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The Enduring Hopi

Peter Iverson

“What then is the meaning of the tricentennial observance? It is a reaffirmation of continuity and hope for the collective Hopi future.”

The Hopi world is centered on and around three mesas in northeastern Arizona named First, Second, and Third. It is at first glance a harsh and rugged land, not always pleasing to the untrained eye. Prosperity here can only be realized with patience, determination, and a belief in tomorrow.¹

For over 400 years, the Hopis have confronted the incursion of outside non-Indian societies. The Spanish entered Hopi country as early as 1540. Then part of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado’s exploring party invaded the area with characteristic boldness and superciliousness. About twenty Spaniards, including a Franciscan missionary, confronted some of the people who resided in the seven villages that now comprise the Hopi domain, and under the leadership of Pedro de Tovar, the Spanish overcame Hopi resistance, severely damaging the village of Kawaiokuh, and winning unwilling surrender. Captain López de Cardenas would return soon thereafter and without recorded opposition acquired Hopi guides for exploration in the country toward the Grand Canyon.²

For almost a century, the isolated Hopi location and Hopi preparation for possible invasion limited extensive contacts with the Spanish. The Antonio de Espejo expedition of 1583 passed without incident. Even the more extensive program of Don Juan de Oñate at the end of the sixteenth century did not have as much as an impact as one might have anticipated.

However, the construction of mission churches at Awatovi, Shungopavi, and Oraibi with additional stations at Walpi and Mishongnovi marked an important landmark in the effort to convert the Hopis to Christianity. Twenty-five years later in 1660, a revolt erupted throughout the region fueled by the cultural attitudes of the Spanish. A drought that preceded war surely could be explained by Spanish disruption of necessary ceremonies. The Spanish thus were perceived not only as harsh, but their cultural persecution had proven equally ineffectual, and they were forced to flee New Mexico.³

Hopi killed the four resident missionaries, two at Oraibi, one at Awatovi, one at Shungopavi. They also permitted Pueblo people from the Rio Grande area to take refuge with them, at the far western portion of the intermountain Spanish frontier. The village of Hano remains to this day comprised of Tewa people. The Hopi also anticipated Spanish military reprisal. They moved three villages from the edge to the top of two mesas: Walpi on First Mesa, Shungopavi and Mishongnovi on Second Mesa. Shipaulvoi was established on Second Mesa to safeguard religious materials.⁴

The eighteenth century marked a varying pattern of relations between the Spanish and the Hopis. The era was characterized alternately by resistance and accommodation, but ultimately the Spanish
met with defeat, both because of Hopi recalcitrance and because of the declining vigor of the Spanish empire in western America. Initially Hopis repelled Diego de Vargas, leader of Spain’s Reconquest efforts after the revolt, and continued to provide asylum for refugees from the Rio Grande Valley. Perhaps to placate the Spanish who had returned with a vengeance to New Mexico, Hopis—or at least some of them—then requested missionaries to return. While some families in Awatovi proved sympathetic to the Christian message, most others rejected it, particularly the residents of Oraibi. In 1700, Awatovi felt the wrath of its own Hopi opponents. All those who fought back were killed; the village was leveled. In the years that followed immediately, Hopis spurned a force of the Spanish Governor Pedro Rodríguez Cubero and even invaded Zuni Pueblo in an effort to keep Christianity from sweeping further west. A subsequent Zuni-Spanish force also met with little success, as did another party dispatched, indeed led, by the latest Spanish administrator, Governor Félix Martínez in 1716.5

Franciscan missionaries persisted in their efforts during the 1730s, 1740s and 1750s. The most successful padre probably was Father Carlos Delgado in the 1740s, but he enjoyed his primary success with Indians from the Rio Grande area, several hundred of whom he convinced to move to Isleta. Other missionaries, including Fathers Rodríguez de la Torre, Silvestre Vélez de Escalante, and Francisco Garces were allowed to enter Hopi land and occasionally preach, but they achieved little else. Discouraged, the priests could recommend only the policy of force to further their efforts at conversion.6

