

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Anthropology and History: Can the Two Sister Disciplines Communicate?

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8tg067g7>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 18(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Lyon, William H.

**Publication Date**

1994-03-01

**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

## COMMENTARY

# Anthropology and History: Can the Two Sister Disciplines Communicate?

WILLIAM H. LYON

---

---

The writer of Native American history faces many vexing problems: the lack of aboriginal documentary or published sources; the reliance on subjective, oral Indian testimony; the need for internal tribal histories; and the investigation of non-Western aboriginal cultures, which is refractory to the methods and concepts of the modern social scientist.

Among the problems of writing Indian history is the lack of communication between historian and anthropologist. Although ethnohistory developed as a separate entity in the 1950s, history and anthropology have not successfully merged. As Reginald Horsman has pointed out, the two have divergent interests in the writing of Native American history.<sup>1</sup> These divergent interests involve different methodologies and emphases. Historians write about (recent) Anglo-Indian contacts and federal Indian policy; anthropologists write of precontact existence. Historians approach

---

William H. Lyon, a professor emeritus of history at Northern Arizona University, has taught and researched in the fields of the American West and Navajo history.

native biography from the printed sources, anthropologists from the oral testimony of informants. History does not use, or rarely uses, the primary method of research of anthropology—field-work. Historians view the aboriginal cultures from afar, the anthropologist from within the hogan. The historian writes narrative prose, free of jargon; the anthropologist writes highly technical, deductive analyses that sometimes are hard for his fellow anthropologists to understand.<sup>2</sup>

Historians, it has been said, look at their craft in a fundamentally different way from anthropologists. Historians use the diachronic approach and deal with phenomena as they occur or change over time, while anthropologists use the synchronic approach and view events during a limited period of time, ignoring historical antecedents. Historians concentrate on change over time and tend to forgo the functional analysis of a whole culture or aspects of a culture that do not change. Anthropologists, on the other hand, attempt to achieve a timeless, scientific explanation of the patterns of a whole culture, dividing it into its constituent parts, each of which might receive a chronological treatment in its separate place. When the sources run dry for the anthropologists, they may turn to theory to extrapolate from relative cultures of the same period that presumably share traits. Historians do not usually turn to theory but look “downstream” from the past to the present, leaving gaps where the written record is blank. They do not necessarily believe that culture remains stable through time but that it is constantly changing, nor do they glorify the culture or view it ethnocentrically. The anthropologist treats a culture with empathy and discernment, which may lead to “bleeding heart nativism.”<sup>3</sup>

### MAJOR HISTORICAL WORK ON THE NAVAJO

The purpose of this essay is to examine these divergent interests and methodologies as they relate to the writing of Navajo history. Perhaps a very brief overview of historians' work in Navajo history would be in order. The first professionally trained historian who wrote about the Navajo was Frank Reeve, in a long series of articles in the *New Mexico Historical Review*, beginning in 1938. Taken together, his many articles cover Navajo history from our first glimmerings of it to the 1880s. His description is based on the written record and therefore is “objective.”

He exhibits the characteristics of the historian as I have just described them.<sup>4</sup>

However, other historians may not always exhibit those traits. Jack D. Forbes has written an empathetic account of the early Navajo in his *Apache, Navaho and Spaniard*, an exhaustive description of Spanish relations with the two Athabascan groups. Forbes argues for the early arrival of the Navajo into the Southwest, perhaps as soon as 900, which date is not supported by tree ring dating. Nor does the record speak when he insists that the Apache were not warlike until the Spanish entrada; Navajo attacks on Spanish communities in 1606 and 1608 belie this contention. In violation of clear historical evidence, he refutes Alfred Barnaby Thomas's statement that the Navajo sold slaves to the Spanish; he seems to want to divorce the Navajo from disreputable actions. He seeks to include the Navajo and Apache in what he terms the "Great Southwestern Revolt" (1680–96), although historians continue to call it the "Pueblo Rebellion," signifying that it was primarily a Pueblo event. Apparently, Forbes is highly speculative in trying to include the Navajo and Apache in this revolt of the seventeenth century.<sup>5</sup>

After retiring from a career in journalism, Frank McNitt took up the cause of Navajo history and placed before us a remarkable record. As he immersed himself in the Navajo past, his subjects captivated him. His biography of Richard Wetherill (1956) is generally favorable to the headstrong Anglo trader and amateur archaeologist, as opposed to his Navajo customers, who killed him in 1910. *The Indian Traders* (1962) is a straightforward account of Navajo economic history. In *The Indian Wars* (1972), his fascination with the Navajo becomes apparent; in it his central thesis is that Navajo raids on Pueblo and Hispanic settlements were retaliation and reprisal for slave raids on the Diné. Perhaps the reasons for Navajo raids were more complex and involved replenishing their sheep herds, among other things. McNitt sought balance in recounting Navajo history, however. His article on the difficult trek of the Navajo to Bosque Redondo in eastern New Mexico is entitled "The Long March" instead of "The Long Walk"—a currently popular term that was not in use at the time of the event. McNitt clings to the record and does not theorize, and it is probably too much to accuse him of "bleeding heart nativism."<sup>6</sup>

McNitt was unable to complete his study of warfare between the Navajo and the Euro-Americans, and indeed his volume had already become quite lengthy just by carrying the story up to 1862.

