

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Late Holocene Research on Foragers and Farmers in the Desert West.
Edited by Barbara J. Roth and Maxine E. McBrinn.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/95r555vs>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 40(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Geib, Philip

Publication Date

2016-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Late Holocene Research on Foragers and Farmers in the Desert West. Edited by Barbara J. Roth and Maxine E. McBrinn. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2016. 216 pages. \$50.00 cloth.

This is a book by archaeologists, for archaeologists, but one perhaps most likely to pique the interest of those deeply enmeshed in the study of foragers and farmers in the Southwest and bordering portions of the Great Basin. The book contains many stimulating chapters, and is a welcome, well-produced addition to my library, so it is not my intention to criticize; this is simply my judgment about what will likely engage most readers of an interdisciplinary journal. Unlike many edited volumes in recent years solely focusing on either the Southwest or the Great Basin, in an attempt to bridge what at times resembles separate, divergent research traditions and theoretical paradigms, in this collection editors Roth and McBrinn bring together researchers from both areas. One hoped-for outcome was to stimulate application of different approaches to understanding the past within each region. For the Great Basin, Searcy and Talbot write that “a broadening of research interests beyond the gastric ecological perspective” includes such issues as “social structure, identity, exchange relationships, and communities” (241). While these are common themes in the Southwest’s considerable heterogeneity in research agendas, the editors imply that, as Great Basin researchers have demonstrated, greater attention by Southwestern researchers to models stemming from human behavioral ecology (HBE) could be beneficial.

Including the editors’ short introduction, there are ten chapters of varying length and descriptive detail. Four chapters concern areas of the traditional Southwest, two for New Mexico’s northern Rio Grande area and two for Arizona’s Tucson Basin, and all four are focused on the period during which Mesoamerican domesticates were initially being used (around 2100 BC in the Tucson Basin and around 1400 BC in select portions of the northern Rio Grande area). Three of the remaining chapters cover the Fremont culture/complex of late prehistory (Common Era), centered in Utah and spilling slightly into far eastern Nevada and far northwestern Colorado. Long deemed a “northern periphery” to the greater Southwest, Fremont research has often been, in Searcy and Talbot’s words, theoretically and methodologically divorced from research trends in the Southwest (240). The final two chapters concern portions of the Mohave Desert in the Southern Great Basin and prehistoric developments in the Common Era.

Edited volumes which grow out of professional meetings symposia, like this one, tend toward diversity, even when the topic is defined quite closely. Given that this one involved researchers from across such a broad and diverse geography and from two distinct overall scholarly traditions, it is unsurprising that the papers vary. The editors identify three main themes that run through all papers to greater or lesser extent: the role of the environment in shaping prehistoric behavior, flexibility in farming and foraging adaptations, and diversity in settlement strategies.

Unfortunately, the book lacks a discussion chapter (or chapters) by a senior researcher that compares and contrasts the various arguments put forth and places them within a larger interpretive context. While the editors’ introduction partially

covers this task, it is often beneficial to have in addition a detached and critical perspective or two. Such commentary is frequently done by those with in-depth familiarity with regional archaeology, but some of the more insightful analysis often comes from those who speak to the general themes involved from outside an elevated research tradition. Such important themes include, for example, the costs and benefits of different mobility strategies employed by cultures, especially under the constraints of trying to incorporate domesticates into the economic mix.

Some of the chapters were significant because they summarized data or findings that are poorly reported, if at all, outside of specialized gray literature from various agencies. The chapters by Railey (Albuquerque Basin, NM), Barlow (Range Creek, UT), and Roberts and Ahlstrom (Las Vegas Valley, NV) stand out in this regard. Barlow's is the most detailed of the book and I appreciated the specifics about the well-preserved archaeological record of Range Creek. Some of the other chapters could have benefited by this level of detail, yet, at more than twice the length of many other chapters in the volume, doing so would likely have increased the volume size to more than four hundred pages. Barlow makes a compelling case about the role of different strategies of food storage and residential mobility practiced by Fremont farmer-foragers. Nonetheless, I think that the earliest storage features (~AD 400–860), which are small and dispersed near field settings, were most likely used to store seed for next year's maize planting and not "contingency caching" of food to be used later in the season (177). This does not alter Barlow's argument for residential mobility during this early interval; indeed, much of the maize during this time may have been consumed green during the growing season rather than letting it dry from winter consumption.

