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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores how the written word and natural and cultural landscapes entwine to create a place, the process by which Arizona’s landscapes affected narratives written about the place and how those narratives created representations of Arizona over time. From before Arizona became a state in 1912 to the day its citizens celebrated one hundred years as a state in 2012, words have played a role in making it the place it is. The literature about Arizona and narratives drawn from its landscapes reveal writers’ perceptions, what they believe is important and useful, what motivates or attracts them to the place. Those perceptions translated into words organized in various ways create an image of Arizona for readers. I explore written works taken at twenty-five year intervals—1912 and subsequent twenty-five year anniversaries—synthesizing narratives about Arizona and examining how those representations of the place changed (or did not change). To capture one hundred years of published material, I chose sources from several genres including official state publications, newspapers, novels, poetry, autobiography, journals, federal publications, and the Arizona Highways magazine. I chose sources that would have been available to the reading public, publications that demonstrated a wide readership.

In examining the words about Arizona that have been readily available to the English-reading public, the importance of the power of the printed word becomes clear. Arizona became the place it is in the twenty-first century, in part, because people with power—in the federal and state governments, boosters, and business leaders—wrote about it in such a way as to influence growth and tourism sometimes at the expense of minority groups and the environment. Minority groups’ narratives in their own words were absent from Arizona’s written narrative landscape until the second half of the twentieth century when they began publishing their own stories. The narratives about Arizona changed over time, from literature dominated by
boosting and promotion to a body of literature with many layers, many voices. Women, Native American, and Hispanic narratives, and environmentalists’ and boosters’ words created a more complex representation of Arizona in the twenty-first century, and more accurately reflected its cultural landscape, than the Arizona represented in earlier narratives.
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PROLOGUE:

POINTS OF ENTRY

“The first word gives origin to the second, the first and second to the third, the first, second, and third to the fourth, and so on. You cannot begin with the second word and tell the story, for the telling of the story is a cumulative process, a chain of becoming, at last of being.”

N. Scott Momaday

I grew up in a small southwestern Colorado town, a community where everyone knew one another, and had for generations, a place where the Anglo, Mexican, Ute, and Navajo kids in my school were the children of the same families my mom and grandma had gone to school with. My brother and I were the fourth generation of my family to reside there. A few miles south of my childhood home, the Montezuma Valley spreads out to meet the Mesa Verdes; a two-hour drive to the southwest, the red rock canyon country of Utah and the high desert plateau beckon. To the north, within minutes of my town, the foothills of the San Juan Mountains give way to snowy peaks, and with a hard morning hike, treeline is attainable before lunch.

Small towns have few secrets and many stories, narratives that belong to the place—words that grow out of its rocky soil, fed by mountain streams—and to the people who share them. My grandpa was an outstanding storyteller. He owned the Chevy dealership, with one of the few gas stations in town, and he seemed to know everyone in Montezuma County. I learned at an early age that every place has more than one story. Depending on what we were doing on any given day, a different story belonged to the place and the activity. Fishing on the Dolores River brought

forth the story of my mom’s first catch, in later years the story of my first catch, but once Grandpa told a cautionary tale about the boy who drowned. Other river stories centered on floods, the day a thunderstorm upriver brought water pouring down the valley and washed out the bridge, or the time the high water decided to take its old route through the barnyard. Sometimes the stories included my grandpa or my family, but more often the narratives involved people my grandpa had known and events that had happened before I was born. The place I grew up in was a varied story landscape, as rich in words as it was in natural places and diverse people.

WORDS

I have always seen the world through words. When I hear a story, I see the words as they flow across space, each word as it is articulated, connected to the word preceding and the word following. When I view a landscape, I see the place through words, either as stories I know that are connected to it, long chains of words laid out on the land, or as inquiries I have about it, question marks punctuating sage-covered hills or empty buildings. I also understand the world through words, comprehending best when I read about places and events.

A lover of words—how they fit together, how a group of words employed in a certain order creates a place or an event for a listener or a reader, how once turned into a story the words exist forever—I have always been interested in the process of story making. I listened as Grandpa would alter a story he had told many times to make it a lesson, and as he added or left out details to suit the occasion. The place or event that the story was attached to in these different tellings had not changed, but the narrative did.
I also noticed that people new to our town had to learn the stories that belonged to the place. A simple statement—“We’re taking the horses down to McElmo tomorrow,” for example—would mean nothing to a newcomer. To a longtime resident of Montezuma County, McElmo Canyon denoted winter range for cattle and horses; my grandma knew it as a place to gather wild rhubarb along the irrigation ditches and buy cantaloupe from the dryland farmers; area high school kids knew it as a post-football-game-party location. Imbedded in our knowledge of the place McElmo were stories about early ranchers and a vague understanding that the land had once belonged to the Ute tribe, stories we knew existed but were intangible to us. The narrative about McElmo Canyon imparted to the newcomer depended on who was telling the story. The place would become real in whatever manner the narrative was told. The many layers of stories covering a single place fascinated me.

I have lived most of my adult life in Arizona. When I moved to Flagstaff to attend college, I became the newcomer. Because I had grown up in an environment where the stories were part of what made the place and its people, naturally I wanted to know the narratives that belong to my new home. I became a student of Arizona stories and experienced from the other side the myriad narratives attached to any one place. My own stories of northern Arizona had been formed directionally, from north to south. When I envisioned the San Francisco Peaks, I viewed them from their north side; the Peaks had always been “south” for me. At Northern Arizona University, however, many Arizona stories began south of the mountain; Flagstaff is “north” for many NAU students. For longtime Flagstaff residents the narratives are not directionally oriented at all, but are central to their lives, the way Dolores River Valley stories are for me.
How a person mentally processes a narrative depends on where that person is standing. The stories people hear and tell are refracted by their experiences and their perceptions. This is important when looking at narratives about and arising from a place; different experiences beget different narratives, creating different places but anchored to the same place. It is the power in the words of a story, this variety of narratives about and enabled by Arizona and how they are used, that interests me; all of the words laid down over time, word by word, as N. Scott Momaday says, story by story until we stand one hundred years later in a place where the narratives reflect a diverse and complex cultural landscape, yet a place where a constitutional amendment declares only English words are “official.”

**WORDS ON THE LAND**

Words help write a place into being, according to Momaday, the first word giving origin to the second, the first and second to the third, and so on. Momaday’s narrative in *The Names* writes his life into being and at the same time creates for his readers the places he has lived and visited and the events he has experienced. He describes this process of creating and becoming in his talk and subsequent essay “The Man Made of Words,” as he explains how an event central to Kiowa identity, a night of meteor showers in 1833, had to be dealt with in words to be understood.\(^2\)

Similarly, in an analysis of George R. Stewart’s *Names on the Land*, Wallace Stegner states, “What Stewart understood was that nothing is comprehended, much less

possessed, until it has been given a name, either casually . . . or formally.”

Stories facilitate understanding, words on the land connecting people to their places.

Stories about and grown out of the land have been told for centuries. In “The Sense of Place,” Stegner quotes Yeats discussing the legends that belong to the land in Ireland and remarks that America is too large and new to have this sort of thing. Places in America and the American West do have legends attached to them and places are often named and known for these narratives. In *Wisdom Sits in Places*, Keith Basso explores such places and the connected nature of Western Apache language, history, and place. The names of the places evoke the stories of the past, centering the people morally and anchoring their identity to the landscape.

But the Western Apache narratives attached to the place could not be imparted to people who did not speak or understand the words. If all people spoke the same language and if the words meant the same thing in every culture, then the Spanish explorers coming into what would become the American Southwest would have heard the legends and stories attached to the place. Likewise, the British settlers landing on America’s Atlantic shore would not be entering what for them was a blank page of a place but instead a place with stories covering it, narratives they could understand. The creation of a place often occurs in words, spoken and written. When culturally and linguistically different people enter what to them is a new landscape, the place is created anew in their language.

Stegner also describes the contributions words, stories, make in creating a place. “The fact that Daniel Boone killed a bear at a certain spot in Kentucky did not

---


make it a place,” Stegner writes. “It began to be one, though, when he remembered the spot as Bear Run, and other people picked up the name and called their settlement by it, and when the settlement became a landmark or a destination for travelers, and when children had worn paths through its woods to schoolhouse or swimming hole. The very fact that people remembered Boone’s bear-killing, and told about it, added something of placeness. No place is a place until things that have happened in it are remembered in history, ballads, yarns, legends, or monuments. Fictions serve as well as facts.” In thinking about place in this manner, a place does not exist until it is named, until it is created in words, until it is spoken or written into being. Americans have rewritten and overwritten the country’s landscape, forcing their own narratives on the places they perceived as blank pages, and changing stories as they translated older, non-English narratives.

Equally true, however, a place also contributes to, facilitates, the words written about it or emanating from it. A desert plain populated with saguaro cacti and granite boulders will (probably) inspire a narrative different from the story motivated by a seventh-floor walkup in a city center. But what if that city is at the edge of the Sonoran Desert? Momaday says, “None of us live apart from the land entirely.” The land and the stories about it are co-generating, each contributing to the creation of the other. It is through these stories, in the writing and telling, and in the listening and reading, that humanity can come to an understanding of the world and their place in it.

William Cronon explores the relationship between the natural world, narratives, and history in “A Place for Stories,” using stories written about the Dust Bowl as his lens. Seeking to comprehend the events that culminated in the Dust Bowl as his lens. Seeking to comprehend the events that culminated in the Dust Bowl as his lens. Seeking to comprehend the events that culminated in the Dust Bowl as his lens.

---

6 Momaday, “The Man Made of Words,” 166.
Bowl and its aftermath, contemporaries of the catastrophe and historians writing about it later explained and contextualized the issues differently, depending on their own perceptions and experiences. The Dust Bowl narratives, and all place-centered stories, are never complete; they are rewritten as people continue to explain and understand their world. Cronon writes, “The importance of the natural world, its objective effects on people, and the concrete ways people affect it in turn,” are at the heart of environmental historians’ project. Cronon concludes that narratives “motivate and explain our actions, the stories we tell change the way we act in the world.”7 The stories written about a place reveal writers’ perceptions, what is important and useful, what motivates or attracts, perceptions derived from an actual landscape. Those perceptions written down also create an image of the place for a reader. Arizona’s natural landscapes, its deserts, forests, mountains, and valleys, affected the lives of the people who visited and occupied them. Arizona also was written into being and, like the Kiowa night of falling stars, had to be dealt with in words to be understood. This study is an exploration of that process, Arizona’s natural and cultural places contributing to the creation of stories, and stories contributing to the creation of Arizona.8

OVERVIEW

From before Arizona became a state in 1912 to the day its citizens celebrated one hundred years as a state in 2012, words have played a role in making it the


8 Like Cronon, I will use the terms story and narrative interchangeably (see ibid., 1349, fn5). The proper name “Arizona” indicates the culturally constructed and politically bounded location that writers bring into being through words; the natural landscape—the place itself—becomes the raw material for those stories about Arizona and influences the character of the narratives.
This project explores representative written works taken at twenty-five year intervals—1912 and subsequent twenty-five year anniversaries. In examining the words about Arizona that have been readily available to the English-reading public, the importance of the power of the printed word becomes clear. Arizona became the place it is in the twenty-first century, in part, because people with power—people in the federal and state governments, and boosters and business leaders—wrote about it in such a way as to influence growth and tourism often at the expense of minority groups and the environment. A lack of access to the means of exercising the power of words meant that the Arizona known and experienced by Native Americans, for example, was absent from the narrative until the second half of the twentieth century. Those who wrote and published in English, who had access to and control over the means of publishing, had an advantage (one of many) over those whose narratives were told orally and in other languages; the Arizona written into being in English words became the Arizona most well known to the nation and the world.

The narratives about Arizona did change over time, from literature dominated by boosting and promotion, and written predominately by Anglo men at the time of statehood (an intellectual landscape that obscured narratives not written down or told in English, and neglected stories not told by men), to a body of literature with many layers, many voices. Women, Native American, and Hispanic narratives, and environmentalists’ and boosters’ words created a more complex representation of Arizona than earlier stories had envisioned. Those who control the words control the narrative, which determines the nature of the place written into being. Natural and cultural landscapes entwine with words about and brought forth from them to create a place. Books have been written about the natural and cultural landscapes of Arizona, works that examine those landscapes broadly or narrowly, but no extensive
study has synthesized narratives about Arizona; studying stories about and originating from the place and how those words change (or do not change) over time contributes to an overall understanding of the place.

I have chosen dates at twenty-five year intervals, sections of time marking statehood and the twenty-fifth, fiftieth, seventy-fifth, and one-hundredth anniversaries. To capture the span of published material contributing to the creation of Arizona in words and drawn forth from its natural landscape, I chose sources from several genres, including official state publications, newspapers, novels, poetry, autobiography, journals, federal publications, and the *Arizona Highways* magazine. I chose sources that would have been available to the English-reading public, publications that demonstrated a wide readership (award winners and bestsellers, for example). The study is arranged chronologically; just as words arranged in a sentence need the first word first, the second next, and so on to give words meaning, so too narratives about a place are built on each other. What did people know about Arizona at a given moment in time? What type of literature, philosophy, or policy was produced in Arizona at that given moment? And how did the natural landscape influence the words written about it?

In examining the formation of Arizona narratives, themes emerge. Literature boosting the state is present throughout the hundred-year span, but especially at the fifty and one hundred year anniversaries. Descriptions of the state’s natural landscapes appear in many forms. In early boosting narratives, Arizona is land and resources to be exploited; at mid-twentieth century land ethic and conservation themes emerge. The dichotomy of "modern miracle" versus "Old West" and a cliché of temporal extremes—the oldest landscape, youngest state or the oldest natural landscape, youngest cultural landscape (until Native American narratives in their own
words become part of the Arizona story) are also prominent characteristics in the narratives.

Arizona has been created in fiction and verse, with inherent contrasts, as the romantic westerns of Zane Grey and the stark portrayals of federal Indian policy by Oliver La Farge describe the same places in vastly different ways, and Sharlot Hall’s poetry proclaims the dominance of men over the Arizona land while Wendy Rose reveals the Hopi reverence for the place that she cannot fully claim. Memoirs, inhabiting the desert narratives, range from pioneer reminiscences to modern stories of homelessness, and include early twentieth-century Native American autobiographies in the as-told-to genre, narratives filtered through Anglo perceptions, and Indian memoirs written in the authors’ own words in the 1970s and 1980s. Finally, Arizona’s official words, those in the state’s constitution and added as English-only amendments and anti-immigration measures reflect citizens’ perceptions. The contrary nature of Arizonans who held the power to affect the words produced a progressive, labor-friendly constitution, but over time the liberal character of the document has been eroded.

Chapter one explores Arizona’s narratives at statehood. In 1912 Arizona had struggled through a contentious constitution-making process wherein President William Howard Taft vetoed the document based on the inclusion of a section allowing the recall of judges. The offending section was deleted, Arizona became a state, and then its citizens promptly voted the section back into the constitution at the next election. The words of the constitution itself, and the words written by the convention delegates and in newspaper reports as the document was debated, became the first official words of the State of Arizona. Words about the place, though, had been set down preceding the statehood fight. Sharlot Hall’s poetry and the articles she penned for Out West magazine introduced readers to and informed
them about the place. Zane Grey turned his experiences in Arizona into bestselling works of western fiction. The characters in his novels were transformed by the unyielding natural landscape, the same landscape readers learned about in Hall’s articles and that shaped the nature of the real-life people who inhabited the place.

By 1937 Arizona had become a destination, no longer just a region to travel through. Chapter two examines the literature written about and drawn from the place at that time. The federal government encouraged tourism and business relocations, promoting the state in the Federal Writers’ Project Arizona Guide. Well-known authors wrote from Arizona, using it as inspiration as J. B. Priestley did during a vacation in Wickenburg, and as setting to reveal the injustices of the Indian education system as Oliver La Farge did in his bestselling works of fiction set on the Navajo Reservation. The stories of Native Americans and other minorities were written by Anglos and published by Anglo presses in popular as-told-to autobiographies. The tribes depicted in the state guide and supplemental bulletins were written from the white perspective; several decades would pass before Indians gained control of their own stories from the Anglo publishing industry.

Chapter three examines the narratives of Arizona at fifty. By 1962 Arizona was becoming in some ways an epicenter of a conservation movement that sought to protect and preserve natural places. The damming of the Colorado River at Glen Canyon spurred many forms of literature, about the place specifically and about the natural world generally. Inhabiting the desert drew out a conservation ethic, revealed in memoir form. Naturalists Joseph Wood Krutch and Ann Woodin lived within miles of each other in the Sonoran Desert north of Tucson. Originally from the Northeast, both wrote out of and about an appreciation for the natural world, enhanced as their lives entwined with the desert. Helen Sekaquaptewa wrote of inhabiting the desert in a completely different manner from the Anglo
conservationists; as a Hopi woman educated in off-reservation boarding schools, she returned to live on the Hopi Mesas and embraced traditional ways of life while simultaneously accepting the importance of an Anglo education and sending her children to those schools. Arizona’s arrival at fifty years of statehood prompted celebratory publications rife with boosting language, extolling the wonders of the “Arizona miracle.” Consumers of the anniversary literature who read nothing else about the state would have had no notion of its diverse and complex cultural landscape or the threats to its natural landscapes.

The diversity of Arizona’s cultural landscape that is revealed in its narratives in 1987 is explored in chapter four. N. Scott Momaday, Wendy Rose, and publishers producing other Native Americans’ works told Indian narratives in their own words. Barbara Kingsolver wrote stories about women from their own perspectives, giving them a strong voice. Exploitation and degradation of the state’s natural landscape had not abated, and informed the works of many environmentalists. Ann Zwinger continued the tradition of naturalists, writing lyrically yet scientifically about the deserts of the state. Edward Abbey took a harsher stand against people who degraded the environment and especially against state leaders who not only supported but pushed the gospel of growth. His anti-growth rhetoric also led him to espouse an anti-immigration stand, one with an element of intolerance toward Hispanics. Abbey’s was not a minority viewpoint. The complexity and diversity of voices apparent culturally and linguistically led to a backlash and the passing of an English-only amendment to the state’s constitution.

The themes of environmentalism, intolerance, boosting, memoir-writing, and poetry continued into the twenty-first century. The epilogue inserts present literature from the first decade of the century into the timeline of Arizona’s written narratives. Truesnow.org provided a platform for material about the fight to save the San
Francisco Peaks, a virtual library accessible to readers all over the world. Jeannette Walls wrote an inhabiting-the-desert narrative for a twenty-first century audience. Luis Alberto Urrea defended and gave voice to a beleaguered and no-longer ignored Hispanic minority exposed to abuse by the passage of anti-immigration measures and another English-only amendment. Following the 1962 precedent, as Arizona celebrated its one-hundredth year as a state, the centennial literature promoted and boosted the state with little mention of environmental degradation or racial animosity. The stories of Arizona at one hundred reveal a state where narratives, and those who write and read them, are still in conflict.

WORDS INTO STORIES IN EARLY ARIZONA

The place that became the state of Arizona had been inhabited and explored for centuries before Europeans arrived. The early desert and plateau dwellers, whose empty homes had become places of mystery and wonder by the early twentieth century, told stories about the place in which they lived, evoking an image of the place in words for their listeners. The region was spoken into consciousness in the languages of Native American people long before Euro-Americans immigrated into the land. Those narratives complicated the place when Arizona’s Native Americans wrote and published their own stories and the historic connections between the occupants of the ancient structures and modern Indians became accessible to English speakers and readers.

Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Spanish priests and explorers traveled from the south and east into Arizona’s interior and wrote about their journeys. The nineteenth century brought American explorers and settlers, miners, railroad companies, and soldiers entering Arizona from the east and across the Colorado River from California in the west. Mormon farmers entered from Utah, first to the
Arizona Strip on the north side of Grand Canyon’s natural barrier, then after establishing a Colorado River crossing at Lee’s Ferry, settled along the Mogollon Rim and among the valleys of the San Francisco, Gila, and Salt rivers. As settlers and visitors to Arizona, Americans dealt with the place in words in several ways. They brought their own stories and created new ones to explain landscapes markedly different from the ones they had known. They rewrote older stories, translating words from indigenous languages and Spanish into English, and adding to or subtracting from the narratives to conform the stories to their own cultural understanding. They remade the exotic landscapes into forms they could understand, and fashioned an imagined future from the wealth of natural resources they encountered.

As a model of how newcomers encountered and translated, consider Elliot Coues’s 1900 English translation of Father Francisco Garcés’s diaries from his explorations of Sonora and Arizona in 1776. Coues, army surgeon, scientist, and historian, so heavily footnoted Garcés’s text that it is as much Coues as Garcés who created the idea of Arizona for readers of the journals. A literal palimpsest—words written over partly erased words on a manuscript—Garcés translated narratives told in the Hualapai language into Spanish, which were translated into English by Coues. Coues’s familiarity with and interest in the journey allowed him to annotate seemingly mile by mile. Whereas Garcés wrote, “June 7. I traveled four leagues east, and arrived at the Jaguallapas [Hualapai],” and described the place simply, “At this rancheria there is an arroyo with running water, plenty of grass, much game, and much seed of chia.” Coues’s version of the story adds to the narrative. “Crossing what remained to him of the Sacramento Valley, Garcés finds the Hualapai or Walapai Indians living in the vicinity of present Kingman, seat of Mojave County,” Coues wrote in his translator’s notes, in an over five-hundred-word rewriting of
Garcés’s concise journal entry. Coues built contemporary (in 1900) images with Garcés’s eighteenth century translations of Hualapai words.

A similar process occurs with narratives about Grand Canyon. Americans attempted to comprehend the natural landscapes of Arizona by capturing the place in words. American explorers had been coping with and writing about the unique and awe-inspiring (or plain awful, in some of the descriptions) Arizona landscapes since the mid-nineteenth century. First in reports to Congress, later in articles and books, the descriptions of the land these men explored, the people they met, and the experiences they enjoyed and endured created a place in the minds of their readers. Commissioned by the United States Secretary of War, Joseph Ives’s expedition in 1857 followed the river to Grand Canyon and traveled east through the northern part of what would become Arizona. Ives’s report to Congress, published in 1861, quickly dispensed with the stated purpose of his mission, affirming the river’s navigability. He then committed a significant portion of the report to the specifics of a place of remarkable, rugged beauty and interesting people. Ives stated, “The region explored after leaving the navigable portion of the Colorado—though, in a scientific point of view, of the highest interest and presenting natural features whose strange sublimity is perhaps unparalleled in any part of the world—is not of much value. Most of it is uninhabitable, and a great deal of it is impassable.” However, rather than submit a brief report writing off the territory as a beautiful yet useless waste, Ives continued, “It being doubtful whether any party will ever again pursue the same line of travel, I

9 Francisco Garcés, On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer; the Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garcés (Missionary Priest) in His Travels through Sonora, Arizona, and California, 1775–1776, Vol. 2, Elliott Coues, trans. (New York: F. P. Harper, 1900), 316, 319. Coues’s rewriting of Garcés’s encounters with the indigenous peoples added another layer of words obscuring Native American voices at the time. The Native Americans’ own stories in their languages existed first. Then Garcés’s stories about these people were written in Spanish and told from his perspective, and in 1900 Coues’s translation with his perspective about the various tribes in his extensive notes were added.
have thought it would be better, in place of condensing into a few lines the prominent facts noted, to transmit the journal kept during the expedition."¹⁰ This nearly three-hundred-page report details the geography, zoology, and ethnography of the northern regions of the territory, and creates an Arizona for the readers of this report as a region of dualities, a place of uselessness and possibility, of barrenness and unimaginable beauty, a place uninhabitable and yet inhabited.

No landscape was as remarkable as the Grand Canyon, a place that revealed the inadequacy of descriptive language. Readers were challenged by two counter-visions, John Wesley Powell’s from the river and Clarence Dutton’s from the rim. The popular edition of Powell’s report to Congress, *Exploration of the Colorado River of the West* (published in 1875, republished and expanded into *Canyons of the Colorado* in 1894), became famous for its visual descriptions and the chronicle of his trip through Grand Canyon. A travel book published by the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company between 1902 and 1906, *Titan of Chasms*, included an eleven-page essay by Powell that reiterated much of his previous work for a new audience, travelers on the AT&SF heading west. "It is a region more difficult to traverse than the Alps or the Himalayas, but if strength and courage are sufficient for the task, by a year’s toil a concept of sublimity can be obtained never again to be equaled on the hither side of Paradise," he stated.¹¹ Powell’s readers could conclude that this Arizona

---


was mysterious, remarkable, and unreachable except by a few daring souls who explored the hard, rugged terrain and re-created its unusual challenges and exceptional landscapes with words, reading even as they passed near the very places Powell described, ensconced safely and comfortably in their railcars.

Dutton’s *Tertiary History of the Grand Canyon District* (1882) presented a parallel view, from the Canyon’s rim, the view most visitors would experience. Dutton’s is a thick book, dense with information yet eloquently written, that sought to comprehend the vast landscape at geological and literary levels, much as naturalists endeavored to understand Arizona’s natural landscapes seventy years later. “The earth suddenly sinks at our feet to illimitable depths,” Dutton wrote, upon reaching the edge of the great chasm. He described the view from Powell’s Point, “A stretch of the river six miles long is in full view, flowing in the dark depths of the granite more than a mile below,” writing the place into being for readers, a view that can also be seen by regular folks traveling to the Canyon, unlike the descriptions of the sheer rock walls viewed from the river that only a few adventurers would see.\(^{12}\)

While explorers’ journals and reports detailed desolate expanses of wilderness and astonishing scenery, other books and pamphlets disclaimed the rugged wildness, embraced its progress toward “civilization,” and extolled the virtues of Arizona’s climate and resources. Again this duality—desolation and possibility—created an Arizona in the minds of readers that was at once barren and verdant, harsh and pleasant, uninhabitable and the perfect place for settlements. Writers of the state have produced booster literature for over a century, the narratives employing words

about its natural landscapes to promote economic development rather than a scientific, experiential, or moral understanding of the place.

“Arizona is a land of marvels for the scientist and the sightseer,” wrote Patrick Hamilton, introducing Arizona to readers in 1881. “The topography of the country in variety, weird beauty, and massive grandeur, is not excelled on the continent.”\(^{13}\) Hamilton was editor of the Prescott* Democrat* when the territorial legislators commissioned him to compile a handbook in 1880 to expound on Arizona’s resources and entice immigrants to the territory. Several editions of *Resources* were published, each more expansive than the previous. Two separate editions published in 1881 were printed at the territorial capital in Prescott. The third edition grew to 275 pages, a fourth to 414, and the book was sent to A. L. Bancroft and Company in San Francisco for professional publication. Such was the impact of Hamilton’s *Resources* on the perception of Arizona that in an 1885 speech to the Thirteenth Territorial Legislature, Territorial Governor Frederick A. Tritle commented that the book was a “thoroughly reliable and exhaustive resume of the attractions and resources of the Territory. It was a credit to the author, and has been of material benefit to Arizona. It has had an extensive circulation, not only in the United States, but I have been informed in Great Britain and Canada.”\(^{14}\)


Railroad companies participated in creating Arizona in words as well, as seen by the AT&SF travel book. The Southern Pacific Company employed literature to create a place attractive for settlement. *New Arizona* was a condensed, easy-to-read, forty-page volume distributed at train stations.\(^{15}\) Published in 1900, the purpose of this booklet was to attract wealthy men with money to invest. The pamphlet contains “a thoughtful message addressed to thoughtful men . . . If you have a little money, or, better still, a great deal, there are few countries that have within themselves the power to respond so quickly, surely, and generously to well-directed efforts.”\(^{16}\) Boosters imagined a future Arizona prospering under the influence of wealthy men. Their understanding of the place, the Arizona their words created for readers, left no room for wilderness or minorities.

Arizona at the time of statehood was remote and wild, but its narratives were already rich with exaggerated descriptions. Themes that would mark the literature of Arizona in ensuing decades—desolation, beauty, opportunity, loss—emerged in pre-statehood narratives; those themes would be developed and challenged throughout the state’s first one hundred years.

\(^{15}\) Southern Pacific Company, *The New Arizona: A Brief Review of Its Resources, Development, Industries, Soil, Climate, and Especially Its Advantage for Homemaking* (San Francisco, CA: Passenger Department, Southern Pacific Company, 1900), see page 33. The authors doubt a reader will “will wade through all the pages . . . unless, indeed, he may be stranded in some remote railway station, and altogether out of literature.”

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 6; 10.
CHAPTER 1
DEFINING A NEW STATE, 1912

On February 14, 1912, after waiting fifty years, Arizona Territory became the State of Arizona. Its citizens had spent those years advocating for their region, describing its virtues and potential in written narratives, often countering visitors and nonresidents’ narratives that expressed views of the limitations of the place. Both boosters and critics described the characteristics of the landscape and its people as they perceived them, engaging in the work of defining Arizona in words. The written narratives about and coming from Arizona at the time of statehood portrayed an Anglo perspective, written from Anglo experiences, and created an image of the place for Anglo consumption, for English speakers and readers.

At the time of statehood Arizona was remote and in some ways inhospitable, a space to travel through, not a destination. The population of Arizona in 1910 was just over 200,000. Until the railroads were built through the territory, it was accessible only by horse and wagon, and on foot. Visitors and settlers could not reach the territory by rail until the 1880s. In the fall of 1877 the Southern Pacific Railroad extended only to Yuma from the west; it reached Tucson on March 20, 1880. In the next year Chinese workers laid track across the territory’s southeastern desert and arrived at the New Mexico Territory border in May 1881. In northern Arizona, tracklayers for the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad (soon to become the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway) built its road along the 35th parallel in the spring and summer of 1880, reaching Needles, California, in June of 1883. Throughout the territory, dozens of regional rail lines connected mine and lumber camps to the small communities from which the ore and logs could be sent to market
and where supplies could be brought in.\textsuperscript{17} The railroads opened the territory to the nation, making travel easier, and Arizona towns along the rail lines began advertising their districts as destinations rather than simply stops along the way to somewhere else.

The railroads participated in regional boosting as well, advertising Arizona to travelers in the East and in Europe. The Southern Pacific Railroad magazine \textit{Abroad}, for example, intended for a European tourist audience, devoted its March 1912 issue to the new state. "Phoenix is cosmopolitan, representatives of every state in the union being here,” the guide declared. “A surprising number of young men are established here, and ‘college men’ are numerous. We venture to say that the charm of the desert, the sense of freedom out-of-doors, the large spaces, and the beauty of the environing [sic] mountains will steadily bring to this entire center men of culture and of original ideas.”\textsuperscript{18} The descriptions employed here to describe Arizona became familiar phrases in a variety of publications about the place.

Arizona at the time of statehood boasted few roads, and the roads it had were local, dirt and gravel surfaced, connecting mines, ranches, and small communities with larger towns. Funding for roads was limited. The federal government restricted borrowing by territorial governments, therefore most of Arizona’s roads pre-statehood were financed and built by the counties. In 1909 the territorial legislature


\textsuperscript{18} Quoted in “Arizona Is Exploited: Railroad Magazine Circulated Throughout Europe Devotes Entire Issue to Opportunities for Settlers and Tourists Here,” \textit{Arizona Republican}, April 24, 1912.
appointed an engineer and established a two-road highway system. The east-to-west road began in Duncan near the New Mexico Territory border; it traversed the mining country of the southeast, passed through Clifton, Safford, and Globe on the way to the Roosevelt damsite and the future Roosevelt Lake, then on to Mesa, Tempe, and Phoenix, ending the long trip across the southwestern desert in Yuma. The north-south route began in Flagstaff, ran through Prescott, then south to Phoenix and Tucson, and culminated at Douglas on the Mexican border. None of the roads were paved.\textsuperscript{19}

On the eve of statehood, then, the Arizona that most nonresidents knew would be an Arizona created in words and pictures; and in 1912, before color photography was widely used, written narratives would have reached the largest audience. Residents of the territory wrote about the place in stories, poems, and newspaper articles. Non-Arizona newspapers covered the state with a much different perspective, those reporters writing with an outsider’s view. Writers of fiction created an Arizona in their stories that became a familiar Wild West place. Indian people became part of the written narrative landscape of Arizona just as farmers, the desert, and Grand Canyon did. At the time of statehood, however, Native Americans did not have the same access to place defining and creating words, to the language (English) or the means (publication) that these non-Indian poets, novelists, and newspaper editors possessed. The barriers of language and access, and a bias against oral narratives meant that the literary Arizona written for the majority of Americans in 1912 was an Anglo Arizona, a place viewed through the eyes of white, English-speaking writers and readers.

As settlers worked to manage the unique yet challenging landscapes, to gain physical control, writers endeavored to define it, to impose an intellectual control, to

\textsuperscript{19} Pry and Anderson, 3, 24–25.
gain an understanding of the place. In defining Arizona’s landscapes, writers employed phrases that became familiar, and almost sacrosanct over time. Words described the dichotomy of the state’s miraculous growth, an instant civilization, juxtaposed against rock-exposed natural features dating from the dawn of time, temporal extremes that continued to define the state for over a century, and the natural landscape extremes characterized as lush forests and desert wasteland. Natural landscapes cannot be confined within political boundaries, and as writers sought to define Arizona’s physical borders, the space that it would encompass within the nation, they found that canyons and deserts overlapped these invisible lines. Descriptions of Arizona’s people were as recognizable (and stereotypical) as those defining most Western dwellers at the time, the independent pioneer, the rugged cowboy, the motivated businessman, and the subdued yet mysterious Indians. All of these words defined Arizona, characterized it, and gave it meaning.

