

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Northern Navajo Frontier, 1860-1900: Expansion through Adversity. By Robert S. McPherson.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/19h77659>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Kelley, Klara

Publication Date

2002-03-01

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/>

ty disappeared “legally” in a Montaukett court case against Long Island Railroad Company. In 1909, the case reached the New York Supreme Court, but only after the New York legislature inserted an amendment into the Montaukett’s enabling act allowing the trail to proceed, stating the court would determine “the existence of the Montauk Tribe” (p. 127). During the trial, railroad lawyers introduced new criteria for determining who was an Indian. These lawyers argued the Montauketts were no longer Indians since the plaintiffs had not turned their backs on civilized society. Moreover, the lawyers argued the Montauketts had “diluted their ‘Indian blood’” by intermarrying with “alien races” (p. 130). Since the Montauketts did not conform to the stereotypical American view of an Indian and had married other non-Algonquian peoples, the Montaukett ceased to exist legally. The judge in the case, Abel Blackmar, concurred, finding the burden of proof was on those who claimed tribal membership. The Montauketts had ceased to exist as a legal tribal entity.

It was this decision that led Marian Fisher Ales to conclude that the Montauketts ceased to exist as a tribe. It was statements like that which make the Montauketts effort to secure federal recognition so difficult. Nevertheless, Strong’s ability to move the Montauketts experience into the present bodes well for the Montaukett effort to undo the prejudice of the past. In the end, *The Montaukett Indians of Long Island* does give the reader a new appreciation of the Montauketts’ history. Anyone interested in the question of when and how the Montauketts—or any other Indian group—suddenly found themselves no longer “real” Indians will benefit from Strong’s work. It may also serve as a cautionary tale for any Indian entity seeking federal recognition. The Fowler-Pharaoh split shows the problems of factionalism while trying to secure federal recognition. It is not a book one reads hoping to discover new insights or understandings about the historic Algonquian experience. That, however, was not Strong’s intention.

Michael J. Mullin
Augustana College

The Northern Navajo Frontier, 1860–1900: Expansion through Adversity. By Robert S. McPherson. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2001. 144 pages. \$19.95 paper.

The meat of this book is a chronicle of Navajo relations with neighboring Utes, Paiutes, and especially Mormons and other “Anglos” in southeastern Utah during the late nineteenth century. The book was originally published in 1988 by the University of New Mexico Press.

McPherson presents his story as a refutation of the idea, offered by this reviewer and others, that Navajos suffered colonial domination and capitalist exploitation by dominant classes in the United States after the US Army conquered the Navajos and held perhaps half of them captive outside their homeland at Fort Sumner, New Mexico. McPherson claims that exploitation and

domination make the subordinated helpless, unable to struggle or act on their own behalf (self-determination). Thus, struggling, self-helping people, especially when successful, are not dominated or exploited. The thesis that frames McPherson's chronicle is that the Navajos of the late nineteenth century acted successfully on their own behalf by expanding into southeastern Utah at the same time that "Anglos" were doing so, and therefore did not suffer colonial domination or capitalist exploitation.

While "the northern Navajo frontier" of the book's title includes an extensive area in southern Colorado and northern New Mexico, McPherson's focus is on southeastern Utah and the adjoining parts of Colorado and New Mexico, where occupants of southeastern Utah were also active. The book consists of a short introductory chapter that states the thesis sketched above, followed by six chapters that chronicle various types of political-economic relations among Navajos and the other groups, followed by a summary and conclusions. The six chronicle chapters cover relations among Navajos, Utes, and Paiutes (chapter two), Mormon and Navajo cultural parallels (chapter three), Indian relations with Mormon and other "Anglo" farmers and ranchers (chapters four and five), trading posts (chapter six), and northern additions to the Navajo Reservation (chapter seven).

The meat of the book contains much to interest any student of southwestern history, regardless of theoretical persuasion. McPherson chronicles events as represented in surviving written records. McPherson has recovered much on-the-spot local testimony from obscure sources. Mindful of the biases inherent in these records, researchers will find this book a useful resource. Chapter two, for example, shows in detail the dense web of interconnections (marriage, trade, political leadership) among Navajos, Utes, and Paiutes, groups with different culture histories whose various uses of the area overlapped. Chapter six brings out little-known details of trading logistics, such as trading posts clustered along the north side of San Juan River to avoid the reservation and federal licensing authority and, in this era before bridges, each operated its own ferry. Chapter seven shows that from the first years after Fort Sumner the civilian federal authorities wanted to expand the Navajo Reservation north of the San Juan River because the land could be farmed intensively to feed a population that, according to McPherson, relied on government-issued rations for survival.

McPherson does not successfully demonstrate the thesis stated in the first chapter. McPherson's critique of the idea that Navajos have suffered domination and exploitation after Fort Sumner falls flat because he does not define domination and exploitation as do the researchers he critiques. Research (including mine) abounds showing that dominated or exploited people struggle and act otherwise on their own behalf, even successfully, though success is partial and temporary, while the need for struggle is constant. McPherson seems to deny the possibility that domination and exploitation can be institutionalized—that social structures and processes can predispose individuals to have and act out mutually conflicting interests, and can take from some and give to others, whether the individuals are aware or not.