The task of completing that narrative fell to Clifford Trafzer, a trained historian, whose swift narrative of Kit Carson's campaign against the Navajo and their resulting incarceration at Bosque Redondo (1864–68) is the story of unrelieved disaster—murder, pillage, imprisonment, and destitution. Trafzer believes that military officers underreported Navajo deaths in Carson's invasion. To counter their false data, he relies on oral testimony of contemporary Navajo, as recorded in Ruth Roessel, *Navajo Stories of the Long Walk Period*, from which he draws a bleak picture of American rapine. But it is arguable whether Roessel's informants told such a somber story, and one should remember that these informants were three or four generations removed from the event, which would make corroboration of their testimonies desirable.<sup>7</sup>

At the recent Taos Conference celebrating the life and career of Kit Carson, whose military campaigning was chiefly responsible for the Navajo incarceration, Trafzer's work was lambasted as "bad history" and "rhetoric." Trafzer backed out of attending the conference when he learned that Lawrence Kelly was a participant. Is the charge against Trafzer "bleeding heart nativism?" Perhaps so.<sup>8</sup>

Gerald Thompson's book *The Army and the Navajo* came out of his graduate work at the University of Arizona. In contrast to Trafzer, Thompson, using the Fort Sumner file in the National Archives and War Department records, did not conclude that Bosque Redondo (or Fort Sumner) was a tale of untold hardship and suffering. Indeed the Navajo captivity reflected the "antisavage" views of nineteenth-century humanitarians. However, even though the Navajo, in the long run, did not take up large-scale (irrigation) farming and did not settle in villages as the Anglo civilizers thought they should, some positive results occurred. The Navajo were in danger of extermination, or at least the loss of tribal identity, at the hands of the New Mexican militia, the Ute, the Zuni, the Hopi, and other hostile Indians. Their enforced migration to eastern New Mexico prevented these losses. Navajo and white developed mutual respect for each other at Bosque Redondo; a greater sense of tribal unity was fostered, and Navajo leadership became irrevocably committed to peace rather than raiding. Thompson presumably mis-identifies some accomplishments, such as the adoption of wagons or irrigation, but he is right in saying the Navajo learned metal working and were on the road to silversmithing, that they made modifications in their clothes

and housing, and learned the value of money and its relation to articles and goods.<sup>9</sup>

In his treatment of the northern Navajo frontier in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Robert McPherson demonstrates the sense of change and detachment. His book *The Northern Navajo Frontier, 1860–1900* presents the Navajo as the molders and shapers of their own destiny, whose diffused leadership—facing diverse Anglo immigrant groups and stopping just short of war—achieved a vast expansion of their lands and a preservation of the main elements of their culture.<sup>10</sup>

For the period of the 1920s and 1930s, three historians have investigated the Navajo past: Lawrence Kelly, Donald Parman, and Kenneth Philp. Their thoroughly diachronic historical studies examine aspects of Navajo culture in a specified time period. Instead of a static society, as the anthropologists would see it, they chronicle change and development. They place Navajo culture in the larger framework of the New Deal, and they hold themselves aloof from the vicissitudes of Navajo life.<sup>11</sup>

Thus it can be seen that historians have not investigated all phases of Navajo history, and not all of them have lived up to the historical canon. They have tended to concentrate on two periods of Navajo history, the 1860s and the 1920s to 1930s. As a general rule, historians have not been well informed of anthropological studies; nor have anthropologists incorporated the work of historians into their accounts. Three case studies of anthropologists will highlight the problems and complexities of interaction between the two sister disciplines.<sup>12</sup>

### THREE CASE STUDIES

#### **Klara Kelley**

An example of an anthropologist who has ventured into history is Klara Kelley, whose two articles and one book—“Federal Indian Land Policy and Economic Development in the United States,”<sup>13</sup> an interpretive survey of federal Indian policy from 1776 to the present; “Navajo Political Economy before Fort Sumner,”<sup>14</sup> a conjectural reconstruction of pristine Navajo society; and *Navajo Land Use: An Ethnoarchaeological Study*,<sup>15</sup> an archaeological case study of a township in the public domain of the United States

placed in historical perspective—are very strong on theory and weak on historical data.

