

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation. 2 vols. By Peter M. Whiteley.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4jk8m712>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(4)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Sekaquaptewa, Pat

**Publication Date**

2008-09-01

**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/>

of maize agriculture in the prehistoric southeast, as suggested by other workers, like Baden and Beekman who promote “looking beyond historic yields and determinants of techniques, maize varieties, soil types, climate and socioeconomic contexts” (*American Antiquity*, 2001, 515).

There is much to consider in *Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine’s Island, Georgia*. It is not a perfect monograph, but it is an important one. New data are presented and the interpretative stance, taken by Thomas, is a refreshing change for archaeological studies of ancient American Indians.

*Eruan G. Garrison*

The University of Georgia, Athens

**The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation.** 2 vols. By Peter M. Whiteley. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2008. 1,137 pages. \$100.00 paper.

Why care about the Orayvi split of 1906—a tiny civil war in some small tribal town in northeastern Arizona? Peter Whiteley reminds us in his comprehensive two-book series that people love everything Hopi (and I am not just saying this because I am one). Hopis, he says, have long attracted external interest as they seem to provide the missing link to a mysterious past attested by the impressive prehistoric structures in North America at Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde and that Hopis preserve more pre-European culture than perhaps any other Native North American society. At times, while reading through Whiteley’s review of the work of his predecessors and contemporaries (Fewkes, Stephen, Voth, Titiev, Levy, Bradfield, Clemmer, Rushforth, and Upman, to name only a few), I could not help but compare the small army of “ologists” that has peered into Hopi society during the last hundred years to the fictional Talamasca in Anne Rice’s witch and vampire novels—who, for the sake of knowledge, are busy researching and documenting everything supernatural over the ages, while supposedly not interfering. I mean no disrespect to Whiteley who has undertaken a monumental task in producing a comprehensive, up-to-date decoder ring on Hopi history, society, and culture. He clearly has done so with deep respect for the Hopi-insider perspective and with meticulous attention to the mountain range of data across disciplines. No other work compares here.

I understand why Hopis are so interesting to outsiders, but why the Orayvi split in particular? According to Whiteley, at the formal beginnings of engagement with the United States around 1900, Orayvi was the largest and oldest of the Hopi towns. It was remote, politically and economically autonomous, and a relatively pristine indigenous American society. He says that anthropologists in the late nineteenth century were attracted to the marked persistence of pre-European culture and matrilineal kinship as a topic of special academic interest. Whiteley claims that by the 1930s the split became the subject of formal anthropological inquiry as a window into social structures in crisis and because of its comparative import for societal transformation globally. Apparently those in the British structural-functionalist school speculated as

to the evolutionary stage and process of development of the Hopi villages, supposedly looking for evidence that all societies evolve with similar patterns. Whiteley also reminds us that among southwestern archaeologists, the split embodied an ethnographic model to explain prehistoric Puebloan societies—settlement growth, the budding of offshoots into new settlements, and progressive site abandonment.

So why does Whiteley want to reopen this particular can of worms given the extensive work of his predecessors and others in this area? His gripe should be ours (Hopis') as well. Whiteley feels that "it is little short of astonishing that for an event so much in the anthropological eye, the pervasive antipathy to historical records should entail neglecting such a rich vein of information . . . and to neglect these sources altogether in the service of deductive explanations seems scientifically myopic" (16). Whiteley views the split as both a structural and historical event, thus requiring attention to what he calls "the documentary record" (everything from the published works of his colleagues and original field notes to census counts, government reports, allotment surveys, and lists). Given his global review of the data, Whiteley identifies four types of explanatory hypothesis for the split: (1) sociological (which focuses on social organization, demography, economic resources and cultural capital, and a sequence of events from 1890 to 1912, and asserts that the split was caused by a fragile social system where independent matrilineal clans revolted in a sense from the weak village superstructure); (2) materialist (which focuses on material causes, such as population pressure on a diminished resource base that gave rise to infighting over usable farmlands); (3) ideological (which focuses on acculturative pressure and how it produced political factions, and asserts that this produced an ideological rift regarding imposed governmental programs such as schooling, land allotment, and missionary pressures to convert); and (4) agential (which focuses on Hopi social and political thought, and asserts that the split was caused by a deliberate plot on the part of politico-religious leaders, consistent with prophesy and given the contamination of the religious order).

Whiteley ultimately argues that the split was a complex historical event resonating across social modalities—organizational, economic, religious, and political. Finally, in line with his work under hypothesis four above, he stresses that the split was also an articulated political process, driven by the agential decisions of instituted social leaders in response to the evolving social and ecological environments the Orayvi faced in the decades before 1906. In other words, Orayvis did not have a flawed governmental (social) structure, they were not simply splitting into factions and fighting over land, water, and American policies, but rather Orayvi leadership decided to split the village for what they perceived to be good reasons—reasons tied to what was important to them and to what was happening in the changing world around them. The beauty of Whiteley's work—solid ethnohistory—is that it can resonate with both the Talamasca and the vampires.

This is going to be a challenge for those of you who are not Hopi-philés. Whiteley does something radical here to academia's understanding of Hopi social structure. To date, most "ologists" have constructed an idea of the

average Hopi family as being comprised of a female-headed, extended family unit, with corporate property interests passing from a mother to one of her daughters. Further, in a traditional government made up of such “matrilineal clans,” each clan is thought of as owning a clan house (a clan “headquarters”), a ceremony with officers, duties and powers, and land. However, after comprehensively reviewing the work of anthropologists and comparing their theories to the documentary record, Whiteley concludes that such characterizations are significantly inconsistent with the actual life arrangements of Hopis. Instead Whiteley describes the presence of “conjugal households” with important matrilineal aspects. He views such a household with its conjugal (marital) and affinal (in-law) relations as the base unit of Hopi society. He suggests the presence of marriage alliance rules (at least at the time of the split) among higher-ranking clans. Specifically, he focuses on the leading matrilineal households that had control over those clan houses containing ancestral items. Whiteley argues that during the split, clan houses aligned factionally, and that the village chief and high-ranking ceremonial officers held most of the good farming lands, the latter for the duration of their service only (the land didn’t pass along matrilineal lines within their clans). Whiteley says that not all Hopi families (or lineages within a matrilineage/clan) had clan houses, ceremonies, or land, which suggests that these families exercised a “use it or lose it” approach to using other (unused) lands.

The implications for the “ologists” are great as the characterization of the Orayvi matrilineal clan corporation is the foundation for all sorts of conclusions about the nature of matrilineal societies, the structure and evolution of government, the basis of Hopi and other pueblo land-use rights, and the likely reasons for the creation and abandonment of other pueblos. The implications for Hopi history and contemporary society are even greater where Hopi society insists on operating under the traditional land-tenure system without clear written rules and given increasing complex litigation over competing land rights in tribal court. Simply put, if Whiteley is right about the myth of the average Hopi matrilineage/clan having corporate land rights, then land use may be untied from clan and village ceremonial obligations, which are suddenly subject to the intent of the original and subsequent user when transferred. This sounds too simple. Perhaps we (Hopis) might enlist Whiteley and his considerable ethnographic skills to investigate the operative norms in this area today.

*Pat Sekaquaptewa*

The Nakwatsvewat Institute

**Place and Native American Indian History and Culture.** Edited by Joy Porter. Peter Lang AG: Switzerland, 2007. 387 pages. \$89.95 paper.

*Place* is a cross-disciplinary key term, but there is not a cross-disciplinary way of knowing and understanding place. Porter identifies an American or Western notion of place and sets out toward an intervention of place and history