

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Seed-Eaters and Chert-Carriers: The Economic Basis for Continuity in Historic Western Shoshone Identities

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4p2708zf>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 13(1)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Clemmer, Richard O.

Publication Date

1991-07-01

Peer reviewed

Seed-Eaters and Chert-Carriers: The Economic Basis for Continuity in Historic Western Shoshone Identities

RICHARD O. CLEMMER, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Denver, University Park, Denver, CO 80208.

BY "historic Western Shoshone identities," I refer to those I found in a short but intensive and productive six-week field season in summer of 1989. I call these identities historic, rather than contemporary, because they do not seem to be products of contemporary political conditions. Rather, they seem to either have arisen or persisted during the historic period, ca. 1880 to the present. Some might call this the "reservation period," but since less than 40% of the Western Shoshone population was living on reservations until well into the 1970s, that designation is somewhat inappropriate.

These identities were aboriginal, but that is not the point I wish to stress. Steward (1938:248) flatly denied these identities had any significance. My purpose, then, is to ascertain why they persisted during a period in which they would be expected to disappear, or why they became more important when, if Steward was right, they had not been so aboriginally.

First of all, what were they? They are too numerous to list here, but among them are Goshute, or *Kusiutta*, named for the frequent dry dust storms in their territory and for their proximity to the Utes; *Tosawihi*, 'white knife carriers,' (White Knife Shoshone), named for their use of white flint-like rock from the Tosawihi quarry area and for their frequent habitation of that area; *TiPattikka*, 'eaters of pine-nuts,' so called for their heavy dependence on that food item as an important resource; *Akaitikka*, 'eaters of northern salmon'; *Niwitikka*, 'people-eaters,' so named, not because they ate people, but because they lived

in an area around Jarbidge and Goose Creek where there had lived, according to legend, a race of giants that ate people and whose ghosts¹ might still be encountered by the lone traveler; *Watatikka*, 'seed-eaters'; *Tokoitikka*, 'snake-eaters.'²

Steward (1938) made it quite clear that throughout the Great Basin, groups of people living in specific areas were called by specific names, or identities, associated with the areas in which they lived. These identities reflected food sources, items of technology, or characteristics of specific areas. For example, Steward (1938:71) noted that Railroad Valley Shoshone called Southern Paiute "*Tavinai*," (*Tapenii*, 'sun-plural' or eastern-dwellers). Some of these names were applied to more than one group—for example, *Tipattikka*, 'pine-nut eaters.' This name was applied to Shoshones in the Reese River-Austin area, but it also was applied by Owens Valley Shoshone to the Tubatulabal, and by people living north of the Austin area to the Grouse Creek Shoshone in northern Utah. Some, or perhaps most, of the groups also applied the names to themselves, although it is not clear from Steward's ethnography whether the custom was universal aboriginally (cf. Thomas et al. 1986:279-283).

Although Steward was able to elicit much information on these identities and their parameters in the 1930s, there are any number of reasons for predicting their disappearance by that time. First of all, these identities, according to Steward, did not denote bands and had no formal institutions associated with them.

Their bases were entirely geographic. In a sense, you were what you ate and where you lived. Steward's insistence on the nonexistence of bands and fixed territories among the Western Shoshone has led to some lively debates (see Steward 1970; D. Fowler 1966; and C. Fowler 1982 for summaries). Nevertheless, little additional information on the nature of these food-named and area-named groups has been forthcoming, aside from C. Fowler's (1982) work with the Northern Paiute, to be discussed below. Thus, Steward's assertion that the identities were meaningless in terms of population units or political relationships remains problematical but certainly is not to be dismissed. There is every reason to believe that with a shared culture and language, and a kinship system that allowed for maximum flexibility, these identities would be unstable, amorphous, and ephemeral from the very start.

Second, a hundred years of social, economic, and political change would have made food- and area-named identities superfluous. Steward (1955:57-58) gave this assessment of Western Shoshone culture change.

The Western Shoshoni were spared the more crucial difficulties experienced by Indians who had a fairly tightly-woven fabric of community culture. When miners and ranchers entered their country a century ago, individual families readily attached themselves to white communities. When their native hunting and gathering resources were depleted, they worked for wages sufficient to maintain their very low standard of living. . . . Most Western Shoshoni . . . were only loosely tied to any definable locality or cohesive social group, for there were no community bonds beyond kinship and friendship. Persons commonly wandered from place to place. . . . Western Shoshoni acculturation has come about . . . through face-to-face association with whites. . . . The individual families were quite free to adjust to changed circumstances.

