



University of Texas at El Paso

From the SelectedWorks of Jeffrey P Shepherd

January 2008

At the Crossroads of Hualapai History, Memory, and American Colonization: Contesting Space and Place

Contact
Author

Start Your Own
SelectedWorks

Notify Me
of New Work



Available at: http://works.bepress.com/jeffrey_shepherd/1



Project
MUSE[®]
Scholarly journals online

At the Crossroads of Hualapai History, Memory, and American Colonization

Contesting Space and Place

JEFFREY P. SHEPHERD

On a cold morning in March 1994 dozens of Hualapais woke up at 6:00 a.m. to prepare for a run that would take them nearly two hundred miles along the Colorado River, from southern Arizona northward to their reservation on the rim of the Grand Canyon. The runners, ranging in age from five-year-old girls and boys to octogenarian women dressed in brightly patterned camp dresses, retraced the steps that their ancestors had taken over a century ago. In 1875 hundreds of Hualapais broke out of an internment camp in which they had been held by the U.S. military for a year. The La Paz Run, named after a camp inside the Colorado River Indian Reservation where the military relocated Hualapais in 1874, is part of what has become an annual, weeklong commemoration of survival in the wake of colonization. During the week of cultural events and social activities, tribal elders recount stories of forced removal, starvation, and the famous escape back to their homelands in northwestern Arizona, a place they call Hai:tat.¹ Tribal members on and off the reservation visit with each other, people from neighboring tribes come to the community, and old friends recount the best and worst of times.

The stories told by the elders and the collective memories of the community reveal a cultural landscape symbolizing death and suffering as well as hope and inspiration. Along with Keith Basso, I believe that

words and places carry meaning. Morals, identity, and culture are embedded in the streams and fields of Native landscapes. . . . Places serve as cultural mnemonic devices that remind people of events and the significance of those events for morality, behavior, and identity.²

But these acts of commemoration and storytelling about racial violences and conquests serve a purpose beyond reminding people about morality and behavior: they stand as acts of defiance and decolonization. Stories told by the elders about the Long Walk from La Paz and the contemporary retracing of that moment of Indigenous resistance play a part in redefining and rescripting the narrative of colonization in northwestern Arizona.

Standard, even “new Indian history” narratives of relocation and removal have generally avoided critical discussions of colonialism, memory, and space. Choosing instead to emphasize the important political, economic, social, and even cultural implications of such dislocations, much of what passes as “Indian” history fails to account for more numerous types of being in time and space. Top-down assimilationist policies and structural changes in the national and global economy have undoubtedly influenced Native patterns of movement, but many scholars have failed to investigate spatiocultural considerations, the persistence of Indigenous knowledge of place, and geographical continuity and the layers of meaning that frame Native identities and sense of place.³ We have failed to think spatially. In short, the sum total of the individual process of remaining in place and the collective experiences that constitute a tribe’s spatial memory help them understand their past and future in a decolonial manner.

Decolonial frameworks have structured much recent literature about Indigenous peoples and nations.⁴ Primarily outside or on the margins of the disciplinary fields of American Indian history and ethnohistory, work by critical scholars in American Indian and Native American studies has moved beyond discussions of the material impact of colonialism on Native people. A growing chorus of scholars has interrogated the impact of colonialism upon different dimensions of Native life: language, conceptualizations of history, narrative and performance traditions, relations with landscapes, metaphysics, and identity, to name a few. One such critique from Waziyatawin Angela Wilson has argued that “part of the colonization process for Indigenous Peoples has been the constant denigration of our intellectual, linguistic, and cultural contributions to the world.”⁵ Indeed, colonialism and colonization constitute relations of inequality perpetuated by one nation-state or empire toward other sovereign peoples in an attempt to extract resources, land, wealth, and knowledge. Various forms of control facilitate the extraction of resources.

Racialization facilitated colonialism by consolidating arguments for the appropriation of land and the criminalization of Indigenous religious practices. Compulsory school attendance, relocation, grave robbing, and forced sterilization worked hand in glove with these genocidal actions. Colonialism also included the construction of the very notion of “the West” and its material and ideological manifestations such as the printed word, science, rationality, objectivity, Christianity, private property, and the individual as superior forms of human existence. These manifestations rationalized and helped to facilitate the physical expropriation of resources from Indigenous lands and the controlling of Indigenous peoples themselves. In particular, the practices and professions of history and geography worked in tandem to delegitimize Indigenous conceptualizations of space, place, and the past.⁶

Challenging and uprooting these manifestations of colonialism form the core of the decolonization project as it exists in the lived experiences of Native people and the theoretical contributions of scholars. Drawing upon and even challenging the work of subaltern and postcolonial studies, decolonization collapses the dichotomy between scholarship and activism by revealing how academia, science, rationality, liberalism, and other projects have fueled and justified traditional notions of colonialism. To quote Winona Wheeler: “A large part of decolonization entails developing a critical consciousness about the cause(s) of our oppression, the distortion of history, our own collaboration, and the degrees to which we have internalized colonialist ideas and practices.”⁷ Decolonization offers a new set of tools to better understand how Indigenous peoples such as the Hualapais conceptualize, use, and perceive, on their own terms, their past and the places around them.

Using the Hualapais as an example, I argue that viewing Hualapai history through a convergence of space, place, and time reveals the stunning successes they have achieved in maintaining connections to and ties with traditional sites, cultural places, band homes, village locations, and the Indigenous geography of northwestern Arizona. Heeding the warning of Wilson, that “colonial dominance can be maintained only if the history of the subjugated is denied and that of the colonizer is elevated and glorified,” I highlight Hualapais’ resistance to relocation, armed confrontation with colonizing Anglos, seasonal migrations as wage laborers, use of railroads, constant car rides to Phoenix, and seemingly endless flights to Washington DC to argue that Hualapais have forged an Indigenous,

hybrid conceptualization of space and place that subverts colonial notions of history and geography.⁸ This persistence has remained in the shadows of “Indian” historiography because scholars have focused on a few traditional issues and employed the limited, though useful, methodology of ethnohistory. This methodology remains rooted in academic understandings of the history and culture of the “Other” rather than seeking to use Indigenous epistemologies as its starting point. Moreover, much literature on “Indian” history takes for granted the intellectual components of the very same colonialism that worked to dispossess Native peoples: liberal democracy, the individual, Cartesian notions of time and space, and the Western construct of history. Rather than critically investigate Indigenous movement and rootedness in place, scholars have imposed their own colonial visions upon Native peoples. They have done what Maori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith has observed in the relationship between Western scholarship and colonialism: “They came, they saw, they named, they claimed.”⁹