By this time Spanish colonialism had waned to such a point that force could no longer be seriously considered. Except for one brief period, Hopis essentially were rid of the Spanish presence. This short exception came from about 1777 to 1781, when drought and smallpox combined to force many of the people to leave their country for Zuni, Sandia, and elsewhere in New Mexico. For a time, it seemed as though the Spanish finally would conquer these stubborn occupants of the mesas, but the rains returned in 1781. Once again, the people had endured. In fact, when we contrast the record of Hopi-Spanish relations with that of the other Pueblo Indians, we cannot help but recognize that the Hopi during the eighteenth century remained more thoroughly independent of Spanish culture. As the Tewa anthropologist Edward Dozier would put it, Catholicism became compartmentalized in the Pueblo communities of New Mexico; the Hopis did not even permit compartmentalization. The Hispanic presence, save for the few years after the 1680 revolt, remained in New Mexico; it never became completely established in northern Arizona.7

The independence of Mexico in 1821 did not alter the Hopi distinction. Contact between the Mexican government and its officials with the Hopis proved minimal. During this period, the primary field of diplomacy and conflict for Hopis lay with other Indians, principally the ever-growing and expanding Navajos.

Anglo contact with Hopis preceded the Mexican War. According to historian Harry C. James, the famous fur trapper Bill Williams may have been the first United States citizen the Hopis encountered, perhaps in the year 1827. James does not consider Williams the ideal initial emissary. He quotes Kit Carson: “In starving times no man who knew him ever walked in front of Bill Williams.” Williams probably later served as a guide for the party of Captain Joseph Walker, who in 1834, shot twenty Hopi men who had vainly protested against the Walker entourage’s destruction of their crops.8

On the other hand, the outcome of the Mexican War signaled that the Anglos were not only a power with which to reckon, but potentially a source of assistance. As early as 1850, Hopis traveled
to Santa Fe to appeal to the new government. James S. Calhoun, Indian agent for New Mexico Terri-
tory (which then included Arizona), reported in October to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Orlando
Brown:

The seven Moqui Pueblos sent to me a deputation who presented themselves on the 6th
day of this month. Their object, as announced, was to ascertain the purposes and views
of the Government of the United States towards them. They complained bitterly of the
depredations of the Navajos . . . . I came to the conclusion, that each of seven Pueblos
was an independent Republic, having confederated for mutual protection . . . . 9

In August 1851, Hopis again made the trek to Santa Fe, and Calhoun observed that the thirteen
delegates wanted to see if he “would do anything for them.” He added:

They complained that the Navajos had continued to rob them, until they had left them
exceedingly poor, and wretched, indeed, did they look. . . . These Indians seem to be
innocent, and very poor, and should be taken care of. The Navajos having exhausted,
or nearly so, until the Moquies increase their stores to an extent that shall awaken
their cupidity. . . . 10

The tension between Navajos and Hopis over land and land usage is one, to be sure, that has con-
tinued with varying degrees of intensity to the present time. So Calhoun’s comments are of interest in
that regard. But they also reveal the extent to which images of both peoples could be crystallized dur-
dering the first years of Anglo-American administration. Early on in the Anglo mind (though not all Bu-
reau personnel would share this perception) Hopis rather than Navajos came to be perceived as peace-
ful, embattled, and worthy of assistance. It is not that this image is incorrect, but it is important to
understand that it may have been established firmly and immediately.

In any event, the Anglo administration soon moved against the Navajos. The resultant campaign,
in which Kit Carson and other noteworthy personalities figure, found ready assistance from the Hopis
and other tribes with whom Navajos had clashed. Navajos, of course, were removed temporarily from
the region through the Long Walk of 1864. But not all of Navajos were incarcerated, particularly those
in the westernmost reaches of their sprawling settlements. Moreover, through a treaty of 1868, the Na-
vajos were permitted to return to a portion of their country, rather than being banished permanently.
A Hopi reservation had yet to he established, and the land dispute inevitably would reoccur. 11

