

7-1-1996

Of Boundary Shifters and Disappearing Tribes: Reverberation between East Africa and the American Southwest

Jan Bender Shetler

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Shetler, Jan Bender. "Of Boundary Shifters and Disappearing Tribes: Reverberation between East Africa and the American Southwest." *New Mexico Historical Review* 71, 3 (1996).
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol71/iss3/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Of Boundary Shifters and Disappearing Tribes: Reverberation between East Africa and the American Southwest

JAN BENDER SHETLER

In their recent collection of essays, *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America* (1993), Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, et al. outline some of the ways in which historians of Africa and Latin America are engaged in meaningful dialogue. In his introduction to the essays, Steve J. Stern argues that in spite of extreme fragmentation and specialization in historical studies there is also an increasing incidence of “reverberation” in which scholars now carry on their debates across disciplinary and geographically defined boundaries. Indeed, it has now become necessary for historians of Africa and Latin America to be comfortable in the academic discourses of anthropology, linguistics, literature and economics, among others. *Confronting Historical Paradigms* argues for a convergence of interests around three interrelated themes common to both Latin America and Africa—the capitalist world system, struggles over labor, and the problem of peasantries.¹

Historians of Africa have long appreciated the overlapping concerns of Africa and of the African diaspora in the Americas but have tended to overlook the less obvious reverberation in terms of Native American history. Anthropologists made these connections during the heyday of structural–functionalism but let them fall into disuse as universalist theories were discredited. As social history and historical anthropology increasingly meet on common ground, I would suggest that there are important areas of convergence for scholars of the American Southwest and scholars of East Africa in particular. Historians, anthro-

Jan Bender Shetler is finishing dissertation research as a Fulbright Fellow in Mara Region, Tanzania. She writes from her farm in Dove Creek, Colorado, where she lives with her husband and two sons.

pologists, and archaeologists of the precolonial/precontact era of each region are concerned with trying to understand sociocultural change where different groups practicing different subsistence strategies made a living and interacted on marginal and fragile ecosystems.

Each set of scholars struggles with older historical paradigms that assume a linear evolution of "eras" and cultural changes through diffusion. These assumptions have led to similar dead ends in both fields. Regarding East Africa, the ahistorical assumption that discrete tribes moved as a unit across the landscape led scholars to speculate about superior Hamitic peoples from the north who brought civilization to Bantu-speaking Africa. Archaeologists of the Southwest, meanwhile, are left with the continuing problem of the Anasazi "disappearance" or "abandonment" hundreds of years before European contact. In each of these fields, scholars are coming to new understandings about the past by looking beyond ethnically or culturally assumed categories of human groups to larger regional systems where peoples who followed different subsistence patterns worked out interdependent means of interaction over the centuries. Researchers are now questioning fixed ethnic identities and exploring the ways in which "boundary shifting" occurred over time.²

Two books that have recently appeared point out the exciting convergence and reverberation between these two widely separated geographic areas. *Being Maasai: Ethnicity and Identity in East Africa*, edited by Thomas Spear and Richard Waller and *A Hopi Social History: Anthropological Perspectives on Sociocultural Persistence and Change*, by Scott Rushforth and Steadman Upham clearly illustrate that scholars of similar interests in different geographical areas have far too little interaction with each other, which in turn necessitates much "re-invention of the wheel." Each field of study has its own historiographical tradition that includes strengths and weaknesses and that would benefit from interaction. Both books mentioned above represent significant collaboration between historians and anthropologists, although the disciplinary boundaries seem to be holding more firmly in Southwestern studies than in African.³

It is my hope that this article will spark some of that much needed "dialogue across fragmented intellectual boundaries and a wrestling with theory and paradigm as they had been developed in the West."⁴ As a historian of precolonial East African history who finds herself living in the Southwest and listening to the historical debates here, I hope to perhaps open new doors for further inquiry. Since I know East African historiography better than Southwestern, my comments tend to come from one direction, although my hope is that scholars of the Southwest will provide Africanists with comments from the other direction. When I read *A Hopi Social History*, I was struck by the similarities to East Afri-

can historical issues and debates and by the possibility to learn from each other. Each set of scholars could be challenged to entertain new models or avenues of inquiry that have been useful elsewhere, rather than to simply accept a universal solution to similar historical problems.