Refocusing an analytical lens upon Hualapai views of space, memory, and geographical hybridity resonates with the notion that “Indian” identity is an inherently contested mosaic of identities. Identity, like space, place, and history, is a complex terrain that is comprised of multiple factors and forces; it is not something pure or unadulterated. And yet all these factors have been defined by scholars working within academic fields that employ discourses and standards that exclude Indigenous views. Because of the impositions of scholars who have reified narratives of Hualapai decline, there is an urgent need to investigate Hualapai views on colonization as it has impacted their land, history, and memory. This Indigenous, indeed, Hualapai, line of vision rejects and critiques Enlightenment assumptions about time and space, the colonizing goals of the American nation-state, and the alleged separations between memory, place, and history. These conclusions are rooted in the lived experiences of Hualapai people themselves and in the academically based intellectual work of Indigenous scholars such as Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, who argue that an “oppositional, place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization by foreign peoples[,] . . . fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other people in the world.”¹⁰ As such, the Hualapais have faced modernity through the workings of colonial law, liberal democracy, capitalist development,

and Western time to construct identities that reflect and reimagine pre-conquest relations with the land. This is not a primordial or essentialist vision but an organic sense of peoplehood articulated from their lived experiences and ongoing struggles to hold onto their land, history, and homelands.¹¹

CONTESTING SPACE AND PLACE AT THE
END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Control of space and territory has formed a core arena of contention between Indians and non-Indians.¹² European notions of land and topography privileged private tenure and bureaucratic definitions of space while using the science of geography, techniques of mapping, and the power of surveying as tools of conquest. Military power across the nineteenth century enforced legislation that tried to concentrate Indians onto reservations where they could be controlled and monitored. When concentration failed, states employed genocidal tactics of dispersal and ethnic cleansing to “open” lands populated by Indigenous peoples. Hualapais encountered these new regimes of power in northwestern Arizona as non-Native Americans moved into their lands beginning in the 1850s and the U.S. military began a war of extermination against them in the 1860s and then relocated them to southern Arizona in 1874. Their attachment to homelands led them to escape and return northward a year later. When they went back, they discovered non-Indians encroaching upon their lands. This influx altered their interaction with the landscape and forced the Hualapais to adapt new strategies of movement through space.¹³

Less obvious manifestations of colonialism accompanied this blatant military conquest. For instance, non-Indians categorized Indigenous landscapes as “public domain” and “private property,” integrating them into a new field of knowledge and a matrix of laws and signs that marked them as beyond the reach of Hualapai bands. According to David Sibley in *Geographies of Exclusion*, this spatial colonialism reflects how “power is expressed in the monopolization of space and the relegation of weaker groups in society to less desirable environments.”¹⁴ Government bureaucrats, surveyors, and ethnographers in the mold of John Wesley Powell, the Civil War veteran who traveled down the Colorado River in 1867, mapped much of the region for the U.S. Geological Service, and became

the head of the Bureau of Ethnology, worked as the “frontline” intellectual agents of colonialism.¹⁵ Such individuals imposed upon the Indigenous landscape a series of state-sponsored borders infused with a new geography of colonialism. These new maps codified new modes of power that represented a “jurispathic” legal system and a voracious capitalist economy capable of wielding any number of colonizing technologies.¹⁶

The colonization of Indigenous space dovetailed with the colonization self-identification. In essence, the Hualapai “tribe” that emerged in the 1870s had no relevance in the historical or cultural sense until Anglos invaded the region. More accurately, “The People,” or Hual: Amat Pa, as they called themselves, lived in small rancherias that tied together the extended kin networks of roughly thirteen decentralized bands. According to linguists, they spoke a derivation of Pai and were in the Yuman language group, which connected them linguistically to the Mohaves, Yavapais, and other Indigenous peoples along the Colorado River. Bureaucrats, administrators, Anglo citizens, and the military constructed the idea of the Hualapais by imposing non-Hualapai standards of identity upon the Northeastern Pais, who lived across six million acres of territory in northwestern Arizona. They distorted the Indigenous name of one Pai band and used it carelessly to identify all other bands.

Thus, conquest and colonization brought new visions and conceptualizations of identity that drew upon Western philosophy, political theory, and social organization. According to Stuart Hall in *Formations of Modernity*, “the West” (a conceptual frame used to “see” the world) allows those within its discursive tradition to characterize and classify societies and peoples into categories, reduce complex stories into simplistic systems of representation, and create criteria of evaluation that are alien to non-Western cultural subjects.¹⁷ Non-Indians racialized Hualapais as inferior “Others” who were deficient in all the markers that Westerners used to ascribe to themselves a sense of superiority and racial domination. By labeling the Northeastern Pai bands as “Hualapais,” Anglos continued the conceptual colonization that marched hand in hand with the geographical, cultural, and political colonization of the Indigenous peoples of northwestern Arizona.¹⁸

The reified identity that homogenized the Hualapais’ band affiliations also sought to erase both their sense of history and their distinct cultural relations with the region. Like the Maori in New Zealand and Indigenous peoples everywhere, there are few clear distinctions between space and

time. Pai interaction with what Westerners term “space” was functional (“the place where water grows,” i.e., a spring), spiritual, or tied to family relations, for example, Ha Kiacha Pa’a (Mahone Mountain), named after the Pai family. It was fundamentally tied to a sense of being that Westerners sought to sever with terms such as “frontier,” “Indian Country,” “reservation,” and so on. Nineteenth-century forced relocation and removal also constituted relocations of the psychic, spiritual, cultural, and ethnogeographical identities of Indigenous peoples: they were a form of cultural genocide. Stripping people of their land also stripped them of their identity and history because the land “reminded” them and “spoke” of their past. And yet the Pairs eventually accepted the term “Hualapai” for its functional implications and added it to family and band identities that proved useful in local discourse. Thus, the Hualapais created what University of Victoria professor and Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred terms a “nested identity” that included band and family names as well as the more superficial terms such as “Indian” and “Native American.”¹⁹ The significance of the usage of the term “Hualapai” would be profound because the landscape, the reservation, the tribal government, and eventually the historical narrative of their history would eventually employ the term. Despite its historical inaccuracy and colonial origins, “being Hualapai” in the wake of the American invasion of their homelands had a literal and symbolic utility.²⁰

The Hualapais adapted to nineteenth-century spatial and demographic conquest in creative and surprising ways. They incorporated wage labor into their kinship networks, and they furtively violated the so-called property rights of landowners to visit traditional cultural sites.²¹ Capitalist expansion in the West was fast and relied on agriculture and extractive industries, both of which were labor- and capital-intensive. Growers, ranchers, and mine owners needed an exploitable labor force that would work for low wages and frequently accept seasonal production schedules. As capital and the state expanded into Hualapai land, half of the bands moved beyond the purview of the state by breaking away from all contact with whites. They moved into the Grand Canyon and slowly disassociated themselves from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, superintendents, the military, and the Anglo population. Other bands refused to gather around the first military agency at Camp Beale Springs, a few miles from the small town of Kingman. Others moved to Tekiauvla Pa’a (Big Sandy), the traditional location of the band by the same name.