The Hopis dealt with another new presence in the region. The recently established Mormon com-
munity in Utah began to push southward, and in 1858, the well-known Mormon emissary Jacob Ham-
blin was dispatched by Brigham Young to Hopi country. Hamblin and his associates made many visits
to Arizona during the next years. Hopis appeared more impressed with Mormon industry than doc-
trine, but they were willing to allow a Mormon settlement near Moenkopi and added foods to their
diet because of the Mormon presence. 12

Jacob Hamblin and John Wesley Powell, who braved the rapids of the Colorado River through the
Grand Canyon at this time, marked the beginnings of the transition to the modern era of Anglo-Hopi
relations. The construction of various transcontinental railroads was an important sign that the Amer-
ican frontier soon would come to a close. In Arizona and New Mexico, the advent of the Santa Fe Rail-
road would have a dramatic effect upon the socioeconomic life of many Native American peoples. The Hopis were about sixty miles north of the proposed Santa Fe line through northern Arizona. Though the tracks would not go near their villages, the reality of the railroad forced the federal government to come to terms with the reality of the Hopis.  

Federal officials initiated, briefly, an Indian agency at the site of Keams Canyon in 1874. It was a most tentative commitment and short-lived besides, lasting for all of two years. The Hopi then were assigned as a subagency to the Southern Navajo Agency. The arrival of the Santa Fe (actually, then, the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad) in 1881 together with the expanding Mormon and Navajo populations and the inability of an Indian agent to dislodge two Anglo “meddlers” whom he disliked helped prompt President Chester Arthur to create by executive order a reserve “for the use and occupancy of the Moqui and such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon.” Such typically elastic language mirrored the conviction of late nineteenth-century policymakers that the consolidation of different Native American communities on the same land might be necessary and in fact desirable. Reservations were perceived by many influential folks as a kind of intermediate way station on the road to assimilation. If anyone had informed that undistinguished president, Mr. Arthur, that the Hopis would still have a reservation one hundred years after his proclamation, he or she would have been branded a dreamer, or worse.  

The neat rectangular lines of the reservation proposed by agent Fleming probably went unnoticed by most Hopis, who continued to be able to live in pretty much the same fashion as before, or so it initially appeared. Hopis may have been generally unaware of the precise reservation boundaries, but they soon gained additional awareness of Washington’s expectations. During the Americanization Era of the late nineteenth century, the federal government goal was, in the unconsciously ironic words of a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, “to make the Indian feel at home in America.” Part of the Americanization process included compulsory education in white schools. It would be in this arena that some of the most striking cultural confrontations would occur.  

The first school in Hopi country opened its doors at Keams Canyon in 1887. Some twenty Hopi leaders signed a petition to the Commissioner asking for such an institution, but such a request did not have the full support of all members of the tribe. Oraibi quickly emerged as the focal point of the deepest and bitterest opposition to the enrollment of children in school.  

As in other Indian communities, the people at Oraibi and elsewhere within Hopi communities perceived—correctly, one might add—that schooling was a central feature in the assimilationist program; schooling was designed to change their children, to alter their values, beliefs, and goals. Moreover, attendance in school conflicted with the availability of children for religious instruction in the traditional ways. This was particularly true for children who were shipped eastward in the early 1890s, often against their will, to schools such as Carlisle in Pennsylvania and Haskell in Kansas. But education posed a dilemma and a threat even if the schooling were to take place locally.  

Another integral element in the Americanization effort would be the encouragement of individual land holding. This component inspired such pieces of legislation as the General Allotment Act of 1887, sponsored by Senator Henry Dawes of Massachusetts. Under the authority granted by this act, the president could authorize the division of communal land holdings into individual parcels. An Indian agent could choose a parcel for any member of the tribe; “surplus” land—now in short supply at
the close of the frontier—could be sold. Given the relatively small Hopi population, quite a bit of land thus could have disappeared from tribal control. Moreover, the individualization of land threatened the communal nature of Hopi society and economy.  

