

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Culture in the Making: The Yavapé of Central Arizona, 1860-1935

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/29r3p29x>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 24(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Grytz, Gerhard

Publication Date

2000-06-01

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/>

Peer reviewed

Culture in the Making: The Yavapé of Central Arizona, 1860–1935

GERHARD GRYTZ

If I have to, I can look back and see where I came from and not to be proud, but to be confident, because that provided me the stepping stone to where I am going to. But yet, I don't know where I am going to. And it's good because I have the confidence to know that when I get there, I know that I still have somewhere to go. That way I never rest.

—Stan Rice, Jr.,
president of the board of directors, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe¹

The degree to which any Native American group has remained “culturally intact,” in other words, has retained a Native American identity, has most often been measured by the group’s ability to cling to Native traditions in a modern world. Cultural change is usually interpreted as an assimilationist move. However, all cultures undergo constant changes as they adjust to new living conditions and attempt to keep cultural identity intact and successfully function in changing environments. This is especially true in the United States, where Native societies, more often than not, were on the receiving end of European and American policies of conquest. Here in particular, culture—the blueprints for everyday behavior—reveals its flexible nature. Culture is always in flux, accommodating identity with the ever-changing external reality.

Ethnohistory can be credited for promoting these aspects of cultural change over time into the rewriting of Native American history. Older studies were generally concerned with entire regions or large North American tribal units. Until recently, few ethnohistorians studied smaller Native American groups, especially those in the American Southwest; even today, traditional historiographic approaches continue to dominate the research concerning these groups. The majority of these studies emphasize the confrontational

Gerhard Grytz is a German native who received his bachelor’s degree in history and English/American literatures from the Universität Augsburg and a master’s degree in history from Northern Arizona University. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate in the US West History program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas finishing his dissertation, “Creators or Creations of the West: German Immigrants and Culture Formation in Arizona, 1850–World War I.”

aspects of Euro-American/Indian history and focus on the Indian frontier. Yet many smaller tribes did not vanish with the end of this frontier. They weathered the changes wrought by colonialism and continue to exist today.²

The expansionist, aggrandizing, and genocidal activities of the Euro-American invaders dramatically affected many Southwestern tribes, forcing many significant changes in their economic, social, and political lives. Viewing these groups solely as passive victims would be inaccurate. Many of these groups deliberately employed strategies enabling them to better adjust to the cultural and socioeconomic changes occurring around them, making survival possible. One of these groups is the Yavapé, a sub-tribe of the Yavapai, that still lives in North Central Arizona.³

From the first violent encounters with Euro-Americans in the 1860s to the establishment of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Reservation in 1935, the Yavapé made dramatic cultural adjustments leading to the reorganization of their sociopolitical life. They made these changes in order to survive as Yavapai people. Most significantly they transformed their family-based and family-oriented egalitarian social structures, which featured only temporarily assigned war and raiding leaders, into a hierarchical political organization headed by a permanent chief or chieftess with an advisory council. This is an excellent example of how people under stressful conditions adapt to satisfy their needs in a changing environment.

The Yavapé was the only Yavapai group to successfully adapt to a hereditary chieftainship. This was due largely to their unique situation upon returning to their homeland from the San Carlos Indian Reservation. In contrast to other Yavapai groups, the Yavapé found themselves without land, reservation, or economic security. The history of their socioeconomic and political adjustment is a prime example of how a small Native American group negotiated its traditions to survive culturally. "Some people have suggested that we [the Yavapé] were survivalists," states Stan Rice, Jr., president of the board of directors of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe. A close look at their history, however, indicates that they thought of "traditions [as] evolutionary stages," as Rice also suggests.⁴ The Yavapé used tradition as a legitimizing force to valorize new customs they wished to accept and, alternately, de-legitimize practices they wished to abandon. During each of three distinct phases—confrontation, exile, and accommodation—the Yavapé underwent a process during which they altered the "unwritten law by which [they] live," a process best described as culture-in-the-making.⁵

At the time of European contact, the Yavapai inhabited large portions of present-day Arizona. The tribe consisted of four divisions, each with its own name, dialect, and region. The Southeastern Yavapai, or *Kèwèvkopáya*, occupied territory in Southern Arizona. The Western Yavapai, or *Tòlkapáya*, ranged over an area bordered on the west by the Colorado River and on the east by the Black and White Tank Mountains. The *Wipukpáya*, also known as the Northeastern Yavapai, lived from the Middle Verde Valley and the Sedona Red Rock country to as far north as the San Francisco Peaks. The Yavapé, or Central Yavapai, occupied the area around present-day Prescott and Jerome.

The existing historiographic and ethnographic studies suggest that none of these four sub-tribes numbered more than 500 members each.⁶

The desert environment of the Yavapai sub-tribes required the development of an efficient and adaptable subsistence culture. Over time, the Yavapai adapted to an often hostile, arid environment through an intricate annual cycle of gathering, hunting, and small-scale agriculture. From May to October, Yavapai families migrated to take advantage of the growth cycles of important wild food plants. During this period, Yavapai diet consisted of lemon berries, various cactus fruits, saguaro, walnuts, manzanita berries, yucca, and juniper berries. Overall, however, the most dependable source of food was mescal.⁷ When important wild plant food was scarce—from late fall to early spring—the Yavapai depended largely on hunting. They hunted mule deer, rabbits, bighorn sheep, antelope, and a variety of smaller mammals and birds. To a limited extent, the Yavapai included small-scale agriculture in their cycle of hunting and gathering, planting and harvesting corn, beans, and squash.⁸

Social and political structures supported the Yavapai's fragile subsistence economy. None of the four Yavapai sub-tribes formed a unified political entity and rarely did they form political unions with one another. They had no need for powerful tribal leaders. Instead, they operated under a loose social organization centered around the family, allowing them to capitalize on the seasonal cycle of hunting, gathering, and small-agriculture most efficiently. The family served as the nucleus of all social, cultural, and economic life. In these primarily matrilineal families, the elder members presided over religious and political matters while the younger tribesmen took charge of hunting and occasional raiding parties.⁹

Aboriginal Yavapai economy and its subsequent social organization depended upon the unlimited, free access to a broad variety of use areas. Despite frequent confrontations with their Navajo and Apache neighbors, the Yavapé and other Yavapai sub-tribes enjoyed relatively undisturbed lifeways until the early 1860s. Between 1583 and 1776, few Spanish explorers visited the area or made contact with the Yavapai. These encounters were, for the most part, brief, infrequent, and friendly. But in the late 1840s, Euro-Americans began passing through Yavapai territory on the way to the gold fields of California. Archeological evidence suggests that the first violent encounters between the Yavapé and Euro-Americans occurred as early as 1849.¹⁰