Finally, others moved northwest, farther toward the Arizona, California, and Nevada confluence and, interestingly, the location of their emergence into the world as told to them by the Creator.²²

Those who engaged the marketplace, like the Tohono O’Odam of southern Arizona, confounded Manichaeic dichotomies such as traditional and modern by blending the two concepts via mobility and adaptation within the context of wage labor. I borrow the concept of “resistant adaptation” from historian Cynthia Radding to describe how Hualapai wage labor situated the subaltern identities that non-Indians termed “primitive” within the hegemonic landscape of modernity in subversive ways. The culturally and practically motivated manipulation of labor demands enabled bands to maintain kinship ties and “traditional” movement across their cultural landscape within the context of the cash economy and to refuse proletarianization.²³ Band leaders worked as crew leaders, who stood between managers and tribal members and organized Indigenous labor. Managers and growers, for their part, did not care which individuals worked for them as long as crew leaders could promise a specific number of people on a consistent basis. This tactic kept cash flowing into the family and band, while it also allowed Hualapais to maintain traditional obligations to kin.

By 1880 Hualapai leaders began demanding the repossession of their homelands in the form of a reservation, while at the same time non-Indian civilian leaders and military officials again proposed relocating them to the Colorado River Indian Reservation.²⁴ Although this colonization of Hualapai space was destructive, the new borders between Native and non-Native space were not hermetically sealed, as policy makers claimed: they were not, as Sibley discusses, “pure spaces devoid of the other” because Hualapais retained and reclaimed them in ways that reflected their own memories and traditions. Tribal members remembered the trauma of the Long Walk to La Paz and how it extracted them from their landscape, so they more forcefully requested a reservation, their own protected space, on the Colorado River. The Colorado River held an important place in the Hualapais’ cultural history because it was their first home after emergence from Spirit Mountain. The first families lived on the river’s banks and slowly migrated up from its waters and eventually onto the high plains of the Colorado Plateau. Demanding a reservation along the river reflected the Hualapais’ practical desires for access to water, but it also reflected an Indigenous geography that

rooted the tribe to its place of origin. Fortuitously, in 1883 they received an executive order reservation that sat in the middle of their aboriginal homelands and ran along 110 miles of the river.²⁵

This successful struggle to preserve some land stemmed from the Hualapais' lived experiences and their collective identification with the land and the memories attached to it. Resistance to the growing settler society of Mohave County and the dictates of the military and the Indian Bureau was one strand of a larger anticolonial thread binding them together as a people. Refusing relocation and delineating their territory highlighted a pivotal moment in Hualapai "peoplehood." Fusing their memories of the escape from La Paz with ties to their specific origins, band territories, and collective identity, Hualapais articulated a central demand of all Indigenous peoples: the right to determine how they interact with the surrounding world. This resistance echoes the insights of John Allen, who in *Lost Geographies of Power* argues that "all places are saturated with the fixtures and fittings of power[,] . . . [yet] particular places may play host to a variety of cross-cutting arrangements of power."²⁶ The coercive and ideological power of the state and its apparatuses does not emanate unilaterally and hegemonically from one locus; it may be concentrated in particular places and contested by multiple sources of contravening power. In the case of the Hualapais, no single group controlled enough power to force them to the Colorado River Indian Reservation, so tribal members and federal officials negotiated a spatial balance of power symbolized by the reservation. One leader, Schrum, noted, "I would rather die and move on than go back to that place, that La Paz, where our people died."²⁷ The words of Schrum carried weight because he was the only Pai leader who did not officially surrender to the U.S. military.

This negotiation of state power and colonized space should not be overexaggerated, however, for several reasons. First, only four bands of Northeastern Pais had direct historic connections to the land that became a reservation. The Ha 'kasa Pa'a (Pine Springs) and Yi Kwat (Peach Springs) bands, for instance, spent most of the year there, but the Ha Kiacha Pa'a (Mahone Mountain), Tekiauvla Pa'a (Big Sandy), and Amat Whala Pa'a (Hualapai Mountain) bands lived nearly fifty miles to the south. So while the reservation fell within the larger cultural geography of tribal homelands (it ran along the Colorado River, which was part of Hualapai origin stories), it did not reflect the recent experiences

of all bands. Moving there would force several band members to alter a layer of their identity that rested on constant interaction with specific places and locations. Yet the reservation represented an economic and symbolic place of refuge where band members could survive and negotiate modernity.²⁸

The drawing of boundaries did not inherently define the meaning of the reservation, which reflected divergent views of the past and competing visions of the spatial future for tribal lands. The Hualapais struggled for the protected reservation so they could maintain traditions and build a tribal economy, but federal officials sought the reservation to use as a “laboratory of civilization.”²⁹ This linear view of history and human development possessed by Indian Bureau representatives and Christian missionaries framed the policies that insulated Indians from the “civilized life” for which they allegedly were not prepared by paradoxically segregating them spatially from that same life they were supposed to emulate. Racialized state policies sought to “relocate” Hualapais from history by placing them in a cultural purgatory bound by reservation lines marking them as inferior.³⁰ To make matters worse, superintendents chided Hualapais for refusing to move to the reservation and worried that Hualapais in town and working for ranchers were learning terrible habits from lower classes of people. Yet those same agents accepted payments and bribes from ranchers illegally occupying tribal lands. This colonial conundrum that sought to spatially isolate Indians and racially transform them failed because the Indian Bureau as an agent of the state refused to remove non-Indian ranchers. It also failed because Hualapais demanded the removal of the ranchers from their lands. For tribal members supporting the reservation, the link between nation and the place that it represented involved self-determination and agency, not the eradication of their history and memory.³¹