Rushforth and Upham's book stands out because their conclusions concerning the old question of the Anasazi "abandonment" of many pueblo sites in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries runs counter to past wisdom based on theories of either depopulation or migration. In spite of extensive historical and archaeological study in this area that any African archaeologist would envy, the authors conclude that there still exists no data to substantiate either mass migrations or high mortality rates. Rushforth and Upham posit instead that hunter/gatherers and agricultural puebloan dwellers had a long history of interaction in the area, and developed a flexible "mixed subsistence strategy" that allowed them to oscillate between sedentary and mobile lifestyles. Archaeological evidence from "limited activity sites" of mobile hunting groups, formerly ignored in favor of larger architectural sites of puebloan farmers, supports these suppositions. In their tentative suggestion that "different groups, some relying on strategies emphasizing sedentism and agriculture, some relying on mobility and hunting-gathering, co-existed, perhaps symbiotically." The authors cite African precedents as models that are at least thirty years old and have been modified and surpassed in more recent African historiography.⁵

Past African historiography that dealt with the emergence of the powerful Maasai pastoralists who dominated the Rift Valley of East Africa beginning in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also assumed that new groups migrated from outside and depopulated the areas in which they entered through protracted warfare. The essays in Spear and Waller's volume, though, tell a different story of Maasai pastoralists living in close symbiotic relationship with Bantu-speaking farmers and Okiek-speaking hunter/gatherers. The "pastoral revolution" that allowed Maasai hegemony was only possible within the context of this interdependent system. As pastoralists, the Maasai controlled the source of storable wealth and were thus able to trade with hunter/gatherers for honey, wild plants, and meat, and with agriculturalists for grain. The Maasai diet, despite their ideal of blood and milk, was dependent upon grain. In times of famine, some Maasai men would trade their women and children to agriculturalists in exchange for food. Some agriculturalists adopted Maasai social organization and rituals, and recognized as their leaders Maasai prophets. Hunter/gatherers often spent time in Maasai camps as menial laborers, potters, and ironworkers.⁶

Both books I am reviewing here question the common assumptions about linear evolution, especially claims that humans abandoned earlier subsistence patterns in response to new innovations. Evidence from Africa demonstrates that pastoralists, agriculturalists, and hunter/gatherers have coexisted for thousands of years. Richard Elphick's study of San hunter/gatherers and Khoikhoi pastoralists in southern Africa provides another example of interdependent relations between distinct groups. Pastoralist Khoikhoi joined the San and took up hunting when drought or disaster destroyed their herds, hoping to build up another herd over time. In good times, San hunters became dependents and laborers for Khoikhoi herders and received livestock in return to begin their own herds. Elphick uses a dynamic model of interaction to describe this complex ecological cycle of hunting and herding. Edwin Wilmsen, in another example from southern Africa, *Land Filled with Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari*, explodes the category of hunter/gatherers that delineates them as archaic evolutionary throwbacks. Instead, he argues, hunter/gatherers, are important links in regional systems that involve what scholars have traditionally considered to be more "advanced" civilizations.⁷

Corinne Kratz, John L. Berntsen, and Michael Kenny each write about the Dorobo, or Okiek hunter/gatherers, in the East African Rift Valley as integral and nonexpendable parts of a larger economy in which each group has a distinct sense of identity. Richard Waller argues that the nineteenth-century Rift Valley should be considered as a total regional resource system in which peoples exploited diverse ecological niches in this insecure environment and formed an interlocking regional framework of interdependencies, reinforced through networks of kinship and patronage. Although Rushforth and Upham suggest but do not develop such a model, a similar line of analysis for precontact societies in the Southwest may help explain the periodic rise and demise of large-scale intensive agricultural societies in a marginal arid environment.⁸

Scholars of the American Southwest have recently opened up whole new areas of inquiry by looking at the Southwest as a regional system rather than in terms of its discrete units. Carroll Riley demonstrated through the use of early Spanish accounts, archaeology, and ethnography that the "Greater Southwest" had important trade links with Mesoamerica. Katherine Spielmann further demonstrated similar interdependencies between nomadic plains Indians and southwestern agriculturalists. In both of these analyses, however, southwestern societies, or the "provinces" that made up the region, are defined by their agricultural components even though Riley briefly acknowledged that hunting groups "filled the interstices of the Greater Southwest" and "did function as part of the larger polity to the extent that they were middlemen for trade." Due to a lack of physical evidence, Riley concludes that the

hunters should be treated as “essentially outsiders in terms of the complex of relationships that linked the various Southwesterners.” In a recent review of research on the Southwest, George J. Gumerman acknowledges a lack of attention to the influence of hunter/gatherer populations on agriculturalists. Steadman Upham, one of the few to take up the issue of hunter/gatherer populations, identifies them as indigenous southwestern peoples, different from the Athapaskan groups who arrived much later from the Great Plains. Upham argues that the existence of some of these hunter/gatherer populations was a result of the collapse of the puebloan regional system before the arrival of the Spanish, when many agriculturalists turned to a more mobile lifestyle as a response to crises.⁹

