists, and others who argue that indigenous knowledges “can complement, supplement, and guide biological science and resource management.”⁵⁴ While I agree with political scientist Arun Agrawal that both science and indigenous knowledges share the commonality of being “useful” and that the latter often contains as much rigor as the former, I find that indigenous knowledges are something different because of their holistic approach and the way that indigenous experts embed it within a particular cultural context.⁵⁵

Several examples relative to Makahs and related Nuu-chah-nulth peoples across the Strait of Juan de Fuca demonstrate this. Umeek (Richard Atleo), an Ahousaht First Nation chief from Vancouver Island, describes this as heshook-ish tsawalk (“tsawalk” for short), an indigenous theory that means “everything is one.” In opposition to the Western tendency to compartmentalize experience, tsawalk is inclusive of all reality, both physical and metaphysical. This holistic approach guides the Nuu-chah-nulth values of balance and respect that get expressed as practices, rituals, and protocols through which Native peoples care for human and non-human members of the broader community and propertied items (sometimes one and the same).⁵⁶ Across the Northwest Coast, Native communities embedded indigenous knowledges within larger social systems so as to actively manage local ecosystems. As others have argued, these strategies “attracted [marine] resources, increased and diversified habitats, and increased productivity.”⁵⁷

Generations of meticulous observation of the local marine ecology and environment helped shape these practices. For example, Makahs studied the seafloor by tying together fathoms of kelp and rubbing the bottom bulb with slug slime; when they pulled the efficient submersible collector up, they could assess the composition and health of a particular fishing bank.⁵⁸ Similarly, generations of Makah fishers observed the ecology of the waters off Cape Flattery in order to design the *čibu·d*, a fishing hook made from the knot of a hemlock or yew and specially curved so that dogfish slipped off when they struck, whereas halibut rarely escaped once they took the hook. Furthermore, they baited a *čibu·d* with octopus, which they had learned

⁵³ Charbel Niño El-Hani and Fábio Pedro Souza de Ferreira Bandeira, "Valuing Indigenous Knowledge: To Call It 'Science' Will Not Help," *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 3, no. 3 (2008).

⁵⁴ Charles R. Menzies, *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Natural Resource Management* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 5.

⁵⁵ Arun Agrawal, "Dismantling the Divide between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge," *Development and Change* 26, no. 3 (1995): 433. For more on the relationship between indigenous knowledges and Western science, see Kyle Powys Whyte, "On the Role of Traditional Ecological Knowledge as a Collaborative Concept: A Philosophical Study," *Ecological Processes* 2, no. 7 (2013).

⁵⁶ Eugene Richard Atleo, *Tsawalk: A Nuu-Chah-Nulth Worldview* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004); Philip Drucker, *The Northern and Central Nootkan Tribes* (Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951), 151.

⁵⁷ Dana Lepofsky and Megan Caldwell, "Indigenous Marine Resource Management on the Northwest Coast of North America," *Ecological Processes* 2, no. 12 (2013): 10.

⁵⁸ While presenting on my research at Neah Bay, several Makahs told me about this practice.

attracts halibut but repels dogfish.⁵⁹ Together, these practices and beliefs exemplify what Gitxaala anthropologist Charles Menzies describes as “local-level ecological knowledge... [which] rooted in an intimate and long-term involvement in local ecosystems, can be a crucial tool and source of knowledge for long-term sustainability and immediate resource conservation.”⁶⁰ Embedded in a Northwest Coast ecological understanding of the world (i.e., tsawalk), this specific indigenous knowledge enabled the People of the Cape annually to catch more than 1.5 million pounds of fresh halibut during the late-nineteenth century.⁶¹ Makah indigenous knowledge shaped their ecological understanding of the local marine space, allowing them to exploit it sustainably for generations. So, ecology is there, embedded in the numerous Makah practices discussed in *The Sea Is My Country*; it simply encompasses more than what a narrow definition of the scientific discipline of ecology normally includes.

I would like to once again thank my colleagues for engaging so productively with *The Sea Is My Country*. This exchange has continued to broaden the intellectual genealogy of this monograph and the ideas it engages, while encouraging me to think more productively about my next project that I firmly situate within Pacific Worlds. I appreciated the opportunity to think carefully about what I have written and to engage with them on the intersections of indigenous peoples, Pacific Worlds, and notions of ecology and indigenous knowledges.

⁵⁹ Joshua L. Reid, *The Sea Is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 214.

⁶⁰ Menzies, *Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Natural Resource Management*, 1.

⁶¹ Reid, *The Sea Is My Country*, 217.

About the Contributors

William Bauer, Jr. is a citizen of the Confederated Tribes of the Round Valley Reservation and an Associate Professor of history at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He is the author of *California Through Native Eyes: Reclaiming History* (University of Washington Press, 2016) and *"We Were All Like Migrant Workers Here": Work, Community and Memory on California's Round Valley Reservation, 1850-1941* (University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

Bathsheba Demuth is an Assistant Professor at Brown University, and a Fellow at the Institute at Brown for Environment and Society. Her current book project is an environmental history of the Bering Strait in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It examines how communist and capitalist visions for indigenous peoples and natural resources came to inhabit this shared ecological and cultural space, and how both ideological systems were reshaped by environmental challenges.

Christopher F. Jones, Associate Professor in the School of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies, studies the histories of energy, environment, and technology. He is the author of *Routes of Power: Energy and Modern America* (Harvard, 2014) and is currently working on a project examining the relationships between economic theories of growth and the depletion of non-renewable natural resources.

Edward "Ted" Melillo is Associate Professor of history and environmental studies at Amherst College. He is the author of *Strangers on Familiar Soil: Rediscovering the Chile-California Connection* (Yale University Press, 2015). Alfred A. Knopf will publish his next book, *The Butterfly Effect: Insects and the Making of the Modern World*, in 2018.

Joshua L. Reid (Snohomish) is an Associate Professor of History and American Indian Studies at the University of Washington. His research focuses on indigenous marine space, and he is currently researching his next monograph about indigenous explorers in the Pacific, from the late eighteenth through late nineteenth centuries.

Helen M. Rozwadowski is Associate Professor of History and Maritime Studies at University of Connecticut, Avery Point. She is the author of *Fathoming the Ocean: The Discovery and Exploration of the Deep Sea* (Belknap, 2005) and *The Sea Knows No Boundaries: A Century of Marine Science under ICES* (Washington, 2002).

Copyright © 2017 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.