Non-Indian settlers, in addition to ranchers, had (re)colonized the reservation, further limiting the creation of a “Hualapai place.” Anglo settlers, ranchers, and miners invaded Pai lands in the 1860s and 1870s as the military waged a campaign of ethnic cleansing against Pais in the region. The year of internment and ensuing decade of instability had created a vacuum of people and power in the place that became the reservation. By 1900 dozens of ranchers illegally ran thousands of cattle on the range, Anglo settlers began farming there, and the Santa Fe Railway had appropriated water sources for a train depot it placed on the reser-

vation. Tribal members could not live on the reservation because non-Indians redefined their springs and land as “property” protected by law and the state. Thus, tribal members faced a “curious situation,” to quote an Indian Bureau official in 1923, because they had a million-acre reservation on which only 20 percent of the tribe lived.³²

This richly layered landscape of northwestern Arizona symbolized for Hualapais the crossroads of the past, present, and future. As migrant workers with a hybrid economy consisting of wages, subsistence hunting, and rations, tribal members could remain mobile and retain connections with places containing their history, whether or not they moved to the reservation. Some bands merged with others, and at least one shattered due to the pressures of colonization, but bands such as the Tekiaulva Pa’a, Amat Whala Pa’a, Ha Kiacha Pa’a, Ha Emete Pa’a, and Havasu Baja bands remained close to their traditional rancherias and villages, despite the legalistic transformation of their homelands into private property or public domain. Anglos in Kingman and surrounding towns referred to them as indolent beggars wandering aimlessly, but, seen from an Indigenous perspective, they were resisting Americanization and colonization by evading the gaze of the Office of Indian Affairs. Moreover, some bands used the discourse of Western familial structure to present the image of an assimilated family, when in fact they subversively maintained traditional kin ties and band structures. They even used this fictive de-Indianization to obtain allotments on the public domain in the form of homesteads. Combined with this spatial rebellion and subaltern appropriation of Christian family structure, Native kinship networks and ceremonial practices preserved the symbolic meanings of being Hualapai in particular places, despite modernization and technological change. Their landscape by the early twentieth century had become what Sarah Whatmore terms a “hybrid geography” in which an emerging form of Hualapai agency undermined state intentions, fluidly constructed nature and space, and produced and consumed new ways of seeing “reality.”³³

THE CULTURAL FAULT LINES OF “INDIAN EDUCATION”

The relocations and movements associated with the early reservation era coincided with more familiar forms of relocation and movement in American Indian policy. The practice of sending Indigenous children

to boarding schools constituted a second aspect of assimilation, equal in importance to the colonial land policies of the 1887 Dawes Allotment Act. The education policies fundamentally required moving young people from their families and relocating them to other places. The schools followed a well-known industrial-military model to efficiently assimilate and discipline large numbers of children. Reminiscent of Michel Foucault's prison or asylum, these arguably "total institutions" moved children's bodies through regimented schedules that regulated and monitored every moment of the day. Space conflated with time as children followed the clock and bell in unanimous movements that a centralized power controlled without regard to traditions, seasonal migrations, or kinship responsibilities. Time, like space, could not be lost or wasted.³⁴

These "total institutions" never entirely contained the movement and agency of children or tribal members. Children survived these relocations by sending letters to their parents, running away from the schools, speaking their languages in secret, and finding solace in the company of others. The Hualapai situation initially followed this pattern of relocation before events in the 1890s forced a change in policy for the tribe. After several children came home with diseases they acquired in Albuquerque, Riverside, and other places, their parents refused to return them. Additionally, when the son of Schrum died in 1898 at the Albuquerque Indian School, Hualapais refused to send their children anywhere. Concerned that the children would not receive any education in the English language and in the ways of the colonizer, the parents petitioned for the construction of a school near the reservation. The BIA agreed, and in 1902 Hualapais could send their children to a school fifteen miles from the reservation.³⁵

With the construction of the new school and ending the practice of sending their young people far from home, Hualapais won an important victory in their struggle to control how they interacted with the changing landscape of northwestern Arizona. However, situating the school within their cultural landscape created an ambiguous situation. The school sat on a cultural fault line between federal assimilation and tribal self-determination. Rather than relocating the children beyond the reach of tradition and cultural continuity, the school remained within the geographic boundaries of Hualapai consciousness of themselves as a people. This made the school different from other colonial institutions

that sought de-Indianization through relocation. Hualapais integrated the school and its agenda, the new space it inhabited, and the resources it offered into their world in ways that mirrored their incorporation of wage labor into kinship networks and band economies.³⁶

Daily on the school grounds this fault line between competing agendas and unexpected consequences played out in microstruggles and intimate battles. The principals and staff still followed the bureaucratically determined goals of all schools across the nation by cutting Indians' hair, changing their clothes, punishing them for speaking their language, teaching them English, and giving them vocational skills for labor at the bottom of the industrial hierarchy. Yet having the school located within the larger Hualapai homelands allowed tribal members to undermine the federal assault on tribal and hybrid identities that reflected the changing circumstances and historical realities of early-twentieth-century Indian life. Family members regularly visited their children and argued with teachers, they protested the abuse of their children, and many relatives camped out on the school grounds. Parents appeared during lunchtime and ate school food and even helped children appropriate produce from school gardens. Parents violated the boundaries of the school compound and took their children home for ceremonies and with them to pick cotton in southern Arizona and to round up cattle. The borders supposedly separating the institutionalized space of the school and the culturally layered territory of the tribal homelands possessed an unusually fluid, permeable, and contested quality to them. As neither a purely Native nor a colonial space, the school reflected a mixture of movement and rootedness, assimilation and resistance, past and future.³⁷

REMOVAL REDUX: LIBERAL COLONIALISM AND THE HUALAPAI HOMELANDS

The Hualapais' conflicts over movement, relocations, and space focused on the school and the paradoxical status of the reservation until tribal members could move to the reservation permanently in the 1930s and 1940s. These decades ended some of the problems faced by the tribe during the previous sixty years. The Great Depression forced non-Indians off the reservation and enticed Hualapais to it, and the government replaced the boarding school with a reservation day school in 1938. Importantly, a long-standing lawsuit over land claimed by the Santa Fe

Railway would be resolved in favor of the tribe by the Supreme Court in 1941. By the mid-1940s the reservation had become a fairly stable place for the Hualapais.³⁸

Until these changes brought the federal presence squarely into the lives of Arizonans, the state had been fairly weak and exerted its power unevenly in the region. For much of the early twentieth century, the region's integration into a capitalist market was limited yet growing, and the borders between private and public property were fuzzy, despite the rhetoric of boundedness. Tribal members regularly hunted on private ranches and entered federal lands to visit sacred sites and to gather traditional plants for medicines. Hualapais had exploited this hybrid landscape well until the balance of power changed as New Deal programs forcefully inserted the federal government into the regional landscape. Local economies became especially dependent upon assistance from Washington in the form of farm and manufacturing subsidies, not to mention jobs provided by work and conservation programs. Civilian Conservation Corps camps and numerous federal-and university-based extension agencies established by the Soil Conservation Service brought federal employees regularly into the region. The Hoover Dam blocked the flow of Colorado River water to Mexico yet provided electricity to booming urban centers in Los Angeles and Phoenix. Rural electrification more generally altered the demographics and economy of the region. All of these events served as background for new struggles over land, space, movement, and identity.³⁹

