

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

History Is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley. By T. J. Ferguson and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6sh9p46f>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Levi, Jerome M.

Publication Date

2008

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/>

1807 and 1809 (154). Late in life (about 1819) a series of visions similar to those his half-brother Handsome Lake experienced two decades earlier moved Cornplanter to a more resistance-oriented stance toward the inroads of settler society, but by that time his social authority had passed to his nephew Governor Blacksnake. Cornplanter lived out the remainder of his days in relative isolation on his Pennsylvania land grant, while the majority of Senecas fought tenaciously to preserve their reservation lands from advocates of removal and allotment during the remainder of the nineteenth century.

Abler acknowledges that his perspective on Cornplanter will never satisfy those Senecas “who dwell on the vastness of land surrendered and the pittance received as compensation” (11). He prefers to cite the persistence of Seneca homelands into the twenty-first century (however truncated) as the legacy of the “hard-won diplomatic achievements of Cornplanter and his fellow Seneca leaders in the closing decades of the eighteenth century” and constructs a valid and largely convincing argument to this effect (197). In Abler’s view, the annual August gathering of Cornplanter “heirs and attached family members” for a picnic in the Jimersontown relocation area on the Allegany Reservation (flooding from the Kinzua Dam project eliminated a viable site for such a gathering on the original Cornplanter Grant in 1964) represents a triumph of persistence against overwhelming odds (11, 193).

Yet although we acknowledge such triumphs, we forget at our peril the “vastness of land surrendered and the pittance received as compensation.” Historians of North American settler colonialism might do well to recall that their subject of study is not wholly a matter of the past. Patterns of colonial thought and ideology persist in North America today, and historical studies have the power to play a vital role in their perpetration or in dismantling such perspectives. In Cornplanter’s case, we need not libel him as “the Marshal Pétain of his day” or gloss over the difficult times in which he lived in order to acknowledge that his “strong sense of private property,” evident in his decision to abandon residency on communally held Seneca homelands and in his willingness to accept personal payment for his role in the alienation of portions of those homelands, marked a significant departure from the practices of previous Seneca leaders and contributed to radical changes in the Senecas’ historical circumstances for all time (193, 195).

Jon Parmenter
Cornell University

History Is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona’s San Pedro Valley. By T. J. Ferguson and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006. 336 pages. \$60.00 cloth; \$35.00 paper.

A book that attempts an intellectual- and practice-based rapprochement between Native American and archaeological approaches to the past in the American Southwest is long overdue. Such is the very lacuna filled by Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh’s innovative work. Recognizing that archaeologists

have often discounted indigenous interpretations of the past as little more than mere folklore with marginal scientific value, and that archaeology has tended to alienate Native Americans because its disciplinary practices were viewed by them as irreverent, unethical, or worse, the authors describe a recent ethnohistorical project that incorporated the interests and input of traditional elders and tribal historians from the outset. The fruits of this collaborative research between archaeologists and cultural resource experts who belong to four tribes with ancestral ties to the San Pedro Valley in southeastern Arizona not only expand our knowledge regarding local culture history in rich and complex ways but also have broader implications about how North American archaeology might be practiced in the future, especially regarding its need to repair political and intellectual relations with Native American communities.

The San Pedro River provides one of the few sources of flowing water in this arid region. As such, the valley has been a focus of human occupation for millennia, the cultural significance of which was well appreciated by pioneering anthropologists Adolph Bandelier (in the 1880s) and Jesse Fewkes (in 1908), both of whom came to investigate the valley's prehistoric ruins. Subsequent excavations in the twentieth century uncovered a wealth of material and eventually revealed more than five hundred distinct archaeological sites. The Tohono O'odham, Hopi, Zuni, and Western Apache peoples all have ancestors who lived there, yet previous archaeological and historical research on the San Pedro Valley did not incorporate Native American voices in the interpretation of data.

Begun in 1999 through the Center for Desert Archaeology, the San Pedro Ethnohistory Project was designed specifically to redress this situation by working directly with representatives of the four tribes. Archaeologists and Native American participants together visited archaeological sites, studied museum collections, and interviewed tribal members to collect traditional histories that focus on the San Pedro Valley, with special reference to themes of migration, warfare, social identity, subsistence ecology, and population dynamics. Throughout the process a reflexive methodology was employed that took into account not only the scientific paradigms of the archaeologists but also the cultural needs and research interests of tribal members. Consequently, the familiar role of anthropologists as observers and Native Americans as informants was blurred: both groups contributed knowledge and took notes, photographs, and video. This also entailed the development of dynamic theoretical perspectives on time and space wherein archaeological models were supplemented with culturally specific ones. For tribal members who descend from people who once inhabited the valley, the meaning of archaeological materials is "as much what they portend for life in the present as what they signify about life in the past" (30).