Third, it seems likely that persons who had reservation experiences would quickly become integrated into reservation political and eco-

nomie institutions that would subsume any pre-existing identification with off-reservation areas. Within a generation or two at the most, *Tosawih*, who constituted the bulk of Shoshones at Duck Valley, would surely have become "Sho-Pais"; *Watatikka* (*Wata* = *Artemisia biennis* seeds and other unidentified food seeds [Steward 1938:21, 309]) in Ruby Valley and along the South Fork of the Humboldt would come to identify as "Temoke Shoshones," and so forth. An analogy with another Basin group, the Southern Ute, strengthens this prediction: the Southern Utes did have bands with strong band leadership (Clemmer 1989). The chiefs of the three southern bands, the Weeminuche, Capote, and Tabequache, along with their families, all settled at Ignacio. But by the 1960s, band identification had become virtually nonexistent as a meaningful factor in influencing the leadership or power structure of the tribe (Johnson 1963:120). In the early 1980s, I encountered only one man, a little over a hundred years old, who identified himself with one of the bands (Capote). We would expect, then, that the dichotomy between reservation-based Western Shoshones and non-reservation-based people would break apart any preexisting identities, and the conditioning of lifestyles by either reservation situations or off-reservation, wage-labor situations would complete the process.

THE CONSULTANTS

Imagine my surprise, then, when I found these identities alive and well in 1989, especially at Duck Valley, where the *Tosawih* identity was known and proclaimed. I interviewed 52 individuals: 22 females and 30 males. The 40-50 age cohort yielded the largest number of interviewees (10) but the 50-60, 60-70, and 70-80 age cohorts had nearly equal representation. The largest number of interviewees was at Owyhee (17), with Battle Mountain (10) and Lee (8) running close

seconds. The greater frequency of interviewees over 40 years of age reflects the fact that generally they knew more than those under 40 and referred me to others who tended to be in the same age cohort or older.³

For various reasons that I will detail here, the research design focused on *Tosawih* identity. Twelve interviewees identified themselves as *Tosawih*. They, in turn, identified another 10 interviewees as *Tosawih* who did not identify themselves as such. In all, however, more than half (55%) of those interviewees identifiable as *Tosawih* were self-identified as such. (Many more individuals whom I was not able to interview were identifiable as *Tosawih* on the basis of known kin ties.)

The most frequent additional identities for self-identified *Tosawih* were "Western Shoshone" and "Shoshone." Those *Tosawih* not identifying themselves as *Tosawih* most frequently identified themselves as "Indian" and second most frequently as "Western Shoshone" or, simply, as "Shoshone."

Besides "*Tosawih*," self-attributed ethnicities were "Temoak Shoshone," "American," and "Paiute," as well as what might be called other "old identities" such as "*Watatikka*," or "*Tipattikka*." One man identified himself as "a person from Long-Mountain-Lying-Down," a former village near Austin (Steward 1938:102), that Steward wrote as "*Gu:vadakuahunupi*." Of a possible 10 that might have had some claim to the label, only three identified themselves as *Watatikka*. However, six people identified themselves primarily as "Pine-nut-eaters" ("*Tipattikka*") or "Austin" or "*Tutuwa*" Shoshone.

Neither the "old" identities nor "Temoak," "Shoshone," "Western Shoshone," nor "Indian" was seen as superseding, overriding, submerging, or excluding any other identity. However, with one exception, all self-identified Western Shoshone, Shoshone, and

Tosawih individuals did see "Paiute" as submerging and denying every variety of Shoshone identity. In other words, you cannot be Paiute and also be Shoshone! No one claimed "Sho-Pai" or "Duck Valley Indian" as an identity. Two interviewees flatly denied the existence of the "Sho-Pai Tribe" as anything but a legal fiction.

Other identities perceived by *Tosawih* and consultants and applied to specific Shoshone individuals were "Bruneau Shoshone"; "*Akaitikka*" or "Fish Eaters"; "*Tokoitikka*" or "Snake Eaters"; "*Niwitikka*," "Weiser Valley Paiute," "Northern Paiute," "McDermitt Paiute," "Paddy Cap Paiute," "Other Paiute," "Goshute," "Those Shoshones in Utah" (near Portage; most likely *Akaitikka*, Grouse Creek, and Promontory Point Shoshones, cf. Madsen 1980:94-98; Clemmer and Stewart 1986:531), "Chinese," "Basco" (Basque), and "Bannock." One consultant said the Bannock also were called "Andavich," or "enemy."