One struggle over space and place dominated Hualapai life in the early to mid-twentieth century: a court case against the Santa Fe Railway.⁴⁰ The suit began in the early 1930s as *U.S. v. Santa Fe Railroad* and seemed to be an open-and-shut case for the tribe. However, the lower courts ruled against the Hualapais by arguing that they did not inhabit the areas in question when the federal government in 1866 gave the railway its land grant to much of northern Arizona. This court followed the reasoning of another court that rejected a different suit brought by the tribe for a specific spring; the court said that the Hualapais did not inhabit the region in ways that anthropologists could prove. The court claimed that the Hualapais were a nomadic people who lacked permanent occupancy and a recordable and documented history. Such use of spurious rulings should be understood as what David Wilkins has designated as "masks" used historically by the U.S. Supreme Court. In *U.S. v. Santa Fe Railroad*

the lower courts and eventually the higher courts used several legal and historical “masks” to erase tribal claims to space and land in the region. The courts achieved this end by essentially claiming that Hualapais—and, by implication, all Indians—lacked history in the objective and positivistic sense. Civilization had not reached them, and they lacked private property, so their imprint upon the land and onto the historical record could legally be wiped away.⁴¹

The tribe appealed the case, and it went to a higher court, which agreed with the lower court. The tribe appealed again, and in 1941 the case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in the tribe’s favor by agreeing that the tribe had aboriginal occupancy of the region. More important, perhaps, the Supreme Court signaled that aboriginal occupancy could be proved as a historical fact. Before the Supreme Court made its ruling, however, the lower courts demonstrated a disturbing facet of American jurisprudence. History had not “seen” Hualapais as legitimate actors upon the land, and non-Indian forms of evidence had marginalized Hualapais from colonial visions of “progress and civilization.” Because the Hualapais had not mixed their labor with the soil, they did not have private property and rights to legal title in the Western sense. Thus, non-Indian historians and courts ignored their claims to the land, as hegemonic notions of civilization and property excluded the Hualapais from the parameters of history. Historian Christian McMillen argues that the Hualapais’ successful use of oral accounts in the 1941 case proved revolutionary in American land claims and set an international precedent in the postwar era, despite the disturbing undercurrents of an ultimately positive ruling.⁴²

Following closely on the heels of the 1941 case, the federal government launched another assault on Hualapai history and space. In the early 1950s Hualapais met with the representatives from the Indian Claims Commission (ICC), established in 1946 by Congress to “quiet” title to millions of acres of Native land across the United States. Concerned partly by the Hualapai case and partly by fears that tribes across the country would use oral histories to reclaim their lands, Congress wanted to co-opt the legal avenues for recognition of land loss by creating a bureaucratic and legislative aperture through which the grievances of all Indians would flow. Thus, the ICC became a quasi-separate and semijudicial body that heard land claims lodged by Indians across the United States for the next two decades. The ICC stopped hearing tribes in the

1970s after attending to more than six hundred claims and offering nearly \$900 million in compensation.⁴³

Though they engaged the claims process in 1950, the Hualapais officially filed their claim in 1957 and argued that the federal government had dispossessed them of six million acres of aboriginal homelands. Roughly eight decades after the government created their reservation in 1883, Hualapais still demanded the return of their entire homeland. To that end, Hualapai representatives testified in front of the ICC and offered accounts that demonstrated their sense of place and connections with the land. Of the two dozen testimonies, a few are particularly illustrative. Young Beecher, born in 1877 and raised in the Pine Springs Band, recalled migrating from the north-central portion of the present-day reservation to the area near present-day Kingman. “We lived in what they called villages . . . bunch of families worked together and hunted and grew a little crops. We went to the mountains for wood and elk, the bottoms for beans, and the flats when it was cool enough.” Reed Wellington, another interviewee, delineated the southern boundary of Pai bands. Wellington was born in 1887, lived near Chloride, and came from the prominent Pai band of Chief Schrum. He remembered Cherum talk about the “Yavapai Fighter Band that moved at the end of our territory and fought the Yavapais who wanted our good land. They knew it was ours but they still wanted it and so that is why we needed those fighters on that edge.” Numerous testimonies evidenced the boundaries between Pains and other peoples. Despite such testimony, the ICC ruled that their acceptance of the reservation forfeited their claim to the land, even though they had never lived exclusively on the reservation.⁴⁴

Tribal chairman Sterling Mahone and tribal councilmember Phil Susanyatame reacted angrily to the ruling. The two wrote several letters to the ICC saying that the land had always been theirs, regardless of new laws, according to Mahone, “brought by white men from far away.” They said that they never went to Europe to force Indian laws onto the Europeans’ ancestors, so it made no sense for Americans to expect Hualapais to follow theirs. Besides, said Sterling Mahone, “white people are white people where ever they go. Indians are Indians when they are where they should be. Hualapais should be Hualapais and we need our land to do that the way we are supposed to.” In their letters they expressed what Jennifer Wolch and Michael Dear address in *The Power of Geography: How Territory Shapes Social Life*, that territories as units of

cultural organization serve as places where the “social reproduction of daily life” can occur. Social reproduction is thus altered and undermined as those territories are restructured and assaulted.⁴⁵

The reactions of Mahone and Susanyatame were indicative of the feelings of most tribal members, some of whom were born in the 1880s, when the reservation became a distinct space. The failure to reclaim the land did not totally erase their historical presence on the landscape, nor did it wash away their memories of the past. This is evidenced in several ways. First, despite the negative ruling, they still could go to some of these places and maintain connections with them as sacred sites. Much of the territory was public domain, and they could make a case that tribal religious rights allowed them access to the places. Moreover, the specific act of fighting for the land reminded the people of their history in the region. The stories of their struggles became new memories they could pass down across the generations. And finally, the basic process of remembering and telling origin stories and other narratives constituted a subaltern form of protest against colonialism.