Kelley renders an economic interpretation in all three of these works, perhaps turning to theory when her sources run dry. If we summarize Kelley's thesis, we see that she emphasizes a Marxian or capitalist domination approach. In "Federal Indian Land Policy," the key word is *expropriation*, the forceful taking of Indian lands by greedy white speculators. Her assumptions do not necessarily rise out of her data. She contends that, although eastern Indians regained lands by removal to Louisiana Territory in the 1830s, Americans soon colonized this region also. Under pressure from small, impoverished farmers who were periodically ruined by the upper bourgeoisie, the federal government once again expropriated Indian lands through severalty, a policy enacted in 1887.

Expropriation induced a mania of land speculation in 1818, 1836, 1855, and 1869, which in turn led to depressions in succeeding years. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, machine capitalism wrested control of the national economy from merchant capitalism, and this new form of capitalism affected Indian policy. For example, when Indian economic development began to compete with private industrial capitalism in the twentieth century and threatened the existence of cheap, exploited, subsidized Indian labor, the federal government adopted the policy of termination in the 1940s and 1950s. Before the advent of pump priming by the federal government in the 1930s, the expropriation of Indian lands performed the same Keynesian influence on the economy, an antidote to "busts" [!] or depressions, just as New Deal spending did during the Great Depression. A recession in the future might induce Congress to make further raids on the Native American patrimony.

In this and Kelley's other essays under review, generalizations abound, and the reader is overwhelmed with tantalizing and far-reaching observations. The historian would find much to quarrel with in her citation strategies and in her use of sources.

In her second article, "Navajo Political Economy before Fort Sumner," Kelley recreates Navajo social organization around 1850.<sup>16</sup> In this essay, she cites both Marx and Engels in a general way. She contends that the Navajo were originally classless and egalitarian, until the Santa Fe trade created two class divisions: *ricos* and *pobres*. (Actually, there is some evidence that these two classes of Navajo existed in the 1780s.)<sup>17</sup> The wealthy *ricos* stayed home to guard their flocks and thus tended toward patrilocal

kinship patterns, while the hungry lower-class males (or *pobres*) raided the Pueblo and Hispanic settlements, thus leaving the women in charge of the families and promoting the continuation of traditional matrilineal kinship among a significant part of the population. Not only did American capitalism create rich and poor; it also created patrilocal and patrilineal social organization alongside of the already-existing matriarchy.

In her book *Navajo Land Use* Kelley reiterates and fleshes out her capitalist domination thesis.<sup>18</sup> Before American businessmen transformed the Navajo political economy (here she is dealing more specifically with the Navajo than in her previous works), the Diné had a self-sufficient, family producing economy. Capitalism forced specialization of labor and, as she has said in her previous works, the division into classes. She digresses momentarily to describe the transition from merchant capitalism in Europe to industrial, monopoly capitalism, which searched assiduously for raw materials for manufacturing, impoverished the masses, and created a pool of cheap, landless labor for the factories. This discussion is far removed from her Navajo topic. The New World became a haven for dispossessed European farmers and tenants, she contends; colonization was an important event in the rise of capitalism.

Ignoring the many routes traveled by the argonauts, she avers that the Navajo were conquered because they interdicted Anglo migration to the gold fields of California, a rather amazing assertion since there were so many other ways to get there. In any case, the Beale Wagon Road was not opened until 1857–59, almost a decade after the California gold rush.

Throughout her excursion into American history, Kelley touches on the Homestead and Dawes severalty acts, the Santa Fe Railroad, the West as a safety valve, the creation of the Navajo Tribal Council (1930s), and the federal policy of termination (1940s and 1950s). The underlying theme of her work is capitalist domination. Kelley has not accurately used history in her analysis of Navajo life and culture. Her sources appear to be obscure historians. History and anthropology are not successfully melded together in her work.<sup>19</sup>

## David Brugge

In the beginning of this essay, I said that anthropologists tended to ignore social change and look upon Navajo culture as static in



time. Our second case study of an anthropologist—and an exception to this rule—is David Brugge. More than any other Navajo scholar, he has plumbed the depths of the very murky Navajo past. (The Navajo have left very few artifacts for the archaeologist and, of course, no written records. Furthermore, their memory is no help.) In this historical impasse, Brugge has ferreted out the stuff of Navajo history in many areas, including Navajo social change in the eighteenth century and Navajo servitude or captivity in the Pueblo and Hispanic villages in the nineteenth century.