I found individuals self-identifying themselves in all categories except "Bruneau Shoshone," "Northern Paiute," "McDermitt Paiute," or "Other Paiute," and I did not interview any individuals identified by others as "Chinese" or "Bannock." The four individuals identified by others as various kinds of Paiute also identified themselves as Paiute, but without an area-specificity, aside from one individual who identified himself as "Weiser Valley" Paiute. One of the individuals identified by some one else as "*Tosawih*" actually identified herself as "full-pledge Paiute" because she had enrolled herself that way on Tribal rolls and had accepted the monetary distribution from the Northern Paiute land claim. One individual identified a young grandchild whose father is Basque as a "Basco" (with no negative approbation), but the child was too young to be interviewed about what he thought his identity was.

ANALYSIS

What accounts for the persistence of these identities? First, it is possible that these are simply nostalgic memories, persisting in the same fashion as ethnic identities linger among other Americans who say, "I'm Swedish" when what they really mean is that their great-great-grandmother came from Sweden. Arguments that these may be parallel situations are not cogent. For one thing, Americans' ethnicities are strongly reinforced by the fact that they correspond to modern nation-states. For another, few Americans who are, say, "Swedish," can name the village or specific region of Sweden from which their ancestors came. Western Shoshones can, and do.

A second possibility is that political leaders arose who tried, successfully or unsuccessfully, to organize Shoshones on the basis of these old identities. There is no evidence to support this possibility. In fact, just the opposite seems to have happened. At Duck Valley, a number of Shoshone leaders emerged who all seemed to have been White Knife, but Jack Harris (1940: 100) reported from his field work in 1937 that reservation factions and their leadership had "no roots in the aboriginal life."

A third possibility is one that stretches all the way back to Powell and Ingalls and resurrects the Steward-Stewart-Service debate over the aboriginality of the family-level of socio-cultural integration as opposed to the band level. Powell and Ingalls (1874), relying on key informant interviewing in 1873 and using the Battle Mountain Hotel as their headquarters, discovered—or thought they discovered—six distinct "tribes" of Western Shoshones in Nevada, under 28 different leaders, living in 33 different localities (Fowler and Fowler 1971:105-114). Presumably, each of these "localities" was a distinct community. None of the named "tribes" corresponds to any of the locality-based identities that Steward found in

the 1930s and which I found in 1989.

A few pages later in their report, Powell and Ingalls (1874) refer to the Western Shoshone as being divided into 31 "tribes." That number almost, but not quite, corresponds to the separately listed localities (33) and to the number of leaders (28). Service (1962:94-99) took Powell and Ingall's data at face value, and leaped to the conclusion that Western Shoshones had had bands. If there were any correspondence between Powell and Ingall's six "tribes," or between their 31 or 33 "tribes," or the populations represented by the 28 different leaders, and the identities found by Steward, and by me, I might say that the persistence of these identities was a residue of former band identities. But there is no correspondence. Therefore, I reject this possibility.

A more reasonable one is based on the work of Omer Stewart, with modifications. Stewart (1939, 1942:235-236, 1966) stopped short of insisting that Numic groups were all organized into full-scale bands with distinct chiefs, etc. (cf. Eggan 1980; Stewart 1980). But he did ascribe a localized territoriality to Northern Paiutes, Utes, Southern Paiutes, and Western Shoshones. Paradoxically, he relied on Julian Steward's work to support his conclusion. I say "paradoxically" because to the end Steward (1970) denied that there was any sense of territorial boundedness among Shoshones, except in a few instances, as among Shoshones near Austin and Shoshone in the Fish Lake Valley whose culture "differed only in minor details" from that of the nearby Owens Valley Paiute, whose pine-nut and seed-gathering plots were owned by families (Steward 1938:61-62, 73, 105-106). True territorial boundedness would have been a characteristic of a band-level organization that Steward vehemently denied to Shoshones, except briefly when the White Knife Shoshone, Goshutes, and a few others organized "predatory bands" in response to non-Indian intrusion (Steward 1938:248-249).

But on the basis of Willard Park's heretofore unpublished field notes, C. Fowler (1982) concluded that, among the Northern Paiute, camp groups consisting of up to 10 co-resident families occupied discrete "home-districts" and were given, or perhaps asserted, food-named designations. These groups played key roles in defining rights to resources. Although individuals moved freely between "home districts," they were expected to "check-in" with local residents before gathering food. Access to food was never denied, but birthplace and kinship would always tie an individual to his or her "home district." Thus, the "home district" provided a lasting regional identity to individuals raised there, and an individual would always be associated with his or her "home district." One of Fowler's consultants, who had served as an interpreter for both Julian Steward and Willard Park in the 1930s, put it this way: "It all depends on where you were raised. Later some people might have you as part of their group, and some will always think of you as an outsider" (C. Fowler 1982:125). Why, then, could Western Shoshones not have had a similar relationship to territories?