Finally, a third aspect of the Americanization program was conversion to Christianity and thus conversion away from customary indigenous religious practices, beliefs, and ceremonies. After the Civil War, Protestant missionary efforts intensified among the Hopis. The Moravians came to Oraibi in 1870, the Baptists to Mishongnovi in 1875, and most significantly the Mennonites to Oraibi in 1893. The Mennonite missionary was Heinrich R. Voth, born in a Mennonite colony in Russia, an immigrant to the United States in 1874. Voth’s presence and activities stirred up considerable activity. Not only did efforts toward conversion divide the people, but his attempts to record Hopi ceremonies provoked a good deal of resentment.  

Voth thus represented one of the first ethnologists to work among the Hopis, and his recordings inevitably encouraged greater ceremonial secrecy and stronger suspicion against outsiders.  

Clearly around the turn of the nineteenth century an unprecedented onslaught was occurring upon traditional Hopi life. The Anglo-Americans assuredly should be considered a more serious threat to the Hopi world than the Spanish. The Anglo-Americans had greater numbers and a progressively more sophisticated technology. They also were and are a more immediate and more permanent presence. The Anglo-Americans would be more persistent. The entire thrust of their national experience did not make them yield easily. Could Hopis maintain a separate identity? On what terms should they deal with these newcomers? To what extent were certain accommodations not only inevitable but necessary?  

The history of white-Indian relations in this country suggests that men and women of good will may differ over the appropriate strategy, over the proper behavior, and over the definition of identity. The Hopis are not exceptions to the rule. During the past century, they have disagreed amongst themselves over how to proceed. And while it is useful to review such factionalism, it is still more important not to exaggerate its consequences.  

In the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth, then, Hopis experienced a series of remarkable confrontations with the United States, during the peak of the Americanization era. The allotment program proved short-lived. By 1894 attempts at allotting lands to Hopi individuals had ceased. Opposition by some of the people combined with protests from outsiders interested in the tribe’s well-being led to stalemate, then cessation of the attempted imposition. The people were too intimately tied to the mesas; they had little desire to spread their settlements through their country, even if they would work land removed at some distance from their abodes.  

It was not an easy victory. In 1891 a surveying party sent out in connection with the land allotment scheme aroused suspicion and hostility. The negative response could not entirely be separated from opposition to other government programs, particularly to that of compulsory education. The opponents, hailing from Oraibi and often referred to as “Oraibis” in government reports, ripped out the survey stakes. Cavalrymen were sent out to confront the “hostiles”—another term being applied with increasing frequency. Lieutenant L. M. Brett and his cohorts attempted to enter the ancient village, despite warnings and admonitions to the contrary.  

What happened next may be considered extraordinary and fantastic. It also worked. Spider Woman and Masau-u, the God of Death—as portrayed by two Hopi men—suddenly appeared. They
told the amazed soldiers they must leave; Masau-u took a feather and sprinkled some special and pow-
erful liquid on the cavalrymen. Then the Hopi defenders appeared with weapons of uncertain vintage. 
There was a limit to Lieutenant Brett’s bravery or foolishness. He with his men retreated to Keams 
Canyon. It is a good thing that he did. It is said that Kua-tu-ju-e, an immense winged spirit, could still 
have opposed Brett had he been audacious enough to continue.

Recalling the jingoistic spirit of the age, it will not be surprising to learn that this chapter does not 
end here. Later that month, Colonel P. C. Corbin with four troops and two Hotchkiss guns came to Ke-
ams Canyon where they picked up the understandably hesitant Thomas Keam and moved westward. 
In the face of such artillery, Hopis at Oraibi avoided direct confrontation. They permitted some of 
their leaders to be arrested and taken as prisoners to Fort Wingate, New Mexico Territory. Most were 
returned to their homeland within a year, but one of the apparent issues in the confrontation was the 
government’s insistence that the people accept one man as an official leader, which divided the village. 
The Hopis in Oraibi were not willing to do so. Nevertheless, the government chose to work with Loo-
lolma who was in fact the village chief, but for Hopis he seemed too accommodating to the whites. 
Lo-lolma headed what in Oraibe were called “the friendlies,” and a rival faction emerged there, headed 
by Lomahongyoma, and labeled by unsympathetic officials as “the hostiles.” The two groups disagreed 
as well over control of ceremonies. 21