Brugge believes that the Southwest underwent extreme changes before the Spanish entrada. The Anasazi had abandoned their large apartment structures some two centuries before, and the Pueblo were declining just as the Spaniards came into New Mexico. Brugge speculates on what the Navajo were like before contact with the Anasazi (Could the attractive Anasazi sites be unoccupied for very long? he asks). They hunted, fished, and gathered, used the sinew-backed bow and harpoons, wore skin clothing, coiled flat and twined baskets, relied on dogs and snowshoes for transportation, held a religion based on shamanism, were organized into bands with a flexible bilateral kinship system, and lived in conical dwellings sometimes using the forked stick principle. From the Pueblo the Navajo learned to make pottery, to weave, to build pueblitos (that is, fortified stone apartment houses), to form matrilineal clans, to hold *naachid* (general meetings), and to include kachinas and the Blessingway in their religious practices. The Spanish introduced horses, cattle, sheep and wool, and new crops (the Navajo had become agriculturalists some time before the Spanish came). The Navajo adopted the fish taboo (a great mystery), dropped the use of the harpoon, kept the hogan but eventually repudiated the pueblito, unified the language, modified their skin clothing (with the availability of wool garments), dropped shamanistic religion, settled in rancherias or clusters in place of the wandering band, and rejected political unity, Christianity, and puebloization. Evidently because of Ute attacks, the Navajo were forced out of Dinetah southward and westward, at which time they were joined by Pueblo refugees fleeing the Spanish conquerors. Pueblo contact produced great social change among the Navajo, but about 1750 the Pueblo were either assimilated or returned to the Rio Grande villages, and the Navajo reacted to this change by reaffirming old social values such as the hogan. The rise of Blessingway was a part of their

reaction. About 1750, the Navajo began migrating toward Canyon de Chelly and their new homeland. Brugge interprets much of this social change from pottery artifacts.<sup>20</sup>

Such plotting out of Navajo social change in prehistory is remarkable detective work. But a fair question is, How much influence has Brugge's concept of social change had on the Navajo view of their culture and on other anthropologists who study it?<sup>21</sup>

Brugge's probe of Navajo captivity in the Hispanic and Pueblo communities—and Navajo holding of captives in their rancherías—is no less perceptive. For the number of captives in the Rio Grande communities, he relies on the Catholic baptismal records. Enough of these parish records have been preserved to estimate the number of captives—Ute, Apache, and Comanche, as well as Navajo. Most Navajo baptisms occurred after 1820, reflecting the time of Navajo wars with the Hispanics and then the Anglos. Unlike Lynn R. Bailey, who has also written on the subject,<sup>22</sup> Brugge uses the term *slavery* sparingly, preferring the terms *captive* or *servant*. His stance is much less condemnatory than Bailey's toward the Euro-Americans, but Brugge does believe that the Navajo were the victims of aggression. Throughout his account, he seems to believe that warfare or Indian raiding was the root cause of taking captives.<sup>23</sup>

If there is a fault with Brugge's revelations on the captivities of the Navajo, the Pueblo, other Indians, and Mexicans, it is that he has not placed the subject in a larger context. We learn little if anything about New Mexico politics during the 1850s and 1860s, the time of the great slavery controversy, nor of a comparison with American chattel slavery (the New Mexican bondspeople were not chattels), nor a comparison with the captivity narratives from nearly all the Indian tribes of North America. Withal, his focus is a narrow one.<sup>24</sup>

### Clyde Kluckhohn

The third anthropologist who attempted to relate Navajo culture to larger Western intellectual traditions was Clyde Kluckhohn. In that sense, his treatment did not have a narrow focus, as I have characterized anthropology at the beginning of this article. And yet his lack of perspective led him into some pitfalls, which we can now identify.

Kluckhohn's interests were quite catholic, and he might even be called something of an academic rolling stone. Early in the 1930s, he was a follower of Edward Sapir and John Dollard (I am not sure exactly what that means), then of Father Berard Haile (pronounced Hi-lee), the Franciscan priest at the mission St. Michaels on the Navajo Reservation. For a time he seems to have been a devotee of the Italian sociologist Vilfredo Pareto. Then inexplicably to outside observers, he became the founding director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard from 1947 to 1954, even though he did not even know the Russian language. Finally, in what was probably an abiding interest throughout his academic career, he turned to psychology-psychoanalysis shortly before his early death in 1960.<sup>25</sup>

Kluckhohn was such a generalist and roving scholar that he is not identified with any school or thesis. Therefore, his overall significance is somewhat limited. Recently, James Faris charged that Kluckhohn borrowed too much from Haile without proper attribution, that he persisted in Western rationalism in which he failed to examine Navajo culture on its own terms, and, lastly, that he plagiarized James Stevenson's description of the Navajo ceremonial Nightway.<sup>26</sup>

Kluckhohn identified a social grouping among the Navajo between the extended family and the clan, which he called the "outfit," containing a number of extended families that lived within shouting distance of one another and that could be identified when it came to be planting or harvesting time. Some scholars have denied the existence of such a group; still others have come up with other terms, suggesting a different dynamic of this social level: land use community, resident lineage, local clan element, and, finally, set and network. Kluckhohn was such a stickler for Navajo terminology—determined to find an indigenous Navajo term to prove the existence of any Navajo institution that he identified—that it is strange that he would speculate on this outfit, for which there is no Navajo word.<sup>27</sup>

Kluckhohn concentrated on the study of the Ramah Navajo, where his family ranch was located—still called the Vogt ranch (for tourists and vacationers)—and where he took refuge as a college student to seek a cure for an illness. Kluckhohn often spent summers at the ranch and found money to support his research activities. It may be that the outfit was a peculiarity of the Ramah Navajo. (Gladys Reichard wondered if he thought the Ramah Navajo were typical, to which he responded with a strong affir-

mative.)<sup>28</sup> The Ramah Navajo were an offshoot of the main body. They lived some thirty miles south of Gallup and a few miles east of Zuni and today are not a contiguous group to the reservation.