This kind of relationship could easily account for what Omer Stewart (1978:81-83) interpreted as "ancient intelligence and adaptability."

The ancient Toughness [sic], intelligence, and adaptability demonstrated by the Western Shoshone of Nevada by their living from time immemorial in an environment which in many areas was harsh and afforded little of practical value for a hunting and gathering people has persisted to the present and was documented by Dr. Julian H. Stewart [sic] . . . and Dr. Percy Train, et al., in the 1930's. . . . Dr. Stewart visited eighteen of these communities and recorded ethnographic information about each locality from elderly Western Shoshone who had spent their lives in those areas. . . . He made the point that the various localities scattered over the entire extent of Western Shoshone country had been continuously occupied by the same people since time immemorial. . . .

The second source from the 1930's is the ethnobotanical study by Dr. Percy Train of the University of Nevada, Department of Botany. . . . This research required the finding of old Indians . . . to guide the botanists to the growing medicinal plants. . . . Only a person familiar with a particular area could be helpful.

Perhaps, then, identities persisted because people continued living in exactly the same places that they had lived 50, 100, or even 200 years previously. But even if this were true 50 years ago, it is not nearly as true today. Even in the 1930s, most of the *Tosawih* were living at Duck Valley. So, although continued residence in a natal habitat may be part of the answer, we must look for something beyond residence, or something that might supplement residence, that explains persistence of locality-based identities clear into nearly the 21st century.

One possibility is that the annual *Gwini* (Harris 1940:53-54) festivals, held in conjunction with pine-nut and other harvests, brought people back to their natal localities and thus reinforced locality-based identities. While this process undoubtedly did take place, there is more evidence to indicate that, in post-contact times, these festivals became mechanisms for integrating people from disparate localities, rather than reinforcing provincialism. A July 4th pow-wow pretty much replaced the *Gwini* at Duck Valley, and as early as 1915, Sun Dances were being held in various communities. They continued to be held intermittently through the 1920s, 30s, and 40s in Elko, Deeth, Wells, Ely, and Battle Mountain and attracted Shoshones from many different communities, including those as far away as Fort Hall. In other places, the *Gwini* festival evolved into a "fandango" that included a rodeo as well as the traditional round dances and "talking" (Clemmer 1990a). Regarding the festival held around Austin, Steward (1938:106) said:

The aboriginal area participating in festivals is open to question. In post-Caucasian times

Austin became the site of large festivals which drew people from not only throughout Reese River Valley north to Battle Mountain, and from Ione, Smith Creek, and Edwards Creek valleys, but even Paiute from Walker River and Walker Lake, 100 miles away.

On the basis of what we now know about the increasing discussions of Treaty rights, cultural heritage, and pan-Shoshone political strategies that were going on in the 1920s and 1930s (cf. Crum 1987), I think the fandangos were contexts in which these discussions were multiplied and magnified manyfold. Although Steward (1939) disagreed, Jack Harris (1938, 1940:53-54) regarded the six-day *Gwini* festival as an important integrative mechanism, having multiple functions. In addition to re-enforcing certain cultural and religious beliefs, the festivals also were opportunities for shamans and curers to practice their powers, for information about subsistence resources to be exchanged, for kin ties to be renewed; for marriages and liaisons to be contracted, and for identities to be reinforced. The importance of place of birth, then, would have been automatically reinforced in these get-togethers. I do not think, however, that reinforcement of bounded, territorially-defined identities occurred to the exclusion of the development of a more transcendental Western Shoshone identity. In fact, I think there are good reasons for seeing the *Gwini*, the pine-nut festivals, and later the fandangos as vehicles for uniting these various disparate groups and for transcending the boundaries that might have existed.

TOWARD EXPLANATION

I submit that three factors have kept these old identities alive: kinship, shared culture, and economy. First, to kinship: Shoshone kinship is not lineal and therefore it would seem unlikely that identities could be maintained through inheritance. The kinship system is a generational one in which self-reciprocating kin terms

not only link alternating generations (i.e., grandparent-grandchild) but also virtually lump, in terms of categories, self-reciprocating, alternating generational kin together. Self-reciprocating terms for "cousin" (*dui*, *detch*, etc.) reinforce the collateral coordinates of the generational system.