SHARLOT HALL, CACTUS AND PINE

As citizens of Arizona grappled with the process of defining the new state, Sharlot Hall had been defining the place in verse for decades. As a twelve-year-old child, she traveled on horseback with her parents from Kansas to northern Arizona in 1882, where they built a ranch near Prescott. Hall witnessed the growth and development of the territory and its people. She knew ranchers and merchants, schoolteachers and families, who had emigrated to the place years before the Halls arrived, and she recognized the importance of the pioneer stories, histories that connected the settlers to their place but also defined the place for the rest of the country.
Hall’s first published work was an Arizona story; a Hopi creation story, it appeared in a children’s magazine in 1891.\textsuperscript{20} She wrote essays, poems, and historical sketches, and published in venues as varied as the journal *Archaeology*, the magazine *Land of Sunshine*, and Arizona’s newspapers. Hall’s poetry portrayed the natural landscape of her homeland, her narrative essays described the history of its people and emphasized their strength and fortitude, and her stories revealed an imagination fostered by the place and its people. In the first decade of the twentieth century Hall put her writing skills to work as associate editor of Charles Lummis’s *Out West* magazine, and used her familiarity with and knowledge of early Arizona pioneers to begin collecting their oral histories. In 1909 Hall was appointed to the newly created Office of Territorial Historian by Governor Richard Sloan and became the first Arizona woman to hold public office, a position she held until 1912. She collected documents, books, and other written records of Arizona history and continued her journeys through the territory collecting oral histories. Hall created an accessible past and provided stories defining the place by its own people.

Initially Hall defined the West and its people for readers of *Out West* magazine. Originally published by Lummis in Los Angeles as *Land of Sunshine*, in 1902 the editor changed its name to *Out West* and commissioned Hall to write a poem to appear on the first page of the first issue. The poem was typical of the verses she would write about Arizona, with larger-than-life landscapes populated by

\textsuperscript{20} Juti A Winchester, ““So Glad God Let Me be an Outdoor Woman’: The Conservationist Writing of Sharlot Mabridth Hall,” *Journal of the West* 44, no. 4 (October 2005): 20. Early Arizona’s written narratives not only portrayed a solely Anglo place, absent Native Americans, but when Native American stories were shared, they were written by Anglo authors for Anglo readers. This situation continued well into the second half of the twentieth century (see chapter four). For background on Sharlot Hall, see Margaret Maxwell, *A Passion for Freedom: The Life of Sharlot Hall* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1982); James J. Weston, “Sharlot Hall: Arizona Pioneer Lady of Literature,” *Journal of the West* 4, no. 4 (October 1965): 539–552; Bill Kauffman, “The Queen of Arizona,” *American Enterprise* 15, no. 5 (August 2004): 48; and Winchester, 18–25.
hardier-than-average people. Titled "Out West" to introduce the new magazine, the poem described the landscape as a cliché of extremes, just as Hall’s verses would come to define Arizona. She wrote, “The silence of utmost desert, and canyons rifted and riven/And the music of wide-flung forests where strong winds shout to heaven.” Hall described the residents of the West as a different breed of fellows (in this poem the place is female, the settlers are male), sturdier because of their Western pilgrimage. "And she cried to the Old World cities that drowse by the Eastern main: 'Send me your weary, house-worn broods, and I'll send you Men again!'” Hall would soon describe Arizonans in similar fashion, in verse and in the essays published in *Out West*.

Hall defined Arizona in the first round of its statehood fight in 1906, when Congress determined that the territories of Arizona and New Mexico should be admitted to the union as one state. Arizonans had waited over four decades to become a state. Designated as part of New Mexico Territory in 1848, Arizona was given its own boundaries and name in 1863. The enabling legislation of 1906 once again joined the two southwestern territories, this time as one state, but the citizens of Arizona would have none of it. Capturing that indignation, Hall wrote, "No beggar she in the mighty hall where bay-crowned suitors wait; No empty-handed pleader for the right of a free-born state.” These words form the opening lines of her poem “Arizona,” a tract printed on broadsides and placed on every Congressman’s desk, words that were read into the Congressional Record from the floor in both houses of Congress and published in Arizona’s newspapers, *Out West* magazine, and newspapers around the country.

---


In words mirroring her “Out West” poem, Hall defined Arizona for the citizens of Arizona, the U.S. Congress, and the nation. “The men who from trackless forests and prairies lone and far/Hewed out the land where ye sit at ease and grudge us our fair-won star,” she wrote, leaving out the Native Americans who had inhabited the place for centuries and instead creating an Arizona with her words that didn’t exist until Anglo explorers and settlers arrived. Sarcastically she addressed the belief in Congress that Arizona was not ready to become a state, “Yet we are a little people—too weak for the cares of state!—Let us go our way—when ye look again ye may find us mayhap, too great.”

She defined the territory’s natural landscape in words evoking the description of the West in “Out West,” declaring, “Back to her own free spaces where her rock-ribbed mountains lift/Their walls like a sheltering fortress . . . As the pale dawn-stars that swim and fade o’er our highty Canyons rim.” She proudly proclaimed Arizona’s untamed land and people, comparing what some began calling “The Baby State” to the complacency of older states, writing, “The song of the deed in the doing; of work still hot from the hand; Of the yoke of man laid friendly-wise on the neck of a tameless land.” Her words captured the strength, independence, and determination of the people and characterized the place they had forged into a home. Arizona’s citizens believed they deserved statehood, on their own, unattached to and unencumbered by another territory’s people with whom they may have shared a past but were not creating a shared future.

---

23 Ibid., 109.

24 Ibid., 107–108.
“Arizona” was published in Poems of American History in 1908, and appeared again, in 1911 as Arizonans took up a second fight for statehood, in Hall’s collection of poetry Cactus and Pine: Songs of the Southwest. The publication of Hall’s poems, most of them about or set in Arizona, in one volume and nationally distributed, defined Arizona for readers who may not have read her magazine articles. The first edition sold out quickly; “none could be had a year later,” according to Hall in the introduction to the second edition. She cared little for the title of the volume but the continuation of a theme is evident, from the western landscape of deserts and forests in her “Out West” poem a decade before to the extremes of those features in the poetry about Arizona.

Along with Hall’s essays about Arizona published in Out West magazine, the poems in Cactus and Pine defined Arizona with the authority of one who had advocated for the place for a decade, and provided a tool for English speaking and reading Arizonans to define themselves. The clichés are present in Hall’s writing, in both the essays and the poems, with the extremes of the temporal (oldest natural landscape, newest settlements) and natural landscapes (forest and desert), the Old West and the modern, and the hardy pioneers. Readers of Hall’s articles and poetry would be unaware of Arizona’s large Native American population. Indian people are nonexistent in Hall’s narratives. Her Arizona, the one she writes into being for readers is distinctly Anglo. Instead, Hall readily employs booster language in the articles, using words and tone already rooted in the literature about the territory.


26 See Hall, Cactus and Pine, 1, 6.

27 See, for example, Hamilton, Resources of Arizona 2nd edition; John A. Black, Arizona: The Land of Sunshine and Silver, Health and Prosperity, the Place for
As Arizonans engaged in their first battle for statehood in 1906, *Out West* magazine devoted nearly an entire issue to Hall’s article about the place. The sixty-four-page article reinforced the theme of the stoic, independent, hardworking settler introduced in Hall’s poems. “But if [Arizona’s] isolation, her transportation difficulties, and her years of strenuous Indian warfare have been to some extent obstacles in the path of Arizona’s advancement,” Hall declared, “she has been more than repaid by the character they have bred in her people. They have given her a race of ‘stayers’; the congenital ‘quitters’ came and saw and went on in search of easier lands.” Hall ignored the contemporary presence of Native Americans, instead placing them in the past, as obstacles to “Arizona’s [read Anglo Arizona’s] advancement.”

Much of the article is of the boosting type, with large sections devoted to the wonders of the Arizona’s agriculture, ranching, forestry, and mining. Hall introduced her readers to Arizona’s forests and boasted about its farming potential, stating the territory had “the largest and most valuable forest in the United States—possibly the largest unbroken forest area in the world, covering ten thousand square miles. She has the largest tract of agricultural land west of Kansas . . . Nearly one half of the land in Arizona is capable of cultivation, and with water would be immensely productive.” For Hall and the readers she was addressing, the promise of Arizona’s natural landscapes was in the usefulness of its resources: wide plains for farming and ranching, mineral-filled mountains for mining, thousands of miles of forest for harvesting. The idea that Arizona’s natural landscapes should be left wild, that value existed in its undeveloped land, would not be advanced for several decades.

---

*Ideal Homes* (Tucson, AZ: Republican Book and Job Print, 1890); and Southern Pacific Company, *The New Arizona.*

28 Sharlot Hall, “Arizona” (article), *Out West* 24, no. 2 (February 1906): 73.

29 Ibid., 74, 75.
However, even as she wrote about the natural resources available for extraction and harvesting, Hall recognized the beauty inherent in the places she wrote about. Arizona has often been represented as both harsh desert and lush forest in literature, the dichotomy of extremes, stark and verdant, and the contradictory descriptions of the natural world as both inspirational places and as raw material for industry. While much of Hall’s writing depicts the possibilities for development, she also describes the beauty of Arizona’s natural landscapes.

Of the desert, defining the part of Arizona that most readers would recognize, Hall described the location of Phoenix, “where the mountains run/Naked and scarred and seamed up to the face of the sun; His place—reaches of wind-blown sand, brown and barren and old.” But she also wrote about the place in words that might have surprised her readers, describing spring in the desert in both essay and verse. In an article for *Out West* Hall described the scene when the rainy season arrives, writing, “If it is rain in any quantity, the very drops seem to turn into green leaves as they fall; and, almost before the shower is done, a faint, gauzy film of green, like a scarf blown from the hands of Spring, lies on the canyon slopes and along the wide, low sand-washes.” While this image does not conjure desert landscapes, Hall made sure the reader was still firmly fixed in the idea of the desert as she adds the ever-present cacti to the picture. “And yet in all this fragile, swift-passing beauty the real things of the desert have no part,” she wrote. “It is their working season; they are busy storing up uncertain moisture in leaf, or trunk, or root, for the drouth that is

---


31 Sharlot Hall, “When Spring Comes to the Desert,” *Out West* 22, no. 6 (June 1905), 363.
always ahead.” She described budding and blooming saguaro flowers and the outwardly dead ocotillo suddenly covered with leaves and sprouting flames of orange flowers at the ends of their long branches. “Whole mountainsides are yellow at once with the deep, rich, velvet-textured prickly pear,” Hall explained, and declared, “No other desert growth is more impressive than a great yucca in full bloom,” with its “white cluster of waxen bells” on flagpole-like stems.33

Hall’s poetry also described spring in the desert, creating a life-filled place in what was often portrayed as a lifeless, life-taking landscape. “Every shrub distills vague sweetness; every poorest leaf be gathered/Some rare breath to tell its gladness in a fitter way than speech,” she wrote. “Here the silken cactus blossoms flaunt their rose and gold and crimson, And the proud zahuaro [sic] lifts its pearl-carved crown from careless reach.”34 In both the article and the poem Hall described the texture of cactus flowers—rich, velvet, and silk—and calls to the reader’s mind the iconic image of the saguaro cactus that symbolizes the desert.

Hall captured the opposite extreme of Arizona’s natural landscapes, the dense forest primeval, in essay and verse. “It will come as no light surprise to many that probably the largest unbroken forest in the United States lies within the land that has been called ‘the last stronghold of the desert,’” Hall declared. The forest of yellow pine is “flung like a kingly mantle across the rugged [illegible] mesas of the Mogollon Plateau in Northern Arizona.”35 In 1906 she used the vast forest resources of Arizona to argue for statehood, illustrating the natural resources the territory could add to

---

32 Ibid., 364.
33 Ibid., 368, 373.
35 Sharlot Hall, “The Forests of Arizona,” Out West 25, no. 6 (December 1906), 474.
the union of states. Her essay explained the logging process in detail, from the
surveying of the forest to the cutting of the trees and loading of the logs, and
describes life in the lumber camps and the output of the mills, all in an unemotional,
almost journalistic manner, quite different from the flourishes she employs in her
poem about the Mogollon forests. That poem begins, "In the forests on the
mountains sing the pines a wondrous measure, As the wind, the master-player
sways their branches to and fro: Varied music, full of power; full of passion, joy and
sorrow," and carries the reader along, "And above this earth-born music rings a
highbar tone incessant." The song in the forest builds, "Calling: Upward! Upward!
Upward! Rise and follow where I go!" until it comes to an end, "Wild with all the pain
of living, glad with all life’s harmony." Hall’s poems and articles reveal tension in her views about Arizona and land use;
some could coexist, the extremes of deserts and forests, for instance, but others,
such as forests as God’s creation and humanity’s raw material for development, were
hardly compatible.


37 Hall, “In the Bracken,” *Cactus and Pine*, 105.
Water, or lack of it, was another defining theme as the territory looked to statehood, and would be an issue throughout the state’s history. “The Trail of Death,” a dramatic poem that the New York Evening Post called “the most vivid and terrible picture of the desert ever put into verse” when it was published in Land of Sunshine in February 1901 and reprinted in Cactus and Pine, describes a stunning and wild Arizona desert for readers. The poem begins, “We rode from daybreak; white and hot/The sun beat like a hammer stroke/On molten iron; the blistered dust/Rose up in clouds to sear and choke.” Inspired by the stories of suffering and death on southern New Mexico’s Jornada del Muerto, Hall’s poem used harsh words to create, and supplement, readers’ perceptions of Arizona’s deserts. In stanzas such as “The thirst-scourged lips and tortured sight” and “Rock-caught against a blackened ledge,” describing the need for and the place to find water, Hall created a place worthy of the name Death Trail.38 One hundred years later another story about another trail of death in an expanse of desert, the Devil’s Highway in southern Arizona, would be written, this one about Mexican immigrants walking north with hopes of better lives, and perishing for lack of water (see epilogue).

Hall often looked forward, using her poetry and articles to project the coming greatness of Arizona. A history of Prescott published in the first issue of the newly renamed Out West magazine looked to the future, a modern Arizona, while also harking to the Old West. “There is perhaps no other country quite like this,” Hall wrote of northern Arizona, “where romance and civilization so jostle elbows, where the old strong soul of the West, in which manhood was more than dollars, touches hands so amiably with the bustling commercialism of the new. It is a land that inspires to big things—big ventures, big hopes; a land which in its wild beauty so

possess the hearts of its dwellers that there is a local proverb that a man who leaves it is never happy till he returns.”

Hall’s Arizona, a forward looking place ready for statehood, met resistance in the Arizona of writers who looked to the past in 1912, back to what Arizona had been. Martha Summerhayes’s *Vanished Arizona*, published as a second edition in 1911, described an Arizona that no longer existed, a place of intractable wilderness, few people, and Indian wars. The wife of an army officer assigned to the territory, Summerhayes spent most of her early-married years in remote territorial military outposts. The first image of Arizona Sumerhayes created with her words occurs in the summer of 1874 and is one of dreadful heat as she and her husband’s company traveled up the Colorado River: “From there [Ehrenberg] on, up the river we passed through great canyons and the scenery was grand enough; but one cannot enjoy scenery with the mercury ranging from 107 to 122 in the shade. The grandeur was quite lost upon us all, and we were suffocated by the scorching heat radiating from those massive walls of rocks between which we puffed and clattered along.” By fall she had softened toward the place, and expected her readers would as well. She described the views of Tonto Basin from the Mogollon Rim, writing, “The scenery was wild and grand; in fact beyond all that I had ever dreamed of; more than that, it seemed so untrod, so fresh, somehow.” Despite the hardships of frontier life, she regretted its passing and created the wild Arizona of the past that many readers identified as Arizona still, in 1911.

---


40 Martha Summerhayes, *Vanished Arizona: Recollections of the Army Life of a New England Woman* (Salem, MA: Salem Press Co., 1911), 43, 66-67. See also the review of *Vanished Arizona* in the *New York Times*, “What ‘Arizona’ Used to Mean: Thrilling Days That an Army Officer’s Wife Spent There in the Seventies,” August 27, 1911 “For all who want to know about the past as it really was,” the reviewer said.
Similarly, in a poem published two years after Arizona became a state, cowboy poet and Crazy Horse biographer E. A. Brininstool pleaded, “Take me back to Arizona as it was in the early days.” His poem recalled and described an Arizona past, much like Summerhayes’s vanished Arizona, Brininstool’s early days being Arizona’s pre-statehood days. The second of the four-stanza poem begins, “Take me back to Arizona and the plains of alkali, On the cactus-covered mesa in the desert let me lie,” and continues, “Let me see the city marshal make a gun-play in the street, And a victim later buried with his boots upon his feet.” This was not the Arizona that Hall depicted, the Arizona deserving of statehood, even though her Arizona, the place she wrote about before statehood, was in the past that Brininstool longed for. Both Arizonas became the place for readers and contributed to one of the temporal clichés that has characterized the place for a century, a place both modern and Wild West. “Take me back to Arizona, Arizona rough and wild,” the poet sang, “Where the days were dry and dusty and the whisky wasn’t mild! Let me live again those stirring frontier days when all was new, when the faro banks were frequent but the churches mighty few!” This Arizona was not the place advertised by boosters and editors of newspapers wishing to see the territory grown and developed.

**THE ARIZONA REPUBLICAN AND THE COCONINO SUN**

While Sharlot Hall defined Arizona’s natural landscapes and independent-minded citizens in her poetry and essays, many people received information about the place via newspapers. Those published within Arizona described a place of
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unmatched opportunity, perfect for homeseekers (a word that replaced settlers in Arizona’s booster literature) and businessmen. Articles encouraged farmers and grocers equally to move, and implored tourists to add Arizona to their travel itineraries. Whether completely factual, only based on truth, or not at all resembling the reality of the place, newspapers’ booster words about Arizona became that place in many readers’ minds.

*Arizona Republican* editor Sims Ely recognized the role newspapers play in creating the places written about in their pages. Newspapers, Ely wrote, “have a large part in the making of history in a new land. Without the aid and encouragement of the press, a large proportion of the successful enterprises for the development of Arizona’s resources would have failed of fruition.” The land was not really new and Native Americans and Hispanics had inhabited it for centuries. But the history that Ely intended to make for the “new” land was an Anglo-American-defined one. Ely declared that the policy of his newspaper was to “[stand] up for Arizona and for Arizona’s people, and [make] known to the world the wonderful resources and attractions of this wonderful land.” He concluded his promotional article with “Arizona’s resources and opportunities require no fabrication or exaggeration. The truth is enough.” Newspapers described the prosperity already evident while at the same time extolling its possibilities.

The *Arizona Republican* and the *Coconino Sun* employed these boosting tones when writing about Arizona generally and in describing their own regions. Flagstaff’s *Coconino Sun* was the newspaper of record in northern Arizona; published in Phoenix, the *Arizona Republican* was the largest newspaper, in terms of circulation,
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at the time of statehood.\textsuperscript{45} The editors and reporters focused on economic and tourist opportunities, and a concern about the new state’s borders. The words reflected what the writers perceived as Arizona, what they hoped their readers would believe was Arizona, and what they intended Arizona to become in the future. The Arizona defined by its newspapers was a place where anyone would want to live, should live, and could make a living within.

While Arizona’s citizens waited for the United States Congress to pass an enabling act providing a path to statehood, the state of Utah was petitioning Congress to redraw its southern border to include the northern Arizona region known as the Arizona Strip. Proposing an amendment to the Arizona statehood bill being debated at the time, Utah’s delegation believed that culturally the people residing on the land north of Grand Canyon and south of their border belonged to Utah, most of them being Mormon settlers, and argued that those residents were isolated from Arizona proper by the Canyon’s chasm, the lack of a bridge to cross it, and the long travel distance necessary to get around it.

The amendment failed and the Arizona’s newspapers took up the cause of defining the Strip as part of the new state, not for the people residing there but because of the area’s economic value for tourism to Grand Canyon’s North Rim. As Arizonans voted for delegates to write their constitution, the \textit{Coconino Sun} wrote of this northernmost region, calling on leaders to make sure it remained securely part of Arizona (even as the writer called it the Utah Strip). Declaring, “One of the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{45} Christened the \textit{Coconino Sun} in 1898 after several name changes, the newspaper was the primary publication in the town of Flagstaff. From 1908 to 1932 Fred S. Breen was its publisher and editor. The \textit{Arizona Republican} was founded in 1890. Sims Ely became the editor around 1900, and owned the paper in partnership with S. W. Higley from 1909 to 1912 when Dwight B. Heard bought it. Ely continued to run the paper from 1912 to 1929. For more information about early Arizona newspapers, see the Library of Congress, Chronicling America, http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn87062055/.
greatest assets of the coming state of Arizona is that world scenic wonder, the Grand Canyon of Arizona,” the reporter reminded readers of Grand Canyon’s economic potential. “Its value is not only the great amount of advertising of this territory which is done by the writings and talk of the thousands of visitors to it from all parts of the world,” the article stated, “but by the money which these sightseers leave behind them and the investors and home builders which come here because of seeing the advantages on industrial lines while they come to view the Canyon.” The Sun assured its readers that “Arizona owns both sides of this world-wonder and it is her finest possession, for with each succeeding year, as tourists advertise the great gorge the number of visitors will increase.” Just as Sharlot Hall represented Arizona’s forests as both a place of beauty and a product to be harvested, this reporter described Grand Canyon as scenic wonder and economic asset.

As the war of words over the words of the Arizona constitution continued in 1911, Sharlot Hall, in her official capacity as territorial historian, joined the push to define the Arizona Strip as part of the eventual state of Arizona, and made a nine-week journey to the region to survey its potential. For Hall the importance of the Strip lay not only in its proximity to Grand Canyon but also in the value of its natural resources. She found a country “abounding in a wealth of timber, and of agricultural and mineral resources,” with “sublime scenery” and “an ideal climate.” The Arizona Republican reported that the data Hall collected “ought to be convincing to the people and to the legislature against any proposal to cede that country to Utah.” The reporter stated, “There must be no thought of parting with the strip,” and to secure
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the region permanently to Arizona, “a bridge across the Colorado River at Lee’s Ferry should be built as soon as possible” and Arizona should bolster its ties with the people who reside there.⁴⁷

As the territorial historian and newspaper reporters sought to define the Arizona Strip and Grand Canyon as part of Arizona proper, newspapers also wrote of the Canyon’s severe landscapes as unpopulated, even though its canyons and south rim had been the Havasupai peoples’ home for a thousand years.⁴⁸ A northern Arizona reporter wrote the Colorado River’s Cataract Canyon (also known as Havasu Canyon) into being for Anglo readers, but only included the Havasupai at the end of the article, as a curiosity, not as individuals or a community with their own stories to tell. “There is a little arroyo, one hundred miles in length, that few people in Arizona or elsewhere know very much about. It is known as Cataract Canyon,” the article explained. The writer described an uncommon place for the reader, “For ten miles down this rocky gorge [Lee’s Canyon] into a great red sandstone gap the tourist travels until he arrives at a point where the Lee empties into Cataract Canyon.” Stark
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description increases the drama, and the reader travels along with the reporter as, “Down this walled-in sand bed he travels until a few cottonwoods with tents spread under them denote that at last the [Havasupai] agency has been reached.”

Now the journey becomes less a tourist’s trek and more an adventurer’s toil as the writer describes the place, “The suns rays beat relentlessly down upon the sandy footing below, the cruel heat radiates from the walls on the sides and everybody perspires freely. There is a constant desire to quench an inward fire by drinking the mockery of crystalline purity that rises at the agency and flows with a roar down the narrow bed in the sand.” As the destination is reached, the article concludes, “At night the frogs bark hoarsely and loud, few stars shine above, and now and then the sound of laughter betrays the whereabouts of the few Indians who inhabit the land of their ancestors—the land over which Chief Monakaja reigns supreme, the land of the Supais. The trip is one never to be forgotten and one well worth while, though some hardships must be experienced in getting to this branch house of hades.” The appeal, it seems, would be to adventure-seeking tourists, a place of exciting exploration and beauty. That this canyon was the traditional home of the Havasupai people and set aside as reservation land goes unmentioned, as do any of the Indians’ own stories.

In anticipation of Arizona achieving statehood and with the intent of drawing the attention of an audience it hoped would settle, develop and finance, and tour the new state, the Arizona Republican devoted an entire edition to recommending Arizona, defining it as a modern place where opportunities abounded. The edition portrayed every region and county, many of the towns, and most of the tourist sites.
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49 “Cataract Canyon Scenery: Wondrous Beauty of the Famous Canyon Well Worth the Trip and Hardships to Reach,” Coconino Sun, June 10, 1910.

50 Ibid.
This edition is *Arizona Highways*-like in its scope, two decades before that magazine existed.

Articles about Arizona cities included several located in the Salt River Valley. Readers learned that many of the successful citizens came as visitors but became residents because of the climate and economic possibilities. “Some of the most magnificent homes and business blocks of the city are owned by men who came here as chance visitors, in many instances as reluctant visitors,” the paper stated.\(^{51}\) In a long article extolling the agricultural possibilities in the Valley, potential farmers were told, “Glendale soil is ninety feet deep, and you can’t find a pebble in it as big as a marble . . . Also it is, without a doubt, unsurpassed in [illegible] plant food by any soil in the world.”\(^ {52}\) Readers were led to believe that hands to till the soil were the only thing standing between a sterile and a fertile Salt River Valley. The reality was that the river valleys had been farmed for centuries, first by the Hohokam farmers whose canals laid out over the Valley were evidence of their agricultural acumen, and then by the Akimel O’odham people who were still cultivating along the rivers even as Anglo farmers diverted the water and growing Anglo settlements dug wells and depleted the aquifers.

Mesa made its contribution to the *Republic*’s boosting edition, “to call attention of the person seeking a home in the most pleasant section of the United States,” a place where business owners could invest and grow. The town appealed to tourists to make Mesa their headquarters. “Whether one is a homeseeker or a tourist, they should make Mesa the initial stopping place on their visit to the Salt River Valley,” the writer explained, because it is the nearest community to the great Roosevelt Dam, a sight, and site, to see, and that provided “the best and the most

\(^{51}\)*Phoenix—The Capitol City,* *Arizona Republican*, November 6, 1911.

\(^{52}\)*Glendale—The Garden Spot,* *Arizona Republican*, November 6, 1911.
economical water right in the country.” Unlike the Arizona depicted in other narratives as a harsh desert or Wild West, these writers described an Arizona with water and soil for the Anglo settler, wonderful attractions for the tourist, and as a place in which people came to visit and stayed to live. As in Sharlot Hall’s works, though, Native Americans were invisible in these articles, their existence unmentioned, their stories unwritten.

Tucson was also represented in this state-boosting edition, “The ‘ancient and honorable pueblo’—teems with adventure and romance. Prehistoric ruins and many landmarks of the old Spanish and Mexican civilizations add color to the picture the imagination paints of Tucson’s early history. The reminiscent pioneer can weave many a tale of the early days more thrilling because truer than even the remarkable fiction of the modern magazine writer on present day Arizona life.” Reporter H. V. Failor evoked the Arizona of Summerhayes and Brininstool, a place in history; described gunplay, bad men, cacti, and rattlesnakes; and created Tucson as a place of ancient beauty—ruins of old Fort Lowell and San Xavier Mission, as examples—and natural beauty with Sabino Canyon and “pine crowned mountains.” Native Americans were again unmentioned, but their stories were as important to the fort and mission as Anglo stories, the existence of both Fort Lowell and San Xavier Mission due to Spanish and American campaigns to subjugate and control the Tohono O’odham people. All of these newspaper articles constructed an Anglo Arizona for Anglo readers with their words.

The Coconino Sun ran its own version of regional boosterism in a front-page article four months after Arizona became a state. The introduction enthused over
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54 H. V. Failor, “Tucson: Pima County,” Arizona Republican, November 6, 1911.
Flagstaff’s location and attractions: "Flagstaff is located in such a manner that all our surroundings speak in the most enchanting and impressive manner of the creator’s desire for beauty in all its variation.” Describing all of the wonders northern Arizona had to offer tourists, “As a summer resort we are ahead of any other section,” potential visitors learned about Grand Canyon; Walnut Canyon cliff dwellings and Montezuma Castle and Well; Oak Creek Canyon; Sunset Mountain; the Painted Desert, Lava Beds, and Cinder Beds; and “thousands of attractions” east of Flagstaff on the Navajo Reservation. Much of the space in the newspaper was devoted to describing the beauty of the region, “beautiful bodies of mountain water” and “fisherman’s paradise,” for example, a tourist destination situated in a natural wonderland. But in a section titled “Undeveloped Resources,” including reservoirs and “good auto high lines,” the boosters hoped to attract the would-be investors among the article’s readers, and once again revealed tension between the ideas of natural landscapes as scenery and as economic assets.55

Not only did the editors of Arizona’s newspapers attempt to define the territory within their pages, but they provided space in their pages for Arizona citizens to make the effort as well. C. E. Stastny, a former Iowa resident now of Phoenix (one of those visitors to the Salt River Valley the Republican described who decided to stay), wrote a letter to his old hometown newspaper, the Cedar Rapids Daily Republican. The letter found its way back to his new hometown paper, the Arizona Republican, and thus was printed in both papers. Stastny described his new home in Arizona for Iowans, extolling its wonders. “I do not remember of ever having found such a combination of climate and soil as I have found in this valley, and nothing has ever before impressed me as much as the future of this valley,”

55 “Flagstaff, the Coming Northern Arizona Metropolis: The Town which Has More Advantages and Better Prospects Than Any Other in Northern Arizona,” Coconino Sun, June 7, 1912.
Stastny wrote. He appealed to the farmer and to the investor, detailing the price of land and explaining what can be grown:

I will have to be very brief as I do not want to take up too much space in this paper. I have been told by old settlers here that a farmer can engage in fattening and raising beef cattle, dairying, cheese making, the poultry and egg industry, the raising of ostriches, hog farming, sheep raising, both for mutton and wool, horse and mule raising, the bee-keeping industry, the raising of grapes for both wines and the making of raisins, berry farming, watermelon and cantaloupe growing, alfalfa raising for hay and seed, and in the raising of wheat, barley, oats, millet, corn, kaffir corn, sugar beets, sorghum, sugar cane, cotton, potatoes, Irish and sweet, all kinds of garden truck and winter vegetables, lemons, oranges, tangerines, grapefruit, dates, almonds, olives, peaches, pears, apricots, plums, figs, prunes, apples, and quinces.\(^5^6\)

In that simple list, Stastny and the newspaper's editors, hoped readers would find enough possibilities to employ as many farmers, and the workers in the agricultural industry that supported them, as would want to immigrate to Arizona.

Stastny's letter presented the Arizona that boosters promoted. Columns in the Arizona Republican revealed frustration at the absence of knowledge about the state outside of its borders. One article describes a reporter being asked by a Colorado businessman whether Glendale had trees and lawns, and if the Salt River Valley had schools. The man wanted to know if the stories of typhoid epidemics and tornadoes he had heard were true.\(^5^7\) Arizonans traveling outside the state also discovered what they considered misperceptions of Arizona based on a lack of information or misinformation. Vacationing in California, Phoenician R. A. Mulford was perturbed to find that people struggled, unnecessarily he believed, in southern California with no idea that life could be better for them in Arizona. He wrote, "California is a disappointment to a great many people. California is a great state for pleasure

\(^5^6\) "Such a Combination of Soil and Climate: A Traveled Resident of This Valley Has Found No Where Else," Arizona Republican, January 6, 1910.

seekers and capitalists . . . But some who go there have reached the end of their means and have to stop.” But, he said, “Arizona is not properly advertised. People do not realize how much better conditions are here than in California.” Whether these Arizona residents were members of the communities benefitting from Arizona’s agriculture, business opportunities, and climate, or if they agreed with the booster rhetoric (perhaps the boosters’ words had created this place for these Arizonans as well as for potential settlers), this was the Arizona that they believed existed and they actively boosted the place, participated in defining the state with their words.

Often visitors to the state wrote letters to the newspapers to present corrections to the perceptions they held before their visits. These letters provide a picture of the place as it had been portrayed by writers describing a different Arizona. Charles Moreau Harger, a writer for Outlook Magazine, explained to Arizona readers that the Arizona he read about in the East differed from the place he discovered when he visited. He wrote, “To be sure we have been deluged with articles and pictures showing the picturesque. The Indians, the cactus, the cowboys and similar features are indelibly impressed on the minds of eastern people as characteristic of the southwest. But when we come here and see the fine buildings, the beautiful homes, the remarkable spirit of enterprise manifest everywhere we get an entirely different view.” Often these things of Arizona past that Harger sets aside are emphasized and reinforced by writers such as Martha Summerhayes, E. A. Brininstool, and Zane Grey.

The Arizonans Harger writes about are also unlike those that some writers encouraged readers to believe populated the state. Harger lauded the settlers of the territory, “I have been surprised to find so many college men in the two territories.
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58 “Better Pleased with Arizona,” Arizona Republican, August 20, 1912.
Everywhere you meet men who have come from the best families of the east and who are giving to the southwest the enterprise and education that make the equipment of the eastern college man invaluable to a new country.” He concluded by encouraging Arizonans, “It will take time to eradicate from the minds of eastern readers the idea of wildness associated with the territory but it is being accomplished.”660 Ironically, this continued presence of “wildness” is one of the things Arizona would boast of in the 1960s.

