

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

We Shall Live Again: The 1870 and 1890 Ghost Dance Movements as Demographic Revitalization. By Russell Thornton.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/02g9j4xh>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 10(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Dobyns, Henry F.

Publication Date

1986-09-01

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/>

Reviews

We Shall Live Again: The 1870 and 1890 Ghost Dance Movements as Demographic Revitalization. By Russell Thornton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. 95 pp. \$22.95 Cloth.

In 1981, sociologist Russell Thornton reported an important, statistically significant correlation. Native North American tribes of small absolute size with recent depopulation experience participated in the 1890 Ghost Dance movement at a rate higher than did larger and less demographically stressed tribes. Thornton expands his quantitative analysis to both the 1870 and 1890 population revitalization movements, as he labels them, in this Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph of the American Sociological Association.

In a few summary tables, Thornton presents the results of tests of statistical significance indicating that the smaller a tribe was in 1870, the more likely it was to take part in the earlier millenarian movement. In contrast, more populous Plains groups were likelier to participate in the more militant later movement. Thornton also concludes that recent depopulation experience, but not long-term depopulation as he defines it, is significantly related to seeking population revitalization. Thornton's analysis finds a correlation between Ghost Dance participation and group sizes actually being larger 20 and 40 years after the two movements. He wisely summarizes the mingling of European with Native American genes that greatly contributed to those increases.

This monograph merits praise as one more contribution to a growing literature concerning Native American historic demography and the social and cultural changes population shifts generate. The contribution is, however, limited by serious methodological flaws. The bibliography betrays a monograph written by a sociologist who has read rather widely in anthropological works but cites historians infrequently and rather haphazardly. Given disciplinary reward systems, a sociologist who

dives into sometimes obscure anthropological studies on a topic as esoteric as the Ghost Dance movements is to be lauded. The monograph pays a large price, though, for ignoring a rich, pertinent, historical literature.

A laconic summation of earlier studies of the 1870 and 1890 population revitalization movements ignores abundant information concerning parallel earlier movements with parallel biological and cultural circumstances. For example, historian James Ronda ("We Are Well As We Are": An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Christian Missions," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., 34, 1977) pointed out that Iroquoian-speaking peoples originated revitalization movements in the midst of acute biological and psychological stresses caused by three lethal epidemics that decimated their numbers during the 1630s.

The author refers to difficulty with the concept "tribe," purportedly the entity that he counts consistently. Actually, Thornton did not confront this problem of accurate quantification. He must be credited with including eight "technical appendixes" (pp. 51-84) that present the data analyzed and his contingency tables. The data base, borrowed mainly from James Mooney's 1928 publication ("The Aboriginal Population of America North of Mexico," Washington: *Smithsonian Misc. Coll.* vol. 80, 1928) is methodologically so flawed as to throw the entire statistical superstructure into question. A review affords too little space for a comprehensive critique of methodology, so some examples must suffice to illustrate shortcomings.

Minnesota Ojibwe "other" than White Earth, and "Other" Nevada Paviotso are not meaningful "tribal" entities. The "Pueblo" category includes Acoma, Jemez, Taos, and Zuñi, which are single pueblos. That is to say that they are equivalent to "tribes" among non-puebloan peoples. This list also includes, on the other hand, Hopi, Keres, Tewa, and Tiqua (sic). These are language groups. Acoma is Keresan-speaking, but so are Zia, Santa Ana, Laguna, Santo Domingo, San Felipe and Cochiti. Taos is Tiwa-speaking; and so are Picurís, Isleta and Sandía. Tewa-speakers reside in San Juan, Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Nambé, Tesuque and Hano. Hopi speakers live in Walpi, Sichomovi, Mishongnovi, Shipaulovi, Shongopavi, and Oraibi.

By counting Acoma and Keres each as one, Thornton violated a cardinal rule of statistical analysis—comparing only like entities. If Acoma pueblo is counted, then the other Keresan-speaking pueblos must also be counted. If Taos pueblo is

counted, then the other Tiwa-speaking pueblos must also be counted.

