

Assignment example

[Linguistics](#), [English](#)



A case of Two Sovereignty Claims: Native Hawaiians and Native Alaskans

Introduction Native Americans for thousands of years governed themselves through tribal laws, cultural traditions, religious customs, and through kinships systems such as clans and societies (Hester, 90). The Alaskan natives were not exceptions as they followed a similar pattern in governing themselves. However, the tribes in Native Hawaiians tribes had a centralized governing system with a royal queen being at the helm of the authority of the land before colonization and eventual annexation by the United States. The pattern of sovereignty rights between the Alaskan natives and Hawaiian natives have always followed dissimilar patterns throughout the history of the country, much similar to the two lands. This paper explores and discusses the sovereignty claims of the native tribes in Alaska and Akaka in Hawaii.

Sovereignty Rights in Alaska

Natives of Alaska, a land purchased by the United States from Russia have gone through a tumultuous period of political and legal up and downs before the recognition of their self-government status by the federal government. Throughout the contacts between the aboriginals of Alaska and the Europeans, the natives have hotly pursued their rights to the ownership of their lands. In history, the Tlingit, Tanaka and Haida tribes initially fought with the Russia, and vehemently object the sale of the lands to the US, claiming the rightful ownership. After the sale, they took their struggle to a different player until the recognition of their status through the Congress enacted law, the Alaska native Claims Settlement Act in 1971 (Zellen, 120). The state government of Alaska has over the years softened its stand on

tribal sovereignty amongst the Alaskan tribes. In 1992, the Native Policy Statement, an instrument from the state government codified laws acknowledging the tribal authority and recognized their special status.

Sovereignty Rights in Hawaii

Hawaiian sovereignty efforts are dissimilar from other Native American claims as they demand total cessation from the Union and a return to the previous monarchial rule. However, there are certain actors within the native population who are pushing for self democratic government, whilst others have acknowledged the importance of the Union and are urging fellow tribes mate to stay within the Union. In the same breath as the governments of the other Native Americans, such as those in Alaska, the native populations are pushing to be including in an arrangement referred to as a nation within a nation (Trask, 66). In fact such a bill has been brought before the senate, repeatedly the Daniel Akaka (Kauanui, 173). The proposal fronted by some natives of Hawaii has been radical and extreme, perhaps unaware of the failure by the Texas state to secede from the Union. The independence of the natives land from the United States is unlikely, but the fight to gain more sovereignty is very strong within the states.

Conclusion

Sovereignty is the total annihilation of power and does not delegate, and thus in the Alaskan Natives system, they deal with the federal government as government to government relations. The Hawaiian natives on the other hand are fighting to return their land to the former system of total government and deal with the United States just like other countries deal with the country.

Works Cited

Kauanui, J K. Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity.

Durham: Duke University Press, 2008. Print.

Hester, Thurman L. Political Principles & Indian Sovereignty. London: New York, 2001. Print.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i.

Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999. Internet resource.

Zellen, Barry S. Breaking the Ice: From Land Claims to Tribal Sovereignty in the Arctic.

Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2008. Print.