Arizona newspapers described and defined Arizonans as businessmen, farmers, and homeseekers. This was how Arizona writers saw themselves and wanted to be perceived by readers outside of the state. Harger was confident that nonresidents would eventually be persuaded. Newspaper publishers and reporters outside of Arizona had their own perceptions of the place.

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, WRITING ARIZONA FROM THE OUTSIDE

Newspapers outside of Arizona played a role in defining it for their readers. The Los Angeles Times reporters described Arizona as a satellite of southern California. In describing Arizona as an extension of southern California economically, the writers’ perception of Arizona’s people and its natural landscapes is revealed. On promotional trips through Arizona, the Chamber of Commerce Excursion by train for example, the LA Times was an Arizona advocate and partner in reciprocal tourism. Other national newspapers wrote about Arizona as a tourist destination as well, describing the place in words that emphasized its rugged landscapes and Wild West image. These reporters wrote of Native Americans in one of two ways. Indian people were either unmentioned, invisible in the narratives, or they were written into the stories as defeated and subdued tribes, as impediments to progress (as the reporters

60 Ibid.
defined it), and as members of ancient civilizations. In none of the articles do Native Americans tell their own stories.

In 1910 the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce organized a weeklong train excursion through Arizona to promote California and gain a better understanding of its neighbor. Affluent Arizonans from the Phoenix and Tucson areas often spent their summers in southern California, on the cool coast and out of the desert heat; the LA Chamber members hoped to encourage more tourism from other areas of Arizona. Via the special train, the chamber members visited nearly a dozen Arizona towns, including Phoenix, Tucson, Douglas, and Kingman, and Grand Canyon, on the six-day trip. Though the purpose of the trip was to promote Los Angeles and southern California, Los Angeles Times reporter John S. M’Groarty traveled with the group and documented the trip for the newspaper’s readers. His perception of Arizona reveals how nonresidents defined the place; his words also reflect an Anglo perspective that while typical of the time was ahistorical and racist.61

M’Groarty’s articles characterized Arizona as the miracle of modernization, a civilization grown from the desert wasteland, descriptions that would define it still, fifty years later. His articles also portrayed the Wild West Arizona, a place just a half step removed from the Apache wars that had been sensationalized in the press a few decades before. Encompassing these clichés, an article returned from the excursion described the trip along the Arizona-Mexico border. As the group traveled toward Douglas, the town founded as the smelter site for Bisbee copper mines, “Moon and stars alike had faded, but the scroll of the skies was aflame with furnace fires and

61 See “Now to Arizona: Preparations for Chamber of Commerce Excursion the Middle of March Will Be Rushed,” Los Angeles Times, February 24, 1910, and “The Arizona Excursion,” Los Angeles Times, March 11, 1910. John S. M’Groarty was also a poet, playwright, and chronicler of California missions. He wrote The Mission Play, a three-hour pageant performance about California missions. A Democrat, he represented California in the House of Representatives in the late 1930s.
the never-ending conflagration of the melting pots of the mills. As the gray morning broke across the shadowing buttes we came to Douglas town. It was then that we saw a perfect city upon the desert plain where eight years ago there was no town at all. The furnace fires and melting pots symbolized progress, the city on what once had been untrammeled desert represented civilization, labels that Arizona boosters craved and that revealed what both they and the newspaper writer believed were proper uses for the land.

This miracle-of-growth Arizona quickly gave way to a Wild West Indian battleground familiar to readers of western fiction but having no basis in reality. “Under a crescent moon and led by desert stars,” M’Groarty wrote, “the train sped into the historic plains, where the white man fought the Apache, gory and red-handed, to the last crimson ditch of death in the immortal conquest of Arizona.” M’Groarty’s words reflect a prevailing Anglo attitude that identified Apache people as savage-but-subdued tribes, narratives that discounted and obscured an entire culture rich in a tradition that granted spiritual power to the mountains of Arizona, New Mexico, and Old Mexico where they had lived for centuries before European settlement disrupted their ways of life.

M’Groarty also wrote fiction as history as he described Fort Bowie and reminisced about the “pursuit of old Geronimo into the fastnesses of Mexico, trapping the wily and marvelous Apache at last, after a campaign against hunger, danger and thirst that stands in a place apart in the history of savage warfare. We passed through starlit vales and the dim mountain passes of the Dragoons and the Chirachuas [sic] till the great gash in the mighty hills brought us at last to the stronghold of Cochise, where the last of the fighting Apaches died in his moccasins.
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with the battle cry of defiance on his lips.” Neither story, that of Geronimo’s capture nor Cochise’s death, are correct. Geronimo surrendered and was confined in Florida; Cochise agreed to retire to reservation life in southeastern Arizona and died there of a stomach illness. These fictional war-and-conquer stories characterized Anglo Arizonans’ relationship with the Apache tribes at the time of statehood and for years following.

In defining Arizona as a miracle of civilization, M’Groarty employed patronizing language in describing the Salt River Valley, writing, “There was the land once bare and profitless now fat and verdant. And it made a man’s heart glad to look from that once desolate valley and to drink in its clustered groves, its far-flung spaces of growing grain and alfalfa, and its feeding birds.” His is the same Arizona that C. E. Stastny described, with orange, plum, and peach orchards, ostrich farms, and profitable land and businesses ready for development. “Phoenix is growing like magic,” the reporter declared, “land values are steadily and even rapidly advancing. . . Business properties are fast getting to bring big prices, for the people have begun to realize their city’s future.” Arizona’s growth narrative was already well developed at the time of statehood, and would continue to influence perceptions of the place and the use of its land and resources for the ensuing hundred years.

Other Los Angeles Times reporters wrote specifically about the economic benefits Arizona could contribute to the nation after Congress passed the Enabling Act giving the territory of Arizona a path to statehood. The LA Times explained to its
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readers that with its “vast mineral resources, . . . valley after valley of marvelously fertile lands, . . . [and] mountains and mesas in the north which are generally covered with nutritious grasses” the place abounded in natural resources for exploiting. Arizona was described for tourists, as having “some of the grandest scenery in the world . . . [and] a climate, which, though hot in the summer, is not very oppressive, while in winter it is usually delightful.” And employing another of the common characterizations that defined Arizona, the newspaper described Arizona’s natural landscape in temporal terms, emphasizing geologic time in its “many and varied geologic formations; in fact, every period of the world’s history since the dawn of life is represented in its geology.”

A few months later the Los Angeles Times published another article about Arizona, with the kind of boosting and exposure Arizonans could appreciate, that debunked an image of Wild West Arizona in favor of a responsible, mature if inexperienced citizenry ready for the responsibilities of statehood. Including both New Mexico and Arizona in his analysis, E. D. Ewers wrote, “When it became evident that Statehood was to be realized at an early date, the farseeing men of the Territories began—many of them for the first time—to take an active interest in public affairs.” Territorial legislatures abolished gambling (1906 in Arizona), Ewers explained, and cities imposed restrictions on saloons. With less gambling and drinking, crime decreased. Arizona had addressed its water supply issues, according to the reporter, and he lauded the results. “Under the Salt River project the irrigated farm of the southwest is believed to have reached its highest stage of development,” he wrote. “Fifteen acres is regarded as ample for one family, and with

---


the advantages of Statehood . . . this section looks forward to a large influx of homeseekers.” Potential relocators to Arizona need not worry about good schools, for, “In any campaign for homeseekers one of the first requisites to be considered is good schools . . . It is claimed [Arizona] will enter the Union with as high-grade common schools as most of the thickly-settled states . . . Even in the most isolated desert towns one will observe commodious and substantial school buildings.”

Ewers described a place equal to or better than the established states of the union, a place where farming was easy, water plentiful, a quality education accessible. In a description of the Salt River Valley that could have been written by Arizonan C. E. Stastny, this reporter explained that prosperous (white) farmers grow sugar beets, dates, and oranges. Alfalfa is cut four and five times a year, and a half a million head of sheep are brought to Phoenix each year for shearing and lambing. Readers learned about beekeeping, dairy farming, horse breeding, and ostrich raising and were assured that, while they might have heard dire descriptions of the harsh heat, it was but a small matter. “Of course, the weather is hot in summer time,” the LA Times reporter declared. “If it were not, the country would not be nearly so productive . . . It is a beautiful valley, resplendent under the unhindered sun with green fields and orchards, set in a frame of lovely mountains, red brown, purple, and parti-colored in their coverings.”

This Arizona, described so often in newspapers’ pages, was beautiful in both natural and cultivated ways, already producing and with promise for more.

In an article a year before Arizona achieved statehood, the Los Angeles Times defined an Arizona that was at once prosperous and promising. Within the description of a modern place, Indians have been left out of that prosperity; this is
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solely an Anglo Arizona. The full-page article focuses on the Salt River Valley and Phoenix, with business and economy as its theme. Repeating the oft-stated image of fertile valley, the reporter enthusiastically claimed, "None of these garden spots of the Old World are as rich in plant food or as deep or as easily cultivated as the lands of the Salt River Valley. Near Glendale the silt is sometimes one hundred feet deep. Near Phoenix borings have shown a depth of 500 feet without rock." Juxtaposed against a picture of Phoenix as a modern town—"its own water plant, a start made on a $400,000 sewer system, electric lights, gas, two telephone systems, an electric railway system . . . and two railroad systems . . . Preparations are being made to pave the business section"—the reporter describes Arizona’s Native Americans as indolent. Even though the Akimel O’odham farmers had cultivated the land long before the Anglo settlers arrived, the reporter wrote as if the O’odham people had never planted a seed, “The Indians lost their water supply long ago through its being diverted by proud Caucasian farmers farther up the Gila. But the ‘gentle savages’ can obtain plenty of water by electrical pumping and from shallow wells, and the physical exercise of farming will be of benefit to them.” Articles like this reinforced false narratives that absolved Anglo farmers and settlements of any role in the decimating of O’odham agriculture. But farming had been the way of life along the Gila River long before the intrusion of white settlers. Because no counter narrative existed at the time, this Anglo version of Arizona was the one written into being in the nineteen teens.
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The *New York Times* and other newspapers not located at Arizona’s backdoor defined the territory as a tourist destination, but described it in words that emphasized its strangeness, and wrote about Native Americans using words evoking ancient mystery. These stories failed to make the connection from inhabitants of Arizona’s ancient structures to the modern tribes whose histories and traditions named them as their ancestors. Casa Grande ruin was the subject of several articles chronicling the archaeological excavation of the Casa Grande area; the final article in the series explained archaeologist J. W. Fewkes’s theories and interpretations of the Casa Grande and its surrounds, and related “Pima and Papago” creation stories that include the history of the place. “What have hitherto been but oval mounds . . . are being dug away and the houses that exist within them are being brought to life,” the reporter wrote. “They are being made to give up the secrets of the people who lived within them and formed a part of a civilization that had fallen into decadence not so many centuries before the Spanish fathers came to this section. They are forming the closest link that moderns have ever found between the present people of the Southwest and those that had earlier left so strong a mark upon the country.”73 Had the archaeologists asked the Akimel and Tohono O’odham people (Pima and Papago in the article), they would have already known of the connections between the “earlier” and the “present” people.

However, the reporter did assert the Indians’ direct lineage to the builders of Casa Grande and described a legend told by an Akimel O’odham leader about their ancestors, the canal builders. The story tells of Morning Green, a great medicine man

and leader of the people of the Casa Grande area, who “was able, through his herbs, to control the rain and wind and this secret brought great strength to the Casa Grande people in their rivalry with other tribes.” Another tribe, which according to the legend occupied what became known as Pueblo Grande in the Salt River Valley, had Towa, “A woman of marvelous power, who had control over hard substances, such as stone.” Rivalry between the two tribes led to conflicts, but finally peace was made and “the power of Morning Green over the elements and of Towa who controlled hard things, were united, and the great ditches were dug and water made to flow in them, and the people grew in power and the deserts were irrigated and made to blossom as the rose.” An Akimel O’odham story told to an Anglo reporter, rewritten for an Anglo audience and published in a national newspaper, defined an ancient Arizona, and connected it to a modern tribe.

The Washington (NJ) Star contributed to defining an ancient Arizona as well, writing the Verde Valley’s Montezuma Castle into a place for East Coast readers. Initially this article wrote ancient people into the natural landscape. “Arizona is the greatest museum of natural history in the world, and contains more wonders and freaks of nature than any other similar area in all the universe,” stated William E. Curtis. Then the reporter quoted Arizona Antiquarian Society president Dr. Joshua Miller, who corrected that view. “It is the general impression that the cliff dwellers were an ignorant savage people,” Miller said, “but this and many other structures do not warrant such an opinion. Whatever their condition or plane in the scale of civilization, they knew how to build a house that would stand.” Remarking on the method of constructing the floors of each of the five stories, with the attendant beams on each level, Miller said, “When we consider that all this timber was cut with stone axes, and, together with the stone and mortar, was hoisted more than fifty
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feet along a perpendicular cliff wall, we may form some idea of the immense amount of labor required to construct such a building in such an uncanny and inaccessible place.” Miller’s explanation presented a more sophisticated society than readers were accustomed to learning about. Several decades later, Hopi archaeologists and writers’ words connected the ancients to the modern as Hopi stories of the structures as their ancestors’ footprints became part of Arizona’s written narrative landscape.

Native Americans were also depicted as standing in the way of progress, as the Anglo reporters defined it. The power of words to define a place by devaluing some of its people and justifying what happens to them is displayed in a New York Times article about the new state. “White men have set their eyes on the riches of the Navajo Indian Reservation,” the reporter wrote, “and it may not be long before the proud tribe that has so well preserved its identity will be swallowed by civilization, as other tribes have been.” The writer explained that the Navajo Reservation contains about 2,300,000 acres of land and the tribe has fewer than 2,000 members. Whether or not the statistics were accurate, the words created a northeastern Arizona devoid of all but a few people. The writer stated his case, announcing, “This would give 1,200 acres apiece to the members. It is declared that this allotment is unjust, because white citizens could not take up so much public land.” The reporter lamented that Anglo men have tried to get permission to mine gold and silver on the reservation but have been denied. “The Navajos will not let themselves be dispossessed willingly,” stated the writer, “but they are averse, however, to progress in any form.” The Anglo definition of progress was employed here to designate resource extraction and land development. The assertions and
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conclusions of the reporter and the complaining Anglo citizens are disingenuous—there are many places where an Anglo rancher held more than a thousand acres, with no one begrudging him the land or the space.

When considering Arizona as a tourist destination, one feature nearly always comes to mind—Grand Canyon. In 1912 Arizona was not yet nicknamed the Grand Canyon State; it was never called the Grand Canyon Territory. The Canyon was described as isolated and daunting, magnificent and terrifying. A spur line of the Santa Fe Railroad connected the opulent El Tovar Hotel, opened in 1905, to Williams and the main line. President Theodore Roosevelt had called Arizonans to be guardians of the Canyon in 1903, instructing them “in your own interest and in the interest of the country to keep this great wonder of nature as it now is.” But the president also stated that Grand Canyon was “one of the great sights” and every American should see it.77 Emily Brown Helminger wrote about Grand Canyon in the Houston Daily Chronicle, “Imagine a yawning chasm . . . full of sunken mountains, gorges, terraces, domes, obelisks, precipices, cataracts, and cliffs of every hue and color of the rainbow, carved in granite, quartz, sandstone, limestone . . . and you have in part the composition of the Grand Canyon.” Why, she wondered, would anyone go to New York City or Europe when “the peaceful quiet of the Grand Canyon of Arizona is within reach?”78

In an article that may be one of the earliest arguments against development at Grand Canyon, a Los Angeles Times reporter argued, on economic and on preservationist grounds, against giving permission for a “trolley railroad” to be built


along the Grand Canyon rim. Investors would lose their money, the writer contended, because at most only about 2,000 people a month visited the Canyon in a year. The reporter figured, "If twice the number were to visit it, an average of 4000 a month, or 1000 a week, it would not begin to pay expenses if the fare for riding the road were $2 a trip." 79 That was only one reason to deny the project. The greater objection was:

The Grand Canyon lies far from civilization in a region which never will be densely populated, and the wildness of nature spreads on all sides to a very great distance. The stupendous proportions of the Grand Canyon constitute the chief features of its grandeur, and wild setting for miles on either side is the proper setting for these scenic wonders. After their stupendous magnificence their appeal to the human eye is on account of the wonderful painting that nature has spread upon the rocks. This is properly set too, in the almost bald desert fringed with small pine trees that lie along the 212 miles on each side of the rim of the canyon.

The writer described a spectacular tapestry of northern Arizona landscape and sets it out of reach of many travelers, despite President Roosevelt’s call for all Americans to see it, making it all the more desirable a feature and destination. The writer stated, “We would be very sorry to see any permission given to men greedy of gain or foolish in their speculations to change the work of nature in the canyon,” 80 foreshadowing environmentalists’ arguments fifty years later.

THE FICTION OF ZANE GREY

Arizona was defined by its residents in poetry and by the press, and by newspaper reporters outside of the state writing for a national audience. Arizona was also defined in fiction and by outsiders who moved to the place and adopted it as their own. Bestselling novelist Zane Grey was one of these writers. He came to Arizona for the first time in 1906 as an adult in his thirties, and lived and worked in
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the place for two decades. He described Arizona’s people and landscapes, writing the place into western novels. Arizona also created Zane Grey the western novelist, the place providing the raw materials of landscapes and people from which he created his stories, and the experiences of his own travels that formed his perspective. Famous for tough western characters and his portrayal of the spirit of the land, and making the landscape an essential piece of the stories, Grey defined Arizona for his readers. Grey created his Arizona with unforgiving yet spectacular landscapes, and populated the place with ruthless and courageous characters. He wrote an Arizona into being that often reinforced readers’ ideas of the Wild West.

Grey wrote and published three successful novels during the time of Arizona’s statehood quest: 1910’s *The Heritage of the Desert*, followed by *Riders of the Purple Sage* in 1912, and *Desert Gold* a year later. Grey’s first effort at writing an Arizona story was his biographical adventure of Charles Jesse “Buffalo” Jones, written after he had spent time with Jones in northern Arizona. *The Last of the Plainsmen* was not a bestseller, but it was the beginning of Grey’s defining of Arizona’s landscape and people, and Arizona’s defining of him. In the prefatory note he wrote, “In the spring of 1907 I was the fortunate companion of the old plainsman on a trip across the desert, and a hunt in that wonderful country of yellow crags, deep canyons, and giant pines. I want to tell about it. I want to show the color and beauty of those painted cliffs and the long, brown-matted bluebell-dotted aisles in the grand forests; I want to give a suggestion of the tang of the dry, cool air; and particularly I want to throw a little light upon the life and nature of that strange character and remarkable man, Buffalo Jones.”

---

Like other writers, and Arizona citizens, Grey sought to understand and define the place physically, within borders, and intellectually, as a cultural place and as a people. The Arizona Strip and northern Arizona was the setting for several of Zane Grey’s novels. His first major success came in 1910 with *The Heritage of the Desert*. The setting was clearly Arizona—the Painted Desert and the Arizona Strip. The same year Utah was petitioning Congress for Arizona’s land north of Grand Canyon and the *Coconino Sun* was emphasizing the place as Arizona, *The Heritage of the Desert* demonstrated the vagueness with which that area was often perceived. Early in the story of a young Easterner rescued by Mormon settlers from certain death in the harsh desert at the hands of cattle rustlers, Grey has Holderness, his cattle rancher-rustler say, “The land is owned by the Government, and though your ranges are across the Arizona line they really figure as Utah land.” This combining of Arizona and Utah continues, as Mormon settler August Naab explains to Jack Hare, the Easterner, “If not overstocked, this range is the best in Utah,’ said Naab. ‘I say Utah, but it’s really Arizona. The Grand Canyon seems to us Mormons to mark the line.”

In the first certain description of Arizona in the book Naab tells Hare, “That’s Coconina there, Fire Mountain in Navajo meaning. It’s a plateau low and narrow at this end, but it runs far to the east and rises nine thousand feet. It forms a hundred miles of the north rim of the Grand Canyon. We’re across the Arizona line now.” Grey continued to describe northern Arizona, relying on his experiences there to categorize the landscape as one both beautiful and challenging, characteristics
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important to moving his story forward but also characteristics that came to define Arizona for readers who had never been there. The reader becomes Jack Hare, experiencing Arizona the way Grey created it. “He saw a red world,” Grey wrote, “His eyes seemed bathed in blood. Red scaly ground, bare of vegetation, sloped down, down, far down to a vast irregular rent in the earth, which zigzagged through the plain beneath. To the right it bent its crooked way under the brow of a black-timbered plateau; to the left it straightened its angles to find a V-shaped vent in the wall, now uplifted to a mountain range. Beyond this earth-riven line lay something vast and illimitable, a far-reaching vision of white wastes, of purple plains, of low mesas lost in the distance. It was the shimmering dust-veiled desert.”

Descriptions of places both real and imagined create the heritage of Painted Desert for Jack Hare and for the reader.

For readers of Grey’s novel, this became Arizona and this landscape defined the people who lived in it: “There were the measureless distances to narrow the eye and teach restraint; the untrodden trails, the shifting sands, the thorny braces, the broken lava to pierce the flesh; the heights and depths, unscalable and unplumbed. And over all the sun, red and burning . . . What then of the men who drifted into the desert and survived?” Hare, and the reader, wonder. “They must necessarily endure the wind and heat, the drouth and famine; they must grow lean and hard, keen-eyed and silent. The weak, the humble, the sacrificing must be winnowed from among them. As each man developed he took on some aspect of the desert.” Grey’s way with description wrote an Arizona into being. He “paints the surroundings and
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conditions of this desert life with an attention to detail that makes it all stand out before the reader’s eyes exceedingly vivid and convincing,” one reviewer declared.\(^8^6\)

The interchanging and conflating of the northern Arizona and southern Utah regions continued in one of Grey’s best known works, *Riders of the Purple Sage*. The story of a Mormon ranch woman beset by Mormon men of authority, familiar characters in Grey’s novels, *Riders of the Purple Sage* created relationships between characters and landscapes in fiction that translate to reality in readers’ minds. While the setting is southern Utah—Arizona is never mentioned, Jane Withersteen even telling Lassiter, “I’ll never leave Utah”\(^8^7\)—the novel has come to represent Arizona. The book was immensely successful, became a bestseller, and received favorable reviews. The *New York Times* reviewer wrote, “Grey returns to the scene which he portrayed so powerfully and entertainingly in *The Heritage of the Desert*. The mountain and sage-green plains of southern Utah furnish the setting [emphasis added].”\(^8^8\)

*Riders of the Purple Sage* may have come to depict Arizona in readers’ minds eventually, but in 1912, the novel created Utah. Historian Candace C. Kant sets Surprise Valley, the refuge of Venters and Bess, and eventually Jane and Lassiter, on the Arizona Strip. Geographer Kevin S. Blake sets the valley in Tsegi Canyon, west of Kayenta, Arizona, on the Navajo Reservation.\(^8^9\) However, nowhere in the 280-page
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\(^{8^8}\) “Western Tales and Biblical: Stories of Foreign Lands, Our Own City, with a Profane Episode by Hauptmann,” *New York Times*, February 18, 1912, emphasis added. See also Jackson, 56.

\(^{8^9}\) See Kant, 17; Blake, 208. Kant writes of Grey visiting the Arizona Strip; the trip gave him the idea for setting a story there.
volume is the place Arizona or the Arizona Strip mentioned. The phrase Utah’s southern border is used twice. That is as close to Arizona as the reader gets. Grey described Surprise Valley, writing, “Before him ascended a gradual swell of smooth stone. It was hard, polished, and full of pockets worn by centuries of eddying rainwater. A hundred yards up began a line of grotesque cedar trees . . . He had climbed up that wonderful smooth slope, and had almost reached the base of yellow cliff that rose skyward, a huge scarred and cracked bulk.” The words describe many places in southern Utah and northern Arizona, including Monument Valley that straddles the state line on the Navajo Reservation, Tsegi Canyon, Arizona, and Canyonlands and Arches national monuments in southeastern Utah: “Crags and pinnacles, splintered cliffs, and leaning shafts and monuments, would have thundered down to block forever the outlet to Deception Pass.”

It is an interesting question: When and how did Riders of the Purple Sage become an Arizona story? It was a story written in Arizona, at Grey’s cabin in the White Mountains, thus the place helped create the story. Perhaps the Arizona Republican contributed to the perception of the book set in Arizona when the first Riders of the Purple Sage movie was released in 1918. Announcing, “Arizona Is the Scene of Zane Grey Film,” the columnist wrote, “Riders of the Purple Sage,‘ . . . the greatest western story ever written . . . and is unquestionably the best western picture ever made.” The reporter continued, “Grey came to Arizona for its atmosphere” and explained that much of the movie was filmed in the White Mountains and at Grand Canyon. Identifying the book with the state as the movie was released may have created Arizona in the pages of the book. Rather than
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characterizing and defining Arizona in words in 1912, Riders of the Purple Sage may have created Arizona in film in 1918 and the years following. The novel was made into a movie five times, each filmed in Arizona, and has come to be identified with the place even though Arizona is never mentioned in its pages.

While Riders of the Purple Sage was wildly successful, it did not create Arizona specifically. The Heritage of the Desert, Grey’s first successful book, does include Arizona landscapes, real and imagined. Published a year after Arizona achieved statehood and set along the Arizona-Mexico border during the Mexican Revolution, Grey’s Desert Gold created the southern Arizona borderlands for his readers. Unforgiving desert landscapes once again became synonymous with Arizona in this novel. One of the settings for the story, described first in the prologue, is the desert borderland between Sonora, Mexico, and Arizona. Grey described the Sonoran Desert and the prospectors who traverse it, writing, “It moved Cameron to say that in the years of his wandering he had met no man who could endure equally with him the blasting heat, the blinding dust storms, the wilderness of sand and rock and lava and cactus, the terrible silence and desolation of the desert.”

The second setting, the Belding’s ranch at Forlorn River, is set in Arizona, and “there’s not a spot in southern Arizona that’ll compare with this valley for water or grass or wood.”

Knowing only the Arizona written in Zane Grey’s The Heritage of the Desert, Riders of the Purple Sage, and Desert Gold, a reader’s idea of Arizona would be a wild, uncontrolled landscape full of wild, uncontrolled men. The land is unbearably hot and dry, inhabited by cruel religious fanatics, physically strong and attractive women with little power, crusty old prospectors, and bandits and rustlers. But it is
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also an oasis of lush vegetation, flowing rivers and streams, settled by fortunate, wealthy farmers and ranchers. Two extremes of landscapes, two extremes of people. The uncompromising people and brutal and beautiful landscape with which Grey populated his Arizona defined an Arizona unlike that portrayed by the territory’s boosters; Grey’s was a Wild West.

At the same time Grey wrote an Arizona into being, Arizona made possible the development of Zane Grey the writer. He had already written and published a series of books before setting his stories in Arizona. His Ohio frontier stories, based on family history, did not sell well. “The public wanted fresh stories about the trans-Mississippi West,” what was considered the real West. Grey’s second trip to Arizona, his 1907 expedition with Buffalo Jones to northern Arizona and Grand Canyon, provided a trove of material for his first Arizona-inspired work. He “was struck by the beauty, openness, and people of the intermontane West.” Recognizing the value of both the experiences and what he learned from them, Grey gave his readers a hint of what would follow in the adventure biography of Jones and in his western novels, writing, “Happily in remembrance a writer can live over his experiences, and see once more the moon-blanced silver mountain peaks against the dark blue sky; hear the lonely sough of the night-wind through the pines; feel the dance of wild expectation in the quivering pulse; the stir, the thrill, the joy of hard action in perilous moments; the mystery of man’s yearning for the unattainable.” In one sentence Grey revealed how the place influenced, defined, created him as a writer, and at the same time he created and defined Arizona and its people.

94 Blake, 204.
95 Ibid.
96 Grey, The Last of the Plainsmen, vi.
Arizona motivated Grey’s writing, and from its natural landscapes and the people making a living from them he developed his philosophy that traditional values (hard work, a moral code, and the primacy of a rural society) and the frontier spirit are what made America strong. Grey’s heroes and heroines were characterized by stoic individualism, courage, and moral fortitude; these characters had come to define Western people, including Arizonans, and their characteristics came to define Grey’s work. Grey set nearly half of his westerns in Arizona, and half of those that were bestsellers were stories with Arizona as the backdrop. Arizona and southern Utah were the heart of Zane Grey’s West, and the material amassed from his experiences in those places and written into descriptive prose and action-romances created the author Zane Grey and the place Arizona.

**THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

At the same time that Sharlot Hall’s collection of poetry depicted Arizona’s landscape and people as rugged and matchless in verse, and Zane Grey’s novels described an individualistic society in a starkly beautiful land, and newspapers within the territory and outside of it boosted and defined the place as a prosperous wonderland and the Wild West, delegates to the constitutional convention were shaping words to create the State of Arizona in its foundational document, and some of those same newspapers were creating the place as a Progressive haven for socialist laborites as they chronicled the details of the convention for their readers.

Unlike 1906, in 1910 the fight over statehood was not joint statehood with New Mexico but the words in the document that would create the state of Arizona as a political entity: “Every public officer in the state of Arizona, holding an elective office, either by election or appointment, is subject to recall from such office by the
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qualified electors of the electoral district from which candidates are elected to such office. Such electoral district may include the whole state.\footnote{Constitution of the State of Arizona, article 8, Removal from Office, 1. Recall of Public Officers, sec. 1.} Because these words applied to every elected official, including judges, these words stalled, and nearly squandered, Arizona citizens’ statehood bid.

On June 25, 1910, Arizona Territory Governor Sloan announced the number of and apportionment of constitutional convention delegates; elections for delegates were held in September, and the constitutional convention met in Phoenix over a two-month period that fall. The delegates’ insistence on direct democracy provisions in the constitution, and its subsequent three to one approval by the territory’s voters, created a foundational document and defined a state wherein citizens control governing with the initiative, referendum, and recall. The State of Arizona also became a place friendly to labor, acquiescing to union leaders’ pressure with the words in article 18 and the creation of the elected office of the state mine inspector. Newspaper coverage of the convention and ensuing debate in Congress added layers of defining words, establishing Arizonans as independent and, perhaps, immature, depending on which papers were read.

The constitution is the clearest example of Arizonans as a society defining their state. The constitution says of a people, this is who we are and what we believe is important in creating a government. In 1912 Arizona, authority resided with white men. A 1909 law, passed over the veto of Governor Joseph Kibbey, prohibited anyone from voting who could not read a section of the United States Constitution or write his own name.\footnote{See Sheridan, Arizona: A History, 178.} This law was designed to disenfranchise many Hispanic citizens. Native Americans were prohibited from voting in Arizona at the time of
statehood and women had not yet secured the vote. As a society evolves politically, state constitutions change. Arizona provided for constitutional change based on popular will as well as legislative agenda, thus the words in the state’s constitution reveal a changing definition of a place based on a changing political, cultural landscape.

The words in the constitution defined the state in two ways. First, the constitution established Arizona as a place that would function as a populist direct democracy with recall, initiative, and referendum: "The legislative authority of the State shall be vested in a Legislature, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives, but the people reserve the power to propose laws and amendments to the Constitution and to enact or reject such laws and amendments at the polls, independently of the Legislature; and they also reserve, for use at their own option, the power to approve or reject at the polls any Act, or item, section, or part of any Act, of the Legislature." The constitution provided an eight-hour workday, and safety and child labor provisions in article 18; and women’s suffrage in the first election after statehood, eight years before they received that right nationally. The words of the constitution also defined Arizona conceptually, as the idea of a place where citizens were unbowed to lobbyists, corporations, the federal government, and their own elected officials. Whether or not this was reality, the words of the constitution, with its creation of the Corporation Commission and State Mine Inspector, its strict control of the banking industry, and the inclusion of direct democracy provisions in spite of the federal government’s objections, constructed it that way.
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There are other images of Arizona contained in its constitution. The words acquiesce to the Enabling Act, agreeing that public lands given to the new state would be held in trust in article 10, and renouncing rights to any federal or tribal lands within its boundaries with this statement in article 20: “The people inhabiting this state do agree and declare that they forever disclaim right and title to the unappropriated and ungranted public lands laying within the boundaries thereof and to all lands laying within said boundaries owned or held by any Indian or Indian tribe,” and accepting national government oversight of those federal public lands.  

Also important is what the words do not say. Despite the urging of labor union leaders, the delegates refused to include an English literacy requirement. That would occur as a constitutional amendment seventy-five years later and again as the state neared its one hundredth anniversary.

Constitutional convention delegates met in Phoenix from October 10 to December 10, 1910. Delegates included rancher, former bank president, and Globe’s first mayor George W. P. Hunt, the president of the convention, who supported organized labor and women’s right to vote. He became the new state’s first governor. The vice president of the convention, Morris Goldwater, was also a businessman, the owner of Goldwater’s mercantile, and a past mayor of Prescott. Former acting-territorial governor George Young was a mine owner who brought new methods and equipment (including a steam driven electric power plant and mill) to recover ore from the mines at Goldfield near the Superstition Mountains.
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to these businessmen and other convention attendees several newspapers condemned their election as a takeover of the convention by labor unions and Progressives.