Among other things, colonialism occurs “in the mind” and the interior mental spaces of colonized subjects. Remembering and *not* forgetting such stories and oral transcripts constitute a form of resistance that various scholars have metaphorically referred to “speaking back at the empire.”⁴⁶ They constitute acts of resistance because the larger project of colonialism sought to reshape and replace Indigenous identities in relationship to the state. This involved assimilating Natives physically into the American body politic and relocating their identities to the margins of the American imagination. But the Hualapais simply refused to forget who they were and where they came from. Moreover, Hualapais’ persistent memories and their audacity to voice them in a hostile arena strengthened tribal identity and ironically produced a mountain of written documentation. Oral histories and traditions passed over into archival documentation and today, at least, have returned to the reservation in ways that help the tribe maintain its connections with the land and history. The testimonies also reflected the Hualapais’ resistance to hegemonic notions of space and place because they rejected propaganda that they had to remain fixed on the reservation and passively accept the status quo. Their memories themselves were resistant acts.⁴⁷

At the same time Hualapais testified in front of the ICC about their relations with the land and their sense of place, the federal government

began another program aimed at yet again colonizing Native space. Congress in the 1950s created programs to relocate Indians to cities and terminate the federally protected trust status of Indian lands. These programs sought to simultaneously dissolve tribal lands and send Native people to cities such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and Boston. There they would find wage labor employment as unskilled workers and assimilate into the larger urban society. If and when all or most Hualapais did this, the government would dissolve their reservation and liquidate it as private property. Applying these policies to Native people across the country would finally assimilate them and their lands into American society.⁴⁸

Not surprisingly, this doomsday scenario failed to develop as its visionaries had imagined. Some Hualapais did temporarily relocate to cities such as Chicago before going back home. For instance, Mr. and Mrs. Leo Powskey moved there “hoping to find opportunity knocking at their door” after they completed training at a small technical college. Regular letters home revealed excitement and trepidation at the size and pace of the city, but both finished school and found employment as a mechanic and stenographer, respectively. Within a few years, however, they returned home. Other participants in relocation programs had more difficult experiences. The BIA relocation office duped one couple into relocating to Akron, Ohio, where the factory jobs promised them never materialized. They moved into local shelters and quickly became homeless and unemployed. Racial epithets and discriminatory employers were commonplace, and this couple also returned home.⁴⁹

These examples reflect one end of the spectrum of relocation experiences. Some Hualapais lived fulfilling lives in Los Angeles or Albuquerque and occasionally returned to the reservation to see family and friends. They worked hard and sent their children to school, much like other city residents. However, most Hualapais followed the paths of other Indians in Arizona who agreed to relocation. Relocation from Arizona began with a bus trip to Phoenix, where Indians had to wait commonly for several days until they were relocated farther from home to other cities. This provided many Indians with the chance to see Phoenix and its postwar employment opportunities. Several relocatees had attended the Phoenix Indian School as children and knew the city well. In fact, many of them remembered having a good time, and when they heard that the BIA would send them back, they jumped at the offer. Many tribal members participating in the relocation program simply remained in

Phoenix and evaded the gaze of the federal government. The presence of four reservations adjacent to Phoenix also made it an enticing location for many tribal members.⁵⁰

These responses to relocation reveal the hidden complexities of federal programs, and they blend well with a more nuanced discussion of post–World War II trends toward urbanization. War veterans and post-war youth began leaving their homes out of frustration with unemployment on reservations that had economies based primarily on extractive industries. Thus, Indian populations in cities like Phoenix grew as reservation populations declined. These migrations and movements contributed to a small but growing Indian community in Phoenix that in turn contributed to a range of institutions that supported a growing urban, multiracial culture. Powwows and intertribal dances and ceremonies provided protective spaces that allowed Hualapais—as well as Apaches and Navajos—to remain “Indian” in a generally hostile urban setting.⁵¹ Along with other tribal members in Phoenix, Hualapais helped to re-Indigenize the city by creating Native communities and neighborhoods, while at the same time they struggled with unemployment and segregation. Like the situation they faced with spatial colonization in northwestern Arizona, the implications of conquest were not as clearly or neatly defined in the city.

Hualapais participated in these movements to the city, but their overall demographic patterns followed a different trajectory during the 1950s and 1960s. In contrast to census data that demonstrated a decline of reservation populations and a rise in urban populations, the Hualapai reservation community grew exponentially. At least two trends were at work here. First, many of the Hualapais who went on the relocation programs simply returned home. They never claimed residency in urban areas, even if government reports or statistics made proclamations about a growing Indian population. The demographers and social scientists of the 1960s who triumphantly “discovered” a new species called the “urban Indian” misunderstood the cultural and economic function of urbanization for many Indians when they argued that Indians lived in cities.⁵² Many Native people viewed their residency there as a temporary step in the long-term goal of making money or acquiring an education.⁵³ Ignoring the oscillation between rural and urban spaces, scholars imposed social science definitions upon Indians and assumed that their urban presence spelled assimilation or automatically resulted in anomie

and debilitating depression. Native people did indeed live in cities, but doing so did not strip them of their identity. Understanding this persistence of identities in new or old places is part of a larger articulation of Indigenous spatial meanings across colonial geographies.

In addition to the dynamics created by the manner in which Hualapais engaged the U.S. government relocation program, a second factor contributing to changing relationships with their land and reservation was a substantial change in the reservation economy. A stable land base, new industries, federal programs, and growing tribal bureaucracy created jobs and opportunities for Hualapais. This continued a pattern that began around 1940, dropped during the war, and rose again in 1945 and 1946. Between 1940 and 1960 the population grew from 450 to 900 people. Tribal census rolls indicate that half of that growth came from migrations back to the reservation. Older Hualapais who previously refused to relocate to the reservation because it did not encompass the lands of their band did so now because it appealed to them as a protected space. They could practice their religion without fear of persecution, and they could speak their language without retribution from teachers and employers.⁵⁴ Thus, while relocation and urbanization added Indians to cities, Hualapais participated in a reverse trend that saw their reservation population grow. The Hualapais “in between” the reservation and the city integrated the reservation into a larger cultural landscape that continually tried to reclaim cities such as Kingman into their old conceptualizations of space and place. In essence, the Hualapais tried integrating the historical emergence of culturally Western cities and places into traditional landscapes that existed long before colonization.

