

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Designs and Factions: Politics, Religion and Ceramics on the Hopi Third Mesa. By Lydia L. Wyckoff.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4jj2f8m2>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 15(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Hieb, Louis A.

**Publication Date**

1991-09-01

**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/>

**Designs and Factions: Politics, Religion and Ceramics on the Hopi Third Mesa.** By Lydia L. Wyckoff. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990. 210 pages. \$24.95 paper.

*Designs and Factions* is an analysis of the relationship between ceramic decoration and worldview among the Hopi. Wyckoff's thesis is that the different styles of decoration used by "Traditionalist" and "Progressive" Hopi potters constitute a material expression of their differing worldviews and value systems. To substantiate this argument, Wyckoff describes and analyzes the development of Hopi pottery making, recent Hopi history, tribal factionalism, and the total ceramic production of over half of the Third Mesa potters for one year, 1979-80. Much of the book is convincing and significant; some is problematic yet provocative; a lesser part suffers from oversimplification and inaccuracy.

To set the stage for her analysis, Wyckoff provides an overview of the Hopi at the time of her field research (c. 1980). Central to her thesis are the opposition of Traditionalists and the Progressives and the stylistic differences that she sees as an expression of their opposed worldviews. Unfortunately, her characterization of Hopi factionalism is oversimplified and leaves the reader with the impression that all Hopi are either big *T* Traditionalists or big *P* Progressives, whereas most of the Hopi have little involvement or concern with the political conflicts between the Traditionalists and the Hopi Tribal Council.

At issue is not Wyckoff's discussion of the development of ceramic designs, nor her correlation of ceramic designs with the sociology and economics of modern Hopi pottery making. What is problematic is her attribution of design differences to the worldviews of the Traditionalists and the Progressives. Certainly there are a number of individuals, including the traditional leaders of several villages, who call themselves Traditionalists. The content of their political viewpoint is shaped very largely by their opposition to the Hopi Tribal Council. However, there is no group that calls itself Progressive nor, in my experience, do any of the Hopi refer to themselves as Progressives. Most Hopi people refer to themselves as Hopi; there are no Hopi words for either Traditionalist or Progressive. This is not to say that Wyckoff's description of the content of the Traditionalist viewpoint is faulty. There are Hopi who are relatively less modernized and others who are relatively more modernized vis-à-vis the dominant culture. As a political group, the Traditionalists reflect much of the range of

culture change that the Hopi have undergone in the twentieth century, although many are consciously conservative in their adoption of external material goods or participation in a cash economy.

Are the worldviews of the Traditionalist and non-Traditionalist Hopi different? Wyckoff does not set out the principles of the modern worldviews of the Traditionalists nor of those she identifies as Progressives. Do the differences in ceramics express differences in worldview, or do they reflect a number of other processes of culture change that, in turn, have come to express sociocultural differences? Wyckoff has documented the development of two ceramic styles, a development that can be explained without reference to modern political conflict.

Wyckoff's summary of recent Hopi history reflects the pro-Traditionalist writings of Richard Clemmer. Clearly, there is a need for a history of the Hopi in the twentieth century that is more balanced than this. The Traditionalists' viewpoint and their conflict with the Tribal Council is a significant part of this history, but to focus on this excludes the life experiences of the majority of the Hopi people during this period. Peter Whiteley's history of Bacavi is a model account at the village level. John Loftin's recently published *Religion and Hopi Life in the Twentieth Century*, also about Third Mesa, presents a radically different perspective on the continuities in Hopi worldview in the face of culture change. Both Loftin and Armin Geertz ("The Invention of Prophecy: Continuity and Meaning in Hopi Indian Religion," forthcoming) discuss the role of prophecy in Hopi religion, an aspect apparently not considered by Wyckoff.

Also problematic is Wyckoff's equation of the "Friendlies/Hostiles" of the Oraibi Split of 1906 with today's Traditionalists/Progressives. Whiteley's *Deliberate Acts* (1988) appeared after Wyckoff's dissertation (1985), and her efforts to acknowledge, through footnotes, his historical reconstruction of the religious factionalism at Oraibi is far from adequate. Moreover, the linkage between the events of 1906 and the political conflict that sees the establishment of the Tribal Council through the *Constitution and Bylaws of the Hopi Tribe* (1936) as pivotal is far more complex than Wyckoff suggests. I would add that, while Wyckoff does introduce some new and valuable historical perspectives, especially with regard to Thomas Keam's role in the development of Sikyatki Revival pottery, there are unfortunate gaps in her knowledge of relevant historical sources. She states, "Nothing has been pub-

lished on either the role of the missionary or of the United States during the 1880s" (p. 50, n. 4), in spite of Stephen C. McCluskey's outstanding essay, "Evangelists, Educators, Ethnographers and the Establishment of the Hopi Reservation" (*Journal of Arizona History* 21 [1980]).

In setting out to describe how the Traditionalist and Progressive worldviews find expression in two styles of ceramics, Wyckoff should have presented a more balanced portrayal of the Traditionalists and the Progressives. That historians and anthropologists have failed to achieve this respectful, objective reportage is reflected throughout in Wyckoff's slight but consistent deference to the Traditionalists' political and aesthetic values. Beyond this, there are several misspellings of personal and place names, and the concept of prestation (a gift requiring reciprocity) is reduced to presentation (pp. 16, 20).

Wyckoff is at her best in tracing the historical development of Hopi ceramics and the relationship between style and worldview in two groups of potters. She sees the Sikyatki Revival style (Style B) of the modern Third Mesa Progressives to be descended, through commercialization, from [First Mesa] Polacca Polychrome. The Style A pottery of the Third Mesa Traditionalists derives from Third Mesa Polacca Polychrome. It may be possible to argue that these ceramic expressions of factional[?] ethnicity are accountable by the historical influences Wyckoff documents, without reference to the philosophical tenets of worldview. The alignment of First and Third Mesa potters in a cartel clearly is linked to the economics and sociology of the Progressives. But Wyckoff is not content to rest her case on these external factors. Rather, she contends that her thesis is demonstrated through an analysis of styles, motifs, folk classification, uses, numbers produced, learning patterns, and so on and that the religious-political affiliation of Third Mesa potters as either Traditionalists or Progressives is reflected in their different styles of pottery decoration. Clearly, the differences exist. Does it matter that Progressives do not?

*Louis A. Hieb*  
University of Arizona