

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

A River Apart: The Pottery of Cochiti and Santo Domingo Pueblos.
Edited by Valerie K. Verzuh.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3kx5h764>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Naranjo, Tessie

Publication Date

2011-06-01

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/>

inclusion in that system. From that time on, Britain ignored the fate of its indigenous former allies as part of the domestic affairs of the United States.

The book ends as it began, with the Cherokees. Confronted with encroachment of the Georgia state government during the 1820s, that nation sued to force the United States to honor its treaty commitments. The case went to the Supreme Court as *Worcester versus Georgia*. Chief Justice John Marshall, a Washington appointee, agreed that the Cherokees had some standing before the law, but not as members of the Westphalian system. Nor were they part of the Philadelphian federal system; the state of Georgia ignored the moderate rights enunciated in Marshall's decision and quickly overran Cherokee lands.

Revolutionary Negotiations is a superior study of the political philosophy behind the US government's treatment of American Indian communities. Nevertheless, it defies easy categorization within the historiography of Native America. It is not a straightforward narrative, and although it contains a good deal of derivative material, it is more than a mere synthesis of others' work. Defining its readership is also a bit problematic. On one hand, it makes several important contributions to the field that most audiences can appreciate. Perhaps the most important one is the manner in which Sadosky demonstrates the poverty of Marshall's decision. Despite the ruling's importance as a legal precedence, it severely limited Native communities' political autonomy by denying their ability to treat with the United States as equals. On the other hand, it contains several complex arguments. Despite the fact that Sadosky deploys them in a clear and concise manner, some of his concepts might prove daunting to newcomers to the field, especially because he does not provide much background material on American Indians. Nonetheless, his synthesis of primary and secondary sources and fresh approach to the formation of American federalism makes *Revolutionary Negotiations* a valuable text for advanced students of both Native American history and law and the history of the Early Republic.

George Edward Milne
Oakland University

A River Apart: The Pottery of Cochiti and Santo Domingo Pueblos. Edited by Valerie K. Verzuh. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2008. 192 pages. \$45.00 cloth.

More than a coffee-table book, this is a beautifully illustrated aesthetic and theoretical ethnohistorical study of Cochiti and Santo Domingo (Kewa) Pueblos' pottery holdings in the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture (MIAC)

in Santa Fe, New Mexico, portions of which were skillfully exhibited at MIAC from October 19, 2008, through January 2, 2011 (with accompanying educational guide and exercises).

Following a foreword by anthropologist Shelby Tisdale (director of MIAC and the laboratory of anthropology) and an introduction by editor Valerie Verzuh, the remaining portion of the book is divided into four main sections: "Artistic Community," "Perspectives," "Collections" (which includes "Collecting, Preserving, and Giving Back: A Catalog of the Collections" by Verzuh and a four-part photo "Catalog of the Collections"), and "Appendices" (including "Pueblo Pottery Basics: Materials, Tools, and Technology" and "Time Line of Events in the Southwest").

The title reflects observations by Verzuh that "the river [Rio Grande] that marks the physical division between Cochiti and Santo Domingo also can be seen as a metaphorical demarcation between the dissimilar responses of the two pueblos [*sic*] to outside influences, between insiders and outsiders, and between the varying perspectives explored by the six essays in this volume" (xii–xiii). I am an enrolled and active member of a Northern Rio Grande Pueblo (Santa Clara), but because of the social and political connections between all of the Pueblos, I am aware that the practices and beliefs of the Southern Pueblos—in this case Cochiti and Kewa (formerly Santa Domingo)—are more conservative and strongly influenced by their traditional beliefs than many others. Thus I am able to agree with Verzuh's observation. The comparative study of the two potteries is meant to point out the dissimilarities between Cochiti and Kewa histories in response to non-Keres influences. For example, at a given point in time, "Cochiti's potters incorporated the outsiders' tastes, creating small items for tourists as well as figurative pottery mimicking the non-Cochiti world, while Santo Domingo Pueblo kept the outside world at arms length" (37). Kewa potters focused on making pottery for use, thus keeping their labors domestic. These and other historical examples of differences between the Cochiti and Kewa are interesting. At the time of this review, Kewa is becoming one of the more progressive Pueblos in response to an unusual federally funded financial (\$1 million) opportunity to rebuild their trading post (originally built in 1881, replaced in 1922, closed in 1995, and destroyed by fire in 2001) and open up numerous tourism opportunities in response to the new Rail Runner station established (2009) at the edge or heart of the Kewa lands. "Those train tracks are, in fact, a key part of the plan. The pueblo is banking in large part on train service to bring visitors. 'We're using a modern twist on an old idea,' Tafoya said [tribal program administrator]" (Kate Nash, *From Ruins to Revitalization, Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 31, 2010, 1). The stimulus is the railroad as it was during the middle to late 1800s when Americans began coming to the pueblos by way of wagons and trains following the acquisition

