

employees and representatives, and sometimes the character of government employees sheds meaningful light on the social environment faced by the Pueblos in their efforts to determine the course of their own future. A good example was the relationship of the Laguna Pueblo with school teacher Mary E. Dissette, whom the author describes as “a woman of extraordinary fortitude” but nevertheless was additionally imbued with strong prejudices which came into play not only during her tenure at that Pueblo (118), but also caused disruptions at Zuni, all during the 1890s.

Frost describes in considerable detail the inevitable conflicts between Pueblos and a railroad bent on building a transcontinental line through their territories. Although the railroad and the US government had the power, apparent legal authority, and motivation to eventually complete this line, the Pueblos also had considerable resolve and their own tools to try to maintain self-governance and self-preservation. The author takes a somewhat conservative position when he concludes that questions remain whether the Pueblos “will sustain their culture against the wealth and social consequences of their acculturation” due to the railroad line, but concludes correctly that under the modern-day policy of Self-Determination “the future for them now more than previously is in their own hands, and that is well” (196).

This work fills a vacuum on the impact of this railroad in Pueblo country from the 1880s through the 1930s and will be an important resource for those working on Pueblo history during this period.

E. Richard Hart

Hart West & Associates

Sending the Spirits Home: The Archaeology of Hohokam Mortuary Practices. By Glen E. Rice. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2016. 240 pages. \$60.00 cloth; \$48.00 electronic.

Phoenix, Arizona sprawls over an earlier civilization which the public calls Hohokam. The name “Phoenix” acknowledges that superimposition: the new city rose from the ashes of the old. The Arizona capital is almost unique among major American cities in the presence, everywhere, of both the Native past and Native present: the city is flanked on the west and south by Indian lands. Thirteenth-century “platform mounds”—football-field-sized flat-topped monuments—can be seen at city parks such as Pueblo Grande and Mesa Grande. Nearby, the ancient town of Casa Grande is a national monument.

It is impossible to build in Phoenix without disturbing ancient places. Federal, state, and city laws and regulations require archaeologists to excavate and record these places if construction cannot be avoided. The technical term is cultural resource management, or CRM. Today CRM is done in close consultation with local tribes. Over the last several decades there have been many large-scale CRM archaeological projects.

Sending the Spirits Home summarizes one aspect of all these excavations: mortuary practices, or the material evidence of the care and ritual treatment of the dead. Burials

must be excavated alongside the houses and plazas impacted by construction. Human remains are removed in consultation with tribes, and the tribes determine the next steps—typically, reinternment. It is unfortunate that these remains are impacted by construction, but the necessity of their excavation provides remarkable information about the ancient city and its people. In *Sending the Spirits Home*, Glen Rice, who has more than thirty-five years of experience in Phoenix-area CRM, compiles information on 1,733 burials from thirteen archaeological projects at eleven Hohokam villages (all but one project were CRM). This information has never been made available so broadly; previously, it could be found in scores of technical reports, usually with limited distribution and access. The book is a scholarly text, written for archaeologists and not for the general reader. It won the Fowler Prize, awarded by the University of Utah Press for the “best book-length, single-author manuscript in anthropology submitted to the Press.”

Human remains and the mortuary practices that attended their burial convey information about ancient societies which material remnants—houses and potsherds—cannot. Burials tell us about individual human beings. Rice looks at patterns in mortuary practices: how were individuals treated? Cremation or inhumation? What objects accompanied them? What about age, gender, health? Rice finds patterns that inform us about social roles and spheres of men and women, young or old, status and office, group and individual identity. For example, based on mortuary evidence, Rice concludes, “The authority of women over domestic and craft production activities within the household is in marked contrast to their near-complete exclusion from the village council chamber and village ceremonial life. Yet these distinctions . . . were in place as early as 800 BC . . . well before the start of the Hohokam tradition about A.D. 500. The structuring principles of the first agricultural villages in the Sonora Desert were to persist for nearly three millennia” (29). The book is rich in such insights.

How does Rice interpret the patterns in the mortuary evidence? To begin, he looks very broadly at how societies around the world treat their dead, and in that global context he develops the kinds of information to consider. This is what anthropology brings to the study: knowledge of the amazing range of human societies on this planet. But the history and heritage of this civilization is specific to particular Native groups. Rice turns to descendant communities, the tribes that have Hohokam in their history. He discussed his findings with individuals from several tribes, but his main sources of insight are ethnographies: anthropological studies about tribes, primarily written in the early twentieth century. Ethnographies of that era are sometimes considered invasive by tribes or individuals, but they constitute the most accessible compendia of Native insights for non-Natives. The ethnographic information was not limited to the mortuary practices per se, but included the social and gender patterns Rice finds in the data.

Which tribal ethnographies should be considered? This question is fraught, and Rice offers a clear, transparent account of his decisions. He concludes, “The first source considered was the traditional cultures of the descendants of the Hohokam, the Akimel O’odahm (Pima) and Tonono O’odahm (formerly called Papago) and their neighbors such as the Pee Posh (Maricopa). When these sources were exhausted, the

search was expanded to other tribal groups in the American Southwest. Some of the variables were also drawn from cross-cultural comparisons” (14). Not surprisingly, his list includes four Phoenix-area tribes that often consult, as a group, on NAGPRA matters: Akimel O’Odham, Tohono O’Odham, Ak Chin O’Odham, and Pee Posh. (I use here the tribal designations Rice uses; in his book he of course first introduces these groups with the official names of their reservations and lands.)