The discovery of gold at Lynx Creek in 1863 brought an invasion of Euro-American miners to the area, disrupting the Yavapé's traditional economic lifeways and creating bitter hostilities between the two groups. In less than a year, 736 white miners, settlers, and ranchers flocked to Yavapai County in the newly-established Arizona Territory. They lived and worked primarily in and around the new capital, Prescott, which was positioned in the center of Yavapé lands. The influx of these Euro-American miners and settlers severely disrupted the Yavapé subsistence cycle by imposing limits on their traditional migration range.¹¹

From the beginning, the citizens of Prescott posed a serious threat to the Yavapé subsistence economy. They also posed an intense physical threat to Yavapé survival, organizing Indian-hunting expeditions as part of their genocidal activities. These expeditions traversed the countryside destroying Yavapé camps and murdering any Natives they could find—men, women, and children. An eyewitness observed:

Indians are shot whenever seen, and quite recently a party of whites went into the country . . . and failing to find the Indians at a safely accessible place, invited them to a council, gave them food, and while they were eating, at a given signal fired on them, killing some thirty.¹²

Beyond threatening instant death, these Indian-hunting parties drastically curtailed Yavapé subsistence activities throughout the tribe's primary foraging areas. Even short visits to these traditional areas were very dangerous. Consequently the territory in which the Yavapé could freely hunt and gather was substantially limited. For example, "*mud-esi* [land of salt] Camp Verde [where] the Yavapai people got their salt to season food," was now off limits. "[Salt] was a priceless piece of rock to carry around for months at a time," but was now no longer safely available.¹³

White farmers did further damage to Yavapé sources of livelihood by seizing the best farming lands. To add to these woes, increased hunting by whites quickly led to the rapid depletion of game animals in the region. White hunters armed with rifles were more efficient hunters than the Yavapé. This disruption of their annual subsistence cycle ultimately forced the Yavapé to find alternative sources of food or face starvation. They soon realized that raiding white settlers was an alternate source of food. They ran off livestock and, as farmers reported, took a variety of other agricultural products. This occurred largely when lands were left unattended so as to avoid confrontation.¹⁴

It was not only interference with their economic lives that disrupted Yavapé lifeways. Many areas that they could no longer access safely contained "places of learning and places of worship" important to their cultural system. North of present-day Prescott "rock writings [petroglyphs]—encyclopedias and dictionaries" to the Yavapé—were now inaccessible. This was a critical loss because, as tribal member Ted Vaughn states, "if you don't have access [to these places] you lose parts of your culture."¹⁵ Also north of Prescott is Granite Mountain where, according to Grace Jimulla Mitchell, daughter of Sam and Viola Jimulla, "our people went to pay homage to the Great Spirit."¹⁶ In addition to damaging the spiritual and educational facets of Yavapé existence, restricted access to these areas had other consequences on their social life. For example, "Mingus Mountain," northeast of Prescott, "is *Kavasiu yo-cho ka lava* [or] turquoise cliff, [where] the Yavapai went to get their turquoise." This gemstone was an important element in establishing the social hierarchy since "only a warrior . . . was eligible to wear [a] turquoise bead in his nose." Without turquoise a warrior's social standing was threatened.¹⁷

Euro-American settlers as well as the military used increased Yavapai raiding as an excuse to intensify their genocidal war against the tribe. Their efforts to retaliate resulted in a state of permanent warfare lasting until 1873. During this period, Euro-Americans killed approximately 1,000 Yavapai in a series of conflicts and massacres. Revenge for raiding and stealing only partly explains the slaughter of Yavapai by whites. Euro-Americans were intent on exterminating the Yavapai in order to seize their land and resources, a motivation that had been openly expressed as early as 1860. Though the extermination campaign was not totally successful, by 1873 the Yavapai had lost the battle for their homeland. The last tribal members were captured and incarcerated near Fort Verde on the Verde River during that year along with the neighboring Tonto-Apache.¹⁸ This was done, their captors rationalized, “to protect them, and to see that they had food and clothing.”¹⁹

Several distinct changes occurred in Yavapai life during this time. The intrusion of Euro-Americans led to the destruction of traditional Yavapai economic patterns. Prolonged warfare with Euro-Americans also prompted the Yavapai to make structural and social changes to gain greater internal strength in resisting the intruders. The four sub-tribes began forming political unions, thus emphasizing the influence of the community and lessening the authority of family. Over time, the power of younger band members grew as they took over leadership of war parties and organized the defense of the tribe.

The period of internment at Camp Verde from 1873 to 1875 revealed Yavapai ingenuity in adapting to new living conditions. But their success only led to more tragedy at the hand of Euro-American envy and profiteering. For the first time in their history, the Yavapai found themselves living together in a large, sedentary community over a substantial period of time. At first they struggled to continue their traditional practices of gathering and hunting. But these efforts were hampered by the military in charge of the internees at Camp Verde and by the surrounding white settlers who opposed the Natives' semi-nomadic lifeways. Furthermore, the limited territory to which the Yavapai were confined was insufficient to support a community dependent upon gathering and hunting for its subsistence. Consequently, the Yavapai adapted a new subsistence strategy at Camp Verde by shifting their focus to agriculture. For people who had practiced only seasonal small-scale farming, the Yavapai proved tremendously successful in this new endeavor. They grew wheat and barley in addition to the traditional crops of beans, corn, and squash. The availability of plentiful water from the Verde River made their agricultural success possible, and the Yavapai actually produced a surplus in their first year of farming.²⁰

Ironically, this agricultural success ultimately led to their removal from Camp Verde. White settlers feared the competition and wanted the reservation land for their own use. Furthermore, a second group of whites had economic interests anathema to Yavapai economic success. Merchants in Tucson who comprised the so-called Tucson Ring, had high stakes in the profits from Indian trading and from supplying the people on the reservation. A self-sufficient

Yavapai community meant less demand for supplies and less revenue. The merchants soon lobbied for the removal of all Yavapai from the Verde Valley.²¹

On 27 February 1875 the federal government moved all Yavapai to the Western Apache Reservation at San Carlos claiming that “the Camp Verde project [was] too expensive for the government.”²² On that date, Special Commissioner of Indian Affairs L. Edwin Dudley sent 1,476 tribal members on the long trek, the Yavapai March of Tears, to the reservation in Arizona’s White Mountains. The majority of Yavapai remained there until about 1900. As a result of their removal, both white interest groups were satisfied. The Tucson merchants now controlled a market, supplying a now dependent Yavapai people at the San Carlos Reservation, while the farmers gained access to the desired land.²³