Counting pueblos instead of mixing pueblos and language groups materially changes Thornton's contingency tables. On the question of population decline during 20 years prior to each population revitalization movement, for example, among "large" tribes, the monograph shows "large decline" five participants and nine non-participants and "small decline" nine participants and 13 non-participants in 1890: $\frac{(5|9)}{(9|13)}$. Deleting Hopi, Keres, Tewa and Tigua, but adding Isleta and Santo Domingo (if I correctly understand Thornton's large-small dichotomy) makes the cells $\frac{5|9}{9|11}$ with N=34 instead of 36.

Among "small" tribes, the monograph shows $\frac{22|0}{10|5}$ for the same cells. Santa Ana, Picurís and Sandía had declines larger than 10 percent, or "large" by Thornton's operational definition. Consequently, the large decline, non-participant cell has three cases instead of none. The other 17 pueblos increase the small decline, non-participation total from five to 22. The table becomes $\frac{22|3}{10|22}$ with N=57 instead of 37. In other words, properly counting pueblos increases the overall N to 91 from 73. It also strengthens the clearest correlation that Thornton found!

Because Thornton borrowed Mooney's population figures, which were not well-researched, he made absurd statements. For example: "There were decreases . . . of only . . . 1.6 percent in New Mexico and Arizona" (p. 23) between 1680 "European contact" and 1907. In fact, Pueblo-European "contact" began in 1540, and Spanish colonization of Pueblo territory started in 1598. Most Pueblo peoples in 1680 united in a militant population and cultural revitalization movement of the very type that occurred in 1870 and 1890!

The aftermath of the 1680 Pueblo Revolt was not the 20 to 40 year population recovery that Thornton discerns after the 1870 and 1890 population revitalization movements. The Zuñi-speaking peoples, who inhabited six pueblos prior to 1680, amalgamated into a single village thereafter, to cite one clear case. Zuñi population nadir came about 1760, when it had a reported 664 inhabitants. The positive demographic effect of participating in the 1870 and 1890 movements that Thornton perceives is, in other words, not a result of such action, but a function of *when* the movements occurred. Native North American peoples generally recovered rapidly starting in the 1890s to the 1910s. (Zuñi soared from about 1,500 in 1900 to more than 5,000 in 1970.)

By failing to distinguish tribes from language groups, Thornton counted only 25 Southwestern "tribes" with six extinctions by 1970 (11 pueblos and Puebloan language groups with two extinctions). Mooney actually listed 23 pueblos, and six Hopi villages are well known and reported. Thornton did not, in other words, even accurately transcribe Mooney's data. There were more pueblos in 1907 than Thornton counted for either 1907 or 1680.

Historic pueblo attrition was much greater than Mooney's list indicates. Franciscan missionary Alonso de Benavides (*The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides 1630*, translated by Mrs. Edward E. Ayer. Chicago, 1916), reported some 69,000 inhabitants in 64 pueblos. On that record alone, 1630-1907 extinctions numbered nearer 35 pueblos than two, an error on the order of 1,650 percent.

The differences between Thornton's Puebloan analysis and historic demographic reality are representative examples of procedural defects that pervade this monograph. Demographers admittedly are accustomed to analyzing data collected by others. Custom does not, however, excuse uncritical reliance upon information that was erroneous when published more than half a century earlier, much less inaccurate reading of those data.

Henry F. Dobyns
The Newberry Library

Presbyterian Missionary Attitudes Toward American Indians, 1837-1893. By Michael C. Coleman. Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi, 1985. 222 pp. \$25.00 Cloth.

This fact-filled and meticulously presented examination of missionary attitudes towards Native Americans is both exhaustively researched (particularly in the records and letters of the appropriate missionary societies) and relatively narrowly focused. Neither characteristic is truly unexpected in a work which began, and was to a significant degree completed, as a doctoral dissertation. It is, in fact, even a bit narrower in focus than is implied by the title since Mr. Coleman deals, not with "American Indians" as such, but rather with those members of the Choctaw and Nez Perce tribes who came into contact with Presbyterian ministers.