

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Indian Agriculture in America: Prehistory to the Present. By R. Douglas Hurt.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9m48r6sp>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Endter, Joanna L.

Publication Date

1990

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

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

of great importance not only to researchers in this area but to Native Americans in general and Native American youth in particular.

Morris A. Forslund
University of Wyoming

Indian Agriculture in America: Prehistory to the Present. By R. Douglas Hurt. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1987. 290 pages. \$29.95 Cloth.

R. Douglas Hurt has undertaken an ambitious task in attempting to provide a general survey of American Indian agricultural history, and he has produced a broad and useful reference work. As the first major book to deal with this important subject, it certainly deserves attention. Hurt reviews the achievements and contributions that Indians made to agriculture in North America and seeks to explain the decline of agriculture among Indians after European contact. He argues that the failure of federal agricultural policies for Indians, the harsh environment of the Plains and Far West, and Indian cultural resistance prevented the expansion and, in some cases, the creation of an agricultural economy among Indians.

Hurt's explanation for why Indians were successful agriculturalists prior but not subsequent to European contact focuses mostly on the federal policies that deprived Indians of a land base. Hurt also argues that the government failed to provide long-term financial, educational, and technological support for the establishment of commercially oriented Indian farmers. For the most part, Hurt interprets government policy as misguided and concludes that the government's failure to formulate and execute an appropriate agricultural policy was the reason Indian agriculture did not succeed. Readers are led to believe that with more time, government aid, and education, Indians would have become successfully integrated into the market economy. The argument assumes that Indians themselves had accepted commercial agricultural production as a goal. But Hurt mentions that some tribes were content to raise only enough agricultural products to meet their own needs, while others followed their own cultural traditions and combined agriculture with hunting

and fishing, refusing to rely solely on agriculture. More discussion of the political and economic context in which government policies were made and of the problems Indian farmers faced due to general economic trends in agriculture would have been beneficial.

The problems that Indian farmers and ranchers faced were not just the result of bad government policy, but of conflict between two fundamentally different and incompatible systems of production. It is hard to reconcile the Indians' precontact agricultural achievements with the difficulties the federal government had in promoting commercial or even subsistence agriculture on Indian reservations, unless one explains the differences between Indian and European systems of production and the ways in which native subsistence economies were destroyed. More systematic comparisons between tribes with agricultural traditions and those who had relied primarily on hunting and gathering need to be made in this regard. More generally, attention should have been given to the consequences that Indians faced in being drawn into a market economy, being encouraged to engage in commodity production versus subsistence production, being forced to specialize in raising few types of crops or livestock versus being dependent on a wide variety of naturally occurring resources, and being confined geographically instead of being mobile. Such fundamental changes entailed conflicts not only over ownership of land, which Hurt reviews quite well, but also over the ways in which the land and its resources would be viewed and utilized.

Hurt's argument that the environment limited Indian agricultural development is not very compelling. In reviewing Indian agriculture in the precontact period, Hurt emphasizes that some tribes were very skilled at adapting agricultural practices in even the most arid regions of the Southwest. They planted on flood plains, bred plants suitable to various climates, mastered the timing of planting and harvesting, and developed irrigation systems. In dealing with the postcontact period, he makes broad generalizations about how environmental problems on the Plains and in the Far West inhibited agricultural development. Greater emphasis should have been given to how Indians were deprived of the best lands within those harsh environments, how confinement to reservations restricted Indian mobility, which had been an important adaptation to aridity, and how whites gained

control of strategic water resources. His argument about environmental limitations would have been strengthened by more systematic comparisons between the postcontact agricultural experiences of tribes in different regions, and between Indian and non-Indian farmers who inhabited the same areas and confronted the same environmental constraints.

One of the keys to understanding Indian agriculture lies in a question that Hurt poses in the preface but does not answer satisfactorily: "How did agriculture, rudimentary or extensive, fit into the culture of those particular people?" It is surprising that a book devoted to Indian agricultural history does not discuss the symbolic and spiritual beliefs that Indian people assigned to agricultural practices or the often elaborate rituals and ceremonies that accompanied them. Hurt's treatment of cultural differences between Indians and Europeans primarily deals with concepts of land tenure, division of labor based on gender, and preferences for certain domesticated animals. The cultural differences were more comprehensive than this and included differences in belief systems that defined people's relationship to the environment (not just to land) and prescribed how the land and its resources should be used. Europeans viewed the environment in commodity terms, while Indians assigned spiritual meanings and values to it. For Indians, the purpose of agriculture was for subsistence, while for Europeans it was for profit. A more thorough look at how agricultural practices were integrated into Indian cultures would have revealed that for Indians to become successful commercial farmers, they had to alter their relationship with the environment, change their cultural perceptions of the world, and pursue an entirely different approach to utilizing the land and its resources. Such an analysis would have helped to provide a better explanation for the tenacity of Indian traditions and the Indians' resistance to government policies. Instead, Hurt's argument that cultural resistance to certain European practices inhibited the promotion of Indian agriculture tends to blame the Indians for their failure to accept European values and agricultural practices.

The book is disappointing in several respects. Hurt compares Indian agricultural experiences regionally and topically within a chronological framework, but his comparisons are not very systematic and could have benefitted from reference to the anthropological studies of North American Indians that have utilized

formal comparative methods. This would have helped broaden the scope of Hurt's work beyond his emphasis on the trans-Mississippi West and the Southwest. The use of charts or maps to summarize some of the comparative information that he presents in narrative form would have aided the reader. While Hurt's intent was to be suggestive rather than definitive, some topics should have been treated in a less cursory manner, particularly Indian irrigation and water rights, since these were the key to agricultural success in the semi-arid and arid regions on which he focuses.

Joanna L. Endter

University of California, Los Angeles

Potawatomi of the West: Origins of the Citizen Band. By Joseph Murphy. Shawnee, OK: Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe, 1988. 347 pages.

On 19 October 1989, Father Joseph Murphy, O.S.B., died while on vacation in California. He was seventy-eight. Fortunately, before his death he was able to view with satisfaction the long-overdue publication of his Ph.D. dissertation, "Potawatomi Indians of the West: Origins of the Citizen Band," by the Citizen Band Potawatomi tribe. This dissertation had been accepted by the University of Oklahoma in 1961, and Father Murphy, an honorary member of the Citizen Band, donated the publication rights to the tribe among whom he had labored for so long. When considering the close relationship Father Murphy enjoyed with the Citizen Band, one might understandably be prone to dismiss his work as partial and subjective. Such fears are unjustified. The publication of *Potawatomi of the West* was not motivated by mere sentimentality. The book reflects an enormous amount of research, insight, and evaluation, and is essential to an adequate understanding of Citizen Band history.

The history of the Potawatomi Indians is characterized by the divisive impact of various Euro-American forces on the tribe. French fur traders, Jesuit missionaries, British army officers, and American governmental officials all contributed in one way or another to Potawatomi factionalism. From the seventeenth century to the present, Potawatomi tribesmen have expressed a