In the 1930s, Kluckhohn planned a long-term study of values in the Ramah area, which included Mormons, Texans, Hispanics, and Zuni Indians, as well as Navajo. He received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation and initiated the project in 1949. It lasted until 1955, although the last publication occurred in 1966, six years after Kluckhohn's death. It was a grandiose project, and, considering its very large aims, one wonders how many of its objectives were actually accomplished. What was published lacks a sense of unity; some of the data seem sparse and tentative, and the general outcome does not provide viable conclusions for the scholarly community. Kluckhohn himself constantly emphasized the tentative nature of the project's work.<sup>29</sup>

In 1938, Kluckhohn and his close friend and collaborator Leland Wyman, a botanist at Boston University who spent a lot of time on the Navajo Reservation, published an article in the *American Anthropologist*, classifying the ceremonials or chants. It was a rigorous classification, organizing the ceremonials into six groups, various subgroups, and sub-subgroups. The system seemed to impose Western, scientific order on Navajo religion, but Kluckhohn and Wyman insisted this was Navajo organization, not theirs. A few years later, Gladys Reichard presented her classification, which was much more flexible than Wyman's and Kluckhohn's. The Navajo did not have anything like the Anglo taxonomy, she insisted.<sup>30</sup> So did Father Berard Haile, whose scheme was to divide the chants into two basic categories: those that used a rattle and those that did not. Haile also insisted that Blessingway was in a separate class unto itself, not belonging to any classification. Before publication, Kluckhohn corresponded with Haile, who repeatedly critiqued Kluckhohn's and Wyman's classification and expected to have an article expressing his reservations published alongside theirs. To his dismay, this did not happen; the priest suggested to Edward Sapir that his own material had been plagiarized. Sapir readily agreed that Kluckhohn was capable of something like this and characterized him and Wyman as "smooth johnnies."<sup>31</sup>

Twenty-two years later, Kluckhohn restated his idea of Navajo categories but with a much different scheme. This time he divided ceremonies of all kinds into two kinds—chants and rites—just as Haile wanted him to do. There is a bad side and a good side in his

categorization, very much like the Reichard dichotomy. Witchcraft is incorporated into his scheme of things in 1960, although he rigorously retains the fourfold division described in his 1944 book, but with different terminology. No longer are a large number of chants, or song ceremonials, divided into groups according to ritual, although ritual is present; some chants or rites are dropped or added, or changed from one group to a different category. Kluckhohn admitted that Navajo people lacked consistency in their thinking about ceremonies, and the number of variations was immense. Mingling of chants occurred, and flexibility seemed to be a rule. For example, a chant may be ritually reversed in order to cure a singer who has performed the chant too often.<sup>32</sup>

Over the years, Leland Wyman also retreated from the overall rigidity of the original scheme. He published a number of the Haile manuscripts, in which he began to move in the direction of the twofold chants and rites. In *The Red Antway* (1964), he seemed to stick to the classification; in *The Mountainway*, he declared that there was no conflict between the classification and Haile's twofold division. In *Blessingway*, which is the capstone of Wyman's publication of the chants (not his, by the way, but Haile's), he grudgingly accepts the priest's "alleged dichotomy." Finally, in the *Handbook* (published in 1983 but written by him in 1972), he describes the Navajo ceremonial system in Haile's terms.<sup>33</sup>

### WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Can the gap between anthropologists and historians be bridged? In a real sense, it always has been, and always will be. History, of course, is an ancient discipline, going back to the time of Herodotus. But history and anthropology today are a part of the social sciences, and, since the late nineteenth century, when the scientific manner reigned supreme, they have interacted with each other. As social sciences, they both address all phases of human society: family, state, race, institutions, community, and man's existence and well-being in an organized community. Both history and anthropology have a wide range of interests, from that which is purely social science to that which is humanitarian. History is involved with a wide range of aspects, from pure social data to pure narrative concerning great men or heroes. Anthropology can include religion and folklore on one side, all the way to anthropometry on the other.

The two sister disciplines, however, have not always been familiar with each other's methods and subject matter. Historians have not read much anthropology, and anthropologists have not read much history. But merely reading is a benign activity; each should become involved in the research and the most recent trends of the other. In the interest of greater feedback from one to the other, let us ask two questions: (1) What can historians learn from anthropologists, and (2) what can anthropologists learn from historians?