I think this system might have worked to maintain identities over generations in the following way. I will use a *Tosawihi* - *Watatikka* marriage, say, around 1870, to illustrate what I mean, that is, a marriage of someone whose natal homeland was somewhere north of the Humboldt and west of the Jarbidge area, with some one from the Lamoille Creek-Ruby Valley area. If Harris (1940:50-51) was correct that *Tosawihi* practiced some bride service and temporary matrilocality, then a *Watatikka* man, say in Ruby Valley, who married a *Tosawihi* woman, would have remained with his in-laws, a *Tosawihi* family, for a time. Assuming that the *Tosawihi* did spend a season in Ruby Valley (cf. Harris 1940:44) each year until being moved to the short-lived Carlin Farms Reserve and later to Duck Valley between 1879 and 1880, the relationship between a man and his parents and a woman and her in-laws could have been renewed annually. Even if the family decided to throw in their lot with the *Tosawihi* and move to Duck Valley, the inter-generational relationships would have been strengthened at the births of children. Grand-parent-grandchild relationships were traditionally especially close (Harris 1940:48) and remain so to this day. Reciprocal grandchild-grandparent relationships would have not only maintained differentiation of mother's and father's kindred, but also would have marked the distinction between the *Tosawihi* and *Watatikka* descent lines, without there being actual, formal descent lines. Female and male children of a *Tosawihi* man would call their father's *Tosawihi* father *Kinu*; he would also call each of them *Kinu*. They would call their father's *Tosawihi* mother *hucci*,

and she would call each of them also by the same term. In contrast, they would call their mother's father *toko* and their mother's mother, *kaku*. Their *Watatikka* grandmother would call them *kaku* and their *Watatikka* grandfather would call them *toko*.

I suggest then that the kinship system, post-nuptial residence rules, and kin terminology played an important part in structuring the parameters of community configurations. This pattern may be widespread throughout the Great Basin, since Johnson (1963:120) reported that in the Reservation Period, there was evidence for the persistence of band identity among the Southern Utes in choice of marriage partners, if in no other aspect of life. I further suggest that it is through the kinship system that individuals could and did activate more than one identity, which was tied to the preferred place of residence of classificatory grandparents. Through kin terms, a person could activate the particular identity derived from an adaptation to a particular place.

But persons do not live by kin alone. Shared culture, such as the formation of hand game teams at festivals, undertaking cures or shamanistic healings at power spots or springs, and maintaining various enculturative practices would reinforce kin ties as well as ties to specific localities. For example, upon birth of a first child, a man should take a cold bath as well as a sweat under the direction of his father-in-law. At the same time, shared culture reinforced at festivals, which were becoming increasingly NON-localized, would have promoted pan-Western Shoshone identity. Pan-Western Shoshone identity, then, throughout the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th, became rooted in localized identities maintained through kin networks.

But persons also do not live by shared culture alone. Economics played a pivotal role. While individuals did move around, I suggest that what may have appeared to Julian Steward

as random or haphazard migrations may have been very patterned ones. I suggest that individuals and families "wandered" to areas where they had kin, and that due to marriage patterns, an individual might have two or three choices as to where to go. Making a beeline for an area where there would be kin, especially reciprocating kin of one of your identities, only makes sense. Western Shoshones' kin relations and the locality-based identities that went with them became more and more crucial to their survival, especially toward the turn-of-the-century when there was increasing economic competition from non-Indian immigrants, continual restriction of traditional subsistence opportunities, and growing racism on the part of whites.

What, then, were the kin doing "there," wherever "there" was? Let us again take the *Tosawih*—the White Knives—as an example. First of all, it is important to note that even though the White Knives moved nearly en masse to Duck Valley in 1879-1880, most left a few years later amidst rumors that the Reservation was going to be closed (McKinney 1983: 79-83), and because it was not an attractive place for permanent living at that time. Since it had always been seasonally, rather than permanently occupied, and there was no infrastructure such as irrigation facilities, wagon roads, etc., there was little economic opportunity. Where did these people go? Many of them went right back into the territory they knew best, just south and west of Duck Valley and north of Battle Mountain and Elko. What did they do? They did wage work for farms and ranches, continued to hunt and gather, learned how to can produce, worked on shares for part of the farm crop, and tried farming on their own.

Sometimes they even used farming and ranching facilities and techniques to accomplish traditional foraging goals. One woman told me in 1989 that when she was working for a ranch near Tuscarora, they used to get "squirrel" (*enka-cippah*—"red prairie dog"). "It's easy,"

she said, "when you're irrigating. You flood the field and the water makes them come up out of their holes. Then you just grab them and wring their necks." Her description was not unlike that for a traditional rabbit drive: in the pre-contact era, loosely-related individuals forming a camp would surge into a clearing to draw a net around the rabbits where they could be clubbed, under the direction of a rabbit boss who coordinated the net-tightening process. In the farming and ranching era, loosely-related kin would surge into a field to nab the prairie dogs under the direction of the "ditch boss," who opened the gate and caused the water level to rise. In both cases, members of related, extended families cooperated to forage for dinner.