of the territory by the United States at the end of the Mexican-American War. Readers will find excellent historical details and chronologies of change in the papers by J. J. Brody (“The Anomalous Painted Pottery of Santo Domingo and Cochiti Pueblos: A Brief History”) and Bruce Bernstein (“Looking into the Bowl: Part I, Artists and Outsiders”). Readers will also find observations made by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh concerning the signatures on Pueblo and European pottery of interest in his article “Artist Unknown: The Significance of Signatures on Pueblo Pottery.” The chronology of authentication associated with names inscribed on Pueblo potteries shows that by the 1930s many Pueblo potters were still resisting personal signage because, as members of San Ildefonso noted (in 1927), “our own people knew who made the pots” (19). An astute observation by one Zuni potter in 1929 explains another reason for not signing a pot: “I am the only person who makes a checkerboard design around the rim, so I can always tell my bowl by looking at the edge. I don’t have to use any mark on my bowl, because I recognize my design.’ Signatures, it might be said, can be inscribed without signing a name” (20).

Another, very classical, Pueblo theoretical observation is made by Antonio Chavarria (Santa Clara Pueblo) in his essay “Making Pottery, Seeking Life”: “Pots are the same as people—both come from the earth, become part of families, then age and return to the earth. Some are repaired to last just a little longer, others live and work in a household until they are physically unable. This was the life cycle before museums and anthropologists” (13). But time passed and the shift in economies brought by the railroads and the Fred Harvey tourism company led to the development of a mercantile sense of entitlement to Pueblo people and their artistic expressions. Following this, trading posts, galleries, and markets facilitated a new way of economic certainty for indigenous arts-and-crafts people. The new entities not only served as conduits for arts and crafts, but also set the standards for what would be acceptable to outsiders. Thus were born the first Indian fairs, begun during the 1920s and later forming the basis for the present-day Indian Market, held annually by Southwestern American Indian Arts in Santa Fe. It is at this venue that we see the truth of Chavarria’s remark: “The dominant aesthetic remains that of the Western eye and the product, pottery, still is developed to fill that niche” (1). I agree. It is why my mother, sisters, cousins, brother, and all my relatives do the work, and by fulfilling the market desires, we keep cash flowing into the family and therefore the community. My mother (Rose Naranjo) was a well-known micaceous potter, whose works were prized by individuals who would come back to buy new works from her time and again, and now my nieces and nephews are among the family members who are sought out by outsiders. It is undeniably a successful economic endeavor—as long as the art market will continue to support us.

These remarks are designed to situate the historical study of the two Keres-speaking Pueblo potteries traditions. Research shows that between about 1800 and 1850 the potters of Cochiti and Kewa made indistinguishable utilitarian ware; then in about 1850, changes began to occur as Cochiti Pueblo potters became experimental in the design and structure of their potteries. Already by this point, pothunters from American museums and trading posts were in the area buying what the potters had to offer and suggesting innovations regarding design that might increase sales. "Between 1880 and 1925, Eastern museums mounted major collecting expeditions to the Southwestern Pueblos with the mission of creating systematic and encyclopedic ethnographic and archaeological material culture study collections," and "between 1900 and 1920, almost all Pueblo potters reformulated their wares for the marketplace" (ii, 43).

Mateo Romero (Cochiti), in his article "Pot Hunters/Pray for Rain" recounts his frustrations about the commodification of culture and about prolonged and unnecessary cultural secrecy, his own belief in the need for openness, and a breaking of silence about problems in Pueblo communities. "A common perception about and among contemporary Native people is that the historic, frozen-in-time, archaeological/ethnographic experience of their ancestors, grandparents, mothers, and fathers is more authentic, inherently real, and culturally relevant than their own current experience" (59). Romero did a series of paintings that he called "Pot Hunters" through which he showed a vast array of traumas imposed on Pueblo cultural properties, such as defilement of ruins and graves. In *A River Apart*, Romero asks, "How do we honor the spirit of our dead grandfathers and grandmothers between their sacred burial grounds and the blade of the bulldozer?" (55).

I learned a great deal about the history of Pueblo pottery from reading the articles that focused on the processes of change at Cochiti and Kewa, making this case study an excellent contribution to Pueblo Indian studies, indigenous studies, and the studies of Southwest art traditions. This book is interesting and informative with the essays using examples from among the 473 items in the collection (most of which are shown in the photographic catalog) to make their points. The only writing that I found tedious was the introductory chapter by Verzuh who imposed a Euro-American template on the contributors' writings: scholars who write from years of experience with Rio Grande Pueblo material cultural and sociocultural knowledge, ethnographies, and histories. It was unnecessary for her to use the jargon of postmodern anthropology (for example, *multivocality*, *postmodern theorists*, and *metanarratives*) to describe the writings of the contributors. Their writings stand on their own.

Tessie Naranjo
Santa Clara Pueblo