Historians must rely on anthropologists for speculations and judgments about the aboriginal prehistoric past and must accept the anthropologists' description of Indian culture and society. Historians would like anthropologists to delineate social change, to recognize those social traits that are retained, those that are displaced, and those that are assimilated. Historians would like to have the assistance of anthropologists to tell the Native American story within its own context, in its relation to other tribes, and to the Anglo world and society. Conversely, what were the Navajo perceptions of Hispanic, Anglo, and other tribal cultures? What is the meaning of *Diné* to Navajo self-perception (did the Navajo feel superior)? What was the Navajo impact on Anglo culture?

Since the Navajo and other tribes are ahistorical and do not have a memory of their past except as it is mysteriously extrapolated into myth, and since anthropologists are synchronically oriented toward contemporary Navajo, historians will recognize the limitations of anthropologists in reconstructing the Navajo past.

Finally, what can anthropologists learn from historians? Anthropologists can rescue historians from an overemphasis on federal Indian policy and can strive to deepen their accounts by developing continuities from the aboriginal base into the modern world, by placing the Navajo, or any Indian tribe, in the larger historical context, and by noting the impact of Anglo and European cultures on the Navajo, and of Navajo culture on Euro-Americans. Anthropologists can undertake a careful and accurate adherence to the documentary sources, provide a corroboration and evaluation of all fieldwork and oral testimony with the historical record, and be less enamored of their Native American subjects. Anthropologists should eschew theory and jargon and the distracting and imprecise method of notation and citation. They should recognize the immense interaction among Indian tribes and, in the case of the Navajo, the complete break with their

Athabascan ancestors of Canada and Alaska, and the vast amounts of social customs and thought borrowed from the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Arizona. They should note that the Navajo are a highly flexible people who have undergone massive social change in the past, just as they are doing today.

Perhaps all I am saying is that anthropologists and historians should take off their blinders and look at each other's work.

### NOTES

1. Reginald Horsman, "Recent Trends and New Directions in Native American History," in *The American West: New Perspectives, New Dimensions*, ed. Jerome O. Steffen (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979), 124-26.

2. One anthropologist has successfully bridged the gap between anthropology and history: Edward Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962).

3. James Axtell, "Ethnohistory: An Historian's Viewpoint," in James Axtell, *The European and the Indian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 3-15.

4. I have discussed Reeve's contribution to Navajo history in "The Navajo Histories," *New Mexico Historical Review* 68 (April 1993): pp. 247-68.

5. Jack D. Forbes, *Apache, Navaho and Spaniard* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960), pp. xiv-xxiii, 24-28, 66, 177-288. Tree ring dating is presented in J. Lee Correll, *Through White Men's Eyes*, vol. 1 (Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Heritage Center, 1976), pp. 21-23. Alfred Barnaby Thomas, *After Coronado: Spanish Exploration Northeast of New Mexico, 1696-1727* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935, 1966), pp. 12-14. Forbes is of Quechan descent.

6. Frank McNitt, *Richard Wetherill* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1966); McNitt, *Navajo Wars* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972); McNitt, *The Indian Traders* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962); McNitt, "The Long March, 1863-1867," in *The Changing Ways of Southwest Indians*, ed. Albert Schroeder (Glorieta, NM: The Rio Grande Press, 1973), pp. 145-70. McNitt wrote extensively about the Navajo and added materially to our basic knowledge. It is unfortunate that he was unable to complete his study of the Navajo wars during the 1860s.

7. Clifford E. Trafzer, *The Kit Carson Campaign* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982); Ruth Roessel, *Navajo Stories of the Long Walk Period* (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1973).

8. *New York Times*, 10 August 1993. For the Columbus quincentennial, Trafzer sent out a flyer to "Native American Brothers and Sisters," in which he proposed they write a letter to "Dear Christopher" for publication in a collection of essays. "The letter will provide an opportunity for our thoughts on the invasion and conquest of our native lands." Trafzer is partially descended from the Wyandot.

9. Gerald Thompson, *The Army and the Navajo* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1976). See, especially, pp. ix-xi, 158-65.

10. Robert S. McPherson, *The Northern Navajo Frontier, 1860–1900* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), pp. 1–3, 93–95.

11. Lawrence C. Kelly, *The Navajo Indians and Federal Indian Policy, 1900–1935* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1968); Donald L. Parman, *The Navajos and the New Deal* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976); Kenneth R. Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920–1954* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977).