In spite of this important work on regional systems and the interactions of agriculturalists and hunter/gatherers, tantalizingly little work in the Southwest exists that deals with the ethnic identities of these groups, or with the nature and permeability of social boundaries in the precontact era. As Linda S. Cordell laments, “Given the rich resources relating to ethnicity in the Southwest it is disappointing to find that the topic has received so little attention from researchers.” She attributes this in part to the assumption archaeologists make that modern pueblo identities correspond largely to their precontact analogues. Cordell cites African scholarship that could provide models for understanding ethnicity as being fluid over time.¹⁰

In contrast, much recent East African literature has been concerned with the ways in which ethnic identity and economic specialization seem to converge at particular times and places. Maasai oral traditions about the creation of the world delineate three categories of people: herders, hunters, and farmers. This simple division does not accurately describe the complex ways in which people related to each other in the Rift Valley, but it does indicate one important way people understood themselves in relation to others. These ethnic and economic boundaries were constantly crossed as Maasai lost their cattle and “became Dorobo,” or farmers built up their herds over generations and “became Maasai.” John S. Galaty, however, argues in Spear and Waller that these boundaries were not completely flexible and open, but instead were negotiated in specific and complex ways—otherwise, they would have had no efficacy as boundaries.¹¹

In Southwestern historiography, “tribal” names as categories of historical analysis seem to be even more frequently imposed on the past in rigid and potentially misleading ways. Upham, in particular, has challenged interpretations of precontact society in terms of the “ethnographic present.” Rushforth and Upham argue for a recognition of a continuing substratum of hunter/gatherer populations in the Southwest who have been ignored by archaeologists because of the unobtrusive

character of their material remains. Yet the authors do not seek evidence (slim though it might be) as to the identity of these hunter/gathers or how puebloan dwellers might have slipped in and out of hunting/gathering lifeways when the need arose. Were these people a separate group with their own identity or a seasonal manifestation of puebloan society? What were the institutional mechanisms that allowed people to cross those boundaries? The possibilities have been obscured by prior assumptions about "Hopi" as a unit of social analysis when a bounded society of this type may only have existed during reservation years. How did the meaning of "being Hopi" change over time? When does it become an anachronism to use this term?¹²

Joseph Tainter and Fred Plog have similarly criticized the central archaeological notion of "cultural traditions" such as "Anasazi" or "Mogollon," identified in Southwestern material remains. In the same volume, Upham, Patricia L. Crown, and Stephen Plog elaborate on this critique by using the East African example of Acholi ethnicity that was documented by Ronald Atkinson. He argues that Acholi identity was a result of heterogeneous groups gradually forming larger political and economic alliance networks that in turn led to the adoption of a similar and distinctive Acholi language and culture. Using this model, Tainter and Plog reevaluate Southwestern prehistory by starting with assumptions of "cultural heterogeneity and adaptive variability," rather than the evolution of homogeneous cultural traditions. Others have argued that archaeologists fundamentally distort the record of the past because they force all their data regarding material remains into an abstract set of normative pigeon holes.¹³

By questioning the unit of analysis and moving beyond assumed categories of ethnic identity, scholars can begin to make sense of the larger picture of interaction between groups rather than contemplating each in isolation. It then becomes clear that there is not one set of boundaries, but multiple boundaries and group identities that operate in different circumstances. Rushforth and Upham discuss Hopi social structure in terms of segmentary lineage, marriage, and religious affiliations, each of which create different sets of social boundaries. But what are the possibilities for social mechanisms that connect to people outside the "Hopi"? In their chapter about the period from 1680–1879, the authors document the large influx of refugees from the Rio Grande pueblos to the Hopi mesas. What were the connections (kinship, patronage, trade relations, or religious institutions) between the Hopi and the Rio Grande pueblos that made this massive movement and settlement of people possible?¹⁴

Rushforth and Upham, in their chapters on social change theories, include a solid critique of scholars who give prominence to sociocultural contact from outside the society in question, through diffusion or acculturation theory. They fail, though, to ask a more fundamental question: How does the anthropologist determine the boundaries of those "different, autonomous sociocultural systems" that come into contact?¹⁵