Even before the passage of the Enabling Act, or the calling of the constitutional convention, or the election of the delegates, the *Los Angeles Times* stridently cautioned against the influence of labor unions at Arizona’s convention. Those unions, the editor wrote, “Propose to make a constitution which shall not stop at guaranteeing laboring people the right to form voluntary organizations as they may see fit . . . Beyond all this they aim openly at putting into the constitution certain clauses which shall forbid courts of justice . . . to issue injunctions against strikers bent on committing violence.” Exercised about this one thing, the strike, the *LA Times* declared, “No State constitution will be acceptable to the Supreme Court of the United States which formally justifies the boycott, picketing, rioting, destruction of property, assault upon persons, and the taking of human life.”104 However, Democratic delegates to the convention had agreed to take up organized labor’s causes, and the *LA Times* editor recognized that the decisions belonged to Arizonans, but, “if being forewarned they fail to be forearmed and permit propaganda to capture the constitutional convention, in one way or another, in fact in every way, it will be so much the worse for Arizona as a Territory or as a State.”105

The *Los Angeles Times* described an immature, unaware Arizona citizenry ready to succumb to the uncontrollable forces of socialism and organized labor. The *New York Times* also sounded the alarm before the convention got underway. But
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the editors of this paper were troubled by the great number of Mexicans and the low English-literacy rate that had been reported about Arizona. The NY Times described the territory’s impressive physical size, writing, “Arizona is larger than the Kingdom of Italy. It is almost as large as New York and all of New England . . . All of the farms of Rhode Island could be put in one irrigated valley in Arizona. Arizona has one forest larger than the State of Indiana. The two hundred miles that the Colorado River plunges through the Grand Canyon is believed to be the world’s greatest power producer.” However, according to the writer, Arizona “will come into the Union with only 200,000 inhabitants, 60 percent of whom are of Mexican blood, and frequently ignorant of the English language . . . Arizona, it will be seen, is something of a problem at the very outset.”

Whether true or not, these statistics defined an Arizona with great potential but populated, according to the article, by backward, illiterate Hispanics.

National newspapers were not the only publications cautioning Arizona’s citizens. The Democrats promoted initiative, referendum, and recall but, according to the Arizona Republican, they “centered only on one side of it, the theoretical, in the assumption that all men are perfect and at all times interested in public questions.” On the Republican side, the Arizona Republican worried that the professional politicians who lobbied the territorial government for mining companies had sold themselves “like Judas for thirty pieces of silver” and were telling citizens “that the only escape from corporation domination . . . is the surrender of every right the people of this county have.” The Republican editor viewed the initiative, referendum, and recall as an insult to the intelligence of the taxpayers of Maricopa


County and “one of the most vicious schemes ever devised.” The editor’s biggest concern was that Congress or President Taft would not approve a Progressive constitution.

Convention delegates were elected September 12, 1910. In an editorial appearing as the election was being planned, the Arizona Republican used dire warnings to alert Arizona’s citizenry to the wiles of Washington, DC, politicians. The editor presented his view of Arizona and its relationship to Washington as a place under attack by DC politicians, “Let there be no mistake about the situation,” he wrote. “This ‘threat’ is an admonition to the people of Arizona to frame a constitution acceptable to the president and the congress, or be prepared to accept the defeat of statehood . . . If we do not submit a constitution that meets the views of the president and the congress, we stay out of the Union . . . If we do want statehood, let us frame a constitution which will meet approval at Washington. If we don’t want statehood, if we are determined to frame a freak constitution and, in the words of our friend, the Arizona Democrat, are willing that the president and congress shall ‘do as they damn please about it,’ let us say so.” By electing Republicans to the convention, the Republican believed, statehood would be assured because that party would not include the direct democracy and labor provisions in the document. But in describing the territory’s relationship to the federal government in this way, the newspaper reinforced the Us versus Them mindset that would define the state throughout its history.

The Arizona Republican gave a call to Republican Party arms, declaring, “Control of Arizona’s constitutional convention by the democrats, and the writing of a constitution full of populism, would be a signal to the enemies of statehood in the


senate to bar the doors.” The newspaper warned its readers, “The dominant element in the senate will set its face like a rock against our admission, if we are so foolish as to give this element [the Democratic politicians and their program of popular government] an excuse.” On the same topic of direct democracy the Coconino Sun portrayed Arizonans as foolish and impatient, animating the debate for readers, “The recall of judges is a mere device intended to meet the demands of those who are too impatient and fickle to submit to any stable government” and called the initiative and referendum provisions “new fangled reforms.”

Undeterred by the newspapers’ alarmed portrayal of the specter of a radical Arizona if its citizens yielded to the temptation of direct democracy, the constitution approved by the convention delegates was decidedly Progressive. Governor Sloan fought its adoption, fearing, rightly it turned out, that the document would not be approved in Washington. The governor said, “There has been a big change in sentiment since the delegates to the convention were elected and I am confident that the proposed Constitution will be badly defeated at the polls. It is about the worst [illegible] ever turned out and is objectionable to all classes.” Despite the governor’s misgivings, voters accepted the document, changed it under duress after the president’s veto, and at the next election reinstated it as initially written.

Congress did approve the Arizona state constitution, including its provisions for labor and with the initiative and referendum intact, but with the stipulation that judicial recall would be removed. President Taft vetoed the statehood bill on August 15, 1911, stating that the territory must change the document before he would
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approve it. Congress had crafted an amendment to the bill, removing the recall of
judges from the language of the constitution. The Nelson Amendment stated, “Article
8 of the said constitution of Arizona, in so far as it relates to the ‘recall of public
officers,’ shall be held and construed not to apply to judicial officers, and that the
people of Arizona shall give their assent to such construction of Article 8 of the said
constitution.” Congress passed the Nelson Amendment on August 21, 1911, and
President Taft signed it a day later. Thus Arizona was codified, set down in official
language in the state constitution, and reinforced in the first election after statehood,
with women’s suffrage added and the recall of judicial officers reinstated.

The contentious nature under which the document came to be accepted, the
words approved by the state’s people and disapproved by the nation’s government,
signaled the kind of relationship the state would have with the nation’s leaders going
forward. The words were chosen carefully to leave no doubt where the men who
framed the document, and by implication the state, stood on matters of governance.
The Arizona and New Mexico Enabling Act was designed specifically to guard against
a constitution unacceptable to the federal government by requiring the approval of
the president as well as Congress. Ultimately Arizonans got the constitution they
wanted. The Arizona defined in 1912 was remarkably similar in attitude to Arizona in
2012, independent-minded, stubborn, and defiant of federal jurisdiction, yet
markedly different in politics, with its stance on labor unions, women’s rights,
progressive policies, and English-literacy requirements.
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114 Wishing to avoid the experience of Oklahoma’s admittance to statehood, wherein then-president Theodore Roosevelt disliked that state’s constitution as written but believed he had no authority to require changes, Congress designed New Mexico and Arizona’s enabling act to require the approval of both Congress and the President of the United States.
In his first State of the State address to the first meeting of the first state legislature, Arizona Governor George W. P. Hunt presented his idea of Arizona, the place he believed the new state was and could be. In an 18,000 word message, Hunt described Arizona for listeners and readers, employing not the rhetoric of the recent fight for statehood but rather the clichés that had been and continued to be the defining words of Arizona. “In natural resources and the possession of patent possibilities, Arizona is bounteously blessed. Her acres are broad and fertile, her mountains and streams rich with mineral wealth; her forests are well-nigh virgin; her skies are blue; her climate as of another Italy,” the governor pronounced, “her people honest, hardy, self-reliant, brave.” Nothing in Hunt’s address contradicted the many Arizonas created in words by 1912. The Arizona of the state’s constitution and the newspapers coverage of a state becoming can be found in his words praising the state’s self-reliant people. The Arizona of Sharlot Hall’s poetry can be found in Hunt’s descriptions of the state’s natural landscape. The Arizona of Zane Grey’s novels can be found in the governor’s portrayal of the citizens as hardy and brave, and the newspapers’ booster language can be found as Hunt illustrates Arizona’s “bounteous blessings.” The governor concluded, “Thus endowed, all things are possible to the forty-eighth state of the union. Whatever of ills there might be—industrial, financial, or social—there is the wherewith to right them . . . I feel justified on reporting to you that the condition of the state is good.”

The next twenty-five years would present all of these challenges—industrial, financial, and social—and would require a broader understanding, a redefining, of the idea of Arizona.

---

CONCLUSION

Throughout its history, Arizona has often been described and characterized—defined—by outsiders or for the benefit of outsiders. Arizona’s narratives in 1912 define the place by the already familiar phrases that describe an independent people and landscapes of extremes—lush forests and stark deserts, modern civilization and Wild West. While its natural landscapes made possible the creation of lyrical poetry and bestselling western novels, the writers of those publications succumbed to and contributed to the characterizations that were becoming cliché but would continue to define the state in the future. Native Americans were written into the stories about the state in stereotypical and racist language, lacking control of or access to the means of writing in their own words and telling their own stories. Minority people’s access to the publishing apparatus would enable a broader defining of Arizona in the future. The fight over the words in the state’s constitution reveals a breach between the state’s people and the federal government that would also mark that relationship going forward. As Arizona developed, economically and culturally, some of the clichés gave way to a more-encompassing perception of the place. However, the clichéd words remained present and persistent.
Arizona’s twenty-fifth anniversary of statehood passed with hardly a mention. Twenty-five years had added a system of roads across the state’s vast natural landscape and doubled the state’s population, from just over 200,000 at the time of statehood to nearly 500,000 in the 1930s. The boom years of the 1920s gave way to the bust years of the 1930s. The Great Depression matured the people and changed the land. The place that had been insistent yet independent in its fight for statehood, in the 1930s was increasingly aided by the federal government in the form of New Deal programs that built and improved the state’s infrastructure and described the state in publications to encourage visitors.

Industries that contributed to sustained population and economic growth, particularly copper mining and agriculture, experienced market collapses in the early Depression years. In 1933, Arizona’s copper production and sales had dropped by ninety-four percent and unemployment in the mines by eighty percent. Drought coupled with falling cattle prices forced ranchers off the land, and cotton prices fell from eleven to four cents a pound. Migrants traveling from equally devastated regions to the east joined Arizona residents in looking for work.

The state’s minority communities bore exceptional hardships as the federal government attempted to manage the effects of the Depression. The Indian New Deal changed federal policy toward Native Americans, including a shift to local rather than boarding schools; the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act imposed Anglo-governing
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methods on tribal governments; and the specter of a southwestern Dust Bowl led to the implementation of a devastating sheep reduction plan on the Navajo Reservation.\textsuperscript{118} Hispanics in central and southern Arizona endured extreme unemployment due in part to the failures in the mining and agricultural industries. As many as 18,000 Mexicans may have left Arizona for Mexico between 1929 and 1937 due to the unfavorable economic conditions. Many of those people were U.S. citizens.\textsuperscript{119}

Federal relief assistance came in the form of employment in the Civilian Conservation Corp, and programs through the Public Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. New Deal assistance changed the natural landscape of the state, raising visitor centers at national parks and monuments, facilitating reforestation and soil erosion control, building dams to control flooding and provide power, and constructing roads across the deserts and through the mountains. Arizona was no longer an isolated out-of-the-way place. Thanks to federal funds for road improvements, the physical landscape seemed less a wilderness and more accessible. Several towns had airfields. The City of Phoenix purchased Sky Harbor from the Acme Investment Company in 1935. Tucson’s Davis-Monthan Airport was the largest municipal airport in the country when it opened in 1927.\textsuperscript{120}


\textsuperscript{120} Davis-Monthan Airport was built in accordance with U.S. Army guidelines but remained a municipal airport until 1940 when it became Tucson Army Airfield.
New Deal funds also changed Arizona’s narrative landscape, directly as the Federal Writers’ Project writers described and explained the state to encourage tourism, and indirectly as the roads and national park development brought more people, including writers, to the place, made possible new experiences and changed perceptions, and added to the layers of words about the state. The FWP work on the Indian reservations added to the narratives about the state, as the lives, landscapes, and stories of the state’s native people were written into the guides and bulletins. Meanwhile, Native Americans were still excluded as participants in this type of place creation as Anglos continued to control the process as writers, editors, and publishers.

In the 1930s, Arizona was represented in images, moving pictures on the big screen. Nearly a dozen Zane Grey novels were adapted into movies during the decade, including *Arizona Raiders* in 1936, an adaption of Grey’s *Riders of the Spanish Peaks; Desert Gold* that same year; and *Heritage of the Desert* twice, in 1932 and 1939. Also in 1939 the iconic John Ford western *Stagecoach* starring John Wayne and prominently featuring Monument Valley landscapes was released. The Arizona depicted onscreen was a place of hard landscapes, hard people, and hard lives.

For readers however, whose perceptions of Arizona were shaped by words, the place was more than harsh landscapes and bandits. In 1937 Arizona was a canvas on which a British novelist wrote his vision of America. It was raw material for federal government-employed writers to produce a body of literature encouraging

visitors to the state. Arizona was not just a place of movie cowboys and Indians but also a land of real Indians negotiating the cultural differences imposed by an encroaching Anglo world and federal government powers. Indians’ stories were told through Anglo ethnographers in fiction and autobiography. Arizona’s ancient heritage was explored, excavated, re-created, and written up in archaeological reports and popular magazines as Euro-American authors tried to come to terms with a landscape that did not fit within their cultural understanding. The barrier of language and an Anglo bias toward oral traditions meant that the Native American histories and connections to these places would not be given credence; these stories too would be appropriated and told by Anglos.

J. B. PRIESTLEY, *MIDNIGHT ON THE DESERT*

In the winter of 1936 *Harper’s Magazine* published an article by British novelist, playwright, essayist, and broadcaster J. B. Priestley. In “Arizona Desert” Priestley explored the location’s enchanting environment masked by the article’s plain title, and, inspired by the Arizona desert, he examined America’s place in the world. He described the stark beauty of the desert and the bounty of America’s natural resources. The presentation was lighthearted but the undertone was serious. What is this place America, what does it mean and do? What can it accomplish, should it accomplish? These were questions seemingly drawn out by Priestley’s time in the Arizona desert.

Priestley employed the clichés familiar to descriptions of Arizona, the dichotomy of Arizona’s age—prehistoric and brand new—and landscapes of abundance and sparseness, and the wonderland atmosphere of the place. “Everything that happened here [in Arizona] before yesterday is prehistorical,” Priestley wrote. “Turn back a page or two, and the Indians are still raiding, the bad
men are shooting up the towns, and the traveler whose horse has gone lame is dying of thirst.” Men not yet old could remember those times, yet Arizona’s children saw dusty dirt tracks paved and towns appear along them. Seen through the eyes of a British visitor, America, and Arizona specifically, was new. “Here along these Western highways, with their fine surfaces, careful grading and banking, elaborate signs, their filling stations, their auto camps, their roadside eating-houses and hotels, their little towns passionately claiming your custom in a startling sudden glare of electric signs, is a brand-new busy world.”¹²¹

Arizona’s landscapes were both old and new. On the age of Arizona’s natural landscapes Priestley wrote, “In the north, where you are a mile and a half high, there is the Grand Canyon, which is enough in itself to clear a whole continent from the charge of being dull. But you also have the Painted Deserts and the Petrified Forests. The dinosaurs left their tracks in these parts. When the giant meteor decided to imbed itself in the earth, it chose Arizona, and you may see the crater it made, near Winslow.” But Arizona’s cultural landscape was new, according to Priestley, and he made no mention of the Indian people, some of whom had inhabited the place for a millennium, or the state’s Hispanic population who had lived there for centuries. “Everything here had no existence, would have meant nothing if it had been dreamed of, the day before yesterday,” he declared. “It is all today’s doing. It is all brand-new. And most of it, in its pretty frivolity of colored lights and facetious appeals, seems to have no more to do with the savage countryside itself than a jiggling line of chorus girls would have. Yet like America taking its place of leadership

in the world, the towns along Arizona’s highways were conducting us . . . straight across the waterless wilderness, day and night.\(^{122}\)

Driving along the highways from Los Angeles to Wickenburg, in the vastness of the Arizona desert, Priestley was given to wonder these things. The open spaces of desert connected by paved roads, railroad tracks, and more recently by air travel, caused him to wonder about America writ large. The youngest state, with what Priestley later readily assigned as the oldest of landscapes, in a relatively young country provoked an ageless question: Is this country and its people up to the task before it? Other nations were following America’s lead, Priestley surmised, “America does not know where she is going, but if she walks into some abyss of barbarism, she will not walk alone. This I concluded, was a solemn responsibility . . . American political and social ideas, though they are changing already, will have to bound forward, to borrow some of the enterprise and courage of the engineers and builders and even of this new wayside population, in order to keep up. In short, you will have to discover where it is you are taking us.”\(^{123}\)

Priestley grieved the unrestrained use, or misuse, of Arizona’s resources, writing, “There was a time not very long ago when these ranches in northern Arizona carried feed for vast herds of cattle. But what the cattle left, the sheep that followed almost completely destroyed, pulling up the very roots . . . The desert hills have been swept clean of feed for cattle; forests containing easily marketable timber have been massacred without quarter; mines have been worked in what once seemed the cheapest way, but in what since proved to be the most expensive fashion.” Yet, exclaiming upon the wonder of Boulder Dam he wrote, “It is worth traveling weeks to see. It is like the beginning of a new world . . . a world of giant machines and titanic

\(^{122}\) Ibid., 360, 359.

\(^{123}\) Ibid. (Priestly mistakenly gives the year of statehood as 1910.)
communal enterprises." The title of the article holds the promise and the possibilities of America. Add a little water, build this miracle called Boulder Dam, and watch the desert bear fruit.

Priestley was not immune from the superlatives of boosterism, and he was writing an article entitled “Arizona Desert” for a national audience. In writing about the Wickenburg area, the dude ranch where he and his family wintered, he could be composing a brochure for the Wickenburg Chamber of Commerce. “Our chosen district,” he wrote, “has the best winter climate in the state, which means that it has one of the best winter climates in the world . . . Here I prophesy that as transport becomes quicker, cheaper, easier, the Wickenburg district will become increasingly important, for a winter climate as good as this will prove a better gold-mine than the Old Vulture . . . There’s gold in them thar hills, but the best of it is the January sunshine.” He described the air, “enchanting . . . crystal clear . . . gives the Arizona landscape its enduring charm,” and the landscape, using words like “magically molded” and “unbelievably sumptuous.”

Priestley recognized that he might be writing advertising copy when he described Arizona, and he invoked the epitome of tourist advertising, the railroad publications. “One reason why even moderately intelligent people sink deeper and deeper into disillusion is that nothing now comes up to the advertisements,” he

124 Ibid., 363, 365.

wrote, and “now Arizona is having its share of this glittering and deceptive nonsense. One of the wildest descriptions of it is This Wonderland of the Great Southwest. This is enough to make any intelligent adult regard the place with the gravest suspicions.” But wait, Priestley said. “For once these descriptions have an almost scientific precision. Nothing has been exaggerated. I am not a son of the state, have not ten cents invested in it, and am not being paid to boost it. Nevertheless, I declare that Arizona really is a wonderland . . . It is filled with marvels. Wizardry has been at work here.”

Just as Sharlott Hall had written about the place twenty-five years earlier, Arizona was described in the cliché of extremes, as Priestley informed his readers, “There are great tracts of virgin forest, as well as hundreds of miles of desert. There are mysterious Indian ruins all over the place. There are strange heights called the Superstition Mountains, where men have gone to look for lost gold mines and have never returned. There is about the whole state a suggestion of the Arabian Nights. Its vegetation, with the immense pillars of saguaro cactus dominating everything else, is fantastic. Its rocks hide treasures of gold, opals, and rubies, and are covered with ancient writing.”

“Anything might have happened, and still might happen, in this vast empty state,” Priestley declared. “This was the last state to enter the Union, and if it is not the most fantastic of them all, I will eat my hat and it shall be a ten-gallon Stetson.”

The possibility exists that something inherent in the Arizona landscape caused even a British novelist with a reputation for being caustic in his observations
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126 Ibid. For another example of railroad tourist publications, see Chapter 1, page 2.

127 Ibid.

128 Ibid., 361.
about America and society, to wax in exaggerated exposé even while ruminating on American leadership as he drives through the Arizona desert.  

The words in “Arizona Desert” became part of Priestley’s next book, his third memoir Midnight on the Desert. In the article Priestley described the Arizona desert at night, writing, “The nights are even more spacious than the days. No lid of darkness is clapped over you. The spaces are wider than ever, and are lit, night after night, with all the stars of the Northern Hemisphere, as precisely defined as the stars in a planetarium.” This description may inform the title of the book; midnight, often symbolizing a time of great darkness in literature, does not symbolize darkness in Arizona. In this book midnight does not describe a time of great darkness but a time of looking forward, looking toward the dawn, and the desert does not depict a hopeless arid wasteland but instead an empty expanse full of possibilities.

As in the Harper’s article, Arizona was the setting of Midnight on the Desert. Priestley expanded on the place, again utilizing time and extremes to emphasize the matchless landscape. He described his middle-of-the-night walk to his writing shack situated at the edge of the ranch,

In the silence, slowly picking my way, I thought about this Arizona country. The New World! It seemed to me the oldest country I had ever seen, the real antique land, first cousin to the moon. Brown, bony, sapless, like an old man’s hand. We called it new because it was not thick with history, not a museum and guidebook place. Man had been here such a little time that his arrival had not yet been acknowledged . . . This country is geology by day and astronomy at night. It offers a broad view of what is happening generally in the solar system, with no particular reference to Man. But it has magnificent routine. The early mornings, in winter, are cold, very fresh and pure. Then, under the burning noons, the red cardinals and the bluebirds flash among the cottonwoods, as if nature had turned outrageously symbolic. The afternoons are simply so much sunlight and aromatic air. But at sunset

---


the land throws up pink summits and saw-toothed ridges of amethyst, and there are miracles of fire in the sky. Night uncovers two million more stars than you have ever seen before; and the planets are not points, but globes.¹³¹

This was the desert and its midnight, thoroughly Arizona to Priestley. However the book was not all cliché, or completely benign.

From his place of comfort on the desert Priestley made these observations about Arizona, “Thinking, then, of all those Arizona people around me, fast asleep while I smoked and ruminated in my hut, I considered—not too pompously, I hope—the little classless society they had temporarily evolved. How had they achieved this appearance of happy equality? There are not many of them,” he wrote, “and they all live very close to the desert and the mountains, and might still be called pioneers. There are no great inequalities of income or privilege . . . There are few rags, fewer diamonds.”¹³² Priestley may have been observant about Arizona’s natural landscape, but he seems not to have observed Arizonans. He was unaware of the reservations or the barrios, had not encountered their residents.

As Priestley continued with his discussion about wealth and privilege, declaring privilege was more insidious than wealth, he used Arizona as an example of a near-ideal society, writing, “What is needed is a juster distribution of wealth with as little privilege as possible. Owing to certain local and temporary conditions, a state like Arizona comes nearer to achieving this than the older communities do, with the result that it seems far nearer to our idea of a free and happy democracy.”¹³³ Priestley’s ignorance of, or ignoring of, the state’s minorities meant that his representation of Arizona as an ideal was narrow, confined to an Anglo Arizona. Like

¹³¹ Ibid., 2–3.
¹³² Ibid., 102.
¹³³ Ibid., 105.
Sharlot Hall’s characterization of Arizona at the time of statehood, Priestley rendered Native Americans and other minority populations invisible in his narrative.

While titled *Midnight on the Desert*, the book was not predominantly about Arizona. Midnight on the desert is the setting, the time and place Priestley chose to get his papers in order. For Priestley the desert turned up another perspective, not only a western, or a paradise, or an adolescent 25-year-old state, though those elements of the place are in the book, but the arid expanse also enabled a contemplation that is antithetical to the clichés. The idea of rugged western individualism that prevailed in much of the writing about and the living in Arizona provoked in Priestley a commentary on the communal aspects of American life.

“American economists and politicians and newspaper editors may go on and on shouting about their individualism, but the great unconscious drift of American life, it seemed to me, was away from it, set towards a very different shore.” Priestley “realized at once that what had always impressed me in America had never seemed to belong to a strongly individualistic civilization. On the contrary, it was not by what a single person can accomplish, but always by what can be done by collective effort that America had always shown herself so new, formidable, and fascinating,”134 as in the building of Boulder Dam.

“The collective man, the socialist citizen, is not a weird new type that may arrive in the United States any year now,” Priestley believed, but rather, “In almost all but his theories, the average modern American is the collective man. His impulsive advances seem to be always away from that famous individualism. He has no objection to mass movement. Nearly everything he does is being done about the same time by a million others. He likes doing exactly what all the others are doing. So does his wife.” This was not a bad thing, according to Priestley. Americans were,

134 Ibid., 118.
“a people who, while saluting the old banners of economic individualism, are always busy expressing themselves collectively, and doing it with an ease, force, and natural cohesion.” It was this communal mindset that provided work at Grand Canyon for the unemployed through the Civilian Conservation Corps and built Boulder Dam.

Priestley’s descriptions of Arizona’s natural landscapes bracket the narrative about America. The Arizona desert facilitated his musings about America, and Grand Canyon, Priestley believed, could facilitate a better America. He began with the desert, describing it from his place in Wickenburg. And he ended with descriptions of Grand Canyon. Of his trip to Grand Canyon he wrote, “I have heard rumors of visitors who were disappointed. The same people will be disappointed at the Day of Judgment. In fact, the Grand Canyon is a sort of landscape Day of Judgment.” He continued, "It is not a show place, a beauty spot, but a revelation. The Colorado River, which is powerful, turbulent, and so thick with silt that it is like a saw, made it with the help of the erosive forces of rain, frost, and wind, and some strange geological accidents; and all these together have been hard at work on it for the last seven or eight million years . . . It is the world’s supreme example of erosion. But this is not what it really is. It is, I repeat, a revelation. The Colorado River made it, but you feel when you are there that God gave the Colorado River instructions.”

His description of Grand Canyon, just as his discussion of American communalism, commands attention.

Priestley was so moved by the Grand Canyon that he declared, "If I were an American, I should make my remembrance of it the final test of men, art, and policies. I should ask myself: Is this good enough to exist in the same country as the Canyon? How would I feel about this man, this kind of art, these political measures,
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135 Ibid., 119, 121, 123
if I were near that Rim? Every member or officer of the Federal Government ought to remind himself, with triumphant pride, that he is on the staff of the Grand Canyon.” More thoughtful, and again reflecting on the landscape’s age, he wrote, “Perhaps it is not size nor the huge witchery of changing shapes and shades that fill us with awe, but the obscure feeling that here we have an instantaneous vision of innumerable eons.”

Midnight on the Desert quickly became a bestseller. What did this book tell the reading public about Arizona? Perhaps along with the truth about the landscapes contained within the clichés of time and extremes, there is also the falseness of the idea of American individualism. That this idea was generated by a trip to Arizona is remarkable. Priestley may have been thinking these things before he visited the state. But he chose to include them in a book inspired by his visit. Ostensibly the moment in time is that 1936 night when he burned his papers in Arizona, doing some housekeeping before he traveled back to England. Broadly, the book is about America, its place in the world, its ascending to a position of leadership, and its stereotypical individualism that Priestley believes masks the reality of a communal society.

FEDERAL WRITERS’ PROJECT, ARIZONA GUIDE AND BULLETINS

J. B. Priestley’s commentary about the communal nature of American life finds validation in the programs of the New Deal; through opportunities like the Federal Writers’ Project (FWP), the American people (in the form of their government) took care of each other, even making sure unemployed writers had work. The states and their assets became communal, as their landscapes were shared with the nation through the words of the American Guide series. Just twenty-

137 Ibid., 285, 286.
five years earlier Arizona’s people were defying the federal government to get the constitution they wanted, and in 1937 the federal government provided a service to the people of the state, publicizing, redefining, its resources, people, and attractions in the *Arizona Guide* and its attendant bulletins, while employing the state’s writers.  

The bulletins, published by the Federal Writers’ Project with the Arizona State Teachers College, reveal that Anglo Arizona and Native American Arizona are not the same place. The bulletins were a deliberate effort by the federal government to present minority cultures to readers, but the people and places presented are simply that, presented, not active in telling their own stories. The bulletins’ forewords took great care in asserting the authenticity of the books’ contents. “The material was gathered through personal contact on the reservation, verified by documentation, and carefully checked by experts,” stated the foreword to *The Apache*. All of the sources cited in all of the bulletins’ bibliographies were written by Anglos, and predominately by Anglo men. Indians found themselves in the middle of an American society addressing the question of assimilation, visible both in the act of writing

---

138 Well-known author and artist Ross Santee, the state director of the Federal Writers’ Project (FWP), refused to have his name printed in the *Arizona Guide*. Two versions of the story exist. In the first version, the undeserving “Brass” in Washington had their names printed on the first page in large type; the writers who actually did the work were not included. (Monty Noam Penkower, *The Federal Writers’ Project: A Study in Government Patronage of the Arts* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977], 93n42). In the second, the WPA officials refused to list the names of Santee’s staff so “the tough wrangler said, ‘then leave mine out.’” (Lawrence Clark Powell, *Arizona: A Bicentennial History* [W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.; Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History, 1976], 144.)


(Native Americans’ stories told by Anglo writers) and in the content of the words, in the FWP Indian bulletins, in Oliver La Farge’s fiction, and in the as-told-to Native American autobiographies that became popular in the 1930s. The writers of the Works Progress Administration (WPA), the ethnologists and anthropologists adapting Native American autobiographies, and even La Farge as he incorporated his knowledge of Navajo life into his novels, became interpreters of minority culture. Their versions of the Indian people and reservation life became what the English-reading public in the 1930s knew of Indians and reservation life.

The main purpose of the state guides was to describe a place people would want to visit. The Arizona Guide exemplifies the cliché of extremes—the temporal in the youngest state-oldest natural features; the ancient, primitive, and modern cultural landscape; and the varied, abundant, and stark natural landscape—endemic to descriptions of Arizona: “Arizona is the nation’s youngest state, and alive with the spirit of youth. Yet if we count the aeons through which it has been inhabited by man, civilizations that have come and gone, Arizona is an ancient and venerable land.” Extreme follows on extreme in this passage early in the book:

 Arizona is a land of contrasts geologically, racially, socially, and culturally. Its mountains tower a mile or more into the air; the rivers have cut miles deep into the multicolored earth. Snow lingers on the peaks while the valleys are sweet with the fragrance of orange blossoms. Here are sere deserts and the largest pine forest in the world. Here are fallen forests turned to stone, and forests of trees that have survived the slow change from jungle to desert by turning their leaves to thorns. Modern transport planes fly on regular

141 For information on writing the state guides, see Penkower, The Federal Writers’ Project and Bernard A. Weisberger, ed., The WPA Guide to America: The Best of 1930s America as Seen by the Federal Writers’ Project (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985).

passenger and mail routes, while Hopi grandmothers scatter sacred cornmeal on the newborn infant and pray to the sun for blessings.\textsuperscript{143}

This was the same Arizona described in 1912, the same place characterized in Hall’s \textit{Cactus and Pine} and newspaper articles. Except for the addition of the airplane, this could have been Zane Grey’s Arizona.

These passages reveal how the writers expect readers to view the people of the state. All of the descriptions that follow, whether of mining or agriculture or tourism, will be seen through the window that these words frame:

Arizona has been the home of . . . cliff dwellers who built shelters of stone, learned how to shape clay into pottery, but did not practice even the rudiments of agriculture; of pastoral tribes who built pueblos, planted corn and cotton beside irrigation canals; of fierce raiders who preyed upon their peaceful neighbors; of swashbuckling \textit{conquistadores} and gentle priests who strove to impress the faith and culture of Spain upon the natives they found here; and last of these modern interlopers, the Yankees, who leveled mountains for their copper, laced the face of the land with ribbons of concrete, dammed rivers to make the deserts bloom, and in less than a century worked changes vaster than their predecessors had wrought in thousands of years.\textsuperscript{144}

According to the \textit{Guide}’s writers, then, Arizona was the place where primitive cliff dwellers had lived, where Indians were characterized as agriculturalists and warriors and Hispanics as explorers and priests, and where now resided the Anglo trespassers who had co-opted and admirably used the state’s natural resources.\textsuperscript{145} This was the Arizona presented to potential visitors and settlers, an Anglo representation with an emphasis on natural resources as economic assets.

In considering Arizona’s natural landscape, as in other Arizona narratives, the \textit{Guide} described the extremes, but in this case the extremes occur in two

\begin{quote}
\begin{footnotes}
\item[143] Ibid., 4.
\item[144] Ibid., 3.
\item[145] The Arizona \textit{Guide} writers categorize Spanish and Italian people as white. See 41.
\end{footnotes}
\end{quote}
descriptions about the desert. The first, in a description of the Sonoran Desert, reads, “The mountains are seldom heavily forested, and the plains and broad level valleys maintain characteristic desert flora or are destitute of vegetation.” The second, also describing Arizona’s desert landscape, tells the reader, “Even were it not for the myriad growth of flowers, the word ‘desert’ as applied to Arizona would be misleading, for there are always green shrubs and cacti to add color and variety to the landscape.”\(^\text{146}\) The writers of the *Arizona Guide* were not certain which extreme to employ.