In archaeology, this is called “ethnographic analogy” or “up-streaming”: using our (admittedly imperfect) knowledge of tribes in the relatively recent past to project back in time. Up-streaming has been standard operating procedure in Southwestern archaeology for more than a century. While “up-streaming” honors the descendant communities, the logic is not without problems. What if something happened in the deep past that is not contained in the ethnographies?

Platform mounds are a case in point. A score or more of these monuments were scattered across the Phoenix area, each marking a separate community or town. Anthropology suggests that pyramids and “mounds”—a poor term for monumental structures—almost always indicate a society with rulers and leaders. The archaeology certainly supports such a view, with clear evidence of elites living atop the platforms in oversized houses. And that is how the platform mounds are remembered in O’Odham traditional histories: rulers (who were not O’Odham) lived atop the platform mounds until the people rose up and ended that oppressive social system. O’Odham people today and in the ethnographies do not have that kind of social structure.

Rice notes that O’Odham peoples’ “egalitarian ethos . . . seems at odds with the public architecture, elite residences, and settlement hierarchy of the Hohokam [but] . . . archaeological models [of social hierarchy] may be too narrowly focused to provide a useful understanding of the Hohokam” (9). I’m puzzled: the archaeology clearly indicates marked differences in social status between the few people living atop the mounds and the many people living below. And O’Odham histories tell precisely that story. But Rice says it wasn’t so: “Platform mound centers . . . look like incipient polities” but really they are the “Hohokam version of the [O’Odham] pan-village alliance” (42).

This is the trap of up-streaming: the past has to be like the present, even when it wasn’t. Anywhere else in the world, platform mound centers would be exactly what the O’Odham say they were: small polities (states). By the time the anthropologists arrived, Native societies in Arizona no longer had such things, but it appears that in the past, they did. The result of up-streaming is to deny modern Native peoples any deep history—at least, as history is recounted by non-Natives. Eric Wolf pinpointed this dilemma in his classic book, *Europe and the People Without History* (1982). Only Europeans get to have history. Up-streaming assumes unchanging continuity, but both Native traditional histories and archaeology tell us that the past was eventful, changing, historical.

Native traditional accounts are histories of events, of mistakes and successes, and of lessons learned. Just like everywhere else in the world, stuff happened! And, as with O’Odham platform mounds, not everything in the past survives into the present. At several times and places in the American Southwest, what happened long ago differs

from the societies described in ethnographies: Chaco Canyon was a capital city; over much of the region, there were brief periods of serious warfare; and the Hohokam had rulers. Native histories refer to these events, and the archaeology confirms that the region had a dynamic history. This is not to deny connections between modern Native peoples and their past; that connection is very strong and it is, above all, historical. Up-streaming makes that history hard to see.

Stephen H. Lekson

University of Colorado Museum of Natural History

The Settlers' Empire: Colonialism and State Formation in America's Old Northwest. By Bethel Saler. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015. 392 pages. \$45.00 cloth and electronic.

In 1836 Congress created the vast territory of Wisconsin out of the northwestern portions of the earlier Indiana and Louisiana territories. Although leading Anglo-American settlers may have assumed that the American colonization of Wisconsin would prove straightforward, in *The Settlers' Empire* Bethel Saler presents a nuanced case study that belies such a reading of state formation in the Old Northwest. Territorial history has largely fallen out of fashion in recent decades, but Saler makes a persuasive case that a reexamination of state formation in the region can illuminate not only the creation of the Anglo settler state in North America, but also the profound impact that this process has had upon historical production itself.

In seven dense but absorbing chapters, the author outlines a multilayered history that begins with the transfer of the Old Northwest from Great Britain to the United States in the 1780s and concludes with Wisconsin statehood in 1848. The first three chapters of *The Settlers' Empire* examine the ideologies, policies, and administrative mechanisms that formed the central axes of political rule of what Saler terms America's "domestic empire" (6). Beginning in the 1780s, American policy makers and leading political theorists articulated the idea of an expanding American state grounded in a republican political culture. This culture would be based on a territorial period, eventual statehood, the imposition of a land grid system, local government following the township model, group migrations of Anglo-American colonists, common law, private property, and state regulation of intimate matters and family relations. However, realities in the Old Northwest disrupted the straightforward application of these plans, most notably due to the presence of both the indigenous inhabitants and the long-standing, culturally heterogeneous French-Indian communities in the region.

In the treaty process that followed the War of 1812, federal officials sought to unilaterally impose their vision of a republican state on the Indian peoples of the region, including multiethnic groups such as the Stockbridges and Brothertowns as well as the Menominee and the Ho-Chunk. And while the indigenous peoples did become "enmeshed in a colonial legal system" (100), several historical realities constrained both the power and the reach of the national state: disagreements among