12. I have described the work of Father Berard Haile and Gladys Reichard, two anthropologists, in two articles: "Ednishodi Yazzie: The Little Priest and the Discovery of Navajo Culture," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 11 (1987), pp. 1–41; "Gladys Reichard and the Understanding of Navajo Culture," *American Indian Quarterly* (Winter 1988). I have also reviewed J. Lee Correll, *Through White Men's Eyes*, in the *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 11 (1987) (see note 5), comparing this collection of documents with Lawrence Kelly, *Navajo Roundup: Selected Correspondence of Kit Carson's Expedition Against the Navajo, 1863–1865* (Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company, 1970), probably unfavorably, indicating the imprecise methods of editing and notating by an anthropologist (Correll) compared to a historian (Lawrence Kelly). I have also reviewed the history bibliography of Navajo studies up to 1868 in this article.

13. In *Economic Development in American Indian Reservations* (Albuquerque: Native American Studies, University of New Mexico, 1979), pp. 30–42.

14. In *The Versatility of Kinship*, ed. Linda S. Cordell and Stephen Beckerman (New York: Academic Press, 1986).

15. Klara Kelley, *Navajo Land Use: An Ethnoarchaeological Study* (New York: Academic Press, 1986).

16. Kelley, "Navajo Political Economy," pp. 307–10, 313–20, 328–29.

17. Whiteley identified *pobres* and *ricos* before American contact in Klara B. Kelley and Peter M. Whiteley, *Navajoland: Family Settlement and Land Use* (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1989), pp. 32–34. Kelley, in her portion of the book (pp. 43–201), relies much less on generalization and concentrates on a factual presentation, based on an unusual number of sources. For a review of this book, see Frank E. Wozniak in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 16:4 (1992), pp. 238–40.

18. Kelley, *Navajo Land Use*, ch. 2.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 6–10. She misinterprets Fred Albert Shannon on the safety valve theory. See Shannon, "The Homestead Act and the Labor Surplus," *American Historical Review* 41(1936), pp. 637–51; and Shannon, "A Post Mortem on the Labor Safety Valve Theory," *Agricultural History* 19(1945), pp. 31–37. She ignores William S. Greever, *Arid Domain: The Santa Fe Railway and Its Western Land Grant* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1945). See Kelley, *Navajo Land Use*, p. 24. She also ignores the general works of Francis Paul Prucha and William T. Hagan and the more specialized studies of Henry E. Fritz, Robert W. Mardock, and Loring B. Priest, as well as Robert A. Trennert. She relies much (but inaccurately) on the obscure D.S. Otis, *The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973).

20. David Brugge, "The Protohistoric among Non-Pueblo Groups of the Southwest," *Collected Papers in Honor of Harry L. Hadlock*, ed. Nancy Fox (Albuquerque: Papers of the Archaeological Society of New Mexico, no. 9, 1984); Brugge, "Navajo Prehistory and History to 1850," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 10, *Southwest*, ed. William Sturtevant (Washington, DC:



Smithsonian Institution, 1983), pp. 489–50; Brugge, *Navajo Pottery and Ethnohistory* (Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Tribal Museum, 1963); Brugge, "Navajo Pottery in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," *Plateau* 63:2 (1987), pp. 3–8.

21. A sociological study of social change is Thomas D. Hall, *Social Change in the Southwest*, (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989). Hall is very heavy on theory, as an anthropologist perhaps would be, but he does relate a lot of history from a wide variety of sources that are often cobbled together to make a pastiche of chronological events. It is difficult to see the direction in which Hall is going.

22. Lynn R. Bailey, *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest* (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1966).

23. David M. Brugge, *Navajos in the Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, 1694–1875* (Window Rock, AZ: Research Section, Parks and Recreation Department, Navajo Tribe, 1968), and (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1985).

24. Loomis Morton Ganaway, "New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy, 1846–1861," *New Mexico Historical Review* 18 (July 1943). For slavery in the larger context, see David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966). For captivity narratives, see James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), and Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," in *The European and the Indian* (see note 3), pp. 186–206.

25. For biographical sketches with bibliography, see Talcott Parsons and Evon Z. Vogt, "Clyde Kay Maben Kluckhohn, 1905–1960," in *American Anthropologist* 74 (February 1962), pp. 140–48; Walter W. Taylor, John L. Fishler, Evon Z. Vogt, *Culture and Life: Essays in Memory of Clyde Kluckhohn* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973, passim. Kluckhohn's relationship with Father Berard is in William H. Lyon, "Ednishodi Yazhe: The Little Priest and the Understanding of Navajo Culture," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 11:1 (1987), pp. 28–32. For the influence of Pareto, see Kluckhohn, "A Navaho Personal Document with a Brief Paretian Analysis," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1 (Summer 1945), pp. 260–83. Kluckhohn's interest in psychology is (probably) pervasive, but here I cite the following: Dorothea Leighton and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Children of the People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948). Kluckhohn was responsible for the first four chapters, which constituted a psychological study of the Navajo and which was a companion volume to Kluckhohn and Leighton, *The Navaho* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946); Kluckhohn, "Personality Formation among the Navaho Indians," *Sociometry* 9 (1946), pp. 128–32, which is reprinted in Richard Kluckhohn, editor, *Culture and Behavior* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), pp. 177–81; Kluckhohn, "Navaho Politician," in *In the Company of Man*, ed. Joseph Casagrande (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 439–65; Kluckhohn, "What Modern Parents Can Learn from the Navajos," *The American Indian* 4:2 (1947), pp. 11–13.