A large portion of the *Guide* is dedicated to explaining the state’s politics, agriculture, industry, and transportation. Rather than describe in boosting language and exaggeration, leaving those types of descriptions for the landscapes, the *Guide* writers presented facts about the state in seemingly neutral tones, but in a way that demonstrated its attractiveness, such as this paragraph about dude ranches: “There are more than three hundred dude ranches in Arizona. Some have large herds of ranging cattle and only a few guests, others have many guests and just enough cattle to keep the visitors entertained. Still others dispense entirely with the cows and specialize in swimming pools, tennis, and relaxation in the sun.”\(^\text{147}\) Readers were encouraged to use the *Guide* to plan a trip to and through Arizona, and the writers intended that what they reported, the visitors would actually see. However, the place the *Guide* presented was an Anglo Arizona, the dude ranches and other attractions set up and written down for Anglo consumption as tourists and readers.

The *Guide* emphasized the otherness of Native Americans, telling readers that while Arizonans were indifferent to their state’s history, “The ‘another-redskin-bit-the-dust’ type of reminiscence offers unfailing delight. An Arizona newspaper


\(^\text{147}\) Ibid., 93.
sponsors an annual pioneer reunion and makes it the occasion for publishing many tales of the state’s turbulent beginnings as told, and perhaps embellished, by early settlers. These stories are placed on file by the Arizona Historical Society, ultimately to comprise a unique, if not altogether accurate chronicle.  

148 Was this an exaggeration, the Guide writers describing Arizonans in a way they perceived readers want or will accept? Or was it the mindset of writers and readers alike? Probably the latter, considering this bit of Eurocentric information: “A third of Arizona’s inhabitants are Indians and Mexicans, unassimilable into an Anglo-Saxon population, and there are many reasons why the Caucasians have attained only a limited degree of homogeneity.”

149 On Hispanics, readers learned, “Arizona owes much of its color and individuality to the Mexicans, who largely retain their own culture and customs in an environment constantly growing more alienized. Almost every city and town of any size has its Mexican quarter—squalid, for most of its inhabitants are laborers in the lower wage brackets, but picturesque withal.” The Guide writers found accomplished, successful Hispanics worthy of mention, but in a manner emphasizing strangeness, saying, “History is filled with the names of Mexicans who played a prominent part in the development of the first settlements. Their descendants are respected, prominent, and in some cases well-to-do. In Yuma, Nogales, and Tucson especially, are to be found many families of Spanish extraction enjoying friendly business and social relationships with Anglo-Americans.” However, the writers also stressed what they believed was the more common characterization of Hispanics, explaining, “The Mexican has been called ‘the chore boy of Arizona.’ His economic status is such that he has little opportunity to adopt the modes of life followed by the lighter-skinned

148 Ibid., 5.
149 Ibid., 7.
people who employ him, but it is also true that he has slight inclination to change his
ways.” The Guide’s writers relegated Hispanics to second-class citizenship and
then placed the blame on Hispanics for the writers’ having to classify them that way.
These stereotypical and racist images contributed to an Anglo perception of Hispanic
inferiority that increased in intolerant rhetoric and would culminate in a series of
anti-immigrant and English-literacy measures in the 1980s (see chapter four).

In describing Native Americans, the Guide said, “The Indians also afford a
bright and novel note for the Arizona scene . . . More than the Mexicans, the Indians
are reluctant to assume the features of American life, although this reluctance is in a
measure overcome among Indian children educated in boarding schools maintained
by the great white fathers.” Indian people may have been novel for new arrivals,
but not novel in the sense of new; Native Americans had been in the place longer
than the rest. The paternalistic belief that the boarding schools were necessary and
successful belied the reality of the system’s devastating effects.

The Federal Writers’ Project writers worked with officials at Arizona State
Teachers College in Flagstaff to develop some of the material they were collecting
about Native Americans into a useful form for teachers. This collaboration resulted in
several bulletins, each booklet dedicated to the exploration of an Arizona Indian
tribe. The Hopi, The Navaho, The Apache, and The Papago were published before the
Guide. In 1937 Native Americans’ words were filtered through Anglo lenses or
appropriated and re-created by Anglo storytellers. In the 1930s, Indians were still

---

150 Ibid., 7, 8, 159.

151 Ibid., 8.

152 Oliver La Farge addressed these issues in his books and short story fiction;
see the next section in this chapter.
subjects written into Arizona rather than participants writing their own stories about their place.

The introduction to the Hopi booklet served as the introduction to the series of bulletins. It was ethnocentric, more so even than most of the words about Native Americans in the *Guide*. Herein lies the barrier, the boundary that has, at this time, not yet been crossed, or even discerned: “The study of any group possessing a written language falls within the scope of history, and such a group thereby becomes a civilized people. The tribes to be discussed are all primitive, in the sense that they do not write their own language. This is the technical distinction between primitive and civilized.”

In three sentences the FWP writers classified entire cultures as primitive and lacking history—since the Indians had no written language, and since written language signals civilized, the Indians were not civilized. This conclusion is patently false; written and oral forms of communication are not mutually exclusive.

The bulletins, as well as the *Guide*, adopted a tone that made each indigenous culture appear foreign, even as the writers described livelihoods similar to the Anglo way of life. For example, this description is found in *The Hopi* but could also be applied to another tribe, an Anglo western frontier community, or a neighborhood in a metropolitan area: “A Hopi dance is not only a religious ceremony, but it is a folk art, a holiday, an opportunity for visiting and other social activities, the reward for a tremendous amount of labor on the part of the sponsors, and the focal point upon

---

153 *The Hopi*, ASTC Bulletin 18, no. 2 (September 1937), prepared by FWP (Flagstaff, AZ: ASTC, 1937), 5. Writing Indians into the intellectual landscape, the way words have defined and described Native Americans in Arizona over time would be a worthy project, but beyond the scope of this study.

which all of the other activities converge.”155 Another example, this about Hopi religion from the Guide, could be applied to most religions, including Christianity: “Rich in an ancient inheritance of mythology and folklore, the Hopi’s religious life resolves itself into an annual cycle of ceremonies that occupy the forefront of their thought and conversation.”156 The Guide and bulletins writers contributed to an image of Native Americans as exotic and “other,” in using words like “ancient” and “mythology” and in describing events that occur in most cultures, such as dances, as if only practiced by Indian people.

Both the Guide and the Navajo bulletin emphasized the people’s ability to culturally adapt. The bulletin explained that knowledge about Navajo life is unbalanced, that more was known about weaving and mythology than of economics and law.157 The Apache bulletin was less scholarly or ethnologic than the others, and more patronizing than the Apache section in the Guide. The Guide stated, “Until they were at last subdued they were the most warlike tribe in the southwest. Their fighting spirit was especially evident in the period 1870–1900, when the encroachments of white settlers roused them to fierce resentment,” at least allowing that the fighting was provoked by white encroachment. But the bulletin drops the hostililities right at the Apaches’ feet, blaming a genetic defect, “The Apache is still given to flaring rages of anger and jealousy. In the absence of his ancestral outlet of warfare he occasionally turns on his own tribe, his family, his friends.”158

155 The Hopi, 7.

156 Arizona Guide, 32.

157 The Navaho, ASTC Bulletin 18, no. 4 (November 1937), prepared by FWP (Flagstaff, AZ: ASTC, 1938). Did the researchers and writers ask questions on the reservation, prompting an interest among Navajo people to begin telling their own stories in the future? Or did the writers simply consult the published material available at the time? This is another area that requires more research.

The tone of the Papago bulletin was one of admiration. The *Guide* contained only a paragraph about the O’odham people, both Akimel O’odham (Pima) and Tohono O’odham (Papago) combined. The bulletin observed that the Tohono O’odham people had no interest in the politics that affected their region, stating they “showed no apparent interest in Mexico’s revolt against Spain in 1820, the Mexican War, nor the Gadsden Purchase.” The main effect of these events on this people, the defining of an international border that separated their communities, was not readily apparent in the 1930s, as free movement across the border was still possible. The FWP writer acknowledged, with admiration, the difficult lives the O’odham people live on Arizona’s southern desert, “The agriculture plan utilized every drop of the meager water supply and supported hundreds where a smaller number of whites would have starved.” This countered assertions made early in the century that the O’odham people “squandered” the land and water (see chapter one).

The Tohono O’odham have their own narrative landscape, as do all people, but theirs entered the Anglo written word in the form of the publications of their songs by Ruth Underhill. The bulletin explained the songs, stating, “When Elder Brother founded the Papago tribe he established for all time the custom of meeting every situation in life with a song. The songs are the spontaneous poetic creations of individual singers. Some of them are narrative cycles recounting exploits legendary and personal. Others are lyrical expressions of constant communion with the power of nature . . . Songs are still being composed and, if they seem especially inspired and gain favor, may be added to the literature of the people.”

---

159 *The Papago*, ASTC Bulletin 20, no. 3 (October 1939), prepared by FWP (Flagstaff, AZ: ASTC, 1939), 5.

160 Ibid., 6
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translations and explanations of the songs remade them in English for an Anglo audience (see as-told-to section below).

This paragraph, from the middle of the Guide, explained better than any other the reality of Arizona, of many societies:

Most of the songs, sayings, habits, and customs that belong to Arizonans as a people were bequeathed to them by widely varying and often sharply conflicting cultures. The first Arizonans were Mexicans and Mormons, cowboys and prospectors, miners and soldiers, Serbians, Confederates, Yankees, Italians, English, Spanish—and Indians. They lived in Arizona as groups of strangers—more or less isolated from each other by barriers of nationality, creed, or geography—fighting for life and property in a grim but promising wilderness. And there was not one of them who did not try to pass on to his children both his conception of the new land and the most vital elements of his native culture. Today it seems that none of them quite succeeded in this and that none of them completely failed.162

The reader is unsure whether this is a worthy sentiment or a criticism. But at the time it was written, while it was true that none of the Arizonans mentioned had “completely failed,” Anglo appropriation and categorization of minority cultures’ stories had created for readers an Arizona that was distinctly Anglo.

**THE ENEMY GODS AND THE FICTION OF OLIVER LA FARGE**

One goal of New Deal programs was to help citizens who experienced economic hardships; another was the reform of policies that burdened the poor and minorities. With good intentions, the Indian New Deal attempted to do both of these things. As the consequences of federal policy became clearer however, supporters of the Indian New Deal began to question some of its results. One of those concerned was Oliver La Farge, often referred to as an “Indian expert” by government officials and citizens alike. After earning a bachelors degree in anthropology at Harvard, La Farge came to know Native Americans through his work as an ethnologist on the Navajo Reservation. He was sent by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to the Hopi

---

Reservation to assist the tribe in writing their constitution as they strived to comply with the Indian Reorganization Act. A member of the Eastern Association on Indian Affairs, he became its president in 1932. In that role, as he learned more about the federal government’s policies in dealing with what was then known as the Indian problem, La Farge became aware of the need “for a wedding between ethnology and politics.” Ethnological work could inform government policy, La Farge believed. Though his organization worked closely with the BIA, it was La Farge’s fiction that illuminated the plight of Native Americans for the public. According to his biographer D’Arcy McNickle, “What doubtless was his most significant contribution was that he brought Indians into the consciousness of Americans as something other than casual savages without tradition or style.” It was this contribution, La Farge’s narratives about and drawn from Arizona, that helped create for readers the Arizona of the Navajo people.

La Farge criticized the results of assimilation policy and wrote his criticism into stories of Navajo people negotiating between two societies, the traditional Navajo and reservation culture, and the Anglo world pressed upon them through boarding school education. La Farge “was not unaware of the potential for influencing attitudes toward Indians through his writing.” The Arizona of The Enemy Gods, and of La Farge’s other works of fiction, was the Navajo Reservation, its natural landscape and people, and the Indian boarding schools where the Navajos were


164 Quoted in Caffey, 4.

165 Caffey, 5.
forced to send their children. His words revealed a people dealing with destructive and ever-changing government policies, sympathetic, tragic portrayals, yet stories still told in Anglo words from an Anglo perspective.

La Farge first experienced the Navajo Reservation in 1921 at age nineteen as he participated in an archaeological excavation. His initial impression of northern Arizona was less than complimentary. “The country repelled me,” he wrote in his memoir, “its emptiness, its gaudiness and its sheer size all proclaimed ‘not for human consumption.’ We were dazed physically by the fierce, color-killing sunlight and emotionally by the mass effect of this sudden presentation.” After days of riding through the country and working in it, he had a change of heart. “You could lose yourself in the great spaces of the Navajo country,” he wrote. “You could do this literally and die of thirst, or spiritually and forget that the white world existed, like water backed too high against a levee, all around the reservation.”

La Farge admired the Navajo people, respected their traditions, and embraced the high desert plateau where they lived. His posture was reflected in his writing.

*The Enemy Gods* tells the story of a Navajo boy, Myron Begay, who attends a boarding school and finds that he is happier there than at home on the reservation where his mother’s new husband abuses him. He is schooled in Christianity, embraces academics, and refuses to return home during the summers. Myron begins to see his people through the eyes of the Anglo teachers and missionaries, and his goal is to become a leader who can save his people, not from American society but from their backward lives. Myron sets his sights on becoming like Tall Man, a respected member of the tribe whose father was white and whose mother was a member of a powerful clan. Tall Man “had made himself a leader, and was now one

---

of the most effective delegates to the still new Tribal Council which the government had set up. To many Navajos, particularly younger ones, he represented the achievement of being fully Indian while understanding and mastering the white power.”

The Enemy Gods of La Farge’s story are the forces that work to destroy Navajo society in the guise of saving the Navajo people. The Enemy Gods are the United States government policies that mandate Indian children must attend boarding schools, the missionaries who lecture about the evils of traditional Native American religions and the risks of backsliding, the teachers and school officials who forbid the speaking of native languages and who teach skills insufficient for life on reservations, and an American society that demands homogeneity and compliance.

La Farge used a conversation between Myron, his school friend Homer Gatewood, and one of Homer’s older relatives, to illustrate for his readers the role education played in Navajo society. Homer does not want to return to school after the summer; Myron wants to be a different kind of Navajo, “civilized,” and chooses to stay at school during the summer; Homer’s relative is the most conservative traditional Navajo Myron has ever seen. Speaking to Homer, the old man says, "No, my grandson. You want this schooling, even if it is hard. There are many tribes of Long-Haired People, of Earth People, many strong warriors, but this one tribe, the Bellacana, conquered them all. Why? Because he knows more, I think. By paper and by wires he talks to his friends in the distance, he leaves his words behind him when he goes away. He makes things we cannot make. He is here, he is all around us, we cannot get rid of him. Therefore we must learn his secrets that we, Navajos, may

continue. Long ago we asked for these schools. We want them. It is not pleasant for you, but you need it, I think.’”

Then he speaks to Myron. “Now you, grandchild,” he says, “I think you are making a mistake, too. If you learn all the white man’s way and forget the Navajo, if that happens to our young men, then we die, we are destroyed, as surely as if by warfare. The man who will serve his people in the years to come, the man who will strengthen them, is the man who can learn all of the one without losing the other. That is what we are hoping for, we who used to be warriors and leaders, and who still wear the old-fashioned clothes.” The Navajos intended the schools for learning about Anglo ways, but not to replace Indian ways.

Myron and the Navajo people are negotiating between two cultures. La Farge illustrated the Indian people’s dilemma with a conversation between Myron and his uncle, Shooting Star:

Shooting Star went on: “White men count everything. How many Navajos do they say there are?”

“Forty thousand, I have heard.”

The old man tasted the high number. “Many people. Pass them by you one by one – many people. Eh! And Indians, all together, how many?”

“Three hundred times a thousand and fifty thousand, about that, they say.”

“Many people. And Mexicans, how many?”

“I don’t know. They are counted in with the rest, the Bellacana I think.”

“Strange. They aren’t the same. But then, after the Bellacana stopped fighting the Mexicans, they came together against us. That’s it, I suppose . . . The white men all told then, between the two seas, how many?”

“A thousand times a thousand – a hundred times all that, and then twenty times it. That is what they say.”

He doubted that his uncle could in any way grasp the number he stated. He watched the old man’s concentrated face. At length Shooting Singer sighed.

“Did you ever shake water from your hand onto a plate or a board or anything like that? Each drop stands up by itself, with lots of room around it.

---

168 Ibid., 46. The Navajo people asked for the schools. One of the federal government’s responsibilities enumerated in the 1868 treaty with the Navajos was to provide a teacher for every thirty students. See Parezo, “The Diné (Navajos): Sheep Is Life.”
That’s how we were, we and the Mokis, the Utes, the Supais, the Apaches, and the rest. The Mexicans, too. They were many, but they were pasturage for us. But you pour a whole barrel of water onto those drops – where are they then? That’s what the Bellacana is.169

This seemed to La Farge to be Arizona’s cultural landscape in 1937, Anglo culture pouring over and absorbing all of the others. But those minority cultures were not absorbed.

*The Enemy Gods* was not La Farge’s first venture into writing about Navajos. His first novel *Laughing Boy* tells the story of the romance, marriage, and tragic end of the relationship between a young Navajo man raised on the reservation and a Navajo girl who has been sent to boarding school and returns to the reservation changed and emotionally distant. *Laughing Boy* won the 1929 Pulitzer Prize for literature; it had its genesis in a short story published in *Dial* magazine in 1927. That story, “North Is Black,” also explores the cultural divide between Navajos and Anglos. In this story a Navajo man follows his love, a white girl, to her home in the north, becomes friends with her people, and lives among them for a while. But an absence of cultural understanding, on both the Indian and the Anglo sides, results in a vicious argument, and the man returns to the reservation, alone and bitter.170

A prolific writer, La Farge composed stories about the Southwest, the desert, cowboys, and other tribes besides the Navajo. But he was well known for his Navajo stories. Following on *Laughing Boy* and informing the story in *The Enemy Gods*, La Farge published a short story in the *Saturday Evening Post*, again telling the story of the cultural divide existing between on- and off-reservation communities. “Higher Education” is another story of the effects of boarding school education on Navajo children and families. It is told in the first person by an Anglo archaeologist working


on the reservation who observes the events but participates in them only peripherally, as an outsider. The story tells of Lucille’s homecoming to the reservation from boarding school, her affair with the Anglo proprietor of a nearby trading post, and her subsequent suicide when she cannot find a place in reservation society but has no alternatives.\textsuperscript{171} Sardonically naming the story “Higher Education”—many policymakers and missionaries believed that a boarding school education would elevate the Indian people out of what these Anglos saw as uncivilized reservation life—La Farge demonstrated the complete severance from Navajo society that boarding school children experienced, and the inability to rejoin that community when they returned to the reservation.

The narrative of Navajo people negotiating between cultures in 1930s Arizona is revealed in nonfiction as well. \textit{Desert Wife} is the autobiography of Hilda Faunce, who with her husband was a trader on the Navajo Reservation. Often trading posts were the centers of community on reservations, serving as buyers of Indian goods and sellers of supplies, and a place where news was exchanged from both within and outside of the reservation. The Faunce’s trading post was of this type.

Faunce described her first glimpse of Arizona and her thoughts about it, this from the perspective of a woman who has lived in and is traveling from Oregon:

“Each step seemed to carry us farther from every comfort, from the very last trace of civilization. More than once I was panicky. I wondered what Ken could see in country like this. The emptiness, the barrenness, the vastness threatened me. Almost I cried out to him to turn back; I could not face life in a country without one spear of green grass, with nothing but rocks and bare dirt, with never a human being in sight.”\textsuperscript{172} As

\footnote{171} Oliver La Farge, “Higher Education,” \textit{Saturday Evening Post} (March 31, 1934), reprinted in Caffey, 45.

\footnote{172} Hilda Faunce, \textit{Desert Wife} (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co. 1934), 58.
it has with so many others, the Arizona desert grew on Faunce. She described the landscape during sunset, writing, "Suddenly the sun was gone. The east was a glory unbelievable until one looked at the west. Here was a jumble of blue and purple cloud shadows and scarlet flame high lights with gigantic rays of brilliant yellow shooting high into the heavens. There was color in the desert itself, not in vegetation, but in the very earth and rocks. In the afternoon sun the reds and blacks and blues had seemed unreal enough; but I would never have believed, had I not seen them, what they could be in the light of the sunset." ¹⁷³

Faunce also described the people, occasionally the Anglos who lived and worked at other trading posts and at the edge of the reservation, but mostly her story was about the Navajo people. Describing an encounter with a Navajo schoolgirl at a neighbor’s hogan, she wrote, "The schoolgirl sat on the box that held the cooking things and said, laughing a little, ‘I may be Navajo, but I can’t sit on the ground any more without my feet going to sleep. I work in a missionary’s family near the Indian School and Ship Rock and I am to be here only a few days more. I’m glad; it’s too hard to keep my clothes clean and I don’t get along very well with ‘blanket Indians’; I have been away too long.’” ¹⁷⁴

Like the characters in The Enemy Gods, the Navajos whom Faunce knew were navigating cultural divides. She described the reaction of parents when the Indian agents arrive to take the children to school, "The Indian agent, the highest official on the reservation, wanted one child in each family sent to the government school; but most families hid the children from the authorities." One child sent to the reservation school, John Mitchell, now an adult in Faunce’s telling, finds himself in a position similar to Lucille’s in La Farge’s “Higher Education,” with no discernable way to fit in

¹⁷³ Ibid., 67.
¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 92.
when he returned home. Trained as a mechanic at the boarding school, Mitchell cannot find employment among the white people and has nothing on which to ply his trade on the reservation except the windmills, which many other Navajos can also repair. In Desert Wife, John Mitchell was described as a lout of a man who, unable to find his way in either Anglo or Navajo culture, steals from his people and robs their ancestors’ graves. In “Higher Education,” unable to find her way, Lucille throws herself off a cliff. In The Enemy Gods Myron Begay fares little better, committing murder in Flagstaff after betraying his people, telling lies about their ceremonies to a group of missionaries and aid members in an effort to make himself appear more civilized.

The Enemy Gods received favorable reviews in the national media. One reviewer called the book “a powerful and penetrating novel” and remarked on its revelation of the effects of “well-meant attempts to change racial habits, racial beliefs.” Another reviewer declared that until “reservation schools or missionary colleges produce” a Navajo scholar with the fine skills of writing and storytelling, “we shall have, in all probability, no pictures of the Navajo as fine and serious as these Mr. La Farge has given us.” This reviewer stated that “in the ordinary way of things,” only a Navajo could tell the story of being caught between native and white. That is, if a Navajo who could speak and write English could tell his story, the rest of the world would finally understand the damage caused by government policies. The reviewer understood the result of policy, that Native Americans have “been so strangely and sometimes so brutally victimized by two conflicting cultural patterns” but failed to grasp an underlying issue, the destructive policies revealed in the very

book under review, as is evident in her belief that only reservation schools and missionary colleges could, or should, produce a fine Navajo scholar.\textsuperscript{176}  

There is a subtle recognition in the words La Farge gave the old man to speak to Myron Begay and Homer Gatewood in \textit{The Enemy Gods}, an understanding of the power of the written word, its supremacy in this case, and the importance of an orally-based society to learn it to gain power. “By paper and by wires he talks to his friends in the distance, he leaves his words behind him when he goes away,” the grandfather says.\textsuperscript{177} The Navajos, and all people with an oral tradition but with no written language, have histories and traditions, and stories to share. But the power inherent in the written word to create and control was recognized, at least by Oliver La Farge, an Anglo writer telling stories about Indians. As Native Americans learned to read and write English and claimed that power, their own stories became part of Arizona’s intellectual landscape and helped to create the place with their words.

\textbf{AS-TOLD-TO AUTOBIOGRAPHIES}

Native Americans’ first-person accounts did exist in the 1930s, stories told by Indian people, recounting life on Arizona’s Indian reservations; these as-told-to autobiographies became popular during the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{178} Told by Indian

---


\textsuperscript{177} La Farge, \textit{The Enemy Gods}, 46.

people in their native languages to interpreters, these life stories were translated, transcribed, reviewed, and published by Anglo ethnographers. Wholly unlike the reporting-foreign-peoples style of the FWP bulletins, more detailed and personal than Oliver La Farge’s fictional stories of reservation life, and beyond J. B. Priestley and the WPA writers’ frames of reference, these autobiographies reveal Native Americans living the way people have always lived, hoping for, as La Farge wrote, “more rain, less sickness (and prayer is effective for both of these), a little more land perhaps, good hunting in the fall, peace within the community, peace all around, not to be pushed around by white people, above all peace and continuity.”

Each telling, each book, begins with several paragraphs that describe the process of receiving the story. The ethnologist identified an “informant,” usually a person in the community with whom the scientist had a comfortable relationship and had been working closely with for several years. Rather than ask questions, the ethnologist allowed the story to unfold from the teller’s memory in whatever manner he or she recalled. An interpreter translated the story bit by bit and the English version was written down and clarified. Often the ethnologist ordered the story chronologically and removed repetitive details, but otherwise the story remained unchanged, autobiographical rather than biographical. Well-known ethnologist Edward Sapir supported the recording of these autobiographies, writing, “And so there arises, partly under cover of orthodox ethnology, partly in unconcern of it, the primitive case history—biography or autobiography. One discovers that a ‘primitive’ can talk, often prefers to talk, about his personal memories even where they do not

---

179 La Farge, Raw Material, 154.
Anthropologist Walter Dyk spent the early 1930s studying clan and kin relationships on the Navajo Reservation. To provide context for the data he was collecting, he began writing the life histories of some of his informants. A “more pedestrian tale was needed,” Dyk believed, “some long slow narrative that recalled the ordinary, the petty, the humdrum insignificant affairs as well. With a view to obtaining such material, not alone for the light it might throw on the functions of clan and kin but on Navajo life in general, I asked one of my informants, an old man, Left Handed by name, to relate what he could remember of his life, insisting that he leave out nothing, no matter how trivial.” Old Man Hat was Left Handed’s father’s older clan brother.

Left Handed’s narrative began in the spring of 1868 with the story of his birth at the time of the Navajo’s long journey home after four years at Fort Sumner, and ended with his marriage, about twenty years later. The Son of Old Man Hat was about sixty-six years old when he told his stories, recollections of daily activities on the reservation. He tells of sheep and goat herding, cooking and eating, and playing with other children. The reader learned about reservation social life, dances, visiting relatives, marriages. This was Arizona as Navajos know it, Left Handed’s Arizona taking form for the readers.

The importance of sheep to Navajo life and culture is reflected in the stories. Left Handed tells this story from his early childhood: “About this time I began to herd

---


around the hogan in the morning and evening when the sheep came home. But I was so small. I went out with the sheep like a dog. I just walked along with them and stayed right in the middle of the herd. I was afraid to go around them, but while I was in the middle of the sheep I wasn’t afraid of anything.”¹⁸² A reviewer of the book commented on this aspect of the story, the daily life that centered on sheep herding. The Navajo’s “dependence on these animals and methods of herding and breeding are brought out here” something new in the body of literature about the Navajo people at the time.¹⁸³

Ruth Underhill worked as an ethnologist for the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Tohono O’odham Reservation in southern Arizona in the early 1930s. She wrote several books, scholarly and fictional, about the people, called Papago then. Maria Chona was Underhill’s “hostess, guide, and means of introduction to the various villages,” as well as an informant. Chona’s father was the governor of Mesquite Root, “an ancient village now abandoned, and Chona spent her girlhood there under conditions differing very little from those of pre-Spanish days.”¹⁸⁴ In the introduction Underhill explained that Indian storytelling methods differed from Anglo telling styles and “involve a repetition and a dwelling on unimportant details which confuse the White reader.” As such, she acknowledged, “It is an Indian story told to satisfy Whites rather than Indians.”¹⁸⁵ Underhill revealed a cultural divide that ethnologists

¹⁸² Left Handed, 8.


believed existed, and perhaps it did, a lack of Anglo understanding but also a lack of patience for Indian narrative style.

Underhill chose Maria Chona for “reasons other than intimacy and opportunity . . . She is not the aberrant type, which so frequently attracts the attention of the White investigator. She accepted her culture completely, and one reason for choosing her was that she had come into contact with so many of its important phases.” Underhill was interested in Chona’s life, differing from male informants in that as a woman, Chona “could take no active part in the ceremonial life. But her father was a governor and a warrior; her brother and one husband were shamans; her second husband was a song leader and composer. And a Papago woman’s history is interesting in itself, because, in this culture, there persists strongly the fear of woman’s impurity with all its consequent social adjustments.” However Chona was not the ideal, or perhaps stereotypical Papago woman that Underhill identified. As a child Chona started composing songs. “Making songs is the Papago achievement par excellence, all outward acts being considered merely as a preparation for it,” Underhill told the reader. “She had some urge to accomplish, as the men accomplished, and the proper avenue was song making. So Chona made songs and saw visions, and had to have her shaman’s crystals cut out by a minor operation” because song making was not a female occupation. 186

Nevertheless Chona composed songs as she grew older, simple songs, Underhill explained. Often songs are changed by the composer “only by a word or two,” the reader learns, “from songs which had been well known for years. Many

186 Ibid., 4. Underhill did not elaborate on what type of surgery was required. According to Jill Leslie McKeever Furst, in the First Times, when I’itoi spat on the shaman’s head, I’itoi’s saliva formed stones, which “sank into the shaman’s heart.” Tohono O’odham people believe every shaman has four stones in his or her heart (The Natural History of the Soul in Mexico [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997], 55-56).
Papago compose in this way . . . None consider it plagiarism, for song making is the spiritual crown conferred on one who has already achieved in the physical world.”

Studying this aspect of Tohono O’odham culture persuaded Underhill to write *Singing for Power*, a book about song that both underlies and girds the Tohono O’odham culture. This book also provided context, the origins and purposes of the songs. A song’s genesis originates in the power within the song creator. Each song also holds power and confers power.

Sharlot Hall’s poetry developed from her life as a pioneer woman in northern Arizona. Tohono O’odham songs arise from lives lived in the southern Arizona deserts. Both are Arizona narratives, in verse. Underhill provided the setting for O’odham songs and created a picture of hard living in a hard place for her readers, writing in the introduction, “So the Papagos wandered, calm and smiling, back and forth across the waste of brilliant barrenness which Elder Brother, their god, had given them. They shot the ground squirrels and the rats and birds. They picked the caterpillars from the bushes. They shook the seeds from every blade of wild grass. They brushed the spines from cactus stems and roasted them for hours in a pit with a fire over it.” The old woman who related this story to Underhill said, “To you Whites, Elder Brother gave wheat and peaches and grapes. To us, he gave the wild seeds and the cactus. Those are the good foods.”

Tohono O’odham songs are not only methods of self-expression. Underhill tells the reader, “It was a magic which called upon the powers of Nature and constrained them to man’s will. People sang in trouble, in danger, to cure the sick, to confound their enemies, and to make the crops grow. They sang as they fought and

---
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as they worked, all together . . . In such a community, song became not only the practical basis of Papago life, but also the most precious possession of the people. The power of song was an honor to be earned; it could not be assumed lightly at the mere whim of an individual.\(^{189}\)

Underhill described cultural differences between Anglo and O’odham response to singers and song makers. In Anglo culture, “the singer stands outside the practical stream of life, and is thought of, perhaps even by most of us, as an idler.” But in the Tohono O’odham culture, Underhill explained, “The honored men are singers. The man who has fought for his people gets no honor from that fact, but only from the attendant fact that he was able to ‘receive’—or compose, shall we say—a song . . . What of a society which puts no premium whatever on aggressiveness and where the practical man is valued only if he is also a poet? What of a society where the misfit, wandering hopelessly misunderstood on the outskirts of life, is not the artist, but the unimaginative young businessman? This society not only exists but has existed for hundreds of years.\(^{190}\)

The origin of this Tohono O’odham philosophy is found in their creation story. The O’odham live in a land scattered with ancient structures, Underhill explained. “Archaeologists are still hunting for these vanished people, who built the Casa Grande, five stories high. The Papagos know where they went: Iitoi drove them, some to the north and some to the south. We may conjecture whether they are to be found mingled with the present Pueblos of New Mexico and Arizona or confounded with peoples of the almost obliterated cultures of ancient Mexico.” The O’odham know what battle was fought at each place and, according to Underhill, “They know that the actual conquest came through singing: ‘Iitoi had a song for everything.’

\(^{189}\) Ibid. 5, 6.

\(^{190}\) Ibid., 7–8.
Though his men did the fighting [that would be the Tohono O’odham people, whom he brought up from underground], Iitoi confirmed their efforts by singing the enemy into blindness and helplessness. So he laid the foundations for the Papago world.”

One of the most essential practices for Tohono O’odham life in the desert is the annual ceremony to bring the rains. The traditional rituals begin at the end of the dry season, at the time of year when the saguaro fruit ripens. The fruit is harvested, the pulp mixed with water, and the mixture allowed to ferment for two days. “The making and drinking of cactus liquor is Papago rain magic,” Underhill wrote, and “it is the duty of every man to drink his fill of this liquor; to drink to a saturation, even as the rain-soaked earth is saturated. In accordance with the rules of Papago magic, which always imitates the desired event, this act will bring the rain to moisten the earth.”

Within Quijotoa Mountain
There is thunder.
I looked through it and saw
In every direction
Light!
Wind came, clouds came.
I sat above them. Underneath, the mirage glittered.
Rain fell,
The mirage was gone.

Corn is forming.
Beside it, squash is forming.
In the yellow flowers
The flies sing.

Following the ceremony for pulling down the clouds, the season of rain comes and the corn is planted. Underhill writes, “Night after night, the planter walks around

191 Ibid., 14.

192 Ibid., 21–22.

his field ‘singing up the corn.’ There is a song for corn as high as his knee, for corn waist high, and for corn with the tassel forming.  

The corn comes up;  
It comes up green;  
Here upon our fields  
Green leaves blow in the breeze.  
Blue evening falls,  
Blue evening falls;  
Near by, in every direction,  
It sets the corn tassels trembling.  
The wind smoothes well the ground.  
Yonder the wind runs  
Upon our fields.  
The corn leaves tremble.