Some Shoshones tried full-time farming. Consultants mentioned Indian settlements and homesteads for Rattlesnake Creek, Antelope Creek, Rock Creek, and Magic Creek—all tributaries of the Humboldt River. One of them is drawn as an "Indian Homestead" on a General Land Office land plat drawn in the 1890s. Four specific individuals were remembered and named as having had places there along with their families. Three had left by 1927, one moving to Battle Mountain and the other two to Duck Valley. One had already died by that time, with his family presumably leaving upon his demise, also for Duck Valley.

Definite beginning dates for these farming settlements could not be ascertained. However, establishment of cattle and sheep ranches and truck farms by non-Indians in a given area seems to have given rise to similar efforts by Indians. One consultant described what seemed to be a similar process in the Starr Valley-Deeth-Wells area, with Indians and non-Indians competing for arable land and water resources. Still other consultants recounted something similar for the Maggie Creek area and for an area close to the confluence of Antelope Creek and the Humboldt River, near present-day Battle Mountain. One woman in her eighties recalled

that her grandfather and other Indians had farms at the confluence of these streams.

When the Battle Mountain Colony was established in 1918, they were told that they had to leave their farms and move to the Colony because, they were told, that was "where they belonged." Non-Indians then took that land, she said. Familiarity with these areas must have initially made these adaptations successful. *Tosawihi* already knew the locations of springs and potentially good land. Hunting and gathering continued to play an important part in supplying food, supplementing wage labor and farming. Rabbits, prairie dogs, kangaroo rats, and ground hog (rock chuck) especially were sought. One consultant affirmed that his relatives in the parental and grand-parental generations used to come down from Duck Valley to Carlin in winter. There they worked for wages cutting ice from Maggie Creek for the ice plant and, incidentally, hunting rock chucks. Seasonal work such as bucking hay, irrigating, running horses and cattle, and cooking for ranch crews either from a chuck wagon or in the ranch kitchen provided some cash as well as "on-the-job-training" in some aspects of farming and ranching. Cash would have been useful in purchasing capital equipment and horses, and some Shoshones used it for just that purpose.

However, ecological, economic, and political conditions were against them. Irrigation over more than a few seasons can result in alkali deposits that kill most domesticated plants. Undependable growing seasons result in frosts either in June or September or both once every few years. Such frosts damage all but the hardiest grasses and potatoes. Cattle and sheep are easily subject to disease, death, and rustling. Indians were well-equipped with the knowledge and skills they needed to farm and ranch, but were not equipped with the access to capital necessary to rebound from setbacks. Legal interpretations of the times favored white

ranchers with deeds. Even though Shoshones continued to hold title by right of use and occupancy (Forbes 1965; Rusco 1989) neither Nevada nor U.S. land-tenure law gave them legal parity with better-capitalized non-Indian ranchers. One consultant told me flatly that white ranchers kept stealing water. When asked why the Indian ranches and farms had been abandoned, consultants responded that they could just "not make a go of it." One case of an Indian being forced out by gunpoint on Maggie Creek was recounted. The creation of the Battle Mountain Colony and non-Indians' assertion of fee-patent over Indians' aboriginal title is a similar situation.

CONCLUSIONS

While "ancient toughness" and psychological attachment to homeland were certainly factors in the continued occupation and use of certain areas by the Western Shoshone, persistence of locality-based identities into the present is neither an epiphenomenal kind of nostalgia nor a residue of putative band solidarity and affiliations. Rather, this persistence reflects a number of successful efforts to use land-based resources in the best possible way—whether to farm, to ranch, to hunt, to forage, to earn cash, or all of the above. Many spots were also used for curing, religious, and personal purposes, just as they had been in the past, by the descendants of people who had used the area in the past and like their ancestors knew it well.

Individuals maintained identities with localities by invoking kin ties that would ensure legitimacy in moving to those localities and using the resources there, whether those resources were intrusive whites with their wage labor or the natural flora, fauna, land, and water. C. Fowler (1982) suggested that locality- and food-named groups

. . . were highly salient to people throughout the Great Basin and . . . may have provided key ecological information as to the availability of alternative foods at a distance, thus affecting the

relation of population to resources over a large area [1982:113].