The archaeological record of the Early Agricultural Period (EAP) in the Tucson Basin is well published, yet the two chapters on this topic challenge conventional wisdom and raise questions worth pondering—especially true for the one by Whittlesey. She specifically argues to "deconstruct" this interval by: (1) questioning the logic behind the EAP label, considering it a "misnomer"; (2) arguing that the people of this interval were not maize dependent; (3) proposing that they remained residentially mobile; and (4) suggesting that there was diversity in subsistence-settlement strategies. The last two points are also argued by Roth, although Whittlesey throws down the gauntlet on these issues in a more forceful manner.

In questioning the often-suggested tie between farming and sedentism, Whittlesey enlists the Apache case of casual cultivation—the plant and leave strategy—that Paul Minnis presented some thirty years ago to make much the same point. The utility of this case as an analogy for when maize cultivation was just getting started seems problematic. Relying more on foraged resources when a crop failure occurs is something that both the Apache and EAP groups could do, but the Apache were also in contact with committed farmers (Puebloans) who could replenish seed stocks for next year's planting. In a setting without committed farmers, where all were casual, there might not be seed to plant again. Buffalo Bird Woman of the Hidatsa discusses the need of saving seed and the economic benefits of selling seed to those that were not provident (Gilbert Wilson, *Agriculture of the Hidatsa Indians: An Indian Interpretation*, 1917, 47–49).

Seed for future planting also should be factored into HBE modeling of the return rates of various farming strategies. So, for example, Table 3.3 of the chapter by Vierra and McBrinn lists the kilocalories per hour for several domesticates, but these do not take into account the volume of seed that should be saved for future plantings and are thus not available for consumption. These rates should be adjusted downward by some factor and are not, therefore, strictly comparable to those of the ecologically wild or weedy species in the preceding Table 3.2; this should be taken into consideration when evaluating economic tradeoffs.

The model of listening to those outside our lofty, topical, and theoretical traditions is a good one for learning and expanding our horizons. This is especially true when, as with this book, informative examples that illustrate the value of given research approaches are used to make the case—rather than just relying on negative critique and prescriptive statements. Perhaps the model is better for a meeting symposium and less effective for this published volume, given the spatial and temporal diversity coupled with the range of topics. Yet I can easily envision that select chapters will be essential reading for researchers and students in the Southwest and the Great Basin.

Philip Geib

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Making Lamanites: Mormons, Native Americans, and the Indian Student Placement Program, 1947–2000. By Matthew Garrett. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2016. \$44.00 cloth; \$29.95 paper; \$28.45 electronic.

Matthew Garrett has written one of the first book-length academic publications on the Latter-day Saint Indian Student Placement Program (ISPP). Between 1947 and 2000, approximately 50,000 Native American youth had participated in the ISPP by living at least one academic year in Mormon foster homes to attend public schools off-reservation (2). Interestingly, *Making Lamanites* came out only several months after some former Diné ISPP students filed sexual abuse lawsuits against the LDS Church. Garrett's book does not directly discuss these lawsuits or ISPP cases of sexual abuse, but he does refer to some Diné students' negative experiences of the program and resentment along with their positive and fond memories (his recent *Atlantic* article "Why Several Native Americans are Suing the Mormon Church" provides some insights). His book argues that although the LDS Church sought to "colonize" through the ISPP, Native American students exercised their own agency, providing an assessment of how some students navigated and confronted both the Indian and white worlds to forge their own identities both in the ISPP and higher education at Brigham Young University.

The development of the program aligned with the United States' termination and assimilation policies. Government and denominational officials targeted the so-called "Navajo Problem," since most Diné school-age children either did not go to school or had issues in accessing schools in the early postwar period. Most ISPP students