Given the emerging picture of interactions between different ethnic groups in the Southwest, is it really accurate to use the term "isolation" at all? Rushforth and Upham use the concept of "isolation" and its subsequent breakdown as a causal factor of social change among the Hopi. But is their concept of "isolation" an objective state that describes the absence of contact with others, or only a lack of incorporation into a nation-state and the capitalist world economy? What is described as Hopi "cultural conservatism" is an aspect of group identity formed in relation to others, not in isolation, as recent Southwest scholarship has so aptly demonstrated. Without the threat of "others" there would be no need for the conservation of tradition. The "others" against which Hopi identity has been formed are not just Anglo society, but the many "others" who inhabited the precontact landscape. The explanation of social stability until 1853 must rest not on a premise of absolute isolation but rather on the nature and extent of the relations with others that operated at the time.¹⁶

Just as archaeologists may have missed the presence of hunter/gatherers because of sparse material remains, so historical ethnographers may have missed the importance of relations with "others" because of sparse remains in the social structure. The remnants of these connections may be found at the level of informal household strategy or, as Peter M. Whiteley's work on the Hopi suggests, in questioning our assumptions about clan structure. In East African historiography, both Carole A. Buchanan and Gunther Schlee, among others, argue that the same lineages and clans can be found in different "tribes" and serve an instrumental purpose in binding people together in different localities for relief, trade, or alliance. In the Southwest, Hartman H. Lomawaima demonstrates that Hopi clans today transcend ethnic boundaries and unite puebloan peoples throughout the Southwest. He uses models from oral tradition to suggest that the Hopi are not unilineal descendants of San Juan "basketmakers" but rather a mixture of peoples from all over the Southwest. Numerous examples from East Africa demonstrate how people from various ethnic affiliations clustered around powerful ritual specialists and healers to form new group identities. Identity seems to have varied according to situation and context. Institutional ties of kinship, patronage, ritual, or trade allowed these various identities to be called into play as the need arose. In the Great Lakes region of East Africa, David Newbury demonstrates how clan identities were reformu-

lated as they, in turn, created the identity of the emerging kingdom. Rushforth and Upham's analysis also includes discussions about the flexibility of clan organization and function as a key to historical change among the Hopi.¹⁷

In their sophisticated discussion of the various anthropological theories of persistence and change, Rushforth and Upham posit an underlying cultural continuity with considerable flexibility in sociocultural arrangements. Yet in their case studies their analysis of the earliest time periods relies heavily on material explanations of change (demographic, environmental) while their analysis of later periods allows for more human agency. Rushforth and Upham's treatment of the most recent time period uses world systems theory without taking into account Steve Stern's critique of Immanuel Wallerstein, which incorporates much of Rushforth and Upham's concern for local particularistic factors of change as opposed to deterministic global factors. Are these discrepancies a result of the nature of the evidence or of the secondary sources on which they rely?¹⁸

A recent book in East African history that deals with these same theoretical concerns about continuity and change through the use of a specific case study is Steven Feierman's *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania*. His work follows various streams of Shambaa peasant discourse surrounding the concept of "healing and harming the land" in relation to political leadership from precolonial to postcolonial times. Feierman, like Whiteley for the Hopi, is interested in restoring human agency to the historical narrative. But, in contrast to Whiteley, he goes beyond the agency of the elite to document, for example, women farmers' resistance to conservation schemes, in which they protested the disenfranchisement of marginal members of society. Although hegemonic discourse is acknowledged as powerful and diffuse throughout society, Feierman demonstrates the existence and efficacy of counter-discourses created by peasant intellectuals. This type of approach might look at the destruction of Awatovi, in terms of the Hopi, less as an example of cultural conservatism and the desire to isolate Hopi society and more as a struggle among some intellectuals to exert moral control over how those new forces would be integrated. This approach would concentrate less on the declining relevance of Hopi lineages and religious/political institutions in more recent times and more on how older cultural concepts have been used in creative ways by various groups within Hopi society to deal with a changing historical context. Although Rushforth and Upham discuss James C. Scott's concept of the "everyday forms of peasant resistance," they do not apply it to the most obvious Hopi actions. The parallels between indirect "colonial" rule and resistance in Africa and the Southwest are legion.¹⁹

Southwestern scholars have a much larger empirical knowledge base in terms of the sheer amount of data regarding population, disease, and material remains. The historical record also reaches back much further. Rather than stand in envy of these resources, Africanists might see in advance the kinds of studies that have yielded the most useful data at a time when resources for scholarship in Africa are limited. Southwestern scholars also have a much deeper and richer ethnographic and linguistic database from which to draw and have experimented with the use of ethnography and linguistics as historical sources.