Viewing the Hualapai sense of place from a different perspective reveals insights that challenge the reservation-urban dichotomy and the non-Indian prescriptions associated with it. Rather than remaining fixed on the reservation as a once-assumed relic of the past, they reshaped the reservation as a homeland situated within their memories and sense of place. Simultaneously, they refused to accept life in urban areas as declarations of defeat at the hands of modernity: cities were also contested spaces that revealed opportunities for intertribal communication. Finally, life moving between cities and reservations or within the interstices of these modern spaces also reflected Indigenous decisions to defy demographic dichotomies mapped out by the settler society.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS: SPACE, PLACE, AND
MEMORY IN HUALAPAI NATIONHOOD

Many of these patterns of movement and interaction with the land continue today in modified form, and they fundamentally rely on reservations as spaces of refuge that constitute a larger and changing cultural landscape. The reservations are reminders of the enduring presence of colonialism, and they are homelands for peoples who continue to encounter hostility and misunderstanding. Indian leaders fight to hold on to them as sovereign lands and refuges from popular culture and consumerism, but one is just as likely to see satellite dishes, SUVs, and children carrying MP3 players as one is likely to hear people speaking their original languages rather than English. The reservations were and are one component of a Native landscape that refuses to submit fully to the spatial pressures of colonialism. They serve an important function in Native life, but they are not the definitive locus of Indigenous geographies or Native cultural maps.

And yet colonialism stalks the Hualapais like a specter on the land. The tactics, strategies, and manifestations of the spatial dimensions of colonialism may change, but the tribe continues to confront colonialism at every turn. For instance, the tribe fights with the federal government over issues of space, but now they must deal with the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration and argue that tribal sovereignty gives them a right to control the airspace fifteen thousand feet above the reservation. They tell the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Interior that they need water to sustain a tradition of farming, and they protest to the U.S. Departments of Education and Agriculture that their schools are underfunded. They cannot use water from the Colorado River, even though their reservation sits along 110 miles of the river. They fight with dozens of local, state, and federal agencies to build a small road on the reservation. And they also want Robby Kneival to pay them the \$25,000 he owes them for allowing him to jump over the Grand Canyon. But that is another story.

Indeed, the stories and memories of space and place are significant for a previously unmentioned issue: the matter of Indigenous nationalism. Nations are defined in various ways, and scholars hardly share a consensus on what exactly constitutes a nation. Hualapais, however, have their own ideas. They retain only a fraction of their original territory, but the reservation signifies a bounded space that is distinct from

the state surrounding it. Tribal members resisted colonization to carve out borders within which they live and build community. In addition to territory, Hualapais have resources in the material and cultural sense. Timber, mining, and grazing industries contribute to an economy that is supplemented by tourism and the Colorado River. Other aspects make Hualapais see themselves as a nation. A multifaceted history that contributes to a collective consciousness about who they are as a people reminds them that they are different from non-Indians surrounding them. Cultural traditions, a common language, and symbols that are used in a mutually intelligible manner also create an interconnectedness that goes beyond a mere ethnic affiliation. Face-to-face relations strengthen kinship bonds, which in turn make social and cultural obligations more crucial to community survival. Nationhood affords tribal members an Indigenous type of citizenship, even though that process of defining and retaining status is a continuous struggle. Internal institutions, tribal government, and an array of laws and regulations connect (for better or for worse) tribal identity with formal bodies that enforce community conduct and monitor tribal membership.⁵⁵

These characteristics all contribute to the ways in which space, memory, and history interact to reinforce Hualapais' sense of themselves as a nation situated within a larger matrix of colonialism. And although such a notion is not without its flaws, Hualapais' resistance to domination has fueled perceptions and collective memories that strengthen their nationalist convictions. This ability to incorporate ideas of nationalism with traditional concepts of space and identity may seem incongruent, but it appeals to tribal members. In the tribal imagination and in the landscapes that shape their worldview, the work they have done in this place to remain sovereign has played a crucial role in defining them as a people.

NOTES

I would like to thank Lucille Watahomigie, Cheryl Beecher, Joseph Flies Away, Monza Honga, Sandra Yellowhawk, and the members of the Hualapai Tribal Council for their comments on this article.

1. Jeffrey P. Shepherd, "Building an Indian Community: The Hualapai Nation in the Twentieth Century," PhD diss., Arizona State University, 2002.

2. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso, eds., *Senses of Place* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1996).

3. R. David Edmunds, "Native Americans, New Voices: American Indian History, 1895–1995," *American Historical Review* 100 (June 1995): 717–40; W. R. Swagerty, ed., *Scholars and the American Indian Experience: Critical Reviews of Recent Writing in the Social Sciences* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); Frederick Hoxie and Peter Iverson, eds., *Indians in American History: An Introduction* (Wheeling IL: Harlan Davidson, 1998); Colin Calloway, ed., *New Directions in American Indian History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); Jay Miller, Colin G. Calloway, and Richard A. Sattler, eds., *Writings in Indian History, 1985–1990* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995); Donald Fixico, ed., *Rethinking Indian History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997); Peter Iverson, ed., *The Plains Indians in the Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985).

4. Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999); Taiaiake Alfred, *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Devon Mihesuah, *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, Activism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003); Marijo Moore, *Genocide of the Mind: New Native American Writing* (New York: Nation Books, 2003); Susan Miller, *Coacoochee's Bones: A Seminole Saga* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003).

5. Waziyatawin Angela Wilson, *Remember This! Dakota Decolonization and the Eli Taylor Narratives* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 13.

6. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York: Zed Press, 1999), 28.

7. Winona Wheeler, "Decolonizing Tribal Histories," PhD diss., University of California, 2000, 212.

8. Wilson, *Remember This*, 24. I use *hybridity* with caution and understand it as a way to conceptualize identity in the broadest possible sense. Indigenous signifies in a cluster of cultural, intellectual, legal, social, historical, discursive, performative, and epistemological beliefs and characteristics that have real meaning to Native peoples. These characteristics changed over time and should be understood within specific historical contexts and from the perspectives of Native peoples themselves. In the midst of ongoing colonization, Indigenous peoples simultaneously retain "traditions" and "invent" new identities within a postmodern world. Whether referring to the colonial trope "Indian" or the construct "Hualapai," Native peoples can look to the past for definitions of "self," while they simultaneously live in and "of" the contemporary world. I use the term *hybridity* to explain the adaptive strategies of Hualapais who might engage the capitalist labor system or use the railroad to retain band and family ties. I also see hybridity as a useful term because it offers an antidote to discourses of essentialism articulated by non-Indians who impose rigid definitions of

“Indian-ness” rooted in the practices of fin de siècle “salvage anthropologists” who feared the contamination of Indian cultures by modernity. Hybridity is a useful notion because it challenges the tyranny of blood quantum, which privileges biological markers over definitions of Indigeneity rooted in community, culture, language, and place. On the other hand, hybridity can be the first step down a slippery slope in which being “Indian” is open to anyone claiming it. The logical conclusion of this line of thinking is that Indigenous identity is everything and nothing. For some discussion of hybridity see Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994); James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); and others. For some recent work on identity see Eva Marie Garroutte, *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); and Circe Sturm, *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

9. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 80.

10. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, “Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism,” *Government and Opposition* 40 (Fall 2005): 597–614.

11. R. J. Johnston, *A Question of Place: Exploring the Practice of Human Geography* (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1991), 3.

12. See, for instance, Cole Harris, *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance and Reserves in British Columbia* (Victoria: University of British Columbia Press, 2003).

13. Shepherd, “Building an American Indian Community.”

14. David Sibley, *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 83.

15. Donald Worster, *A River Running West: The Life of John Wesley Powell* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

16. Thomas Sheridan, *Arizona: A History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995); Sibley, *Geographies of Exclusion*; Robert A. Williams Jr., *Like a Loaded Weapon: The Rehnquist Court, Indian Rights, and the Legal History of Racism in America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).

17. Stuart Hall, “The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power,” in *Formations of Modernity*, ed. Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 275–332, 278.

18. Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999).

19. Gerald Taiaiake Alfred, *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 18.

20. Todorov, *The Conquest of America*; Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York:

Vintage Books, 1979) and *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).

21. Brian Hosmer, *Indians in the Marketplace: Persistence and Adaptation among the Menominee and Metlakatlans, 1880–1920* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999).

22. Conversations with tribal members Lucille Watahomigie, Joseph Flies Away, Monza Honga, and Sandra Yellowhawk.

23. Erick V. Meeks, “The Tohono O’Odham, Wage Labor, and Resistant Adaptation, 1900–1930,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 34 (Winter 2003): 3; Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late Nineteenth Century Pacific Northwest* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

24. Federal Indian policy in Arizona Territory after the Civil War advocated ethnic cleansing of Native peoples from their homelands and then concentrating them on a few large reservations. The government had placed several Pai bands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation in the 1860s and 1870s, and even though they fled the reservation in 1875, relocation was frequently proposed by non-Indian civilians, bureaucrats, and military leaders.

25. Alfred E. Kroeber, ed., *Walapai Ethnography, Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* (1935; reprint, Milwood NY: Kraus Reprint Company, 1976), 47; U.S. Congress, Senate, *Walapai Papers: Historical Reports, Documents, and Extracts from Publications Relating to the Walapai Indians of Arizona*, 74th Cong., 2nd sess., doc. no. 273 (Washington DC: GPO, 1936); Henry F. Dobyns and Robert C. Euler, *Waubu Yuma’s People: The Comparative Socio-Political Structure of the Pai Indians of Arizona* (Prescott AZ: Prescott College Press, 1970); Barbara Morehouse, *A Place Called Grand Canyon: Contested Geographies* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996).

26. John Allen, *Lost Geographies of Power* (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 10.

27. Dobyns and Euler, *Waubu Yuma’s People*, 99.

28. Stephen C. Jett, “The Navajo Homeland,” in *Homelands: A Geography of Culture and Place across America*, ed. Richard Nostrand and Lawrence Estaville (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 168–83.

29. Frederick J. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880–1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).

30. Hoxie, *A Final Promise*.

31. John Frazier, Florence M. Margai, and Eugene Tettey-Fio, eds., *Race and Place: Equity Issues in Urban America* (Boulder CO: Westview Press, 2003).

32. Christian McMillen, “Proving Property Rights and Reclaiming Indian Law: The Hualapai vs. the Santa Fe Railway,” PhD diss., Yale University, 2004.

33. Sarah Whatmore, *Hybrid Geographies: Natures, Cultures, and Spaces* (Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 2002).

34. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York:

Vintage Books, 1979). For a survey of the federal program for “Indian” education see David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875–1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995).

35. Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

36. On making boarding schools “Indian places” see Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called It Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

37. Cole Harris, in *Making Native Space*, provides an analysis of Canadian “Indian” schools and the question of space.

38. McMillen, “Proving Property Rights.”

39. Richard White, *“It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own”: A New Western History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).

40. McMillen, “Proving Property Rights.”

41. David Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999).

42. McMillen, “Proving Property Rights.”

43. Charles Wilkinson, *Blood Struggle: The Rise of Modern Indian Nations* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005); Peter Iverson, *“We Are Still Here”: American Indians in the Twentieth Century* (Wheeling IL: Harlan-Davidson, 1999).

44. *The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Arizona, the Petitioner vs. the United States of America, the Defendant*, docket 90, reporters’ transcripts of proceedings before the Indian Claims Commission, testimony taken on July 23, 1953, Arizona State University, Tempe (hereafter cited as ICC); ICC docket 90, testimony from Young Beecher, 36–37; ICC docket 90, testimony from Reed Wellington, 104–17.

45. Shepherd, “Building an American Indian Community”; Jennifer Wolch and Michael Dear, eds., *The Power of Geography: How Territory Shapes Social Life* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 4.

46. Or, more precisely, “writing back.” See a seminal title in this genre: Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (New York: Routledge, 1989).

47. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Sub Altern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1987), 271–313.

48. Donald L. Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986), and *ibid.*, *The Urban Indian Experience* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

49. Shepherd, “Building an American Indian Community.”

50. Fixico, *The Urban Indian Experience*.

51. Joanne Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

52. See, for example, Jack O. Waddell and Michael O. Watson, eds., *The American Indian in Urban Society* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971); Joan Weibel-Orlando, *Indian Country, L.A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in Complex Society* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991).

53. For examples that complicate the monolithic “urban Indian” construct see Myla Vicenti Carpio, “‘Let Them Know We Still Exist’: Indians in Albuquerque,” PhD diss., Arizona State University, 2001; James LaGrand, *Indian Metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago, 1945–75* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002); Joyotpaul Chaudhuri, Vine Deloria Jr., Edward H. Spicer, and Emory Sekaquaptewa, “Indians and Arizona’s Future: Opportunities, Issues, and Options,” 34th Town Hall, April 8–11, 1979, research report prepared under the auspices of the University of Arizona; and Thomas Weaver, Bernard Fontana, Emory Sekaquaptewa, and Emil V. Hauray, *Indians of Arizona: A Contemporary Perspective* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974).

54. Shepherd, “Building an American Indian Community.”

55. See, for example, Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle, *The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Self-Government* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); Loretta Fowler, *Tribal Sovereignty and the Historical Imagination* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002); Paul Rosier, *Rebirth of the Blackfeet Nation, 1912–1954* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001); Steve Fenton and Stephen May, eds., *Ethnonational Identities* (New York: Palgrave Books, 2002); and Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991).