Additional data indicate that such moves were made in times of plenty as well as in times of stress. People like to visit; or, as Park put it, they seem to move sometimes 'just for the change.' Such ventures expand people's geographic horizons, bringing new information on subsistence areas and options. . . . What may begin as economic (or social) necessity or from curiosity may soon become solidified by a kinship bond. Very soon a network of relationships is created that grants new rights and sets up obligations of reciprocal sharing [1982:127].

I think this process is largely responsible for the persistence of locality-based identities, such as "*Tosawih*," and there is good evidence that the process has continued well into the post-contact era. How those kin- and locality-based identities have been welded into an emerging Western Shoshone Nation, and where various tribal segments fit into this picture, is part of another story, most of it belonging to the field of political science. But the cultural component of that movement cannot be explained if Julian Steward's assumption—or assertion—that economic integration and acculturation obliterated any sense of locality-based identification and made social structure inchoate—is taken at face value. I think it is seriously in error. Shimkin and Reid's (1970:189-190) interpretation of socio-economic data from the mid-1960s on Numic people of the lower Carson River Valley revealed a definite socio-political structure uniting seemingly disparate on- and off-reservation Indian populations where one is not immediately apparent. I think a similar structure has persisted among the *Tosawih* and other Shoshoneans of the Humboldt and Reese River drainages. If anything, economic change reinforced some "old identities" by providing supplements to traditional hunting and foraging pursuits in those localities with which they were associated. The maintenance of the kinship system and kin-relations has provided continuity for those identities which economics reinforced.

NOTES

1. *Co'appih* or ghost, in Shoshone belief, may appear at any time, complete with body, clothes, etc. Ghosts are almost always seen as "the old people," that is, as people from precontact times. I have never heard of a specific individual being seen as a *Co'appih*. Also, the *Co'appih* most often appear in groups. While potentially dangerous due to their power as spirits, living people who are shamans or regard themselves as having some power themselves may increase their power by approaching the *Co'appih*. This was part of the logic behind the "Ghost Dance" started by the Paiute, Wovoka, which was maintained as a religion by some Shoshone individuals as late as the 1970s (Vander 1990).

2. I have used transcriptions based on the orthography described by Thomas et al. (1986:262) wherever possible, or the spellings of Steward (1938) or Harris (1940) where they are more commonly accepted and known in the literature, such as for *Tosawih* and *Gwini*.

3. Research results summarized in this paper are extracted from a larger report deposited at the Nevada State Museum (Clemmer 1990b). The research results in this paper as well as in the larger report should not, and cannot, be interpreted independently of the conclusions to which they lead within the theoretical framework used to organize them, nor of the procedures that were followed in generating them. Because I used the "key informant" and "networking" approaches, the research results should not be interpreted in the same way as those that might have been obtained from either a random or a stratified sample often used in survey research. The results cannot be tested statistically for significance. In other words, the numbers and percentages of persons in any particular category neither indicate nor reflect anything statistically significant. They cannot be interpreted as either the total universe of persons in that category or as any sort of percentages of responses that might be obtained for that category if all 6,000 estimated Western Shoshones had been contacted. Likewise, it goes almost without saying that other inquiries by other investigators who use different techniques or who approach different people on different reservations or who ask different questions might derive different results and reach different conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Great Basin Anthropological Conference, Reno, Nevada, October 14, 1990. Research summarized in this paper was supported with a grant from the Tru-

man-Orr Foundation, through the Nevada State Museum. The assistance of Donald R. Tuohy, Curator of Anthropology, and of Amy Dansie, Assistant Curator of Anthropology, is gratefully acknowledged, as is that of the Elko District Office of the Bureau of Land Management, the Western Shoshone National Council, and the Western Shoshone Council of Elders. I also thank Wick Miller for assistance with Shoshone orthographic transcriptions.

REFERENCES

- Clemmer, Richard O.
1989 Differential Leadership Patterns in Early Twentieth-Century Great Basin Indian Societies. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 11:35-49.
- 1990a Fandango, Symbol, Oratory and Identity: The Changing Ideological Role of Myth Among The Western Shoshone. Paper presented at the Great Basin Anthropological Conference, Reno.
- 1990b From Ethnic to Ethnicity: Conditions Affecting Tosawih ("White Knife") Shoshone Culture and Identity in the Reservation Era. Report on file at the Department of Anthropology, Nevada State Museum, Carson City.
- Clemmer, Richard O., and Omer C. Stewart
1986 Treaties, Reservations, and Claims. In: *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 11, Great Basin, Warren d'Azevedo, ed., pp. 525-557. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Crum, Stephen J.
1987 The Western Shoshone People and Their Attachment to the Land: A Twentieth Century Perspective. In: *Ethnicity and Race in Nevada*, Elmer R. Rusco and Sue Fawn Chung, eds., pp. 15-18. Nevada Public Affairs Review No. 2.
- Eggan, Fred
1980 Shoshone Kinship Structures and Their Significance for Anthropological Theory. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 11:165-193.
- Forbes, Jack D.
1965 The "Public Domain" of Nevada and Its Relationship to Indian Property Rights. *Nevada State Bar Journal* 30:16-47.
- Fowler, Catherine S.
1982 Food-Named Groups Among Northern Paiute in North America's Great Basin: An Ecological Interpretation. In: *Re-*