I am not arguing that Africanist and Southwestern scholars will find the same or even similar social patterns in these two widely separated areas. Rather, since we seem to be working on similar problems, a dialogue between us could suggest modes of inquiry that might not be considered within the particular historiographic tradition in which we each work. It is not possible today for a scholar to span the two geographic areas of expertise as a Harold Courlander or a Melville J. Herskovits might have done thirty years ago, yet it is possible to listen to each other and to apply useful insights to our own work. The two books under review—*Being Maasai: Ethnicity and Identity in East Africa*, edited by Thomas Spear and Richard Waller and *A Hopi Social History* by Scott Rushforth and Steadham Upham—are particular reminders that not only should historians, anthropologists, and archaeologists be in dialogue, but also that scholars of Africa and the Americas can learn from each other in unexpected ways. As Stern suggests in his analogy of the academic household, let's stop leaning out the windows and open the inside doors which connect the rooms of our separate disciplines and fields of study to sit down for a talk.²⁰

NOTES

1. Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, Florencia E. Mallon, William Roseberry and Steve J. Stern, *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

2. John G. Galaty, "'The Eye that Wants a Person, Where Can It Not See?': Inclusion, Exclusion, and Boundary Shifters in Maasai Identity," in *Being Maasai: Ethnicity and Identity in East Africa*, ed. Thomas Spear and Richard Waller (London, England: James Currey, 1993), 174-94.

3. Spear and Waller, *Being Maasai: Ethnicity and Identity in East Africa*; Scott Rushforth and Steadman Upham, *A Hopi Social History: Anthropological Perspectives on Sociocultural Persistence and Change* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992).

4. Steve J. Stern, "Africa, Latin America, and the Splintering of Historical Knowledge: From Fragmentation to Reverberation," in *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, 10.

5. Rushforth and Upham, *A Hopi Social History*, 51–55, 66; P.H. Gulliver, *The Family Herds: A Study of Two Pastoral Peoples in East Africa, the Jie and the Turkana* (London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955) and Jean J. Macquet, *The Premise of Inequality in Ruanda: A Study of Political Relations in a Central African Kingdom* (London, England: Oxford University Press, 1961). For the Rwanda case, see the more recent study by Catherine Newbury, *The Cohesion of Oppression: Clientship and Ethnicity in Rwanda, 1860–1960* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

6. See also John L. Berntsen, "Pastoralism, Raiding, and Prophets: Maasailand in the Nineteenth Century" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1979).

7. As evidenced by the most recent collection of Southwestern research on the precontact era, the assumption about cultural evolution as a matter of "progression" from simple to complex societies is still the guiding paradigm, with important modifications. See George J. Gumerman and Murray Gell-Mann, "Cultural Evolution in the Prehistoric Southwest," in *Themes in Southwest Prehistory*, ed. George J. Gumerman (Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press, 1994), 11–31. For a critique of evolutionary thought, see Fred Plog, "The Sinagua and their Relations," in *Dynamics of Southwest Prehistory*, ed. Linda S. Cordell and George J. Gumerman (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 263–91; Richard Elphick, *Khoikhoi and the Founding of White South Africa* (Johannesburg, South Africa: Ravan Press, 1985); Edwin N. Wilmsen, *Land Filled with Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

8. See John L. Berntsen, "The Maasai and their Neighbors: Variables of Interaction," *African Economic History* 2 (Fall 1976), 1–11; Corinne Kratz, "Are the Okiek Really Maasai? Or Kisigis? Or Kikuyu?" *Cahiers d'études africaines* 20 (1980), 355–68; Michael Kenny, "A mirror in the forest: the Dorobo hunter-gatherers as an image of the other," *Africa* 51 (1981), 477–94; Richard Waller, "Ecology, migration, and expansion in East Africa," *African Affairs* 84 (July 1985), 347–70.