Some of the severest changes in the social and cultural life of the Yavapai occurred during the nearly thirty years of confinement at the San Carlos Reservation. For example, they were forced to live a sedentary, non-nomadic life and were deprived of important religious guidance as Yavapai religious practices were prohibited by federal officials at San Carlos. The Yavapai accepted this ban in order to preserve the community at large. “There was a visionary—a medicine man—who talked to the people: ‘don’t do this—practice religion—because the army will kill you,’” remembers Ted Vaughn from his grandparents’ accounts of this period.²⁴

The development of leadership positions beyond the family level became pivotal to survival. However, the concept of chieftainship among the interned families was more a white man’s construction than a Yavapai invention. In order to more easily manage everyday affairs, Indian agents set up leaders with whom they could effectively communicate. They created a system of tag chiefs who were responsible for distributing food and goods among the reservation population. The Yavapai had little choice but to conform to the agents’ wishes dependent as they were on the food rations the agents provided.²⁵ The system of food distribution also influenced the Yavapai language and the way in which they viewed time:

When they went to San Carlos, they ration[ed] out food, and all they remember was on a certain day, they ration out flour and other things. So *Ma-water-jo-je*, which means getting flour, is Saturday. Sunday was “closed day,” (*wa-sa-am-va*). Everything was closed on Sunday. . . . The rest of the days were numbered . . . one, two, three.²⁶

During their confinement on the San Carlos Reservation, approximately 50 percent of the Yavapai died. This sad affair left few eligible marriage partners within the tribe. As a result, the Yavapai began to intermarry with members of other tribes, particularly the Apache. This is a clear example of how the Yavapai were capable of altering their cultural instructions to meet new circumstances.²⁷ However, this movement towards out-marriage had profound effects on the cultural life of the Yavapai, especially on language use. Since Yavapai and Apache are linguistically unrelated, couples had to devise new forms of communication. But the deep fear of speaking Apache still remained

strong among the Yavapai who had often been mistakenly identified as Apache and hunted and killed. Tribal member Mabel Doka recollects her parents' lives in San Carlos:

My mother was full-blood Apache but I never learned to speak Apache. My father was full-blood Yavapai, and when they got married, the people told my mother, "Don't talk Apache. They'll kill anybody who talks Apache."²⁸

Eventually, English became the *lingua franca* in Yavapai homes. This change was facilitated by the experience of several Yavapai men who served as scouts with the US Army. Euro-Americans wrongly interpreted this increased use of the English language by the Yavapai as a sign of Indian assimilation and acculturation to white society. In reality, it was a strategy of cultural survival.²⁹

During the 1890s a few Yavapai left the San Carlos Reservation without permission and returned to their homelands. The Indian agents at San Carlos did not interfere with this exodus and, in fact, actively encouraged it. Their motivations were by no means humanitarian: the agents had a material interest in the departure of the escapees. The Yavapai occupied an area on San Carlos called the mineral strip. When they left the agents were free to lease this mineral-rich land to Euro-American miners and pocket the profit themselves.³⁰

When the federal government officially released the Yavapai from their internment at San Carlos at the turn of the century, many Yavapai families attempted to return to their ancestral homelands. Forty to fifty Yavapé made their way back to the Prescott area where they joined the few families that had escaped from San Carlos at an earlier time and settled on the outskirts of the city. However, coming home was not what many Yavapé expected. They had hoped to return to a normal, traditional life on their homeland, but instead found that whites had occupied their land and depleted the area's natural resources.³¹

Once again the Yavapé had to adapt to a new situation. They responded by developing new economic, social, and political structures to suit the changed circumstances. They no longer had the federal support of the internment period, a situation most nearly unique to the Yavapé. Unlike other tribes, the Yavapé were not provided with their own reservation or any means of supporting themselves until 1935. In response, they moved toward an economic system that emphasized a combination of traditional hunting and gathering along with ever-increasing economic involvement with Prescott's white society. This arrangement, which involved a rather static community of several families, made further changes in their sociopolitical organization necessary. These adjustments led to one particular family's social and political domination, creating a hierarchical system.³²

When the Yavapé returned to the Prescott region, they had no alternative but to live on federal land. They settled north of Prescott on the slopes of Granite Mountain, on land that was part of the abandoned Fort Whipple Military Reservation. Its location close to the white city gave them both

limited access to some areas they had traditionally used for hunting and gathering and proximity to the Prescott community. This propinquity eventually provided them an opportunity to supplement their livelihood with wage labor and trade. But first and foremost, the decision to settle on federal land appears to have been for reasons of security. Fort Whipple government land provided them with at least minimal security against encroaching white settlers and reduced the threat of relocation.³³

Neither the Prescott community nor the federal government provided the Yavapé with any means of developing permanent housing until the 1930s. Consequently, the Yavapé continued to live in their traditional dwellings, *wahm-boo-nyahs*. Living in *wahm-boo-nyahs* had several positive aspects. They could easily be built, building materials were plentiful, and it gave them the mobility to maintain some traditional semi-nomadic hunting and gathering practices. This mobility also enabled them to use other ancestral Yavapé land north of Prescott. *Wham-boo-nyah* camps set up by the returning Yavapé were initially intended as temporary settlements. Tribal members moved periodically but rarely off federal Fort Whipple land. Two factors determined their choice of campsites: accessibility of water and wage-labor opportunities. Over time, however, the Yavapé community slowly abandoned its spatial mobility as individual members grew more dependent upon wage labor and trade with the white community and cut back on traditional hunting and gathering.³⁴

Proximity to Prescott gave the Yavapé the opportunity to engage in wage labor and trade with white residents. Male Yavapé were employed in a variety of jobs, mainly in the construction and lumber industries. However, male wage labor as the income base for the community was not adequate during the period from 1900 to 1930. These jobs, whether road construction, lumber cutting, or hauling, were temporary and low-paying at best, leaving the men with a sense of economic insecurity. In contrast, female Yavapé labor was more continuous and reliable. Women were most often employed in domestic and child-care services, occupations offering year-round employment. These jobs often had a secondary benefit for Yavapé women who were sometimes able to bring leftover food back to the camp to supplement the families' poor diets.³⁵ Yavapé women also possessed a skill that substantially contributed to tribal income: basket weaving. As tribal member Florence Engle remembers: "My mother was an expert in basket weaving, so that's how she was able to feed us." Whites living in Prescott, as well as visitors to the area, sought these products of traditional Yavapé life. The changing purpose of Yavapé basketry—from everyday use to trade objects—reflected shifts within Yavapé society that altered the culture of which it was part. This point is aptly demonstrated by Viola Jimulla, who, according to her grandson, once "made a basket that was so large that they had to take out the door frame to get it out of the house." Such baskets were certainly not useful in everyday life.³⁶