This is the place that the Tohono O’odham people knew; their Arizona was collected and translated by the Anglo ethnologist and written for an Anglo readership that was seeking explanations for a Native American way of life that existed outside of the Euro-American cultural understanding. The Tohono O’odham narratives and songs were co-opted rather than imparted by the storytellers themselves, the versions Anglos received and consumed were only part of their story, a corrupted story that facilitated a false sense of understanding and contributed to the paternalistic attitudes of American Anglo society.

Similar to Underhill’s translating and publishing of O’odham songs, *Truth of a Hopi* is a collection of Hopi clan stories told by Edmund Nequatewa, a Hopi man from Shongopovi, and edited by Mary-Russell Colton of the Museum of Northern Arizona. However, Nequatewa, who ran away from boarding school as a child but as an adult worked at the museum, wrote his stories in English, providing the translation himself; Colton’s role is to clarify, fact-check, and add explanatory footnotes,

---

194 Underhill, *Singing for Power*, 43.

195 Ibid., 44.
providing a semblance of Anglo control even as Nequatewa tells his own story.\textsuperscript{196} Colton explained that the stories “represent the origin, myths, and history of a group of Hopi clans. They carry us from the very beginning of things down to modern times.”\textsuperscript{197} Countering J. B. Priestley’s assertion that all of Arizona’s culture was new, the Hopi narratives demonstrated that people had inhabited the place and made lives from it long before the appearance of the paved roads and bright lights that captured Priestley’s attention.

Colton explained that the Hopi traditions are passed from father to son orally. When boys reach maturity they are initiated into the sacred societies and are taught the stories, traditions, and history of their people. “Since the intrusion of the White Man and the development of his school system,” Colton wrote, “there has been a consequent breaking down of the ancient customs.” Young men are initiated at older ages. Old men complain about the inattention to the traditions and stories. They “are fearful that their history and traditions may fall into confusion and be forever lost to the coming generations.”\textsuperscript{198} While Colton’s explanation for Nequatewa’s motivation to set down the stories in writing was his fear of their loss, the publication of \textit{Truth of a Hopi} also provided a Hopi representation of Arizona for readers.

The words in \textit{Truth of a Hopi} represent the Hopi people’s understanding of the place, the stories that create their Arizona. The narratives explained how the Hopis came to the Mesas, one clan at a time, but one clan lagged behind. “They were traveling away behind,” Nequatewa wrote, “and they were rather slow because they


\textsuperscript{197} Nequatewa, 3.

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., 4.
would stop to cultivate the land and raise corn to supply them for a few years. They thought that they would build houses and make pottery by which they would mark this land as they went along.”  

The Hopi regard these places where their ancestors paused as the footprints of their people. The Hopis call these ancestors *Hisatsinom*; archaeological evidence supports a Hopi connection to archaeological sites in northern Arizona.  

The archaeological study of ancestral footprints of the Hopi and other ancient people provided new narratives in 1937, as the archaeologists recorded their findings and popular print media reproduced the theories and findings for the public.

**Archaeological Reports and Popular Works**

Archaeological activity increased throughout the Southwest in the 1930s. The public was fascinated with the projects, from start to finish. They were interested in the excavations—the landscape before the digging commenced and the reconstructions after the excavating (because at that time, reconstruction of the buildings and villages often was part of the process)—and the material culture findings. They were interested in the archaeologists’ theories about the people who had lived in the structures and left their footprints behind. Native Americans had their own stories about the people who had come before them. Some tribes considered them ancestors, the oral traditions of other tribes told of how their own ancestors had driven the village builders away. Sometimes the native stories and the scientists’ theories mirrored one another, sometimes not. This Arizona written into being for the English-reading public contributed to a more complex understanding of

---

199 “The Hopi Decide to Seek a New Home. How Certain Clans Received Their Names,” in Nequatewa, 34.

the place; its cultural landscape was not simply the shiny new cities found in Priestley’s descriptions or the abandoned civilizations and simple Indian people described in the Arizona Guide. However, archaeologists imagining this ancient Arizona eliminated Native American traditions and history and their narratives that claimed the place and people as ancestors.

An ancient Arizona was created in layers of written words for readers. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the American reading public became aware of ancient structures in Arizona through the pages of the New York Times, articles that chronicled excavations, explained theories, and connected the ancient to the modern. In the 1930s, the archaeologists sent to excavate the sites wrote reports to document laborious and tedious processes and to construct theoretical frameworks. The reports were rewritten into lay-language and published in magazines and newspapers. Comparisons were made between native stories about the ancient people and archaeologists’ theories. In 1937, eight of Arizona’s eleven national monuments were dedicated to preserving ancient structures and imparting information about them to the general public, and the public’s interest was reflected in high attendance to these sites.201

Excavations at Snaketown, a site along the Gila River downstream from Sacaton on the Gila River Indian Reservation, began in 1934 under the direction of Emil Haury. Noted as a “major scientific discovery,” the area appeared to be a series of desert mounds whose only inhabitants were the rattlesnake colonies that gave the site its name. However, the archaeologists “uncovered the remains of a sophisticated, prehistoric farming culture that had once spread across the upper

201 See, for example, “Many Visit Casa Ruins: March Travel to National Monument and Arizona Cities Sets Record,” Los Angeles Times, May 12, 1935. Tuzigoot was named a National Monument in 1939, raising those numbers to nine of twelve.
Sonoran desert, with influences extending as far north as present-day Flagstaff.\textsuperscript{202}

The excavations at Snaketown allowed Haury and his colleagues at Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation to build on the theory of a new culture concept, a Hohokam people separate and different from Ancestral Puebloan or Mogollon cultures that had been revealed during an excavation at Roosevelt Lake a few years before.\textsuperscript{203}

The Snaketown excavation report was published in 1938. A heavy, thick book, it is full of descriptions and charts, pictures and diagrams, explanations and inquiries on every plot of land and piece of material culture explored during the dig. One of the most interesting finds, something that puzzled the archaeologist, captured public attention, and complicated an understanding of the place was the discovery of an unusual landscape feature—unnatural depressions in the desert. Large and oval-bowl shaped, these depressions consisted of two parallel earthen banks over sixty yards long, nearly forty yards apart, and almost three yards in height, with an open space between the banks and at each end.\textsuperscript{204} Similar features had been found in other places in Arizona. Speculation dating to the 1890s labeled them reservoirs or sun temples, corrals or dance arenas.

In 1918 Frank H. Pinkley, the Superintendent of Southwestern Monuments, trenched and excavated several of these depression features near Casa Grande. His


report, published in 1935, "showed, beyond doubt, the existence of a floor, of prepared side walls and in the case of the Casa Grande structure, of a stone in the center of the floor under which were bits of shell and turquoise." Pinkley theorized that the structures were areas for ceremonies, games, or festivals. As the excavation of one of the depressions at Snaketown continued and its features were uncovered, the archaeologists began comparing it to the ball courts of Central America. "But to find ball courts 1500 miles from their supposed point of origin," Haury wrote, "was somewhat of a shock and it immediately started questions dealing with origin, relationship, and time implications which it was impossible to answer."²⁰⁵

Considering the possibility that the depression at Snaketown was a ball court similar to those in Central America, archaeologists at other sites began to study their features in this light. John C. McGregor of the Museum of Northern Arizona analyzed two depressions near Flagstaff and found they were comparable to the Snaketown court in many ways. Haury writes, "Since the identification of the Snaketown structures as ball courts, they have been noted almost everywhere in southern Arizona and even well into northern Arizona."²⁰⁶ That the inhabitants of this past Arizona could have been culturally connected surprised archaeologists; their theories had not accounted for a communications or trade network that might explain the presence of similar features throughout Arizona.

Arizona Highways documented these finds, making the connection for its readers between the ball courts discovered in northern Arizona during a salvage archaeology excavation for a highway a few miles north of Wupatki, and the courts excavated by Haury at Snaketown in southern Arizona. "Because of the difference in climate and altitude between southern and northern parts of Arizona little thought

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 37, 38.
²⁰⁶ Ibid., 39, 44.
was given to the possibility of any form of communication between the two areas,” Bob Eunson wrote. The excavations “demonstrate some form of communication between the early residents of the south and the prehistoric dwellers of the north.”

The *New York Times* also wrote about these discoveries, and contributed to readers’ understanding of Arizona. “Game courts resembling the ball courts of the ancient Mayans were built by the Pueblo III Indians of Northern Arizona 800 years ago,” the reporter wrote. The article noted similar discoveries, those in southern Arizona by Haury, which led to the conclusion that the structures were ball courts, and a similar feature excavated at Wupatki in northern Arizona. The *NY Times* article explained the significance of communication between northern and southern Arizona and between ancient Arizona and Central America using Eunson’s *Arizona Highways* article language verbatim. By 1937 it could be shown that the people of ancient Arizona were socially connected to and communicated with communities far to the south. What had seemed prehistoric before the discoveries now appeared somewhat more sophisticated.

Another feature revealed in the Snaketown excavation that contributed to the changing representation of Arizona’s early indigenous cultures as being simple or unsophisticated was the discovery of an ancient canal system. Until recently the nearby Akimel O’odham people had made use of some of these canals, irrigating hundreds of acres of farmland. Anglos had known of, and used, some of the canals in the Salt River Valley, but the increased archaeological attention to the region added
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207 Bob Eunson, “Did the Ancients Know? Recent Archaeological Find in Northern Arizona Turns Strange Light on Life Long Ago,” *Arizona Highways* 12, no. 2 (February 1936): 8. Eunson was Assistant to the State Director of the Federal Writers’ Project, Ross Santee’s second in command.

208 “Game Courts Are Dug Up,” *New York Times*, November 24, 1935. Identifying Arizona’s ancient structures with the Mayan culture was not a novel occurrence. Montezuma Castle and Montezuma Well were named under the misconception that they must have been built by ancient Mayan immigrants.
to the number of narratives written about these past farmers in the desert. The *New York Times* reported on the canal systems of the Salt and Gila river valleys, telling its readers that there must have been many people living in the community to have built such an extensive network. Quoting Neill Judd of the Smithsonian Institution, who was preparing an aerial survey of the canals, the *NY Times* reporter wrote, “These canals are remains of real agricultural communities that existed in these sections of what is now Arizona many centuries ago . . . It is a true agricultural culture, in which these people used irrigation methods for the growing of their crops.” Judd continued, explaining, “Many of these waterways would do credit to present-time construction methods. They followed the contour of the land almost perfectly, and often excavations were made through rises in the ground that must have required months or even years to complete.”

Of the centuries-old system, Haury wrote, “No single accomplishment of the Hohokam commands as much respect as their canal systems, designed to irrigate otherwise unproductive land. This achievement forms the very foundation of their complex culture and on it all of their accomplishments were more or less directly dependent.” The archaeologist estimated the Snaketown canal was over ten miles long, comparing it with the Casa Grande canal, which was over sixteen miles in length. The presence of canals added to that sense of the sophistication of ancient Arizona and deepened the popular perception of the state’s indigenous people that

---


had been created in the words of newspaper articles in the nineteen teens and in the *Arizona Guide* and FWP bulletins.\(^{211}\)

Another archaeological excavation, Tuzigoot in central Arizona in the Verde Valley, increased the complexity and depth of readers’ understanding of Arizona’s cultural landscape, further complicating the idea of the state’s “newness.” Excavated under the direction of University of Arizona graduate students Louis R. Caywood and Edward Spicer, the work began in October 1933 with an eight-man crew and was funded by Federal Emergency Relief money. In November the project was reorganized as an Arizona project under the recently established Civil Works Administration. The project, completed in June 1934, undertook the complete excavation and partial reconstruction of the structure, and the preservation of its walls and floors.

The excavation report locates Tuzigoot “on a ridge of horizontal strata of Verde Lake deposits of impure white limestone and reddish sandstone” rising steeply from the valley floor, and includes the excavation plan, an explanation of the layout of the rooms, and a chronology describing when each room was built.\(^{212}\) “The first building that took place at the site of Tuzigoot, no doubt, was on the very summit of the ridge,” the archaeologists wrote. “The site would not have been selected at all if it had not been planned to take advantage of the most commanding area available, whether for purposes of protection or for sheer beauty of location. This deduction is

\(^{211}\) Phoenix got its name from the idea of a new city rising from the ashes of an old one, one in which the remnants of its canal system were visible to and utilized by the place’s more recent inhabitants.

borne out by the fact that the rooms at the lowest level of the ridge offer no indication of long periods of occupation, while remains on the top of the ridge give clear evidence of successive periods of building and long occupation.” The archaeologists estimated that as many as 450 people lived in the structure in what had included seventy-seven first-floor rooms and fifteen second-floor rooms at the height of occupation.213

An Arizona Highways’ article about Tuzigoot contains details not found in the excavation report, explaining for instance, “some of the discoveries made in the excavating were unusual, even in archaeological circles. The jewelry, especially, was of rare quality, with its intricate mosaic and its shell work.”214 Another difference, possibly an artistic license, was this description of burials: “Skeletons of the buried dead, found often under the floors of the rooms, remnants of tapestry-like cloth, charred grains, shells from coastal water, pottery from tribes far north or south—all these articles told a story to the skilled scientific minds [of Caywood and Spicer]. To them it was plain that the ancient dwellers of the ruins had been peaceful agriculturists, comparatively unsuperstitious, and skilled at trading with other tribes”215. However, Caywood and Spicer’s report described only one piece of cloth found, although impressions of woven cloth were discovered in the refuse. The conclusions reached by the Arizona Highways article may be inferred from the report but Caywood and Spicer make no outright conclusions like those found in the article.

213 Ibid. 38, 40.

214 Gladys Thompson Niehuis, “Tuzigoot Ruins: An Account of Arizona’s Newest National Monument,” Arizona Highways 15, no. 9 (September 1939): 5. Rosaline Svob was Niehuis’s tour guide on her trip to Tuzigoot, and perhaps her source for the information in the article. Svob is thanked in the introduction of Caywood and Spicer’s excavation report for her lab work in taking “care of skeletal material” (see Caywood and Spicer, Tuzigoot: The Excavation and Repair, 2).

215 Niehuis, 5.
The author of the article and the archaeologists, and it can be assumed the general public as well, wondered what happened to the inhabitants of Tuzigoot. Hopi tradition tells that structures like these across northern Arizona’s landscape are their ancestor’s stopping places, places where they rested and lived while migrating to the Hopi Mesas. For Hopi people, the structures are not ruins but the footprints of their ancestors. This was not the story the Anglo archaeologists told.\(^{216}\)

Caywood and Spicer questioned an apparent abandonment at the height of occupation, with no evidence of “decadence or no violent and sudden catastrophe in the last quarter of the thirteenth century,” though they draw no specific conclusions. Niehuis wondered as well, adding details not found in the excavation report and assigning conclusions to the archaeologists that they had not made. “We wonder,” she wrote, “as you will, what happened to the former residents; there were no unburied skeletons found. It must have been something urgent indeed, to have taken them away in the midst of the preparation of a meal, leaving everything, even tables set, in some instances . . . Scientists have three alternative solutions: invasion and capture by warring tribes, pestilence of a swift and devastating type, or drought that became unbearable.”\(^{217}\) That no set tables and meals in the midst of being prepared can be found in the excavation report leaves one wondering where this information came from. Nonetheless, set tables and interrupted meal preparation became part of Tuzigoot’s story because of these words, and the Native American stories about it remained invisible in the written narrative landscape.

\(^{216}\) For an examination of archaeologists obscuring of Hopi narratives see Lomayumtewa C. Ishii, “Western Science Comes to the Hopis: Critically Deconstructing the Origins of an Imperialist Canon,” *Wicazo Sa Review* 25, no. 2 (Fall 2010): 65-88.

CONCLUSION

At the time of Arizona’s twenty-fifth anniversary of statehood in 1937, the state had been created in movies as a Wild West place of tough ranchers and renegade Indians and rugged landscapes. The Arizona created in words was more complex, even as clichéd descriptions persisted. The Arizona desert provoked a thoughtful reflection on the state’s seeming egalitarian society and on American community and leadership. Many Americans’ introduction to Arizona came via the words in the *Arizona Guide* and Federal Writers’ Project bulletins. Those bulletins, Oliver La Farge’s fiction, and the as-told-to Native American autobiographies revealed an Arizona separate and apart from, but profoundly affected by the place most Anglo readers knew, yet the stories were still told from an Anglo perspective, were filtered through Anglo words, and retained a measure of Anglo control. Archaeologists’ reports and the subsequent rewriting of their theories and conclusions in popular print media created an ancient Arizona for readers.

Future words about Arizona would be influenced by the growing concern over human impact on the natural environment. While words would continue to reflect a boosting mentality, to increase tourism and investment in the state, the written intellectual landscape of Arizona would come to include challenges to the way resources were manipulated and extracted, and questions about the influence of the cultural landscape on the natural landscape.
Arizona marked its fiftieth anniversary of statehood on February 14, 1962. Speaking at the celebration at the state capital in Phoenix, Postmaster General J. Edward Day declared, “We are standing today in the midst of a land once described by Daniel Webster as ‘a barren waste of prairie dogs, cactus, and shifting sands, incapable of producing anything, and therefore, not worth retaining.’ Look about you at this beautiful, thriving, rapidly expanding city, a fitting symbol of the progress that typifies Arizona today.”218 That barren wasteland, describing the greater Southwest of which Arizona was just a part, contained abundant quantities of oil and natural gas under its shifting sands and rich deposits of coal within its northeastern mesas. The same sun that warmed the earth for cactus also proved to be irresistible to tourists and retirees. The juxtaposing of useless wastes and thriving city in Day’s words mirrored a national discussion involving questions of land value and use, with real consequences in Arizona.

At the age of fifty, Arizona was a place where natural resources, uranium in addition to copper, were extracted in record amounts. It was a place where the population increased dramatically as the new electronics industries moved into the state, as former GIs who had received basic and advanced training at the many military bases moved permanently to state, and as the service industry grew to accommodate the many visitors drawn by sunny days and outdoor activities. In 1960 the population of the Phoenix metropolitan area was nearly what the entire state’s population had been at the twenty-fifth anniversary, around a half million people.

Arizona’s population once again more than doubled in those twenty-five years, to 1,302,000.\(^{219}\)

Day’s words, and the publications produced for the fiftieth anniversary, lauded the Arizona of growth and industry. However, narratives written about Arizona in the 1960s reveal a growing concern over environmental questions, a conservation consciousness that addressed land use and doubted the wisdom, even the morality, of resource extraction. These words built on the belief articulated by Wallace Stegner in his 1960 letter to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, wherein he advocates for wilderness preservation, an idea of wilderness “for spiritual renewal.” “We need wilderness preserved,” Stegner wrote, “as much of it as is still left, and as many kinds—because it was the challenge against which our character as a people was formed. The reminder and the reassurance that it is still there is good for our spiritual health even if we never once in ten years set foot in it.”\(^{220}\)

Naturalists and conservationists wrote about an Arizona that had value because of the beauty of its natural landscapes, its isolated spaces, and what these places could do for the soul. Arizona lent itself to examining such questions, and in the examining, writers imagined and wrote into being for their readers the place they believed Arizona should and could become. Well-known naturalist Joseph Wood Krutch spoke with authority as he wrote about Arizona deserts from the position of a resident, albeit newly relocated, not an outsider. Ann Woodin became familiar to


readers for her book about Arizona. Her descriptions of living in the Sonoran Desert made the place accessible to readers unfamiliar with desert life and offered a contrast to other bodies of literature about desert residents such as early pioneers and Native Americans. Woodin’s words about living in the desert contrasted with the writing of Helen Sekaquaptewa, a Hopi woman who lived most of her life in Arizona’s deserts. In a fine example of words creating a place for readers, Eliot Porter and David Brower’s book about Glen Canyon created and re-recreated a place that became the epicenter of the struggle between industry and conservation.

Many of the voices speaking for Arizona, its government (the governor and the Arizona Development Board) and its powerful newspaper publishers and businessmen, wrote as if Arizona had already, finally, arrived, and had become what it was meant to be and would continue to be—a growing population center with a multitude of resources to collect and sell. Newspaper reporters, within and outside of the state, wrote about an Arizona growing miraculously, both in population and in business opportunities. Los Angeles Times reporter Gene Sherman wrote jealously about the state as a southern Californian remembering when his state was the phenomenon. Arizona’s fiftieth anniversary publications reinforced long-standing clichés and continued to emphasize claims of opportunity and already-abundant prosperity.

Visual media continued to expand and provide additional information to and competition with the printed word. Full-color photographs of the state’s rugged rust-red desert-scapes and lush green forests appeared regularly in the pages of Arizona Highways. Movies such as 3:10 to Yuma (1957) and The Greatest Story Ever Told (1963) brought a version of the Arizona landscape to moviegoers throughout the country. Viewers could tune in to Arizona weekly with television series such as The Deputy (1959–1961) and Annie Oakley (1954–1965). These images and stories
reflect the ideas of Arizona’s past. The Arizona characterized in the printed word reveals a more complex place. Krutch’s publications about the Arizona desert brought a view different than that of developers and boosters, as did Woodin’s and Sekaquaptewa’s memoirs. Porter and Brower’s Glen Canyon created in words and pictures a place that would soon no longer exist, and reporter Gene Sherman wrote about the state with an outsider’s perspective influenced by his residency in southern California. The clichés of extremes, the dichotomy of Arizona’s landscapes—stark desert and lush forests, Old West and Modern Miracle—remained present in the words.

**JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH, THE DESERT YEAR AND OTHER DESERT WRITINGS**

Just as time in the Arizona desert led to J. B. Priestley’s rumination on American society in 1937, so did the Arizona desert influence Krutch’s ideas of open space and the preservation of natural landscapes. Krutch’s belief in the value of the natural world beyond that of its material use was “influenced and shaped to a large extent by the natural phenomena that he observed in the Sonoran Desert,”

221 ideas that his home in the desert enriched and cultivated. Earlier in his life, Krutch had disliked the desert, and used it as “an analogy for despair and alienation.”

222 The Sonoran Desert transformed Krutch into a desert lover and an advocate of the natural world, just as he wrote to transform readers’ perceptions of deserts and nature. A drama critic for *The Nation* magazine, Krutch began teaching drama at Columbia University in 1937. He became an author of some renown, writing biographies of Samuel Johnson and Henry David Thoreau, and exploring issues

---


facing modern humanity. However, it was his desert works for which he became best known.\footnote{223}

Krutch’s desert home during his sabbatical year from teaching in the early 1950s was in Arizona’s Sonoran Desert, about ten miles north of Tucson on Ina Road, and only a mile from the Santa Catalina Mountains. He described the mountains, “close the horizon with stone slopes thinly clad in a dark green which at this distance looks more like moss or lichen than the scattered shrubs which have found there a precarious foothold.”\footnote{224} It was a sparsely settled area with only a few roofs visible from his home. Krutch arranged with publisher Bill Sloane to write a book exploring the experiences of a newcomer “whose innocence and ignorance might give a special tone to his discovery of the desert and desert life.”\footnote{225} It was during that stay that Krutch and his wife decided to move to Tucson permanently.

Krutch had visited the Arizona desert several times, as a “traveler” in his words. His purpose for living in the desert during that sabbatical year was “to live for fifteen months in a world which will, I hope, lose the charm of the strange only to take on the more powerful charm of the familiar.” He hoped “to look at, to listen to, and this time if possible, to be more intimately a part of, something whose meaning I have sensed but not understood.”\footnote{226} It is the search for this meaning in the desert,


\footnote{226}{Krutch, \textit{The Desert Year}, 8, 11.}
something beyond the material, that pervaded Krutch’s writing and contributed to his evolving philosophy.

Krutch’s descriptions of the Arizona desert reflected the perception of a man whose eyes have seen and whose mind has contemplated landscapes in the eastern section of the United States. Unlike other authors, Oliver La Farge for instance, and despite his earlier dislike, Krutch’s response to Arizona’s arid landscape was one of affection. “I know that many besides myself have felt its charm,” he wrote, “but I know also that not all who visit it do, that there are, indeed, some in whom it inspires at first sight not love but fear, or even hatred. Its appeal is not the appeal of things universally attractive, like smiling fields, bubbling springs, and murmuring brooks.” Krutch’s list of “universally attractive” sights might be appealing to eastern eyes, but they might not be universally attractive to natives of the Southwest or the desert. “To some it seems merely stricken, and even those of us who love it recognize that its beauty is no easy one,” he continued, animating a place that to so many appeared lifeless. “It suggests patience and struggle and endurance. It is courageous and happy, not easy or luxurious. In the brightest colors of its sandstone canyons, even in the brightest colors of its brief spring flowers, there is something austere.”

Krutch recognized that outsiders would view the desert differently than those who were accustomed to it and who understood the reality that belied its lifeless appearance. “Neither the plants nor the animals live under what is, for them, painfully difficult conditions. The vegetation flourishes in its own way. For the desert birds and desert animals this is not an unfavorable environment . . . Only to those who come from somewhere else is there anything abnormal about the conditions

227 Ibid., 9.
which prevail.” Krutch hoped that by living in the desert as opposed to merely visiting, he would no longer see it as an outsider, and in that change of perspective gain understanding. In writing about the desert he hoped to facilitate that process of understanding for his readers.

Krutch’s time in the desert produced reflections on quality of life and nature’s contribution to a better world, beyond any material, extractive uses. Believing desert land could not support masses of people, Krutch argued, “On the one hand, it is a very proper environment for those, including myself, who like it. On the other, it is not crowded either with men or with any other form of life. And for those who dislike crowds of anything, that is a strong point in its favor.” While Krutch was wrong in the limits he assigned to what the desert could, or could not, support, at the time he was writing it seemed quite possible that development had reached its limits. The aridity of the landscape would prevent crowding, Krutch believed, because “water gives out before anything else does, long before there is simply no more room . . . Chambers of commerce in the larger cities may dream of more and more irrigation and of more and more industry; but the water will go only so far, even with the mountain dams and the long canals.”

It is that space, the lack of crowding that Krutch attributed to the desert’s usefulness on a moral level. He found “this country more than merely aesthetically satisfying . . . its spaciousness as well as its austerity are more than merely physically—and nervously—reassuring to those who have found the great centers too
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228 Ibid., 27. Throughout this study, descriptions of Arizona’s natural landscapes by writers whose eyes were trained elsewhere (Priestley in England, Krutch in New England, for example), raises the question, do people of the Southwest and West write about other regions in similar ways when they move?

229 Ibid., 88.

230 Ibid., 93.
crowded and too tense.” The problem as Krutch saw it was, “In contemporary society, the all but universal ambition of the individual and the all but invariable aim of every proposed social or political movement is to get, for oneself or for others, more things.”

He explored the idea that an abundance of things, jukeboxes and televisions are two examples, results in a lack of abundance, a scarceness, of other things, including natural places and space. “I shall be reminded how whole acres of New York City in which nothing grows have been turned into a desert far more absolute than any I have ever seen in the Southwest,” Krutch declared, “and I shall wonder whether man himself can live well in a place where nothing else can live at all.”

From his location in the desert, Krutch also gained perspective on humanity’s place in the natural world, and developed a philosophy that countered the ascendant theories of science, psychology, and sociology. “No man in the middle of a desert or on top of a mountain ever fell victim to the delusion that he himself was nothing except the product of social forces,” Krutch insisted, “that all he needed was a proper orientation in his economic group, or that production per man hour was a true index of happiness.”

The desert not only produced musings on the human condition but also brought forth questions about the content of reality. On viewing a purple sunset from atop a desert mountain, Krutch took the opportunity to vent against what he believed were the destructive forces of science. Scientists would tell him the purple sky “was merely a subjective impression produced” by a scientific phenomenon.
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Why, asked Krutch, should his purple-sky world be any less real than the “real” world that scientists describe? He wondered if “the novelty of Science and its recent success have temporarily prejudiced us in its favor? Or can it be that mankind is really moved—as sometimes it seems to be—by some will to self-destruction? . . . Did he first turn from Nature toward the Machine; then turn from Sight and Hearing toward the Formula and Instrument; did he, finally turn away from Will and Value toward Determinism and Ethical Relativity, because he wills his own willlessness and irresponsibility . . . Does he wish thus, once and for all, to extinguish along with himself everything which, it may be, came into being only with him?”

In Voice of the Desert Krutch expanded and elaborated on his conservation philosophy and his belief in the value of nature not simply as a material resource but as an intellectual and emotional resource as well. He gave the desert a voice, one he believed had been missing in the national conversation. To draw in readers unfamiliar with desert country, Krutch compared the Arizona desert to his former Connecticut home. He was a newcomer to the desert; perhaps he made the comparisons for himself as well, for example, “A really blazing day slows down the restless activity of a community very much as a blizzard does in regions which have them.” Krutch explained, “So far as living things go, all this adds up to what even an ecologist may so far forget himself as to call an ‘unfavorable environment.’ But like all such pronouncements this one doesn’t mean much unless we ask ‘unfavorable for what and for whom?’ Of course the desert, it could be argued on this basis, is
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no place for human beings either, yet humans have lived in the desert for centuries, as was Krutch while he wrote this.

Krutch reached readers that may not have been exposed to his books in an article written for the *Saturday Review*, thus representing Arizona to a new audience. The article included excerpts from the last chapter of *Voice of the Desert* and Krutch addressed American society directly on the subject of what makes a natural landscape useful. “To Americans, so often criticized as too practical and too extroverted, [the desert] may still have something to say,” he wrote, and “I for one hope that it is for this use [a place of retreat] than for any other that some part of the Southwest will be reserved for a long time to come. To many Americans what [the desert] has to say may be vastly more important than anything ‘progress’ could bring to it.”

The thought that nature is for humanity’s use only, and whether use can be expanded to mean experiencing (as a retreat, in Krutch’s example), became a key focus of the conservation movement and Krutch’s desert writings.

Krutch argued that a connection needed to be made between the practical consequences of “the reckless laying waste of the earth” and a “large morality,” a kindness shown to all living things because they are alive. Articulating Aldo Leopold’s land ethic for his own readers, Krutch wrote that the answer, the way to make that connection, is to have love, “some feeling for, as well as some understanding of, the inclusive community of rocks and soils, plants and animals, of which we are a part.” He believed that to live “healthily and successfully on the land we must also live with it. We must be part not only of the human community, but of the whole community; we must acknowledge some sort of oneness not only with our
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neighbors, our countrymen, and our civilization but also some respect for the natural as well as for the man-made community."\textsuperscript{240}

Krutch called on people to go beyond conservation. "What is commonly called ‘conservation’ will not work in the long run because it is not really conservation at all but rather, disguised by its elaborate scheming, only a more knowledgeable variation of the old idea of a world for man’s use only."\textsuperscript{241} The problem, Krutch believed, is that humanity refuses to admit that it is part of nature, and it is the voice of the desert that can enlighten the conversation and enlarge humanity’s narrow focus.

"Perhaps no fact about the American people is more important," Krutch wrote, "than the fact that the continent upon which they live is large enough and varied enough to speak with many different voices—of the mountains, of the plains, of the valleys and of the seashore—all clear voices that are distinct and strong. Because Americans listened to all these voices, the national character has had many aspects and developed in many different directions. But the voice of the desert is the one which has been least often heard. We came to it last, and when we did come, we came principally to exploit rather than to listen."\textsuperscript{242} It is true that the desert had a voice for centuries, in the form of its original inhabitants, which had gone unheard. But the voice of the desert, at least in Arizona and in the form of Anglo utterances, in the way Krutch described plainsmen (farmers) and mountaineers (lumbermen), in 1962 had been clear, as demonstrated in the use of the land for decades.

Krutch wrote about the Native American perspective, voice, of the desert, in \textit{Grand Canyon}. Published in 1962 as the Natural History Library reprint of \textit{Grand Canyon: Today and All Its Yesterdays}, much of this paperback pocketbook is a

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid., 193, 194.

\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., 199.

\textsuperscript{242} Ibid., 220 and Krutch, “Mystique of the Desert,” 46.
detailed travel guide to Grand Canyon, creating it for both the visitor and the armchair traveler. Krutch addressed the Native American stereotypes prominent at the time, admitting, and not without annoyance, “You must give the tourist what he wants, and what he wants is what he expects, rather than what is true or authentic. No Indian who ever lived within a hundred miles of the Canyon ever wore anything remotely like the [feather] headdress . . . Actually, of course, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico were inhabited for centuries before the white man came by various Indian peoples whose indigenous culture had reached a high level.”