- source Managers: North American and Australian Hunter-Gatherers, Nancy M. Williams and Eugene S. Hunn, eds., pp. 113-129. American Association for the Advancement of Science Selected Symposium No. 67. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Fowler, Don D.
 1966 Great Basin Social Organization. In: The Current Status of Anthropological Research in The Great Basin: 1964, Warren d'Azevedo, Wilbur A. Davis, Don D. Fowler, and Wayne Suttles, eds., pp. 57-73. Reno: University of Nevada, Desert Research Institute Publications in the Social Sciences and Humanities No. 1.
- Fowler, Don D., and Catherine S. Fowler
 1971 Anthropology of the Numa: John Wesley Powell's Manuscripts on the Numic Peoples of Western North America, 1868-1880. Smithsonian Institution Contributions to Anthropology No. 14.
- Harris, Jack
 1938 The Western Shoshone. *American Anthropologist* 40:407-411.
 1940 The White Knife Shoshoni of Nevada. In: Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes, Ralph Linton, ed., pp. 39-116. New York: D. Appleton-Century.
- Johnson, Clark
 1963 A Study of Modern Southwestern Indian Leadership. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Madsen, Brigham
 1980 The Northern Shoshoni. Caldwell, ID: Caxton.
- McKinney, Whitney
 1938 A History of the Shoshone-Paiutes of the Duck Valley Reservation. Salt Lake City: The Institute of the American West and Howe Brothers.
- Powell, John Wesley, and G. W. Ingalls
 1874 Report on the Conditions of the Western Shoshones of Nevada. In: Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1873, pp. 41-46. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Rusco, Elmer R.
 1989 Early Nevada and Indian Law. *Western Legal History* 2:163-190.
- Service, Elman R.
 1962 Primitive Social Organization: An Evolutionary Perspective. New York: Random House.
- Shimkin, Demetri B., and Russell M. Reid
 1970 Socio-Cultural Persistence among Shoshoneans of the Carson River Basin (Nevada.) In: Languages and Cultures of Western North America: Essays in Honor of Sven S. Liljeblad, Earl H. Swanson, ed., pp. 172-200. Pocatello: Idaho State University.
- Steward, Julian H.
 1938 Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 120.
 1939 Some Observations on Shoshonean Distributions. *American Anthropologist* 41:261-265.
 1955 Theory of Culture Change. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
 1970 The Foundations of Basin-Plateau Shoshonean Society. In: Languages and Cultures of Western North America: Essays in Honor of Sven S. Liljeblad, Earl H. Swanson, ed., pp. 113-151. Pocatello: Idaho State University Press.
- Stewart, Omer C.
 1939 The Northern Paiute Bands. *University of California Anthropological Records* 2(3).
 1942 Culture Element Distributions XVIII: Ute-Southern Paiute. *University of California Anthropological Records* 6(4).
 1966 Tribal Distributions and Boundaries in the Great Basin. In: The Current Status of Anthropological Research in the Great Basin, Warren d'Azevedo, Wilbur A. Davis, Don D. Fowler, and Wayne Suttles, eds., pp. 167-238. Reno: University of Nevada, Desert Research Institute Publications in the Social Sciences and Humanities Publications No. 1.
 1978 The Western Shoshone of Nevada and the U.S. Government, 1863-1950. In: Selected Papers from the 14th Great Basin Anthropological Conference, Donald R. Tuohy, ed., pp. 77-114. Ballena Press Publications in Archaeology, Ethnology and History No. 11.

- 1980 Temoke Band of Shoshone and the Oasis Concept. Nevada Historical Society Quarterly 23:246-261.
- Thomas, D., L. S. A. Pendleton, and S. Cappannari
1986 Western Shoshone. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11, Great Basin, Warren d'Azevedo, ed., pp. 262-283. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Vander, Judith
1990 Nature in Numic Myth and the Shoshoni Ghost Dance. Paper presented at the Great Basin Anthropological Conference, Reno.