To supplement their economy beyond these newfound income sources, the Yavapé continued to engage in traditional activities. The hunting and gathering that had been the basis of Yavapé subsistence for centuries still played an important role in sustaining the fragile new economic system. Hunting and gathering expeditions, which were communal rather than individual outings,

took place north of Prescott in traditional Yavapé land-use areas. These visits might also have served to maintain access to Yavapé rock writings, which contain important information from their forefathers and are places of worship. But even decades after the end of the Indian Wars, the Yavapé had to be cautious when away from Fort Whipple. There was always the chance that whites, fearing the resumption of Apache depredations, might attack them.³⁷

Trying to survive in this vulnerable social position in the midst of a non-Indian pioneer society, as well as adjusting to a new subsistence economy of wage labor and trade, led to the adoption of a new sociopolitical organization that extended beyond the family-based system of authority among the Yavapé. Acquainted with the concept of chieftainship authority from their confinement at San Carlos, the Prescott Yavapai began to turn to the leadership of one particular family. This family had displayed leadership abilities on the paternal side during their struggles with the Euro-American invaders during the 1860s and 1870s. In addition to providing whites with an authority figure with whom they could effectively communicate, the Yavapé continued to need defensive leadership.

The land the Yavapé occupied after their return from San Carlos was—according to white man's law—no longer the tribe's property. When they originally settled on the Whipple Military Reservation, the Yavapé received no guarantees that they could stay. During the early years of the twentieth century, the Yavapé felt the constant threat of relocation as well as other government pressures. In 1912, for instance, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) began taking Yavapé children, often against the will of the parents, from their homes to send them to the Phoenix Indian School. When Yavapé congregated in groups larger than five within the city limits of Prescott, police threatened to arrest them, fearing another Indian uprising.³⁸ Any disturbance occurring in Prescott, especially any event including Native Americans, raised the immediate threat of relocation. In order to avoid this possibility, the Yavapé kept as low a profile as possible. Every effort was made to keep alcohol-related disturbances to a minimum, despite the fact that tribal members regularly produced and consumed beer and whiskey.³⁹

Two individuals, Sam and Viola Jimulla, both born during the internment period at the San Carlos Apache Reservation, began assuming necessary leadership roles within the Yavapé community. They first met at Prescott in 1900 and subsequently married there in 1901. Both became central to the consolidation of the Yavapé Prescott community and the establishment of economic and social ties with Prescott's white society. They were respected tribal members who slowly assumed leadership roles helping to guide their community on the path of self-determination vis-a-vis a Euro-American society.⁴⁰

Viola Jimulla quickly emerged as the spiritual and religious leader of the Yavapé in Prescott. Religion had always been an important part of Yavapai life over the centuries, but during their internment at San Carlos the tribe was banned from practicing traditional religious ceremonies. Lost between traditional beliefs and alien Christian practices, the Yavapé community found its spiritual nexus through Viola Jimulla.⁴¹

In the late 1910s, Viola Jimulla joined the Salvation Army in Prescott. Although she had become familiar with Christianity during her five-year appointment at the Phoenix Indian School, she did not join the Salvation Army for religious reasons only. What attracted her first was the Salvation Army Band. The combination of religious ritual with the use of drums reminded her of the nearly forgotten religious traditions of her own people. This combination of traditional and foreign religious elements brought her to the Salvation Army. For Viola Jimulla, the transition from traditional belief to Christianity was not difficult because "both religions shared some parallel beliefs, especially a supreme being."⁴²

In 1922 Viola Jimulla played a major role in founding the Yavapai Presbyterian Mission Church. Her conversion to Presbyterianism was not entirely surprising. Traditional Yavapai worship shared structural features with this particular faith. Presbyterian elders presided over religious matters as Yavapai elders did in pre-contact society. Viola Jimulla's leading role in the mission gave her considerable exposure as a spiritual leader within the tribe and brought her recognition from several members of Prescott society, especially Grace Sparks, secretary of the Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce and a prominent Presbyterian, a factor that eventually became critical in gaining a reservation for the Yavapé.⁴³

Sam Jimulla's leadership role derived from a different background. It is possible that he was the son of Delche, a famous Yavapé war leader of the 1860s and 1870s. This relationship gave him historically based respect within the Yavapé community. In addition, Sam Jimulla was raised by Bob Blair, an American rancher who lived north of Prescott on the road to Granite Dells. After Blair's death, the Jimullas were able to maintain friendly relations with other farmers and ranchers to the north, allowing the Yavapé to continue to hunt and gather in this area. Sam Jimulla was also central in integrating the Yavapé into the Prescott economy. He appeared, by all accounts, to have been a foreman on any wage-work job involving more than one Yavapé. Because of these roles, the community at large regarded him as a leader, enabling him to become a pivotal figure in the relationship-building between the Yavapé and the white community.⁴⁴

The leadership role of the Jimulla family on the Fort Whipple Military Reservation was manifested in several ways. At the Yavapé campsites, the Jimulla's *wahm-boo-nyah* always occupied an elevated position, demonstrating their importance. Material wealth may be an indication of, and possibly a reason for, their gained prestige. During a time of great hardship for the community, the Jimullas owned eleven ponies.⁴⁵

During the early 1930s, Sam and Viola Jimulla became central figures in establishing the Yavapai Prescott Indian Reservation. By this time, they were the recognized leaders of their community. Their involvement in Prescott's religious and economic life gave them prestige and provided them with the connections they needed in order to gain the support of people in the white Prescott community. In establishing a reservation, the Jimullas and the Yavapé were aided by a number of prominent figures in Prescott society, most notably Grace Sparks. While philanthropic motivations partly stimulated this

support, it also served economic goals. It was in the interest of the business sector to encourage community stability, thereby keeping cheap Yavapé labor readily available.⁴⁶

For the Yavapé, attaining reservation status meant gaining security by eliminating the immediate threat of relocation. The growing importance of wage labor, furthermore, added to the need for a sedentary community. It became, therefore, vital that the Yavapé gain permanent control over the land on which they were to reside. With the help of Grace Sparks, the Yavapé in 1933 secured minimal funds from the Works Progress Administration to build stone houses to replace their traditional *wham-boo-nyahs*. This was not so much an exchange for luxury and commodity as a manifestation and expression of their willingness to live in one definite place.⁴⁷

Sam Jimulla supervised the construction of six stone houses. The first structure erected was a community building used for social and political gatherings. The spatial layout of the new housing community reflected the leadership roles of the Jimullas. They had their own house erected closest to the community center building less than ten yards away.⁴⁸ However, they only built their home after all the others were complete. Sam Jimulla and his family helped erect houses for all other families first—a sign of the giving that was expected of a Yavapé leader if he or she intended to command respect and prestige from the community.