After *History Is in the Land* outlines the project's theoretical and methodological underpinnings, it presents an archaeological timeline of the San Pedro Valley. Tribal participants were taken to visit archaeological sites that represent five main cultural horizons, all associated with the Late Agricultural period. The earliest cultural horizon, from AD 550 to 1100, was the Hohokam archaeological culture. During this time people in the San Pedro Valley

lived in pit-houses; constructed irrigation canals to water their fields of maize, beans, squash, and probably cotton; and shifted from kin-based social organizations to village-based political and religious leadership, indicated by public ritual centers such as ballcourts. The next cultural horizon, or Classic period, from AD 1150 to 1400, was marked by substantial changes in the San Pedro Valley. People aggregated into larger compound villages with platform mounds. This period witnessed significant changes in ceramic styles. During the Classic period, Western Pueblo people immigrated into the valley between AD 1200 and 1350. Their presence is marked by distinctive artifacts and architectural styles, including masonry construction, kivas, and ceramic colanders to mention only a few. "After A.D. 1450 the Hohokam and Puebloan occupants of the San Pedro Valley were either transformed into or replaced by the Sobaipuri people living in *ranchería* settlements consisting of brush and adobe houses" (54). The final phase was marked by the appearance of the Apache. Some scholars suggest that they arrived in southern Arizona sometime between AD 1540 and 1690, although the Apache consultants on the project stated they had been in the region longer (57). In contrast to the earlier cultures, the Sobaipuri and especially Apache peoples left a fainter archaeological footprint, given their relatively sparse material culture and a settlement pattern that was generally more dispersed and mobile.

The most interesting and valuable portion of *History Is in the Land* is detailed in the next four chapters, which describe the work with the Tohono O'odham, Hopi, Zuni, and Apache teams respectively. Historical records indicate that O'odham ancestors lived in the San Pedro Valley until 1760. Not surprisingly, therefore, places in the valley were still known to the Tohono O'odham advisers, many being recalled as prime locales for gathering natural resources, such as bear grass and yucca used to make baskets. Nevertheless, given differences in terminology and spatio-temporal conceptions, it took the Tohono O'odham participants two days before they realized that when the archaeologists spoke about the ancient inhabitants of the San Pedro Valley, such as the Hohokam and Sobaipuri, they referenced O'odham ancestors, peoples the Tohono O'odham know as "Our Cousins to the East." Some O'odham elders readily identified features of the archaeological sites visited, such as the Soza Ballcourt, as corresponding to events described in their oral traditions that recounted "the creation of the Huhugkam, the emergence of the Wu:skam, and their dispersal throughout the land" (83). Examination of museum collections allowed elders to identify many excavated artifacts with O'odham terms and supply new information. For example, in addition to being used simply for ornamental purposes, the ancient shell items were furthermore held to convey mystical powers because they had been collected on sacred salt-gathering expeditions. Similarly, O'odham participants pointed out that "one powerful object that may [be] misinterpreted is the *wepgi hodai* (lightning stone), a flat chipped stone shaped like a projectile point with a rounded base instead of notches. O'odham believe [that] these artifacts are created by a lightning strike rather than by human hands. Lightning stones are considered to be exceedingly potent, predicated in part on the belief that lightning can transform objects and corrupt people's health" (90–91).