26. Evon Z. Vogt, "Clyde Kluckhohn," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. James C. Faris, *The Nightway: A History and a History of Documentation of a Navajo Ceremonial* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), pp. 8–13, 21 n9, 47, 69 n22, 69 n24.

27. Kluckhohn describes the outfit in Kluckhohn and Leighton, *The Navaho*, pp. 109–111. For land use community, see Solon T. Kimball and John H.

Provinse, "Navaho Social Organization in Land Use Planning," *Applied Anthropology* 1 (July–August–September 1942), pp. 18–25. For resident lineage, see William Y. Adams, "New Data on Navajo Social Organization," *Plateau* 30 (January 1958), pp. 64–70. For local clan element, see David Aberle, "The Navaho," in *Matrilineal Kinship*, ed. David M. Schneider and Kathleen Gouch (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961). For set and network, see Louise Lamphere, "Ceremonial Co-operation and Networks: A Reanalysis of the Navajo Outfit," *Man* n.s. 5 (March 1970), pp. 39–59; see also her *To Run After Them* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977) and Gary Witherspoon, *Navajo Kinship and Marriage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), pp. 100–110.

28. Kluckhohn to Reichard, 11 September [1937 or 1938], Reichard Collection, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff. Reichard's Navajo lived in the Ganado area, and she was, in effect, sponsored by the Hubbell family. Reichard was involved in some bitter intellectual controversies with Kluckhohn and Haile over classification and the naming of chants, even the spelling of the word *Navajo*. Kluckhohn insisted she must spell it with an *h*, but *j* was decreed by the Navajo Tribal Council. She objected to the chant name *Prostitutionway*, and after her death Wyman and Kluckhohn adopted her term, *Excessway*. See William H. Lyon, "Gladys Reichard at the Frontiers of Navajo Culture," *American Indian Quarterly* (Spring 1989), pp. 143–48.

29. I will not cite all the publications of "The Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures" here, but I do cite the following: Kluckhohn, "The Ramah Project," in Alexander and Dorothea Leighton, *Gregorio, the Hand Trembler* (Cambridge, MA: The Peabody Museum, 1949); Kluckhohn, "A Comparative Study of Values in Five Cultures," in Evon Z. Vogt, *Navaho Veterans: A Study of Changing Values* (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1951) in which Vogt has only twelve Navajo veterans (plus three nonveterans he included) for his analysis; and Kluckhohn, "The Ramah Navajo," in Smithsonian Institution, *Anthropological Papers*, no. 79, (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

30. Leland Wyman and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Navaho Classification of Their Song Ceremonials*, *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 50 (1938), pp. 3–39; Leland Wyman to Gladys Reichard, 26 March 1946, and 2 April 1947 in Reichard Collection, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff; Gladys A. Reichard, "Another Look at the Navajo," in Reichard Collection; Lyon, "Ednishodi Yahze," p. 28.

31. Wyman and Kluckhohn, *Navaho Classification of Their Song Ceremonials*, pp. 3–39; Wyman to Reichard, 26 March 1946, April 1947, in Reichard Collection, Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff; Reichard, "Another Look at the Navajo," in Reichard Collection, p. 7; Reichard's classification is in her *Navaho Religion* (Bollingen Foundation, 1950), pp. 322–23; Lyon, "Ednishodi Yahze," p. 28.

32. Clyde Kluckhohn, "Navaho Categories, in *Culture and History*, ed. Stanley Diamond (New York: Columbia University Press for Brandeis University, 1960), pp. 65–98. Kluckhohn, *Navaho Witchcraft* (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1944). Louise Lamphere and Evon Vogt have "reanalyzed" the Kluckhohn classification, with the idea of updating and redefining in the light of new knowledge and analysis in "Clyde Kluckhohn as Ethnographer and Student of Navaho Ceremonialism," in *Culture and Life*, ed. Walter W. Taylor et

al. (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1972), pp. 94–135.

33. Leland Wyman, *The Red Antway of the Navaho* (Santa Fe, NM: Museum of Navaho Ceremonial Art, 1964, 1973), pp. 29–33; Wyman, *The Mountainway of the Navajo* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1975), pp. 7–14; Wyman, *Blessingway*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1970), pp. 3–7; Wyman, "Navajo Ceremonial System," in *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 10, ed. William C. Sturtevant, *Southwest*, Alfonso Ortiz, volume ed. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1983), pp. 536–57.