The construction process increased Yavapé awareness of their insecure status. The lack of funds and shortage of materials interrupted the project numerous times, yet during the same period, the Smoki People—a group of whites playing Indian—succeeded in constructing an Indian museum under the very same Works Progress Administration program without any interruption. The Smoki museum was finished before a single Yavapé was able to move into a new home. Interpreting this fact as another example of disregard for the well-being of real Native Americans by the majority of the white Prescott community, the Yavapé pushed even harder to gain reservation status so they would be secure against random, outside interference.⁴⁹

In their quest for reservation status, the Yavapé relied to a large extent on the assistance of a few white members of Prescott society. Sam and Viola Jimulla had the help of Grace Sparks who became their spokesperson in correspondence with Arizona Senator Hayden and John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs. At first, Hayden and Collier thought in terms of a forty-acre reservation. Later, at the recommendation of the Veterans Administration who held title to the Fort Whipple land, they increased this to seventy-five acres.⁵⁰

The Yavapé request was granted in 1935 when the United States Senate voted to establish the Prescott Yavapai Indian Reservation. Prior to the passage of this act, John Collier and the BIA had appointed Sam Jimulla as chief of the Prescott Yavapai. This was, in part, an official recognition of the leadership role Sam Jimulla already played within the tribe. Even more it was a reflection of white society's misconceptions about the social structures and organization of Native American societies. It illustrates the continuing inability of Euro-Americans to distinguish among different Native American groups and their different cultures. Most white Americans were convinced

that all Native American tribes were traditionally organized hierarchically under the leadership of a chief. Only after Sam Jimulla's appointment by government officials, which disregarded what could be considered old Yavapé tradition, did the Yavapé themselves elect Sam Jimulla as their chief.⁵¹

Upon attaining a reservation, the Yavapé were for the first time in almost seventy years free to live their lives without the threat of retaliation or relocation. This recovered freedom and self-confidence was at once expressed by the tribe's attitude toward the Indian Reorganization Act. The Prescott Yavapai immediately rejected the Reorganization Act believing acceptance would mean the abandonment of their newly found political structures. The federal government viewed the tribal government as undemocratic. The irony in this process is twofold. The BIA formally established this so-called undemocratic organization because it believed it was inherent in all traditional Indian sociopolitical entities. On the other hand, the Yavapé reasoned that their new hierarchical political structure was based on old Yavapé traditions, though, in fact, it was not. Over time they had renegotiated their traditions to accommodate a changing socioeconomic environment. Now the Yavapé did not wish to abandon their new political structure since they identified it with success and the achieving of reservation status. The rejection of the act, furthermore, was an expression of their regained self-confidence and independence.⁵²

In the years that followed, Sam and Viola Jimulla made several attempts, with the support of Grace Sparks, to increase the size of the Yavapai Prescott Reservation. All efforts, however, were unsuccessful due for the most part to the affect any enlargement of the reservation would have on public lands open to white use. Denying the expansion of the Yavapé Reservation was another example of the dubious attitudes the majority of non-Indians in Prescott and BIA officials held toward Native Americans. Viola Jimulla succeeded her husband as chieftess of the Prescott Yavapai Indian Tribe after his death in 1940. This white invention of a Yavapé chieftainship continued—passed on hereditarily to the Jimullas' daughters until 1988 when the position was officially terminated.⁵³

Over a period of approximately seventy years, the Yavapé made dramatic changes in the organization of their sociopolitical life in order to survive as a distinct people. The destruction of their fragile subsistence economy by the intrusion of Euro-Americans in the 1860s and the state of constant warfare with the intruders from 1863 to 1873 resulted in the increased importance of community leadership at the expense of the family. Even greater changes in the cultural life of the Yavapé occurred during the almost thirty years of forced internment on the San Carlos Apache Reservation. Pressured by Indian agents, the emergence of community leaders who held everyday authority above the familial influences became essential to tribal survival. After returning to their homeland in the Prescott area, the Yavapé slowly accepted the leadership role of the Jimulla family, which proved to be vital to the development of a new subsistence economy and the establishment of the Yavapé Reservation. It was the combination of outside pressures and internal adjustments that led to significant changes in Yavapé

political structures. Over time, their egalitarian and family-oriented sociopolitical organization transformed into a hierarchical system which more effectively met the needs of the community. These changes made it possible for the Yavapé to survive as Yavapai people in an alien culture while retaining substantial parts of their own culture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank the members of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, especially Stan Rice, Jr. and Ted Vaughn, for their help and cooperation. In addition, this paper could not have been produced without the aid of Hal Rothman and Willard Rollings of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, who encouraged and believed in the author during the process of writing this paper. He is especially grateful to Caoimhín Ófearghail and David Solomon for their questions, suggestions, and editing skills.

NOTES

1. Stan Rice, Jr., president of the board of directors of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, interview by author, tape recording, Prescott, Arizona, 24 March 1997.

2. For more information on the "Indian Frontier" and its alleged end in 1890, see Robert M. Utley, *The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846–1890* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), 257ff.

3. The term *Yavapé* is used throughout this essay when issues are addressed and statements are made that are *Yavapé* specific. When information is based on general Yavapai sources, the term *Yavapai* is used.

4. Rice, Jr., interview.

5. Ted Vaughn, grandson of Sam and Viola Jimulla, interview by author, tape recording, Prescott, Arizona, 24 March 1997.

6. Sigrid Khera and Patricia S. Mariella, "Yavapai," in *Handbook of North American Indians: Southwest*, vol. 10, ed. Alfonso Ortiz (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1983), 38. E. W. Gifford, the leading ethnographer of the Yavapai in the 1920s and 1930s, distinguishes only three Yavapai sub-tribes, including the Yavapé in his northeastern group (E. W. Gifford, "Northeastern and Western Yavapai," in *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 34, eds. A. L. Kroeber, Robert H. Lowie, and Ronald L. Olson [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937], 247–354; and E. W. Gifford, "The Southeastern Yavapai," in *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, vol. 29, eds. A. L. Kroeber, Robert H. Lowie and Ronald L. Olson [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933], 177–251). Gifford's usage and spelling of Northeastern Yavapai vocabulary must be viewed with caution because his primary Yavapai informer, Jim Stacey, had a speech impediment (Vaughn, interview). For a comprehensive description of the Yavapai sub-tribes and their living spaces, see Albert H. Schroeder, "A Study of Yavapai History," *Yavapai Indians*, ed. David Agee Horr (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1974), 22–48, 131–263. According to Cultural Research Director of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Nancy Lee Hayden, archeological evidence produced by recent investigations sponsored by the Yavapai Prescott Tribe suggests that the total population of

the Yavapai peaked at up to 10,000 individuals (Nancy Lee Hayden, cultural research director of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, conversation with author, Prescott, Arizona, 23 September 1997).