Perhaps the most fascinating chapter is the one that describes the work with the Hopi team, given the wealth of tantalizing ethnographic particulars that connect contemporary Hopi religious traditions with the archaeology of the San Pedro Valley. Noteworthy is the pronounced interest that Hopi intellectuals have demonstrated in recent years in relating traditional narratives about Hopi clan migrations to the archaeology of the Southwest and Mexico. In discussions about the San Pedro Valley, several Hopi advisers recounted the story of Yahoyah, an ancient leader of the Gray Flute Society who left the Hopi Mesas and traveled to southern Arizona, “‘where the cactus grew like people with their arms up,’ an apparent reference to saguaro cactus” (99). Similarly, a number of Hopi clans are said to have migrated north to the Hopi Mesas from Palatkwapi (Red Land of the South), a place of sacred power and social upheaval that eventually was destroyed by flood. The exact location of Palatkwapi is unknown, but its significance here is that it sets the context for the interpretation of the San Pedro Valley. The historicity of this tradition is bolstered by the fact that salient nomenclature, deities, and ceremonies the clans from Palatkwapi brought to the Hopi clearly have “southern” and, frankly, Mesoamerican connections. Among these, the ancient people archaeologists call the Hohokam are identified by the Hopi as ancestors known as Hoopoq’yaqam, or “Those Who Went to the Northeast,” which refers to the direction they traveled to reach the Hopi Mesas. Hopi have names for specific Hohokam villages and geographical features in the Hohokam area and describe the Hoopoq’yaqam as living in pit-houses and platform mound villages. When Hopi advisers visited ruins that showed signs of Pueblo influence, such as kivas, in the San Pedro Valley, it confirmed their belief that these places had been constructed by clans from the north, as the clans from Palatkwapi did not use kivas until they arrived at Hopi—a theory in line with archaeological ideas about Western Pueblo migrations into the valley during the Classic period.

Like the Hopi participants, Zuni advisers understood the archaeology of the San Pedro Valley in terms of the trails of their ancestors. So too, the existence of kivas and other signs of Pueblo influence demonstrated for them historical connections between modern Zuni and the ancient cultures of the valley. For example, at the Davis Ranch site kiva, “the fact that ladder holes indicate a ladder was placed over the hearth was thought to be significant because this is still the arrangement at Zuni Pueblo” (164). At this site they also pointed out a type of stone artifact scattered on the ground that archaeologists otherwise would surely miss. These linear fragments of slate-like rock, called *salaa*, were identified as ceremonial dress tinklers. Besides Puebloan connections, evidence from the Zuni language suggests fascinating cultural links between the Hohokam and Zuni. Although Zuni team members mentioned that archeological artifacts should not be excavated but rather left at the sites, they offered important insights on ceramic designs and ritual objects while they examined the museum collections. They also said they wished the Zuni had been involved in earlier archaeological projects, because prior generations knew more about the ancient traditions.

The fieldwork with the Apache team was somewhat different, for several

reasons. First, the memory of Apache occupation in the valley is still fresh and, in many ways, is a sensitive topic given the tribe's historic reputation and treatment in the Southwest. Research therefore gave Apache advisers an opportunity to present an alternate interpretation from the negative one usually obtained from other sources. Second, as relatively more recent arrivals in southern Arizona, the Apache were more interested in conducting research on Apache place names in the valley than visiting prehistoric sites that antedated their arrival. Consequently, only four sites were visited: the Spanish Presidio of Santa Cruz de Terrenate, abandoned in 1780 due to Apache depredations; the US Army post at Camp Grant; a pictograph panel in a rock shelter near Malpais Hill; and the 1871 Camp Grant Massacre site. Third, the documentary record has emphasized relations of enmity, rather than amity, between the Apache and their O'odham, Puebloan, Spanish, Mexican, and American congeners. Thus, before now the Apache's history of peaceful, agricultural, settlement in the San Pedro Valley that co-occurred alongside interethnic friendship, trade, and intermarriage has remained a largely untold story.

Notwithstanding the many strengths of *History Is in the Land*, there are also some weaknesses. Because each tribe had its own traditional history and understanding regarding the cultural significance of the valley and its inhabitants, an archaeological chronology was used up front to give all participants a common frame of reference, "without necessarily privileging this information above other forms of knowledge" (41). Although this sounds nice, it actually amounts to little more than a politically correct statement, as the ordinal presentation of the archaeological chronology before the tribal histories by itself signals the authors' view of the primacy of this history over others, in addition to being employed tacitly throughout the book as the "objective" history against which others are compared. Similarly, in the penultimate chapter Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh "provides a personal illustrated narrative about the theoretical and empirical issues he experienced during project research in Arizona and Washington D.C. It constitutes a meditation on the intersection of the observer and the observed" (229). This lengthy, post-modern reflection is gratuitous and detracts more than it adds to the book's tone and coherence. Nevertheless, Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh's volume overall is a valuable documentation of this comprehensive project. The authors are quite correct in their observation that "the resulting multivocality of Native American histories provides a significant humanistic context for the public interpretation of scientific data. Collaboration between Native Americans and archaeologists has yielded results that would not be obtainable if traditional history and archaeology were not investigated in tandem" (6). In sum, *History Is in The Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley* makes an important and lasting contribution to the literature. It will find a wide and welcome readership among anyone interested in the archaeology and ethnohistory of the Southwest.

Jerome M. Levi
Carleton College