Federal authorities had little desire to see Lomahongyoma and his allies gain the upper hand. 
They had previously gone so far as to ship Lomahongyoma and eighteen other “hostiles” to Fort Wing-
ate in 1891, where they were imprisoned for seven months. If authorities believed this would alter 
the group’s perspective, they were mistaken. The conflict continued, even after Loololma’s death about 
1900. When Tawaquaptewa, a younger nephew of Loololma and Loololma’s chosen successor, as-
umed the position of chief in 1904, things reached a breaking point. The most important ceremonies 
were each being performed by the two sides (which shows that Loololma’s adherents were not simply 
assimilationists) and many believed that these ceremonial deviances threatened ill fortune for all. 22

Lomahongyoma, too, now left this remarkable drama around 1905. He turned over leadership of 
his group to Yukima, and Yukima, if anything, escalated the controversy. How could this crisis be 
resolved, particularly without interference from Washington? Yukima eventually hit upon a solution. 
There would be a kind of duel, in which one side tried to push the other over a line. The bloodless bat-
tle took place in 1906, with Yukima’s band being physically forced outside of the village. The price of 
their “defeat” was eviction. They left the village of Oraibi and built a new village which became known 
as Hotevilla. 23

There were several crucial results of this conflict. On the one hand, Hopis had resolved the matter 
by themselves. This was an exceptional triumph under most trying circumstances. But it proved to be 
a somewhat tarnished victory. The federal government persisted for some time in its policies. Many 
“hostile” leaders were jailed, nonetheless. Tawaquaptewa and the winners did not survive unscathed, 
either. He was forced to attend Sherman Boarding School at Riverside, California, for four years. Dur-
ing his sojourn, he lost some adherents, who turned to Christianity. Tawaquaptewa returned, un-
converted, and disagreements continued. Yet another village, Bacabi, was founded, followed by New 
Oraibi at the base of Third Mesa. Oraibi had won, but in many ways, it was a hollow victory. By mid-
century few people remained in the ancient village, while New Oraibi, site of Lorenzo Hubbell’s trad-
ing post, the Mennonite mission, and a day school, had become the most populous of all the Hopi communities.24

During and since that era, the outside world has not granted the Hopi people the blessing of isolation. Schooling, as already indicated, was a major case in point. In Sun Chief, his autobiography, Don Talayesva vividly recalled his experiences in the strange environment surrounding formal education. Talayesva was among those shipped to Riverside, after earlier schooling on the reservation. He grew up, as he puts it,

. . . believing that Whites are wicked, deceitful people. It seemed that most of them were soldiers, government agents or missionaries. . . . Like Navahos, they were proud and domineering—and needed to be reminded daily to tell the truth. I was taught to mistrust them and give warning whenever I saw one coming.25

Talayesva was predictably resilient. He found humor grim situations—even in school:

I had lots of fun at school this year. Sometime I played jokes on the teachers, but only on days when they seemed happy. They never whipped me, although the disciplinarian paddled me once. One evening after roll call we had gone upstairs to bed. Taps had not yet sounded and the oil lamps were still lighted. Draping a white sheet around my body, I climbed up on the head of the bed, extended my hands, lifted up my face, and said, “Boys, I am Jesus Christ, the Second, the Son of God. I am the resurrection and the life. Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not.”—Just then the disciplinarian walked in and said, “What is this?” I told him I had done no harm, that I was only preaching, but he looked stern and started to paddle me. “These other fellows were in it, too,” I protested. “Well,” he replied, “since you are Jesus I will let you suffer for their sins.”26

Conversion formed another basic part of the Americanization process. Religious conversion, of course, was centrally important, but Indian agents sought generally to make over Hopis earlier in the twentieth century into a white image. Superintendent Charles E. Burton ordered all Hopi men and boys in 1900 to get their hair cut. Those who did not get their hair cut voluntarily would have it cut forcibly. Charles Lummis and others cried out against what they termed “this pinhead official,” but Burton earned only a slap on the hand, following publicity, and remained at his post.27 Another Superintendent, Leo Crane, exhibited his ethnocentricity toward the people he had been assigned. He saw the villages, new and old, as havens of disease and filth, as places that should be abandoned. Consider his description of Hotevilla, and we have another indication of the enduring nature of the Hopi against agents of Crane’s ilk:

It was simply a dirtier duplicate of the other pueblos I have described, without their picturesque setting. And if there is a place in America where aroma reaches its highest magnitude, then that distinction must be granted Hotevilla on a July afternoon. The sun broils down on the heated sand and rock ledges, on the fetid houses and the litter and the garbage, and all that accumulates from unclean people and their ani-
Figure 77. INTERIOR WITH HOPI GIRL
Owen Seumptewa, photograph, 1981 (Courtesy of the photographer, Second Mesa, Arizona)
mals. Multitudes of burros and chickens and dogs. Hosts of dogs. Lank, slinking, half-starved, challenging dogs. Poisonous-looking dogs that would attack one. . . . The smell of cooking arose from the houses, a muttony odor,—although it may have been burro-haunch,—mingled with smoke and the thick incense of smouldering cedar. In and out of the doorways the women passed at their tasks. . . . They were all indifferent, with a contemptuous sullen indifference to the stranger. There was a perfect swarm of children, wary, watching children, ready to dart and hide, long-haired and dirty, and most of them as nude as Adam.28

Hotevilla also was the site under the administration of Superintendent Robert Daniel of another notorious, celebrated incident in June 1920, where Indian Service employees and policemen forced men, women and children to do what Daniel termed “my delousing party.” Daniel could not believe the resistance: “. . . they had to be driven or dragged to the tub, and forced into it like some wild beast, unblessed with human intelligence. Pure unadulterated fanatical perversity is the only explanation.”29

People may respond in different ways to such bigotry and intolerance. They certainly need not be convinced that total assimilation is desirable. Life is ongoing in a world growing ever smaller. People assuredly are living in a world that is ever-changing. When one considers how incredibly the world has changed since 1950, let alone 1900, one wonders about how cultures survive. How could Hopis endure? How could they maintain a separate, integral identity?

The answer is complex and largely beyond the scope of this brief overview. What can be generally noted is that most of the Hopis have been willing to make certain accommodations with the non-Hopis. They have been willing to change, for no culture is static. This change has taken various forms. Hopis have not always been silversmiths. They have had a cyclical tradition of pottery making. Yet they were willing to incorporate silversmithing, and they were willing to encourage the making of pottery. They have not always spoken English, yet now most do. They obviously have not always driven pickup trucks or played basketball. To say that they do so now is not to say they are any less Hopi for such contemporary adaptations.

So why have they endured and how has continuation been possible? Surely values and beliefs continue to inform Hopi decision-making. Moreover, anthropologist Frederick Barth has a telling insight. He reminds us that “a drastic reduction of cultural differences between ethnic groups does not correlate in any simple way with a reduction in the organizational relevance of ethnic identities, or a breakdown in boundary-maintaining processes.”30 The ethnic boundary for Hopis represents a clear and unshakable understanding that begins with the land. The maintenance of a land base has been central to the continuity of Hopi life.

Between the mid-1880s and the late 1920s American Indians lost control over about two-thirds of their land. That result should not have been surprising, given the forces at hand that worked to reduce the Native estate. What is remarkable and even borders on the surprising for the uninitiated is the way in which Indians still found ways to thwart interests that every day pushed for separating them from the land. The Hopis and other Indian communities were determined not to be the generation that surrendered. Indians benefited from knowing more about how others had negotiated in the past. Because Arizona did not join the American Union until February 14, 1912, it increased the changes for Hopis.
and other Indian nations to maintain or add to their base. The Hopis, Navajos, and other Indians did not and truly could not stem this tide entirely. The degree to which in certain areas they found ways to cut losses and work for continuation remains a vitally important and almost entirely unknown story.

Hopi history is an ongoing record of the past, one that reveals victors as well as victims. As it informs us about prior achievements, it may also be preparing the way for future accomplishments. In the final analysis, Hopi history provides a portrait of a people who will not vanish. They will not disappear. They will remain.
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