7. Gifford, "Northeastern Yavapai," 254–264; and William Waddell, "Ethnobotany of the Northeastern Yavapai" (master's thesis, Northern Arizona University, 1986).

8. Gifford, "Northeastern Yavapai," 254–255, 264–268.

9. Henry F. Dobyns and Robert C. Euler, *Wauba Yuma's People: The Comparative Socio-Political Structure of the Pai Indians of Arizona* (Prescott: Prescott College Press, 1970), 10–16, 22ff.; Elaine Waterstrat, *Commanders and Chiefs: A Brief History of Fort McDowell, Arizona (1865–1890), Its Officers and Men and the Indians They Were Ordered to Subdue* (Fountain Hills, Arizona: Mount McDowell Press, 1992), 1–3. It appears that Yavapai sociopolitical organization did not formally acknowledge chiefs. An indication for this absence of a chieftainship in traditional Yavapai society could perhaps be inferred from a comparison of several word lists compiled by ethnographers during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Only one of these vocabularies lists a Yavapai word for chief: *pa-mul'awa* (William Corbusier, "Apache-Mohave and Yavapé; and Apache-Yuma or Tolkepaia. Rio Verde Indian Agency, Arizona Ter. 1873–75. Vocabulary and Notes in Printed Schedule," Archives of the Bureau of Ethnology Smithsonian Institution, file 2249-A). This exception is most likely due to the fact that the preprinted schedule specifically asked for a Yavapai word for chief. None of the other vocabularies mentions *pa-mul'awa* (see William Corbusier, "A Revised Yavapai or Apache-Mohave Vocabulary, 1921" Archives of the Bureau of Ethnology Smithsonian Institution, file 2249-B; William Corbusier, "Additions Made In 1922 to His Yavapai Vocabulary in 1873," Archives of the Bureau of Ethnology Smithsonian Institution, file 2249-C; Albert S. Gatschet, "Der Yuma Sprachstamm," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 9[1877]: 341–418; Albert S. Gatschet, "Der Yuma Sprachstamm nach den neuesten handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 15[1883]: 134–147; Albert S. Gatschet, "Der Yuma Sprachstamm nach den neuesten handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt. Dritter Artikel," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 18[1886]: 97–122; and Albert S. Gatschet, "Der Yuma Sprachstamm nach den neuesten handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 24[1892]: 1–18). For a description of the Yavapai matrilineal marriage patterns without cross-cousin marriages, see Eleanor Doka, "The Yavapais," (?) typed manuscript (Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives, Prescott, Arizona), 6.

10. That the encounters between the Spanish and the Yavapai were mostly friendly was also due to the fact that the Spaniards did not discover gold in the region. For the Spanish contact with the Yavapai, see Alfred B. Thomas, "The Yavapai Indians, 1582–1848," in *Yavapai Indians*, ed. David Agee Horr (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1974), 355–386; Edward H. Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962), 267; and "William Drannan, KILLED INDIANS HERE 1849," inscription next to Yavapé petroglyphs near Willow Lake, Prescott, Arizona, a current archeological excavation site of the Yavapai Prescott Tribe (Nancy Lee Hayden, conversation with author, Prescott, Arizona, 28 March 1997).

11. Thomas E. Farish, *History of Arizona*, vol. 2 (San Francisco: The Filmer Brothers Electrotpe Company, 1915), 323. In 1864, the time of the first territorial

census, 736 non-Indians resided in Yavapai County (see “The Special Territorial Census of 1864 Taken in Arizona,” in *Federal Census—Territory of New Mexico and Territory of Arizona*, Senate Document No. 13, 89th Congress, 1st Session [Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965], 1–48). By 1870 this number had increased to 2,062 non-Indian residents (“Decennial Census 1870. County of Arizona,” in *Federal Census—Territory of New Mexico and Territory of Arizona*, Senate Document No. 13, 89th Congress, 1st Session [Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965], 125–253).

12. Schroeder, “Yavapai,” 39 quotes this account of an eye witness that was first published in the *Hartford Evening Press*, 12 April 1864, 8:1. Further references to these murderous activities can be found in *Arizona Miner*, 6 April 1864, 2:1 and 3:2; 20 April 1864, 2:2; 11 May 1864, 3:3 and 4:2; and 25 May 1864, 4:2–3.

13. Grace Jimulla Mitchell to Weissbrodt, Weissbrodt, & Liftin, Washington, DC, Prescott, Arizona, 30 May 1965, “A Memorialization” (copy of letter, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives, Prescott, Arizona).

14. For the depletion of game animals, see Leisa Bronson, “The Long Walk of the Yavapai,” *Wassaja/The Indian Historian* 13(1980): 39. Descriptions of Euro-American hunting practices are given in *Arizona Miner*, 7 November 1868, 3:1; 17 July 1869, 2:2; 7 August 1869, 3:3; and 14 August 1869, 3:2. For examples of Yavapé raiding, see *Arizona Miner*, 17 August 1867, 2:4; 14 September 1867, 2:4; 5 October 5 1867; 2:2; 13 June 1868, 3:1; 1 August 1868, 3:2; 6 February 1869, 3:2; and 3 December 1870, 2:2; and T. J. Alsop, *Memorial and Affidavits Showing Outrages Perpetuated by Apache Indians in the Territory of Arizona During the Years 1869 and 1870* (San Francisco: Francis & Valantine, 1871).

15. Vaughn, interview.

16. Grace Jimulla Mitchell, as quoted in *The Arizona Republic*, 30 July 1961, D 17.

17. Mitchell, “Memorialization.”

18. Schroeder, “Yavapai,” 38–47. The Spanish apparently had no problem distinguishing between Apache and Yavapai. Here, the excuse of mistaken identity came in handy for the land-hungry Euro-American invaders. Proponents of this idea argue that whites primarily referred to the Yavapai as Yuma-Apache or Mohave-Apache. Yet if the white population and the territorial government officials were so completely unaware of the existence of Yavapai people and the location of their aboriginal lands, then the startling question remains: Why was the county named for the Yavapai in 1864? For more on this, see Kate Ruland-Thorne, *Yavapai: The People of the Red Rocks, The People of the Sun* (Sedona: Thorne Enterprises, 1993), 11, 21–22; and Sigrid Khara, ed., *The Yavapai of Fort McDowell: An Outline of Their History and Culture* (Fort McDowell, Arizona, 1979), 2. For lists of Yavapai/US military confrontations by location and with estimated number of casualties, see “Compilation of Indian Engagement from January 1837 to January 1866, Prepared by Historical Section, Army College” (1925) (photocopy, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives); and Adjutant General’s Office, “Chronological List of Actions, &c., With Indians, from January 1, 1866, to January 1891. Office Memorandum” (photocopy, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives). As early as 1860, white settlers and prospectors in Arizona expressed their opinion that the Yavapai should and could be easily exterminated: “There is a prospect of the speedy extermination of at least one tribe of Indians [Yavapai]” (*The Arizonian*, 26 January 1860, 2:3). For the capture and subsequent placement of the Yavapai at Fort

Verde, see John G. Bourke, *On the Border With Crook* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 190ff.; and Franklin Barnett, *Viola Jimulla: The Indian Chieftess* (Yuma: Southwest Printers, 1968), 3.