But Krutch is susceptible to stereotyping as well, as he described Arizona’s northern plateau region. “The road lies straight ahead through that unusually bare desert which is the Navajo Indian reservation,” Krutch wrote. The reservation encompasses about a fifth of the state’s land, the reader learns, “Nevertheless, the allotment is not so generous as it sounds. Strange and fascinating as the whole area is to look at, a land less hospitable to a human being who tries to live in it is hard to imagine. Most of the red sandy surface is bare of all vegetation and only dotted here and there by little clumps of straggling vegetation,” this description penned by the man who had written that one should not judge a desert by its seeming lack of vegetation, and who declared that the desert deserves a voice. But he did argue for wilderness areas in the book, including desert wilderness, from the perspective of the few who appreciate them. “Of certain other ‘minority rights’ we hear a great deal. But are all such rights exclusively political, religious, and racial?” Krutch asked. “Are
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not the intellectual, aesthetic, and emotional rights of a minority just as sacred? Does democracy demand that they be disregarded?\textsuperscript{245}

Krutch demonstrated, though, a lack of understanding about what inhabiting the desert entails. In a 1962 article he explained that he has not hurt the desert by his work, "I was fortunate in that I was a writer who did the desert no harm even when it was the subject of my writing. Physically, I have left it no less beautiful than it was."\textsuperscript{246} However, practically speaking, sewer and water lines would have been dug to his house, his household would have used water for many purposes, and the air conditioning unit would have used electricity; both the water and electricity likely came from some of the sources Krutch wrote about in opposition. But Krutch did voice an argument that would grow among preservationists, one that Edward Abby championed and articulated succinctly (see chapter four), as he compared the desert north of Tucson in 1962 to when he first began writing in the early 1950s, "Newcomers are quite right to ask me where are the clean pure air and the sparkling night skies which I described so enthusiastically in my first book about the desert. ‘Progress’ has taken away from me both my invigorating air and my brilliant stars."\textsuperscript{247}

In twelve years of living in the Arizona desert, Krutch’s thinking evolved from an ideal, if humans could simply live in such places they would come to appreciate all nature, to the reality that desert landscapes could not sustain even moderately-sized populations. His partial solution to the loss of desert space and his change of heart
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over the decade, from his *Desert Year* opposition to simply visiting a place, came to be that rather than occupying the desert, people should simply visit it. “Perhaps, on the other hand, there is a partial solution,” he decided, “namely the preservation of some sections of it as public land explicitly reserved in Parks, Monuments, and Wilderness Areas. It is far more rewarding to be able to live in the desert than merely to visit it. But that is at least better than nothing and the recognition of ‘wilderness areas’ (including desert wildernesses) as having a value for and in themselves is a step forward.”  

**ANN WOODIN’S *HOME IS THE DESERT* AND HELEN SEKAQUAPTEWA’S *ME AND MINE***

The Arizona desert provided the setting for Krutch’s contribution to a growing national environmental consciousness. For Ann Woodin and Helen Sekaquaptewa the desert was a source of family strength and a learning platform. The Sonoran Desert provided the environment within which Woodin taught her sons, away from crowded city streets. The northeastern high desert plateau was the place to which Sekaquaptewa returned after receiving her education in the city. The stories of both women’s lives, although different, demonstrate life in the Arizona desert, one the story of a Native American negotiating both tribal upheavals and Anglo prejudice, traveling from desert to city and back again, the other an Anglo Easterner transplanted to the desert from the city and embracing her new life there.

The Woodin family’s manner of occupying the desert differed from that of Native American desert dwellers such as the Hopi and O’odham people. Arriving from the University of California, Berkeley, and Bill Woodin’s graduate work in herpetology, the Woodins moved to the Sonoran Desert in 1952 when Bill took the position of zoologist at the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum near Tucson in the year

---
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that it opened. One of the first of its kind, the museum exhibited living plants and creatures outdoors, providing visitors a chance to experience the Sonoran Desert in a controlled natural environment, unlike the experience Ann Woodin and her four sons would have living in the desert and making it their home.249

*Home Is the Desert* is the story of the family’s experiences living in the desert region north of Tucson, a city that, like many other southwestern cities, had boomed since World War II, growing tenfold, from 30,000 to 300,000 people in that time. Written by a woman who had grown up in New England and attended college in the East, and written perhaps for an audience like her wealthy Eastern family, the book was extremely popular, requiring four reprintings in its first year of publication.250 Joseph Wood Krutch wrote the introduction, not so much telling the reader what can be found in the book’s pages but what cannot; his description of the Woodin’s desert activities intrigues, and encourages further reading. Krutch worried that the Woodins would be judged harshly because of their lifestyle, again perhaps with their well-connected families in mind. He feared people would think they live in a messy, dirty house and have messy, dirty, ill-behaved children. “The other possible suspicion which I would like to dispel,” Krutch wrote, “is that the Woodins are people-haters because they are animal-lovers, or that there is anything fanatical, sentimental, or monomaniacal about either of them or the lives they lead . . . They could easily be


mistaken at a dinner party for—well, for the kind of people you meet at the more elegant dinner parties.”

The Woodins embraced desert living. Ann Woodin described the family’s wild-animal pets (including bobcats, ravens, scorpions, snakes, and lizards), the stream next to which they lived, and seasonal changes that occur in the desert. The Woodins originated in New England; the book was written from an outsider’s perspective and encouraged a new or different perception from those most often held by people unfamiliar with the place or whose only exposure to Arizona occurred through western novels, movies, and television shows. Woodin wrote to rid her readers of desert stereotypes, as she described her family’s habitation of the desert. She acknowledged her readers’ prejudices, admitting, “An old tradition defines the desert as a wasteland, a place where only scorpions, deadly serpents, and hermits live.” She wrote, “A less esoteric attitude toward the desert is embodied by such adjectives as hot, dry, hostile, and lifeless. This is how most people who reside in more benign surroundings think of it, and why they naturally recoil from it. Once this was how I thought of it.” Writing for non-desert dwellers, she described the ubiquitous desert symbol, the saguaro, poetically explaining, “Back-lighted by a low-lying sun, their strangeness is accentuated, and I think I will never be able to look at them and feel as if they and I belong to the same world. Whether they are old with many arms, or young with only a first arm beginning to sprout halfway up like a ridiculous bulbous nose, they are equally alien.” Of course the saguaro cactus is familiar for natives of the place, and for the Tohono O’odham people its fruit brings the rain.
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Once Woodin had her readers’ attention and assured them that she is one of them, she was able to draw them into the desert life she and her family experienced. She explained the different ways to see the desert, “through the wondrously revealing eyes of such a naturalist writer as Joseph Wood Krutch, through the startled eyes of the newly arrived Easterner, through the technical eyes of the scientist, through the eyes of small boys.” This last, through the eyes of her sons, was how Woodin positioned many of her chapters. “In our four boys,” she wrote, “the desert has found just the accomplices it needs to infiltrate our lives most effectively. I am still astonished at the pieces of desert to be found in their rooms and pockets. What a specific, surprising, and varied place their desert is!”

It is the wildlife Woodin said people unfamiliar with the desert mention most often. “Aren’t you afraid to live out there, with all those things around that sting and bite?” Easterners often ask her. To the uninitiated she explained, “The fauna is much more misunderstood than dangerous, and you learn to accept it and live with it much as the city dweller does the car-filled streets.” Like Krutch, Woodin compared the desert dwellers’ need to spend the summer indoors with the Easterners withdrawing inside in the winter. However, like Hilda Faunce and Martha Summerhayes before her, Woodin admitted, “The desert summer does not kindle in my breast the same enthusiasm that it does in the breast of my husband.”

But Woodin wrote beautifully, lovingly of the desert landscape. “Most of the day the sun spreads the land with a luminous white wash that diffuses not only color but form and substance. The desert belongs to the sun: it shimmers as the sun
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shimmers, sears as the sun sears, and it flames red as the flaming sun drops behind the mountains. Nothing is between us and the sun. We are tethered to it.\textsuperscript{257}

Her descriptions of the natural desert landscape and living in it, Krutch’s as well, contrast with the constructed desert landscape of the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum that her husband directed and where Krutch served on the board of directors. In an informational guide sold at the museum’s entrance in 1962, for example, the visitor learned about the Demonstration Desert Garden, an “outdoor laboratory for experimenting with various growths that seem practical for cultivation around desert homes.” Co-sponsored with \textit{Sunset Magazine}, the Demonstration Garden mimicked the natural desert and encouraged readers to consider using these plants, explaining that in the spring both natural and constructed desert landscapes “burst forth with multi-colored blossoms that testify to the satisfaction that can come from native plant landscaping.”\textsuperscript{258}

Woodin used the cliché of temporal extremes, of old and new landscapes, in describing the desert and its mountains near Tucson where she lived, and the Colorado Plateau cut through by the Colorado River in northern Arizona. The Tucson-area mountains “are not the smooth, fleshy mountains of my eastern childhood,” Woodin wrote. “They are gaunt and tough, with their ribs showing, and their sinews. It was yesterday that the earth cracked and these pushing shoving mountains were forced up, lifting the dry metamorphosed bottom of the Paleozoic sea high into the air. Slowly over the ages they shook it off their backs, covering their feet with foothills of rubble and filling the valley beyond. Because they are young and because of the lack of continually eroding rainfall, our mountains look new and strong and
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bony.”\textsuperscript{259} Describing the Colorado River canyon country from a boat in the middle of the great river, she wrote, “In the 150 miles we had just traveled, over 150 million years had slipped by in the windings of this river. We had brushed our hands over rock that marked the golden age of the amphibians, over rock that marked the dying of the dinosaurs and the materialization of a few mousy little creatures in whose brains flickered unbelievable things to come.”\textsuperscript{260}

Ann and Bill Woodin took that trip down the Colorado River with specialists in fields such as archaeology and biology and photography to document southeastern Utah and northeastern Arizona’s Glen Canyon before it was flooded by Lake Powell. The Glen Canyon story is a shared story, a shared natural landscape connected by the Colorado River, and therefore a shared intellectual landscape. The dam was built in Arizona, the lake that formed behind it flooded canyons in Arizona and Utah, and the shores of the lake border both states. Woodin described the canyon country, and Glen Canyon specifically, viewed it as they flew to Hite, Utah, to begin the trip downriver, “Beneath us smoothly slipped an incredibly rough desert of sandstone mesas, upthrust mountains, and deep narrow canyons that wriggled like serpents down to the Colorado. In the middle of this desolation and oblivious to it, the big river had carved itself a long and glorious house called the Glen Canyon.”\textsuperscript{261}

Now, in 1964 as she wrote, “The water is slowly rising in Glen Canyon, submerging the rare and beautiful things we once saw, and the Colorado River, now only a trickle of its former self, flows gently southward.” Once the river continually created the canyons, Woodin said, “The last time I listened to the ranger on the rim of the Grand Canyon, he told his impressed audience of the mightiness of the
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Colorado, how you could hear it roar from miles away and see the spray it tossed up as it passed, how it had inexorably cut its way down through thousands of feet of rock. ‘But best of all,’ he concluded triumphantly, ‘this canyon is still in the making!’ The Colorado River’s canyon making in the Glen Canyon had come to an end with the closing of the dam’s gates.

After returning from that river trip Woodin conversed with a newspaperman about the dam and Rainbow Bridge. His response to the lake mirrored what the proponents of the dam said, and her reaction was the same response other opponents had. The newspaperman “waxed enthusiastic at the prospect of this somewhat inaccessible country being, as he called it, ‘opened up.’ In his opinion it would be just grand to have a paved highway leading to the foot of the Bridge itself so that all one had to do was roll down the automobile window. What cannot be seen by everyone with little or no effort, for him had no value, and a wilderness uncut by roads was therefore a needless waste.”

Echoing Krutch, Woodin wrote of the disappearing desert, “In many ways it is an insignificant thing to watch two boys set out on an afternoon’s walk through the desert. They will follow a trail they have walked over many times. They will see the same bushes, the same trees, and hear the same birds. Yet this little vignette is increasingly significant as our Arizona desert is covered with houses or turned into irrigated fields.” She lamented the destruction of “much of what makes life worth living. More than that, we destroy the source of our inspiration. If we are to survive on the desert, the desert itself must survive. And so the problem of space is as acute as any.”
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Helen Sekaquaptewa’s words created a very different Arizona from that described and prescribed by Krutch and Woodin. Born in 1898 in Old Oriabi on the Hopi Mesas in northeastern Arizona, Sekaquaptewa was a child of traditional Hopi parents. Exposed to Anglo culture at boarding school, she embraced Anglo education but was not left destitute by it when she returned to the reservation. Rather Helen and her husband Emory claimed dual cultural citizenship, taking, in Helen’s words, the best from both Anglo and Hopi worlds.\(^{265}\)

*Me and Mine* had its genesis in conversations Sekaquaptewa and her friend Louise Udall shared as the two traveled once a week from Phoenix to the Maricopa Indian Reservation for LDS Relief Society meetings. Sekaquaptewa told stories about her life and Udall wrote them down. Unlike the 1930s as-told-to autobiographies, *Me and Mine* contains no extensive explanation or ethnographic purpose for the book.\(^ {266}\) The title *Me and Mine* hints that this is not a traditional Hopi story. The title is strikingly different from the Hopi Way, a communal way of living—Us and Ours. Another indication that the story will be nontraditional is the inclusion at the book’s front matter of Proverbs 31, beginning with “Who can find a virtuous woman? For her price is far above rubies” (Proverbs 31:10).\(^ {267}\) In addition to detailing


\(^ {266}\) While Helen Sekaquaptewa is ostensibly the author of the book, an “author’s note” at the end of “The Line” chapter (63ff) is signed by Udall, not Sekaquaptewa. A review of the book in *American Anthropologist* gives Louise Udall as the author, yet calls the book an “autobiographical account of a Hopi Indian woman” (Fred Eggan, "Book Reviews," *American Anthropologist*, New Series 72, no. 2 [April 1970]: 411). This is another case of an Anglo process maintaining control of a Native American story. For background on Helen Sekaquaptewa and Native American autobiography see Penelope Myrtle Kelsey, “Native American Autoethnology, Sovereignty, and Self: Tribal Knowledge in New Genres” (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2002).

\(^ {267}\) Sekaquaptewa, front matter.
Sekaquaptewa’s life, this book describes the way living in the desert changed over time, from early- to mid-twentieth century.

Helen and Emory Sekaquaptewa seem not to have been caught between two cultures but instead claimed dual cultural citizenship in both Anglo and Hopi societies. Early chapters of the book described Sekaquaptewa’s childhood as a daughter of a traditional Hopi family whose parents did not want her to attend the Anglo day school. “One morning I was ‘caught,’” she wrote. “Even then, it was the rule among mothers not to let the child go voluntarily. As the policeman reached to take me by the arm, my mother put her arm around me.” Even though Helen liked school, “Tradition required that it appear that I was forced into school.”

Sekaquaptewa related the story of the schism in Old Oriabi caused by Anglo influence and education, between traditional tribal members like her parents, who came to be called Hostiles (to the U.S. government policies) and the progressive members, called Friendlies. The feud culminated in 1906, when Sekaquaptewa, her family, and other Hopi traditionalists were forced to move out of Oriabi and many of the men were sent to prison. The traditionalist families moved to Hotevilla and the children, including Sekaquaptewa, were sent to the boarding school at Keams Canyon. By 1915 she had completed sixth grade at Keams (the highest level attainable there) and asked if she could attend Phoenix Indian School. Her parents would not consent, but Sekaquaptewa was given permission to “go on [her] own responsibility,” meaning she could attend school away from the reservation for three years without her parents’ consent.

Sekaquaptewa returned home to the reservation in 1918, having been away for thirteen years. “I didn’t feel at ease in the home of my parents now,” she wrote. Her discomfort, however, did not arise out of a lack of desire for or knowledge of the
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Hopi way of life. Instead, her refusal to give up the things she had learned at school, reading for example, in the face of her sister's animosity created discord. After their marriage in late 1918, Helen and Emory moved to Idaho, but returned to Hotevilla in May 1920, where they combined aspects of both Anglo and Hopi culture. While they educated their children in the Anglo manner, they worked and kept house in the traditional way, even as other Hopis adopted Anglo lifestyles. “While my neighbors were buying white flour and later bread at the store,” Sekaquaptewa said, “I ground the corn for our bread on the stone mata and matake [sic].”

Life in the desert for Hopi families at the turn of the twentieth century was much different than the life of Woodin and her family, and different than modern Hopi families experienced. Sekaquaptewa explained both the Arizona of the past and of the modern Hopi reservation for readers. Water, and access to it, was vital to the community. When she was a girl, “Every spring and fall there was a community cleaning of the well. The sand and weeds that had accumulated within the basin had to be cleaned out and carried away . . . No one was excused.” But, in the 1960s, “the well has not been used for half a century now. Sand has blown in and piled up on the terraces, and they are grown up with weeds. Some of the retaining walls have collapsed, and some of the sandstone steps are washed away, and the old well is abandoned and forgotten.” In addition to water, corn was essential to Hopi survival. “Corn was literally the ‘staff of life’ in olden days,” Sekaquaptewa said. “The Hopis knew how to make their corn grow in the sandy, arid soil . . . One aimed to have on hand a supply of corn, enough to last two years, so that if there was a dry
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year, one’s family wouldn’t starve. A desperate fear that it might not rain and mature the corn was ever with us. ²⁷¹

While portraying life in the desert, in the villages on the Hopi Mesas and the family’s ranch, and as she described the family’s livelihood, cultivating corn and raising cattle and sheep, Sekaquaptewa did not describe the natural landscape in words other than its relation to the family’s living. There are no descriptions of sunsets or mountains or desert vistas. Unlike Woodin, Sekaquaptewa’s philosophical musings focused on religion. Her philosophy grew out of both the Hopi and Mormon religions. Sekaquaptewa explained the combining of these two views into a multi-religion story, writing, “When we heard of and read the Book of Mormon it sounded like a familiar story. Reading the Bible and the Book of Mormon has helped us to understand the Hopi traditions, and the Hopi traditions help us to understand these books of scripture.” ²⁷²

Sekaquaptewa’s philosophy was also formed by and found in education. She quoted her father as she emphasized the importance of the written word, “He said, ‘The white man has kept a written record of the history of the people from the beginning, while the Hopis have passed their history from one generation to another by word of mouth. With the telling over the years, some of it has been omitted or misunderstood, and changes have been made. The written record is more accurate and true. There will come a time when the written record will be brought to the Hopis by the white man.’” ²⁷³ Sekaquaptewa’s father, once a traditionalist and hostile to Anglo education, now agreed (in 1969) with her way of thinking. He advised his grandsons, “You of the younger generation, stand for what is right. Go to school and
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be diligent, don’t play around, but learn the white man’s language and his ways so you can come back and help your people and fight the pahana in his own way. Who knows? It might be one of you to save our land."\(^{274}\) Echoes of the elder Navajos in Oliver La Farge’s fiction, here demonstrated in reality.

In reviewing *Me and Mine* Fred Eggan named it as “one answer to how the transition from a society based on kinship loyalties to that of modern America can be made.”\(^{275}\) He made no judgment on whether this was good or bad, but his statement was based on the premise that the transition must happen. Eggan stated, "The most profound change is reflected in the title. Hopi children are taught communal virtues, and to think primarily of oneself and one’s family is to be kahopi—not Hopi. The shift from ‘we’ and ‘ours’ is symbolic of the revolution that is required in attitudes before modernization can be effective.” The reviewer took it as a given that “modernization” must happen, and that “modern” is “me and mine,” not “we and ours.”\(^{276}\)

Both Woodin and Sekaquaptewa concluded by discussing what they learned through their experiences, and what they imparted to their children. Woodin’s lesson was a desert philosophy similar to Krutch’s: "The desert, in fact the world of nature, because it is wholly impartial, is a teacher from whom children can learn spontaneously, without resentment,” she wrote. "It is very simple. Should they step in cactus, get stung by a scorpion, be caught in a storm, fail to catch lizards, only they are to blame . . . But, besides this, I hope the desert has taught our sons that they do not own the earth, that it is lent to them for as long as they treat it properly
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and respect the creatures with whom they share it." This was what her boys learned at home, in the desert; home is the first place of edification and forming.

Sekaquaptewa’s final thoughts also reflected on the lessons she taught her children, "When I think upon my children and the kind of people that they are, a feeling of joy and pride fills my heart, and I say to myself, ‘I have had a good life.’" On the dual cultural citizenship she and her husband shared, she wrote, “Most of my chums gave up and went back to their Hopi ways when they returned home from school. They gave in when their parents urged them to forget what they had learned, although they admit that many of the ways of the pahana are better. I was stubborn and held on and would not give up . . . My children would not be what they are, or doing the things they are doing, if I had forsaken the good that I learned at school. We chose the good from both ways of living.”

These are opposing lessons, the desert, the natural landscape and what Woodin believed it taught her boys, and “civilization”—Anglo society, modernism—and what it taught the Sekaquaptewas and their children. Woodin wrote of the desert as the only place to teach and learn values that can sustain the world, and she and her family moved from a crowded Eastern place to “out there” in the desert and lived out those values. Sekaquaptewa’s experience was the opposite and her travels took her from the Hopi Mesas to the “civilized” Keams Canyon boarding school and then to Phoenix Indian School; it is these experiences that she believed would advance the Indian people. For one woman, the desert, its space and land, would be society’s redeemer; for the other, formal education in Anglo schools and the adoption of the Mormon religion redeemed.

— Woodin, 241.

— Sekaquaptewa, 246.

— Ibid., 247.
Glen Canyon, *The Place No One Knew*, and Popular Publications

In the winter of 1962–63, a narrow, remote desert canyon in northern Arizona and southern Utah became the location for the filming of *The Greatest Story Ever Told*, the story of the life of Christ, starring Charlton Heston as John the Baptist. Heston described the region as, “not just like the Holy Land but more as the Holy Land should be.”\(^{280}\) Within a few months, that canyon, known—but not widely—as a place of quiet beauty carved deep into sand- and limestone by the relentless wearing of the Colorado River, would be inundated by the water backed up behind Glen Canyon Dam, and eventually filled with silt settling out of Lake Powell. While the lake filled, Glen Canyon became an epicenter in the escalating conflict over land use in America, a battle over whether and how natural landscapes and resources should be utilized, as materials to be extracted or as resources to be experienced. Glen Canyon “became the place most associated with [the ideas and ideology of the conservation movement] and it became the conservation movement’s mascot.”\(^{281}\)

Just a year after Arizona’s fiftieth anniversary, on March 13, 1963, Glen Canyon Dam’s diversion tunnels were closed and Lake Powell began to fill. On that same day David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club, composed the foreword to Eliot Porter’s *The Place No One Knew*, a nearly two-hundred page, full-color, exhibit-format coffee table book dedicated to the canyon that would no longer exist, depicting scenes that could no longer be viewed and places that could no longer be visited. Most of Glen Canyon is in Utah but its story is a shared one. The canyon is part of a natural landscape divided by a political line drawn on a map, not

---


\(^{281}\) Michaelann Nelson, “Voices of Glen Canyon: The Influence of Place on Imagination and Activism” (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2009), 75.
by a physical barrier on the actual landscape, and therefore its story becomes a narrative landscape shared by both Utah and Arizona.\textsuperscript{282}

Construction on Glen Canyon Dam began in 1956, and while the Sierra Club’s book may have considered the place unknown, Glen Canyon had been considered as a location for a dam at least since 1924. Arizona submitted an application for a Glen Canyon damsite every year from 1924 to 1929, in opposition to the Boulder Canyon dam. Another proposal was offered in 1947, this one by Los Angeles officials for the purpose of generating power for expanding southern California cities.\textsuperscript{283} The conservationists played a role in the choosing of Glen Canyon, finally, as a damsite. In the early 1950s they successfully argued against a dam inside Dinosaur National Monument, and acquiesced one in Glen Canyon as an alternative. Initially, this seemed to be a fair trade; however, in the summer of 1956 the Sierra Club sponsored a boat trip through Glen Canyon and the members discovered the rugged and pristine landscape that would be lost. Determined to right that wrong,

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{282} Eliot Porter, \textit{The Place No One Knew: Glen Canyon on the Colorado}, David Brower, ed. (San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club, 1963; Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith Books, 1988). The full story of the intellectual landscape of Glen Canyon, including written words in stories, poems, and songs, and images in film, photographs, and paint, is begging to be told, a massive project for another time. It seems all Colorado River stories become Arizona stories. This would be an interesting study as well.

conservationists enlisted words and images to press their case against construction of the dam at Glen Canyon.

By the time *The Place No One Knew* was published, Glen Canyon was beyond saving. The book used Glen Canyon as a pictorial rosary beads with which to do penance so as to never commit this particular sin again. The heart of the matter for conservationists, this in Porter’s words, was that an “invasion is taking place—one that will obliterate all the places that bear the nostalgic names, wipe them out for all foreseeable time . . . The waters impounded by this plug of artificial stone spread back through Glen Canyon for one hundred eighty-six miles in all, inundating the sparkling river, swallowing its luminous cliffs and tapestried walls, and extinguishing far into the long, dim, distant future everything that gave it life.”²⁸⁴ That the canyon was little known contributed to its demise.

The book was designed to move the reader emotionally through images. Yet pictures could not tell the whole story. Brower and Porter borrowed words from a variety of writers whose original intent had not been lamenting the loss of Glen Canyon. Photographs could not have done the job alone. Brower’s words in the foreword, for example, create a Glen Canyon beyond what any image could. “Glen Canyon died in 1963 and I was partly responsible for its needless death,” Brower declared. “So were you. Neither you or I, nor anyone else, knew it well enough to insist that at all costs it should endure. When we began to find out it was too late . . . So a steel gate dropped, choking off the flow in the canyon’s carotid artery, and from that moment the canyon’s life force ebbed quickly.”²⁸⁵ No picture could evoke the death of a canyon so clearly.

²⁸⁴ Porter, 14; quotations from the 1988 edition.

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 8.
Porter began his career as a biochemist at Harvard. An amateur photographer when his work was shown in a New York gallery in 1938, the success of that exhibit prompted him to pursue photography full time.\footnote{Information at Lee Gallery, “Eliot Porter Photography,” http://www.leegallery.com/eliot-porter/eliot-porter-biography (accessed June 2013).} Porter’s first publication for the Sierra Club, "In Wildness Is the Preservation of the World," was an exhibit-format book of New England landscape photographs coupled with Henry David Thoreau’s words.\footnote{Eliot Porter, "In Wildness Is the Preservation of the World" (San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club, 1962).} Porter took his initial Glen Canyon photographs on a trip through the canyon in 1960, before the lake began to fill. He came back to the canyon several times in the 1960s, twice accompanied by Georgia O’Keeffe.\footnote{See Porter, The Place No One Knew, 6. He journeyed with Georgia O’Keeffe in 1961, and also visited the canyon twice in 1962, once in 1963 and 1964, twice in 1965 after the lake began to fill, and in 1968 and 1971.} The very marked differences between the landscapes of New England and Glen Canyon stimulated Porter’s creativity and produced stark and vivid images of a place that would soon cease to be. The resulting collaboration between Porter and Brower demonstrates the emotional appeal of entwining words and images to create a place.

Reflecting an opinion also held by Krutch, that it is nature, not progress, that will advance humankind, Brower stated, “The natural Colorado—what is left of it—is a miracle, not a menace. The menace is more likely the notion that growth and progress are the same, and that the gross national product is the measure of the good life.”\footnote{Ibid., 9.} Just as Woodin explained the Colorado River’s continual creation of Grand Canyon, Porter described how Glen Canyon is continually made, and is thus alive, “Down the tributaries pour intermittent floods burdened with sand, each grain a chisel able to liberate imprisoned grains from ancient walls. The streams batter the
canyonsides, tearing away all lose material, and gouging out deep troughs. The narrowness of some canyons—their sides may be hundreds of feet high and less than six feet apart at the bottom—is dramatic evidence of the rapidity of erosion.”

Porter’s words evoked images that even his photographs could not depict. This description can be found in both “The Living Canyon” essay and paired with a picture of Hidden Passage:

> It is reflection that imparts magic to the waters of the Glen Canyon and its tributaries. Every pool and rill, every sheet of flowing water, every wet rock and seep—these mirror with enameled luster the world about. In narrow chasms streams of melted gems flow over purple sand past banks of verdant willow. Small puddles, like shining eyes, fuse the colors of pink rocks and cerulean sky, and wet ripples of mud may do the same thing. In the changing light nothing remains the same from year to year or hour to hour. Flood and drought, heat and cold, life and death alter the finer details incessantly, but they leave unchanged the grand plan and the enchanting quality of the Colorado’s masterwork.

The book’s sponsors hoped that after reading descriptions such as these, no reader could think damming such a place was a good idea.

Porter’s final essay, “The Geology of Glen Canyon,” is an evocative longue durée telling of the canyon story. “At the beginning of the great upwarping the seas drained away and in their place a meandering river carried the waters of the plain into the western ocean,” Porter wrote. “Its dark mahogany waters must have supported an abundance of life which in turn supplied the food needs of many of the riparian birds and animals of the Eocene. But as the continent continued to rise, the character of the river changed. Tributaries, loaded with debris, flowing down the western slopes of the newly born Rocky Mountains, gave it the tools needed to cut its way downward as fast as the land itself was rising.” The river cut its way through the layers of time, until, “Today still, it is cutting into these rocks, which can be seen

---
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exposed on the somber walls of Granite Gorge at the bottom of the Grand Canyon.”

Many of the quotes paired with Porter’s images were words written for other purposes but appropriated to create a place, Glen Canyon, that was no longer the place in Porter’s photographs. Several describe Grand Canyon, such as this quote, excerpted from Clarence Dutton’s *Tertiary History of the Grand Canyon* (1882): “The lover of nature, whose perceptions have been trained [elsewhere], would enter this strange region with a shock, and dwell there for a time with a sense of oppression, and perhaps with horror.” A quote from Donald John Hall’s *Enchanted Sand* (1933), was employed to describe Glen Canyon but actually represents New Mexico and added Native Americans to the landscape: “None but Indians have ever lived in this country, and they exist only as a part of it. They have never attempted to assert themselves, but have grown up in it like the trees. It is their food, their drink, their religion, and their life. Their songs and prayers are all of the earth, the sky, and the rain. They never struggle with it, but use it to help them only as a part of themselves. They pass through it silently, leaving as little trace as sunlight through wind.” Henry David Thoreau’s much-quoted passage from *A Week on the Concord and Merrimac Rivers* (1895), “The finest workers in stone are not copper or steel tools, but the gentle touches of air and water working at their leisure with a liberal allowance of time,” was also adopted as a description of the forming of Glen Canyon.
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Other passages do describe Glen Canyon. Wallace Stegner’s words in *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian* (1954) are anchored in the very stone they describe: “Its walls are the monolithic Navaho sandstone, sometimes smooth and vertical, rounding off to domes at the rims, sometimes undercut by great arched caves, sometimes fantastically eroded by slit side canyons, alcoves, grottos green with redbud and maiden-hair and with springs of sweet water.”\(^{296}\) The reviews of the book also tapped emotion and created the place for readers who would never see Glen Canyon as the place being described. “There is an apprehensive—perhaps a mournful—note in much of literature of nature today,” stated the *New York Times* book reviewer. “A book of magnificent outdoor pictures becomes an elegy on a Colorado River canyon that is in the process of being obliterated.”\(^{297}\)

Not content to let conservationists have the only word, Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, published his own book about Glen Canyon, focusing on the lake that the dam created in an *Arizona Highways*-type book. Describing the Colorado River Storage Project, the dam, the lake, and the future, Dominy made his case for reclamation, declaring, “Man has flung down a giant barrier directly in the path of the turbulent Colorado in Arizona. It has tamed the wild river—made it a servant to man’s will . . . Built of rock and cement and sweat and skill, Glen Canyon Dam stands as a monument to the talent of its builders . . . The manmade rock of the dam has become one with the living rock of the canyon. It will endure as long as time endures.”\(^{298}\)

---

\(^{296}\) Ibid., 40.


Dominy not only described Lake Powell in tones similar to those used by the conservationists describing Glen Canyon, but he described the same features, “Over eons of time, wind and rain have carved the sandstone into shape to please ten thousand eyes. The graceful, the dramatic the grand, the fantastic.”

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall described the lake in a similar manner, stating in the foreword, “Once in a blue moon we come upon almost unbelievable beauty. Such was my reaction at my first sight of Lake Powell and its setting of incomparable grandeur.” But Udall and Dominy’s landscape is viewed from the shores of the lake that has drowned the canyon. “You have a front-row seat in an amphitheater of infinity,” Dominy wrote, and claimed authority to boast and to describe the lake, assuring readers that the authority does not belong only to the conservationists, “I know. I was there.”

Though the most adversarial, the Sierra Club and the Bureau of Reclamation narratives were not the only words writing the place into being for readers. And as the Colorado River was dammed and as Glen Canyon filled, descriptions of Lake Powell began to compete for readers’ place-creating attention. Arizona Highways had dedicated an entire issue in 1958 to the Colorado River, with stories encompassing its headwaters in the Colorado Rockies to its delta in Mexico. The magazine’s Raymond Carlson editorialized, “The Colorado can be a torpid, muddy laggard dozing in the sun, or an angry monster roaring with thunderous fury, chewing away millions of tons of the good earth as it lunges recklessly down, down toward the impatient sea.” Taking the side of reclamation, he concluded, “A lot of millions of dollars and a lot of time have been spent on gentle Old Red. Every cent and every minute spent in
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the process has been worth it.” A year later, in describing the growing dam, Carlson wrote, “The dam will be another shackle to control the mighty Colorado and will be another triumph of reclamation in the West.”

A full issue of Arizona Highways was dedicated to “Lake Powell, America’s Newest Playground” in 1964. In the article from which the issue’s title was drawn, and illustrated with her husband Joseph Muench’s vivid color photographs, Joyce Rockwood Muench described the new lake. The couple was prepared to dislike Lake Powell, having known and loved Glen Canyon, but they were surprised at the beauty that still encompassed the landscape. An account of their seven-day boat trip on the lake, the words and pictures dispel the notion that the dam should not have been built. “With no more than the turn of the head and sometimes not even that, the visitor is exposed to half a dozen different aspects, whether in lighting, cliff configuration, some planted dell, an arch, or a great cave,” Muench wrote. After spending the week experiencing this new landscape, she was sold, declaring, “Having revisited Glen Canyon and been completely conquered by the wonders of Lake Powell so that my enthusiasm, tinged with amazement overflows to anyone who cares to listen, I rather want to stand on some high point and using my biggest voice proclaim: ‘Hear Ye! Hear Ye! Lake Powell is open. Come and see for yourself the world’s most dramatic lake. There will never be anything like it anywhere else. Come play in the sunshine of America’s finest and newest water playground. Lake Powell!”