9. Carroll L. Riley, *The Frontier People: The Greater Southwest in the Protohistoric Period* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987), xi, 14; Katherine A. Spielmann, "Colonists, Hunters, and Farmers: Plains-Pueblo Interaction in the Seventeenth Century," in *Columbian Consequences: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West*, ed. David Hurst Thomas, 3 vols. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 1: 101–11; George J. Gumerman, "Patterns and Perturbations in Southwest Prehistory," in *Themes in Southwest Prehistory*, 3–10; Steadman Upham, *Politics and Power: An Economic and Political History of the Western Pueblo* (New York: Academic Press, 1982), 47–51, 106–8.

10. See Steadman Upham and Lori Stephens Reed, "Regional Systems in the Central and Northern Southwest: Demography, Economy, and Sociopolitics Preceding Contact," in *Columbian Consequences*, 1:57–76; Linda S. Cordell, "Durango to Durango: An Overview of the Southwest Heartland," in *Columbian Consequences*, 1:17–40.

11. John G. Galaty, "The Eye that Wants a Person," 174–94.

12. This argument is integral to Upham's analysis in *Politics and Power*; see also Rushforth and Upham, *A Hopi Social History*, 59.

13. Joseph A. Tainter and Fred Plog, "Strong and Weak Patterning in Southwestern Prehistory: The Formation of Puebloan Archaeology," 165–80 and Steadman Upham, Patricia L. Crown, and Stephen Plog, "Alliance Formation and Cultural Identity in the American Southwest," 183–210, both in *Themes in Southwest Pre-*

history; Ronald R. Atkinson, "The Evolution of Ethnicity among the Acholi of Uganda: The Precolonial Phase," *Ethnohistory* 36 (Winter 1989), 19-43; Linda S. Cordell and Fred Plog, "Escaping the Confines of Normative Thought: A Reevaluation of Puebloan Prehistory," *American Antiquity* 44 (July 1979), 405-29.

14. Segmentary lineage theory is one area in which anthropologists of the Americas and anthropologists of Africa have learned from each other. Rushforth and Upham cite the works of Meyer Fortes, *The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi; being the first part of an analysis of the social structure of a trans-Volta tribe* (London, England: Oxford University Press, 1945) and *The Web of Kinship among the Tallensi: The Second Part of an analysis of the Social History of the Trans-Volta Tribe* (London, England: Oxford University Press 1949); Max Gluckman on *Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa* (New York: Free Press, 1963) and Victor Turner, *The Forest of Symbols* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967).

15. Rushforth and Upham, *A Hopi Social History*, 202. See also Eric Wolf, "Inventing Society," *American Ethnologist*, 15 (November 1988), 752-61 on questioning the unit of analysis as a creation of academics. In Southwest scholarship, this problem is discussed by Gumerman and Gell-Mann in "Cultural Evolution in the Prehistoric Southwest," 13-14.

16. This is similar to the argument that David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975) makes in relation to American values and emancipation—without the category of "slave" there is no concept of "free." See also Steven Feierman, "African Histories and the Dissolution of World History," in *Africa and the Disciplines: The Contributions of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and Humanities*, ed. Robert H. Bates, V.Y. Mudimbe, and Jean F. O'Barr (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 185. On the concept of "the other" see Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

17. Peter M. Whiteley, "Unpacking Hopi 'Clans': Another Vintage Model Out of Africa?" *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41 (Winter 1985), 359-74 and "Unpacking Hopi 'Clans': Further Questions about Hopi Descent Groups," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 42 (Spring 1986), 69-79. Although Whiteley concludes that the mistake in Hopi ethnography was to use "an African model in the Arizona Highland" (p. 372), the same critique of classic descent theory—confusing the ideology of corporate clan unity for the more diffuse reality—has also been made in Africa. See Spear and Waller, *Being Maasai*; Carole A. Buchanan, "Perceptions of Ethnic Interaction in the East African Interior: The Kitara Complex," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 11 (1978), 410-28; Gunther Schlee, *Identities on the Move: Clanship and Pastoralism in Northern Kenya* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1989); Hartman H. Lomawaima, "Hopification, a Strategy for Cultural Preservation," in *Columbian Consequences*, 1:93-99; David Newbury, *Kings and Clans: Ijwi Island and the Lake Kivu Rift, 1780-1840* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).

18. Steve J. Stern, "Feudalism, Capitalism, and the World-System in the Perspective of Latin America and the Caribbean," in *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, 23-83.

19. Steven Feierman, *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990); also see Peter M. Whiteley, *Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture Through the Oraibi Split* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988) and Rushforth and Upham, *A Hopi Social History*, 167; James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1985).

20. Stern, "The Splintering of Historical Knowledge," 10.