19. Doka, "Yavapais," 1.

20. Khera, *Fort McDowell*, 6, 30. William T. Corbusier, *Verde to San Carlos: Recollections of a Famous Army Surgeon and His Observant Family On the Western Frontier* (Tucson: Dale Stuart King Publisher, 1968), 134ff.; and William T. Corbusier, "Record of William Henry Corbusier, Colonel, U.S. Army Retired, 1924," Archives of the Bureau of American Ethnology Smithsonian Institution, No. 4507, 16ff. claim that Yavapai success in irrigated agriculture was due to white instruction. But their success could also be used to strengthen a theory claiming that the Yavapai were originally divided into five sub-tribes. The fifth sub-tribe (Mátgwarapáya) allegedly lived south of Phoenix and, in contrast to the other sub-tribes, primarily based their economy on irrigated agriculture. Over time the members of this sub-tribe were absorbed into the others (Vaughn, interview).

21. Doka, "Yavapais," 1; Florence Dickinson, "NA-GO-NI (The "Saying"): From the Yavapai-Apache Community," *The Journal* (Camp Verde, Arizona), 22 February 1989, B4. "The 'ring' of Federal officials, contractors and others, succeeded in securing the issue of peremptory orders that the Apache [Yavapai] should leave at once for the mouth of the sickly San Carlos, there to be herded with the other tribes" (Farish, *History of Arizona*, 12f.).

22. Doka, "Yavapais," 1.

23. *Weekly Arizona Miner*, 5 March 1875, 2:1. In the same newspaper article the white settlers also express their desire for permanent removal of the Indians: "there was never much good in them and the farther away they are taken the better it will be, provided they stay away and never come prowling back again." For the Yavapai March of Tears, see Corbusier, "William Corbusier," 25f.; and Bill Roberts, "Death March in Arizona Territory," *The Traveler* (Wickenburg, Arizona), June 1996, 1, 5-8, 10. The Camp Verde Reservation was opened to white settlement on 23 April 1875 (see "U.S. Surveyor General to Register of the Prescott Land Office," letter reprinted in the *Weekly Arizona Miner*, 4 June 1875).

24. Vaughn, interview.

25. Vaughn, interview; and Ruland-Thorne, *People of the Red Rocks*, 49.

26. Mable Dogwa and David Sine, interview by Kate Thorne, transcript, Prescott, Arizona, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives, n.d., 2.

27. Dickinson, "NA-GO-NI," B4. Availability of eligible partners within the tribe was limited, as cross-cousin marriages were prohibited (see Doka, "Yavapais," 6). The prohibition of cross-cousin marriages is also attributed by Ted Vaughn to the migration of "Pai people" to the Baja peninsula: "Centuries ago there were two cousins that fell in love with each other and wanted to get married . . . the unwritten law was that it was forbidden that cousins could get married . . . they were exiled or exiled themselves . . . families went with them . . . gathered some people . . . went to Baja finally" (Vaughn, interview).

28. Mabel Doka, as quoted in Dickinson, "NA-GO-NI," B4.

29. For the forced recruitment of Yavapai scouts, see Dogwa and Sine, interview, 3, 6. For shifts in the Yavapai language and English as a *lingua franca*, see Martha B.

Kendall, *Selected Problems in Yavapai Syntax: The Verde Valley Dialect* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), xii, xiii.

30. Doka, "Yavapais," 1; Khera, *Fort McDowell*, 8; and Ruland-Thorne, *People of the Red Rocks*, 50.

31. Mariella, "Yavapai," 44; Khera, *Fort McDowell*, 9; James E. Cook, "Yavapais Still Skeptical," (Phoenix) *Arizona Republic*, 3 August 1975, 1B.

32. In 1903 land was reserved for the Southeastern Yavapai at Fort McDowell near Phoenix. The Northeastern Yavapai were moved to two reservations at Camp Verde and Middle Verde in 1913, and in 1935 the Yavapai Prescott Indian Reservation was established near Prescott, Arizona. For the experience of the Fort McDowell Yavapai, see Patricia S. Mariella, "The Political Economy of Federal Resettlement Policies Affecting Native American Communities: The Fort McDowell Case" (Ph.D. diss., Arizona State University, 1983). For the Verde Valley Yavapai, see Albert H. Schroeder, "A Brief History of the Yavapai of the Middle Verde Valley," *Plateau* 24(1952): 111–118.

33. Donald R. Keller and Pat H. Stein, *Archeological Study At Three Twentieth Century Yavapai Wickiup Sites, Prescott, Arizona* (Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona, 1985), 44; Rice, Jr., interview.

34. For the location of the early Yavapé camps around Prescott and their advantages and disadvantages, see Richard V. N. Ahlstrom, "A Class III Archeological Survey on the Yavapai-Prescott Reservation, Near Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona," SWCA Archeological Report No. 92-21, November 1992, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives, 9; Keller, *Wickiup*, 49; Claudette Simpson, "Lucy Miller From the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe Is a Remarkable Chieftess," *Westward Prescott Courier*, 16 July 1976, 3–6; and Don Mitchell, interview by Donald R. Keller and Pat H. Stein, Yavapai Prescott Reservation, Arizona, 29 November 1984, summary in Donald R. Keller and Pat H. Stein, *Archeological Study At Three Twentieth Century Yavapai Wickiup Sites, Prescott, Arizona* (Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona, 1985), 9–11.

35. For Yavapé employment opportunities in Prescott, see Roscoe G. Willson, "Last of the Yavapais," *Arizona Days*, 13 August 1972, 48f.; Mitchell, interview, 12; Barnett, *Chieftess*, 6, 34; Vaughn, interview; Dogwa and Sine, interview, 5; and Bonnie Walker, "'A Community Remembers,' Viola Jimulla: Tribal Chieftess and Server of the Public," *The Prescott Courier*, 2 December 1986, 1C–2C.

36. Florence Engle, interview by Mona McCrosky, tape recording, Sharlott Hall Museum, Prescott, Arizona, 15 July 1991, tape 845–846; Mariella, "Yavapai," 44; Vaughn, interview. For further information regarding Yavapai basket weaving, see Bert Robinson, *Basket Weavers of Arizona* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1954).