McPherson also fails to support his thesis because of the time and geo-

graphical limitations he places on his story. He fails to show that Navajos were expanding into southeastern Utah after 1860 because he does not systematically review evidence of Navajos there before 1860, a logical necessity to support a claim of expansion. Indeed, in various places he obliquely refers to Navajo presence in the area before 1860. (Navajo family histories and archaeological data collected in the 1950s and 1960s for the Navajo land claim before the Indian Claims Commission indicate many Navajo families north of the San Juan since at least the 1700s, not only hunting and gathering but also herding and farming.)

Furthermore, by limiting the story to local actors, McPherson obscures possible connections to far-away political-economic interests and institutions. Ignoring these classic forces of colonial domination and capitalist exploitation is not the same as showing that they were absent or insignificant. Nevertheless, McPherson's story hints at distant forces, such as pressure by the US Army on the Mormons that induced the latter to seek alliances with Navajos, not an insignificant contribution to Navajo success in gaining (or, I would say, keeping) a foothold in the region. By cutting off the chronicle around 1900, McPherson avoids discussing the amelioration of federal-Mormon relations and how that change might connect with the disappearance of Navajos from the places where they coexisted with Mormons before 1900. Mormons and other Anglos also surely were subject to fluctuations in the cattle market, a classic driver of non-Indian pressure on Indian lands nowhere mentioned in this book.

An interesting exercise would be to compare events on McPherson's northern Navajo frontier with similar events on the other contemporaneous eastern, western, and southern Navajo frontiers such as the events in Arizona discussed in an earlier issue of this journal (Klara Kelley and Harris Francis, "Many Generations, Few Improvements: 'Americans' Challenge Navajos on the Transcontinental Railroad Grant, Arizona," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25, number 3 [2001]: 73–102). Our paper shows that on the local level in the southern Navajo frontier, Navajos seem to have held encroaching non-Indian cattle raisers at bay, and even got more land incorporated into the reservation, just as Navajos on McPherson's northern frontier did. But at the same time, in the south, more distant political-economic interests contributed to the varying outcomes of Navajo struggles and other forms of self-help.

As much as I disagree with McPherson's theoretical orientation, his partial misunderstanding of my work as denying Navajo capacity for self-help has helped me, and I hope other non-Indian students of Indian history. The previous edition of this book was a wake-up call that said it is not enough to describe a high-level colonial political economy and its connection to how Navajo families have dealt with land problems. Readers require more explicit presentations of self-help and, since medium is also message, American Indian voices, strong and direct, are essential. Since the research materials of conventional ethnohistory underrepresent these voices, we non-Indian researchers need to be more diligent in consulting American Indians today and collaborating with American Indian researchers. On this book, such a col-

laboration might have altered some representations of Navajo culture like the parallels between Mormon and Navajo “religions,” parallels that seem strained when one realizes what McPherson neglects to mention that Mormons proselytize, whereas Navajos emphatically do not.

In the fourteen years since the original publication of this book, McPherson, too, surely has learned some new lessons. One wishes that the republication could have included a new author’s preface giving readers the benefit of such learning.

Klara Kelley

Independent cultural resources consultant
Gallup, New Mexico

The Problem of Justice: Tradition and Law in the Coast Salish World. By Bruce G. Miller. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000. 240 pages. \$55.00 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

Bruce G. Miller’s *The Problem of Justice: Tradition and Law in the Coast Salish World* is a comprehensive ethnographic study on the struggle of three indigenous North American communities—the Upper Skagit of western Washington state, the Stó:lō Nation of the lower mainland of British Columbia, and the bands of Vancouver Island, British Columbia—to restore control over their local justice systems in the face of internal and external discords. The three case studies represent Coast Salish communities with somewhat different contact histories and public policies that are both linked and divergent at the provincial/state levels and at the national (Canadian, American) levels. Miller sets out to compare the three communities’ justice endeavors, contrast the ways in which they developed, and examine how justice and tradition are understood and put to use by them. The author (in his introduction) maintains that pre-contact discourses within and between Coast Salish communities have been exploited by colonial powers and have become grounds for divisiveness within indigenous communities. Postcontact differences have spawned different views about and approaches to justice that are at the core of power relations within each community. For a tribal justice system to succeed, Miller suggests, it must be a freestanding system with real control over community residents and tribal assets and resources. Further, because indigenous communities become tribes and have assumed the roles of nations, they must modify their traditional justice systems accordingly, rather than pursue only traditional interpersonal and interfamilial conflict resolutions.

Chapters one and two review the legal national and aboriginal regional environment. Following a brief description of recent developments in the relationship between the state/province and Coast Salish indigenous communities, Miller points to the need for a detailed ethnographic, historical, and comparative analysis of tribal justice systems that will in turn provide the context for local corresponding justice debates (chapter one). Chapter two then weaves ethnographic and historical accounts into an intricate descrip-