37. Simpson, "Lucy Miller," 3–6; Engle, interview; Doka, "Yavapais," 7. For the possibility that these trips served other puposes, see Vaughn, interview; and Mitchell, interview, 10.

38. Simpson, "Lucy Miller," 4; Engle, interview; Claudette Simpson, "As Chieftess of the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe, She Makes Live For Her People: Grace Mitchell," *Westward Prescott Courier*, 1 November 1974, 16–19; Dogwa and Sine, interview, 10; and Mitchell, interview, 10.

39. This is illustrated by the fact that only one *Prescott Courier* newspaper article contained such information over a period of ten years (1901–1911). This was a period

during which the eyes of racist whites scrutinized the activities of the Yavapé and other minorities (see *Prescott Weekly Courier*, 29 September 1906, 2:1). The Yavapé also helped to track down other Native Americans who came in conflict with “American law” in order to ease white-Native tensions (see *Arizona Journal Miner*, 26 July 1905, 5:1). Several newspaper articles in the *Arizona Miner* and *Prescott Courier* from 1903 to 1930 document the relocation fear of the Yavapé and also serve as examples that the Prescott society threatened them with relocation.

40. Barnett, *Chieftess*, 4; Walker, “Viola Jimulla,” 1C.

41. Vaughn, interview. Another source for Viola Jimulla’s exponent position could be traced to her father, known as “Old Jim,” who commanded respect within the sub-tribe and among the white community (see *Prescott Weekly Miner*, 11 February 1921).

42. Vaughn, interview. Even though there is no hard evidence, it is probable that Viola Jimulla’s decision to join the Salvation Army was also motivated by economic desperation in a situation of insufficient food and housing.

43. Walker, “Viola Jimulla,” 1C; Barnett, *Chieftess*, 29; “Indians Helped Form Church,” *Prescott Courier*, 8 March 1974, 1B.

44. For Delche, see Waterstrat, *Commanders*, 61–68 and Corbusier, *Verde to San Carlos*, 56–85. There is no absolute proof that Sam Jimulla was Delche’s son. For Sam Jimulla as Delche’s son, see Vaughn, interview. For Sam Jimulla’s upbringing, see *Arizona Weekly Miner*, 11 February 1921. Ted Vaughn remembers frequent visits to white friends north of Prescott when he was a child (Vaughn, interview).

45. Mitchell, interview, 10; Keller, *Wickiup*, 49; Simpson, “Lucy Miller,” 3.

46. Wilson, “The Last Yavapai,” 2; Claude C. Cornwall, Supervisor, BIA Field Service, Phoenix, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC, 10 January 1934, “Phoenix Indian School” file 41140, RG 75, National Archives; and Barnett, *Chieftess*, 12ff. Viola Jimulla’s and Grace Sparks’ relationship can also be viewed as that of “client and patron.” Sparks collected Native American crafts including Yavapai baskets made by Viola Jimulla and they were both prominent members of the Presbyterian Church.

47. The newly erected stone houses did not have any interior walls, floors, plumbing, installations, or electricity. They were hardly superior to the traditional Yavapé dwellings (Cornwall to Commissioner of Indian Affairs). For an impression, see “Indian Photograph Collection,” Sharlott Hall Museum, Prescott, Arizona, IN-Y-2114P, 1–15. It appears that the Yavapé were offered a lease to sign for the land they lived on, based on a lease rate of \$1 a year (Jos. M. Dixon, first assistant secretary [?], to Gen. Frank T. Hines, administrator of veterans’ affairs, Washington, DC, 1 December 1931, “Phoenix Indian School” file 41140, RG 75, National Archives).

48. Barnett, *Chieftess*, 14; Cornwall to Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and “Indian Photograph Collection,” IN-Y-2114P, 9. Both buildings are still in use today. The former house of Sam and Viola Jimulla is sporadically used by their grandchildren (Vaughn, interview). The community house is now the home of the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archeology Laboratory and Archives located at 530 E. Meritt Street, Prescott, Arizona. Access to the reservation is restricted for non-tribal members.

49. *Prescott Journal Miner*, 25 August 1933, 3:7. For the construction of the Smoki Museum under the Works Progress Administration, see Melissa Ruffner, *Prescott: A Pictorial History* (Virginia Beach: Donning Publishers, 1985), 148f. The construction of

the “Smoki Museum” was finished in 1932. For the construction of their project, Project No. B-3-78 Camp Yavapai, the Yavapé received only \$482, whereas the construction of the Smoki Museum, Project No. B-3-78 Smoki Museum, was sponsored with a total of \$11,742.02 (“Yavapai County Board of Public Welfare. Statement of Amounts expended in cash on the various projects under ERA program,” *Annual Report*, Offices of Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce and Immigration, Prescott, Arizona, Sharlott Hall Museum Archives, “Grace Sparks Collection,” Document Box 40); Phil Deloria, conversation with author, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1 March 1997. A detailed description and interpretation of “white people playing Indian” is now available in Phil Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998). The “Prescott Smoki people” are prohibited from publicly enacting Native American rituals by a court order since 1988 (Rice, Jr., interview).

50. Carl H. Skinner, superintendent of Phoenix Indian School, Phoenix, to commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC, 18 December 1932, “Phoenix Indian School” file 41140, RG 75, National Archives. Superintendent Skinner points out to John Collier that the forty acre parcel in question is “land [that is] positively of no value to anyone else.” In 1934 the proposed size of the future reservation was increased to seventy-five acres (John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC, to Gail D. Allee, US Veterans Hospital, Whipple, Arizona, 14 April 1934, “Phoenix Indian School” file 41140, RG 75, National Archives).

51. Mariella, “Yavapai,” 44; Barnett, *Chieftess*, 14.

52. For a comprehensive description of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), refer to Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*, Abridged Edition (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 321–325; and John R. Wunder, “Retained by The People:” *A History of American Indians and the Bill of Rights* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 66–71. For the rejection of the IRA by the Yavapé, see Thomas Weaver, *Indians in Arizona: A Contemporary Perspective* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974), 46, 98; and United States Government Memorandum(?) to superintendent, Truxton Canyon Agency, Phoenix, 16 April 1982, copy of original, Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe Archives. For various responses by Southwestern Native groups to the IRA, see Richard O. Clemmer, “Hopis, Western Shoshones, and Southern Utes: Three Different Responses to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 10:2 (1986): 15–40.

53. John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC, to Hon. John R. Murdock, House of Representatives, Washington, DC, 18 February 1938, “Phoenix Indian School” file 41140, RG 75, National Archives. Rice, Jr., interview.