Thelma Hall Towle wrote about Glen Canyon and Lake Powell from a local perspective. She knew Glen Canyon before the dam, lived in Winslow for twenty years, and visited Rainbow Bridge six times in those years. She refused to embrace the new lake with enthusiasm, while also acknowledging its benefits, both scenic and utilitarian. “I have never been so torn,” she wrote. “Perhaps one of the saddest aspects of the change is not being able to identify exactly where some of the treasured landmarks now lay drowned—to be so unsure of your location in your own bailiwick.” Of the changes wrought to the scenery she said, “Red cliffs and deep blue buttes are more bewildering than in the old days when the river was deep within the sheerly secluded walls, the river shallow, and shadowed, and the rich and secret feeling of intimacy with the brooding walls is gone.” But she ends convinced, in part, because of a trip to Rainbow Bridge. Of the eleven on the trip, only Towle and her husband had been to the Bridge. One woman had longed to see it for years but was physically unable to make the trip from the river to the arch before the dam was built. The hike reduced to a mile and a half allowed the woman to attain her dream. Echoing the words of Ann Woodin’s newspaperman, Towle decided, “If nine people who would not have seen Rainbow Bridge under the old circumstances can now see it, and if one out of those nine is as elated as she, then I and others who so deeply regret the changes can certainly feel the sacrifice of primitiveness has been in a good cause.”

*National Geographic* devoted thirty-one pages of text and color photographs to the new lake in 1967, a detailed account of Walter Meayers Edwards’s month on

---
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Lake Powell. Edwards had floated through Glen Canyon in 1963, and thus is able to describe the lake and explain what is beneath its water at each point. This was not done sentimentally, with regret, but rather as a story. “One of the best-known landmarks lies beneath Padre Bay,” Edwards wrote. “Here in 1776 two Franciscans, Fathers Dominguez and Escalante, forded the Colorado on their return to New Mexico, after a futile attempt to open a direct route to their order’s California missions. The spot came to be known as the Crossing of the Fathers. As Lake Powell formed, the crossing vanished under Padre Bay.”

The New York Times outlined the conservationists’ dilemma early in the fight for Glen Canyon, before The Place No One Knew was published. The legislation authorizing the dam prohibited any water from inundating Rainbow Bridge National Monument; conservationists expected the ban could keep the diversion tunnel from being closed, at least until Rainbow Bridge was made safe from rising lake water. In 1961 a group of engineers, conservationists, and Congressmen, led by Secretary of the Interior Udall, made the trip by helicopter to the Bridge.

According to the New York Times reporter who accompanied the group, “To prevent the waters of the Colorado River impounded at Glen Canyon from backing up to the foot of Rainbow Bridge, engineers now estimate that they will have to build a series of small dams and tunnels costing about [fifteen million dollars].” A dam would be built in Bridge Canyon, downstream from Rainbow Bridge, to prevent lake water from reaching the arch. Another dam and a diversion tunnel would be built above the Bridge to prevent Bridge Canyon water from backing up behind the downstream dam and flooding the area below the span. The project would be costly, and “will deface the landscape forever. Roads for dam building purposes must, of necessity, be

notched around cliffs and canyons that are visually exciting, while concrete for the
dams would have to be mixed with gravel scraped from nearby mesas, themselves
untouched by man through eons of time.”

The sides had switched, the engineers using the conservationists’ own arguments against them and the conservationists finding themselves arguing for activities that they condemned developers for doing in
any other instance. In the end, Rainbow Bridge remained unprotected and the water
rose to within a mile and a half of the span.

Both the *Washington Post* and the *Los Angeles Times* published articles
praising the dam and the lake. Merlo J. Pusey’s article argued that this human-made
lake was as beautiful as anything nature had created; it had improved the desert
desolation it covered, Pusey believed, and he taunted conservationists for that
reason. “Can man ever add anything to nature? Most conservationists reply with an
emphatic ‘no.’ Even the rank and file of outdoorsmen doubtless agree in principle . . .
But in the minds of increasing thousands, Lake Powell is posing a formidable
challenge to that sweeping generalization,” Pusey wrote. “It is probably the most
beautiful artificial lake in the world . . . It has created a new aquatic paradise in one
of the most arid parts of the country.” Pusey made sure his readers understood the
remarkableness of this achievement, writing to induce emotions opposite of those
cultivated by Porter’s book. “People not familiar with the Four Corners region . . . can
have little concept of its desolation. Bare clay hills and parched prairies extend for
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310 In 1974 the Navajo Tribe sued the Secretary of the Interior, the
Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Director of the National Park
Service in an attempt to preserve religious sites in danger of being inundated by
Lake Powell’s rising water. The tribe lost the lawsuit and the appeal. Today the Park
Service requests that visitors treat Rainbow Bridge “in a manner respectful of its
significance to the people who have long held it sacred” (U.S. National Park Service,
Rainbow Bridge National Monument, “History and Culture,”
hundreds of miles,” Pusey asserted. How, he implies, could a reader not approve of flooding such a place? “For centuries [this country] has repelled human invasion. But water in some measure subdued it, turning scorching and impassable canyons into cool coves where a person may fish or swim or sit and drink in the beauty around him.” According to Pusey, this was the triumph of Lake Powell. But his version left out the fact that people had lived in the Four Corners region for centuries. The original indigenous inhabitants and Native Americans’ traditional knowledge about them go unmentioned, invisible in Pusey’s narrative.

The Los Angeles Times’ message also was aimed at conservationists. “Lake Powell . . . is a wonder in spite of itself,” the article began. “The placid, crystalline waters that fill the lake today give no hint of the turbulence that stirred men and institutions during the years the dam was being debated and built.” The author believed, “If Lake Powell had sprung up full-blown from nature, like Grand Canyon or Tahoe, it would be viewed by Man the Discoverer as an unqualified blessing. But man did not discover Lake Powell. He created it, and its beauty is thus tainted in the eyes of some. Because the purists remember the loveliness that existed there before, Lake Powell is suspect as a substitute blessing, a counterfeit.”

Both places existed, the Glen Canyon no one knew, gone but still present in stories, and Lake Powell, now known, loved and hated, standing as a testament to what was important to both sides in the conflict over natural resources.

---


Gene Sherman, the Los Angeles Times Arizona’s 50th Anniversary Series

In February 1962, Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter Gene Sherman, on hiatus from reporting crime and politics, wrote a series of articles for the Los Angeles Times about Arizona at fifty. A well-known war correspondent in the Pacific theater during World War II and an eyewitness chronicler of the atomic bomb tests in the early 1950s, Sherman won the 1960 Pulitzer Prize for Public Service in Journalism for his reporting on the narcotics traffic between Mexico and the United States that led to negotiations to halt the flow of illegal drugs between the two countries. Yet, he was a nearly lifelong resident of southern California and a Los Angeles Times reporter for his entire career, thus he represented Arizona from that perspective. In his mid-forties at the time of Arizona’s fiftieth year of statehood, Sherman gave the impression of a seemingly much older man longing for California’s youth. In both tone and substance the articles in the series are superficial, revealing as much about southern California and what one reporter believed about his state as they do about Arizona.

The series’ introductory article sets the stage, giving California a starring role in Arizona’s development, much as the Los Angeles Times did in the 1930s: “A new chapter in the growth and development of the West is being written by our neighbor, the state of Arizona,” the writer declared. “Its story of expansion, gaining substance in the shadow of California’s great growth” included factors such as climate, location,
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the development of water resources, and the advent of air conditioning. The Los Angeles Times reporting expanded on the idea of Arizona’s newness, naming it the Miracle of Arizona’s Growth. In part, according to the newspaper, this growth miracle was due to an expanding light industry, led by AiResearch and Motorola, and the subsequent arrival of General Electric, Sperry, and Canon Electric. This post-World War II boom, “has prompted the State to call itself the world’s electronic capital and has made manufacturing by far the leading source of income,” Sherman wrote. This was a reality rarely portrayed in popular media in the 1960s, writers rather focusing on the tourist and Old West storylines. These clichés are also present in Sherman’s reporting; fifteen million tourists visited the state in 1961, “lured by winter sunshine, old western history, and magnificent scenery.”

The first article in the series, published three days before the official Statehood Day, reflected these common, clichéd perspectives of what Arizona had become, but casts the state as a kid-brother in California’s story rather than the star of its own. “Sampling the mood of the state,” Sherman wrote, “one is struck hard by its similarity to California of two generations ago, particularly Southern California . . . TWA and American Airlines yearly swoop eastern travel writers out of the blizzards and deposit them gently but firmly in the Valley of the Sun with the enthusiastic cooperation of the chi-chi hotels, restaurants and dude—oops!—guest ranches. When the junkets are dampened by rain, there is anguished teeth-gnashing, good-natured shoulder shrugging and joshing all around . . . How nostalgic for an old
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Despite his words, Sherman’s tone was less sentimental than scornful, disclosing perhaps a southern California bias against a state that has become increasingly successful in competing for visitors and investors. The population of Los Angeles was five times the size of Phoenix in 1960, and had grown at a respectable twenty-five percent in the preceding decade; however, the population of Phoenix increased three hundred percent during that time.\footnote{Ibid.}

Sherman labeled Arizona “yeasty.” Did he mean restless, energetic, frivolous? Arizona described as each of these terms can be found in Sherman’s articles. A new characterization of Arizona also emerges, the newcomer cliché, that everyone who lives in the state is from somewhere else. As he told about native sons such as Barry Goldwater and Ted de Grazia, he remarked, “Almost everyone seems to be from elsewhere” and half of the population “are newcomers within the last decade.”\footnote{U.S. Bureau of the Census, \textit{Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1961}, 17, 18.} Sherman did not consider the Native American population of Arizona in this or any of the articles in the series.

Sherman attributed the astronomical growth, in part, to the air conditioning unit. “When the West was won, Arizona got tossed half-heartedly into the kitty,” he scoffed. Sounding like Daniel Webster describing the Southwest in 1850, Sherman stated, “It was tucked out of sight and mostly out of mind, a barren patch of wasteland populated mostly by Indians and cows, tolerable in the winter but unbearable in the summer. That was fifty years ago.” Arizona would have remained under-populated without the invention. “Air-conditioning is to Arizona what the iron horse was to California,” Sherman declared, “the key that unlocked the frontier. Without it, the murderous summer temperatures would shrivel the ambition of those\footnote{Sherman, "Arizona Booming as Mecca for Sun Seekers."}
who spur the State to maverick prominence.” California’s distance from the rest of the nation kept it isolated until the railroads provided the means to cross the western expanse. Heat kept the Arizona desert less attractive until air conditioning provided a more habitable environment.

In the series’ second article Sherman paused his mocking tone and with seriousness took up the Miracle of Arizona’s Growth story, echoing Arizona Republican articles at the time of statehood, telling of people who came to Arizona to visit and became residents. Sherman gives as an example Motorola executive Don Noble “who came to Arizona for a vacation, promptly resigned from his Chicago office and was instrumental in the establishment of his firm’s first plant near Phoenix. It set a precedent for other electronics companies.” Arizona is a right-to-work state, Governor Paul J. Fannin explained, “Wages are ten to twenty-five percent lower here than in larger industrial areas while per man production is ten to twenty-five percent higher.” Sherman also interviewed Phil Theiss, regional director of the AFL-CIO Central Labor Council of Arizona, who stated, “This is a good place to live if you have money, or are making money, but it’s a hell of a place to live if you’re making fifty or sixty cents an hour. Then all you get is sunshine.” These words, quoted in an article published in a nationally-read newspaper, described two Arizonas, one for business people and one for the people who work for them. An investor or entrepreneur contemplating starting or growing a business would consider Arizona, based on these words. Laborers and wage earners considering a move would not.

319 Ibid.
Sherman once again framed Arizona from southern California’s viewpoint in an extra article on day two of the series. This was Sherman’s fairytale of Arizona: “There is an air of ascendancy in Arizona, California’s gawky neighbor . . . She’s getting into the act on the electronics circuit and shaking the sand out of her slipper in the fond hope of becoming the Cinderella of the Union by the end of the century.” The picture drawn here in words is a grubby hearth servant with visions of grandeur. What role does California play in this fairytale? Sherman’s tone implies evil stepmother or mean stepsister. Instead Sherman casts California as fairy godmother, writing, “With California her godmother, she hopes to see her cactus turn into the golden coach of industry which can ride to meet the Prince of Prosperity.” Like the Los Angeles Times reporters of the 1930s, Sherman’s Arizona was dependent on California; it was a satellite of the older state.

The third article in the series reveals an Arizona that has moved away from its progressive roots, ideologically becoming the place it will be at its one-hundredth anniversary. For example, state leaders’ words of explanation regarding the rejection of federal aid—“we’ll do it ourselves”—would be reflected in newspapers fifty years later. Unlike 2012, in 1962 conservatives embraced the philosophy but rejected the label. “Groping around for the political conscience of Arizona, you begin to hear one statement repeated constantly from all quarters, Republican and Democratic, management and labor: ‘We elect the man, not the party.’ This attitude stems from the lingering frontier personality of the state that not so many years ago counted more cattle than people,” Sherman wrote. However, his tone is less glib and sarcastic in this article. He explored the idea that “Deep South thinking shades its politics,” and had politicians admitting, “Arizona has a ‘slight heritage of state’s...
rights.” A look back at the statehood fight confirms this statement, but that conflict was embedded in progressive ideals. In 1962 Arizona had become a conservative state. At least that is the perception, and proving perception creates identity, Sherman stated, “If Arizona were not in fact a conservative state, it would now be conservative by association,” because of Barry Goldwater.

Goldwater was not the only conservative voice in the state. “True, the state turned down urban renewal,” said Valley National Bank’s Walter R. Bimson. “We don’t want federal aid. And the same applies to federal aid to education. We’ll do it ourselves . . . I’d say the state is independent rather than conservative.” The results of this “independent” thinking, according to Sherman, could be seen just down the road from the state capital building. “Nowhere is the expression ‘the other side of the tracks’ more apropos than in Arizona’s capital. The demarcation between north and south Phoenix is stark, a miserable commentary on lack of urban renewal.” Sherman wrote of an Arizona seldom described, “Pavement virtually ends at the tracks and south of them lies a large Mexican and Negro community of depressing squalor, muddy with the rains and dust-ridden with the sun.” A clergyman whose church was located in south Phoenix said, “They refuse federal aid and say they’d rather do it on their own. But they never do.”

Sherman became the California partisan again in the fourth article. Published on Statehood Day, this article about water development reflected the view of a person whose home state and Arizona had always been at odds over water. Sherman did not mention the Colorado River Storage Project, Hoover Dam, or the new Glen Canyon Dam. Arizona “hasn’t acted like a state withering from lack of water,
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although of course the plea is that water is the key to the future,” he wrote. “Like all
desert states, Arizona depends on water for progress—and in Arizona, progress is its
most important concern,”324 this from a longtime California resident whose state also
participated fully in water politics.

Sherman’s final article in the series began with the state motto, “God
enriches.” He followed with the statistics, the growth of bank deposits (more than
doubled from 1950 to 1960), industrial employees (again, more than twice as
many), and industrial payroll (three times as much) in the last ten years. “True, God
enriched Arizona with breathtaking scenery, an octave of climate, an abundance of
natural resources, and one of the world’s wonders in the Grand Canyon,” Sherman
declared. Despite his reporting in the “Far Right Label” article, and overlooking God’s
command to take care of the least, Sherman concluded, God “also helps those who
help themselves, and a purposeful bunch of natives and perspicacious outlanders has
benefited by the bargain. In the last decade they have done God’s work well in
Arizona.”325

Of this assignment, to write about Arizona at fifty, Sherman said, “It’s an
extremely interesting assignment, digging a little under the façade of a state
designed for tourist consumption. Not that that’s bad, but it’s often too superficial
and self-serving to give any indication of what makes the state tick.”326 Sherman did
not dig under the surface, did not apply the skills of investigative reporting that led
to a Pulitzer Prize, and seems not to have traveled beyond Arizona’s capital city. He

324 Gene Sherman, “Arizona Less Parched Than Court Pleas Hint: State Has
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325 Gene Sherman, “Arizona’s Money Tide Inundates Desert Lore: Mounting
Bank Deposits, Payrolls Show Tourism Gives Way to Economic Growth,” Los Angeles

326 Sherman, “Reporter at Large: Arizona at 50.”
did not explore the burgeoning environmental conservation movement or the relationships of Native Americans with industry or state leaders. He did not interview people such as Joseph Wood Krutch or Helen Sekaquaptewa to get diverse perspectives, deeper perceptions about Arizona, the place it had been and what it was becoming. Instead, with an eye to his own state of residency, he employed the time-tested truisms of climate, scenery, and tourism, and added the expression of the Miracle of Arizona’s Growth and the newcomer cliché.

Other newspapers published articles about Arizona on the eve of its fiftieth year. Despite Sherman’s posture on Old West versus modern Arizona, the Old West was still profitable for tourism. Thomas E. Lesure of the New York Times described where visitors could find this Arizona, even as he referenced the Miracle of Arizona’s Growth. Lesure wrote, “The magic word in Arizona is ‘growth’—amazing, colossal, stupendous, as Hollywood writers say. All that people seem to talk about is how fast the state is expanding. The way things are going—and the development is real, not fictitious—tourists might easily wonder whether any remnants of the wide open spaces of the Old West still remain.” He assured his readers that “this land of cowboys and Indians maintains its essential frontier magnetism. Provided, that is, that one gets away from the burgeoning metropolitan sections . . . Despite its rapid growth, Arizona remains a land full of breathing space and sights to match.” How is that possible, with this “stupendous” growth? Lesure explained the spectacular population growth had been centered in already-established metropolitan areas, hardly affecting the state’s wide-open spaces.327

Where are these wild, remote places where the reader can find Old West Arizona? One region, according to Lesure, in northeastern Arizona and the Navajo

Reservation, was seeing development due to oil and uranium discoveries, with roads being graded and highways paved. But, “The inroads of civilization are mostly illusory. If one goes a mile or two off the roads, progress seems as far away as ever. Isolated hogans, their doors facing east to greet the rising sun, blend with the brown, mesa-humped landscapes that stretch outward without end.” Another remote area could be found in Palm Canyon in the Kofa Mountains north of Yuma. “More than all else, the gorge, where the trail follows a well-worn mountain sheep path, practically duplicates locales that gold-seeking prospectors stumbled over in search of El Dorados. And it is just as harsh and lonely,” Lesure wrote. The seeker of the Old West need not fear, “Thus, despite its rapid growth, Arizona remains a land full of breathing space and sights to match. On the surface the situation appears to be changing quickly, but for tourists in search of scenes of the Old West it will be a long time yet before the look of the present completely pushes out that of the past.”

Joe Alex Morris chronicled his automobile tour around Arizona for the *Saturday Evening Post*, discovering the place for himself. Morris reinforced the prevailing clichés about Arizona and offered a more thorough (yet still Anglo) perspective in writing about Native American Arizona. Arizona’s dualities, its extremes of natural and cultural landscapes, are reflected in Morris’s descriptions. “Arizona is a big state full of contradictions,” he stated. ”It has splendiferous scenery, including the Grand Canyon, the Painted Desert, the Petrified Forest and miles of gigantic saguaro and organ-pipe cactus. But you can also drive for hours through the most desolate terrain this side of the Sahara, and hunters still regularly and perilously get lost for days in the treeless, rocky back country."

---
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Of Arizonans, Morris explained, “The population at first glance gives the impression of being hustling, friendly young people who live informally and whose knowledge of local history is based largely on television films . . . Yet the state has become a rapidly growing haven for many thousands of ‘senior citizens’ seeking peaceful comfort in ‘retirement cities,’ where no children are allowed and nobody under fifty years of age can buy a home.” Phoenix was the epitome of Arizona’s progress and modernity. “Modern plumbing and manmade lakes have brought phenomenal growth to this hot, colorful land,” Morris wrote. “Millionaires now infest the hills where fierce Apaches once held sway.”

But Phoenix, “with its 459,000 people and 8000 private swimming pools,” was not the only Arizona.^330 Morris took the reader to the Navajo Reservation, describing it in more detail than Lesure did, writing, “The most forbidding and, in some ways, the most exciting area I visited is the northeastern quarter of Arizona, a land of high barren mesas that is dry and hot in summer and bone-chilling when swept by winter winds.” Visiting the Apache reservations, Morris granted the same progress there that has occurred in other areas of the state. “The Apaches,” he explained, “were regularly robbed and cheated for many years, both before and after their fierce attacks on white men in the 1880s . . . But in recent years the 4000 residents of the 1,650,000-acre Fort Apache Indian Reservation have organized numerous tribal cooperative enterprises, developed one of the states finest recreation areas . . . and now own, individually or communally, about 20,000 head of the finest cattle in the Southwest.” Even with its miraculous growth and progress, though, Morris assured his readers that the Old Arizona still existed. “All of this might seem to suggest that Arizona has shed its frontier ways, become sedate and mature and lost the spicy,

^330 Ibid.
rambunctious flavor of the Old West. Any such assumption would be reckless, indeed.”

ARIZONA’S 50TH ANNIVERSARY PUBLICATIONS

Advertising and place promotion often occur simultaneously. At Arizona’s fiftieth anniversary, the partnership between boosting and advertising produced several noteworthy publications. Created for consumption by readers beyond Arizona’s borders, the anniversary publications reveal Arizonans’ views of themselves and their state. The clichés of extremes are present in Arizonans’ own words. “Arizonans have been men and women of rugged adventurous spirit, befitting their ‘frontier spirit’ . . . Writers of national reputation refer to ‘the miracle of the Southwest’ as they report on our progress,” Governor Paul Fannin proclaimed. “This half a century built a bridge from buckboards to jet engines, from mud huts in the mesquite to the gleaming towers in the sky,” declared Arizona newspaper publisher Eugene C. Pulliam.

The reality was that frontier life in Arizona had not been uniformly romantic, not all stories about its colorful past were true, and not all participants in the exploring and settling of Arizona were victors, as the state’s large Native American population could attest. These stories remained untold in the semi-centennial literature (this unfortunate term is found throughout the fiftieth anniversary literature). Similarly, the Miracle of Arizona’s Growth was not experienced by all of the state’s residents, nor were all of the effects of growth positive. As Gene

__________________________
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Sherman’s reporting demonstrated, Arizona’s increasing prosperity did not reach many groups such as Hispanics, African Americans, and Native Americans. 

The most substantial anniversary publication was not an official state publication. The magazine-size, 560-page, three-pound special edition of the *Arizona Republic*’s magazine *Arizona Days and Ways* included histories of the state, its branches of government, and laws; histories of the state universities and the state’s utility companies; detailed stories about dozens of the state’s businesses coupled with their advertising copy; columns and letters by prominent state and federal officials and well-known Arizonans; and reports covering every facet of life in Arizona—cattle and mining industries, housing and retirement, government and education, the medical field, and religious institutions, just to name a few. The book is a demonstration of what a group of people, the *Arizona Days and Ways* editorial board, and those whom they chose to write for the issue, perceived as Arizona, and their endeavor to create and promote a place in which people would visit, invest, and relocate.

In the preface to the publication, the Arizona Development Board, whose self-stated purpose is “to tell folks everywhere how wonderful Arizona is,” described the fifty-year-old state as a place for endless opportunity for all and evoked the post-World War II standard description of the Arizona Miracle: “We’re salesmen for a product that sells itself. But the one thing we never forget—this dynamic economy of ours requires a continuing influx of new talents, new tourist money, new retirement residents, new investment capital.” The book contains no articles by naturalists or references to the developing conservation movement; this publication is strictly devoted to growth.

---

Built from a rough but wondrous landscape, Arizona was now the land of opportunity, according to the publisher of the *Arizona Republic*, Eugene C. Pulliam. He employed the temporal cliché of oldest landscape in the youngest state, “The land that is Arizona, youngest of the states but two, was already old with fossils when the Rockies and Sierras thrust their backbones above an ancient sea. In no other place in America have so many tireless centuries of wind, sun, flood, and irresistible time itself etched great pinnacles against the sky, gouged out vast canyons in the earth, painted the sands a thousand hues, raised up the great mesas, and laid out the vast valleys.” But the Arizona of 1962 was thoroughly modern, Pulliam assured his readers, and the reader need not fear a missed the opportunity. “Here are the people with the indomitable courage. Here are the great forests and the cool high country, the rolling plains of the southern grasslands, the warm living deserts, the placid inland lakes. Here, in short, is opportunity untouched that dwarfs even opportunity realized.”

Arizona governor Paul Fannin described Arizona’s rough land fostering a frontier spirit that still permeated the place. His contribution to the publication explained that in February 1912, Arizona “was a rough territory” with a scattered pioneer population. “Today, we are a highly developed modern state, with towns and cities which are booming,” Fannin wrote. “Yet, Arizona has never lost that territorial spirit of expectancy, the belief that greater things are yet to come, a spirit which has always been the hallmark of the American frontier.” Fannin too, evoked the Arizona Miracle, writing, “Time and again the spotlight is thrown on ‘amazing Arizona.’”

The president of the United States contributed to the story with a letter to the people of Arizona, declaring that the Arizona Miracle resulted from the land and the pioneer

---
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spirit that built a marvelous, forward-looking place and people. John F. Kennedy wrote, “Arizona has reached a rich maturity after a phenomenal growth in population, industry, and scenic recreation . . . The pioneer vigor and breadth of vision which built Arizona are essential well springs of strength for the nation and the continued development of a free and forward looking society in the decades ahead.”

Native son Stewart Udall also ascribed Arizona’s independence to its rugged land and determined people. “Most of us from Arizona,” wrote Udall, “believe we have developed a character all our own, based on the values of imagination, daring, and independence which carved Arizona from the desert land.” Reflecting his position as Secretary of the Interior, Udall described the connection between the people and the land, “Yet, Arizona essentially has been a story of man and his relationship with the land . . . From Arizona’s once-arid acres, we have wrought an agricultural economy which supplies the tables of housewives everywhere. We have developed a minerals industry which is essential to our nation’s prosperity and defense. With nature’s bounty, we have created a mecca for vacationing America.” In discussing Arizona’s challenges, Udall presented ideas that would become part of his 1963 book *The Quiet Crisis*. “To achieve the material things of an urbanized and industrial society, we have at time ignored, denied, and exploited our Arizona landscape and the resources which it holds,” Udall lamented. “Fortunately, Arizona is one of the few remaining states which still has the opportunity to decide its future—to determine what kind of an environment we will leave to our children’s children. Given this opportunity, we must act quickly to preserve and protect our natural resources—our

---


mountains, forests, deserts, and places of history.” Rivers and canyons are not on the list, even as the diversion gates at Glen Canyon Dam were being readied to close.

On Bud Kelland’s first sight of the Arizona desert, arriving in the late 1930s with his son and pulling a travel trailer, he liked it immediately. “Before us spread to infinity the sun-drenched desert of Arizona, incredibly rich in color, embellished by such flora as we never before had beheld. It was Wonderland. We stopped the car, turned to each other, and with common impulse said in unison, ‘Here is where we are going to live!’” A once well-known fiction writer and longtime Arizona resident (Days and Ways calls him “America’s Best-Known Fiction Writer”), Kelland attributed the state’s conservatism to its landscape. He stated, “One cannot live in close touch with our beautiful deserts and our stern, majestic mountains without breathing in an air of honesty and solidity and reverence which they inspire.” This may sound like a call to conservation rather than conservatism, but he continued, “Our environment, our historical background, the character and integrity of those pioneers who wrested this state from the wilderness and set its fertility to produce riches, will never permit it to go blundering off in pursuit of the heathen idols of radicalism or socialism or other isms that threaten our most precious possession—human liberty.” This certainly was not the Arizona that inspired J. B. Priestley’s rumination on communal America twenty-five years earlier. In case the reader still is unsure of Kelland’s and, by his inference, Arizona’s, politics, he wrote, “The conservatism of the United States centers in Arizona under the splendid leadership of Senator Goldwater.”

---
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Women contributed six articles in this 560-page book, writing about retirement living; food; the arts; horses, rodeos, and dude ranches; women’s bowling leagues; and an article about Arizona’s clothing styles. Maggie Savoy, editor of the newspaper’s column Lady Fare, declared, “This Rough-And-Ready country of ours has calmed down a bit, now that they’ve taken the hitching posts off the main streets. And it isn’t necessary to wear your guns to a cocktail party anymore. But we’re still mavericks, when it comes to fashion.” How is that, the reader wonders. Arizona women were wearing leather two years before Paris announced that it was in style, Savoy claimed, and “long before the East discovered ‘crash colors,’ we were wearing them here, aping the crashing colors of the sunset in our silk-screened patio dresses.”

While women reporters received a small amount of space in the book, minorities authored no articles. However, they were written about. In an article titled “Arizona’s Earlier Residents,” a piece actually about the state’s contemporary Native Americans, reporter Ralph Mahoney explained the dynamics of Arizona’s Indian tribes to readers, setting the story in this context: “The Indians of Arizona and the Southwest have been placed in a difficult position: they are part of a society that is ready to engulf them before they are able to adjust to its demands.” His eight-page article discussed each of Arizona’s fourteen Indian tribes, without quoting any tribal members, and describes their languages, religions, agricultural and farming methods, arts, and reservation lands, from the perspective of an Anglo reporter who was certain all of these cultural identifiers will eventually fade away. Mahoney also wrote of the people who built Arizona—Chinese, Japanese, Italians, Hispanics, and African Americans among them. “None could have envisaged the wealth in people
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that followed the path across the continent to hack towns and cities out of an arid
desert and a virgin forest,” Mahoney wrote. And now, in 1962, “In their hands and in
their minds lies the future of Arizona.”³⁴³ Though they dug pits for the mines, cut
trees for the timber companies, and built houses in the growing suburbs, none of
these groups were found in the anniversary edition articles about these industries.
Unmentioned are the contributions of minority workers in turning the frontier into
this modern state.

The only piece contributed by an ethnic minority in this huge book is a letter
to the people of Arizona from the Chinese Chamber of Commerce. The Phoenix
Chinese Chamber of Commerce was incorporated in 1939, at a time when
discrimination against Chinese was customary and widespread. The Chamber sought
to help Chinese American citizens “integrate into the mainstream of society through
participation and involvement in community affairs.” By 1962 Chinese Americans had
achieved significant prosperity in Phoenix.³⁴⁴ Perhaps from this position of quiet
prosperity they felt secure to comment. The letter is the only minority voice in any of
the semi-centennial publications. “Arizona, as is true of all America, is composed of
various races, religions, and creeds, each and all contributing their share of their
cultural heritage and characteristics to the life-stream of the country,” the letter
begins. “We, both the American-born and those of us from the old country of China,
are proud of whatever influence—quiet, reserved, more felt than seen—that we
might have had in fostering the cultural, financial, and civic growth of our beloved
State of Arizona.” The Chamber wrote in a nonthreatening tone, yet still asserted


³⁴⁴ Chinese Chamber of Commerce Arizona, “About Us,”
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their role in Arizona’s development. The short piece ends this way, “Arizona has been bountiful to us and we are grateful for the many opportunities which the American way of life has afforded us. We, your neighbors of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, pledge ourselves to continue to put forth our best endeavors in behalf of Arizona.”

To mark the beginning of the year of the semi-centennial, the Arizona Republic included an anniversary supplement to be distributed with regional newspapers in January and February, inserted within the regular newspaper edition. Each newspaper printed its name and the issue date in the space provided on page one. The twenty-four page, four-color supplement focused on the image of Arizona progress, dryly stating, “In her comparatively short life as a state, Arizona has vaulted from a position of baby state to a position of preeminence among her peers . . . and has attained such maturity she leads the other forty-nine states in ten of twelve important growth indices.”

One article retraced Arizona’s history and explored Anglo-Indian relationships. The authors allowed for the provoking of the Apache by Anglos, “Antique newspapers and traditional western writers cast all cowboys and miners as strong silent saints, all Indians as red demons. History, on the other hand, casts reds and whites alike as human beings.” The supplement included articles on Arizona’s growth, with all of the requisite numbers in population (a 959 percent gain in population from 1900 to 1960), tourists (which accounted for $290,000,000 of the state’s 1960 income),


bank deposits (375 percent of the 1950 total), and income from manufacturing (an increase of $300 million from 1956 to 1960).\(^{348}\)

*Arizona Highways*, the state publication with a national audience, combined its February and March issues into one large anniversary publication. Edward H. Peplow, the same reporter who coauthored the newspaper supplements, wrote of the epic Arizona chapter in the equally-epic American story. “Nothing about Arizona has been small,” Peplow wrote. “The turbulence of her geologic history and the treasures laid down then in her rugged vastness; the unsung accomplishments of her prehistoric inhabitants which parallel those of early Egyptians; the ironies of her first explorations by white men; the treacheries, struggles, tragedies and heroisms which marked her Americanization; the vision and work which have guided her from a position as baby sister among states to that of most dynamic in a dynamic nation.”\(^{349}\)

The vice president of Valley National Bank, Herbert A. Leggett, took up the booster language to encourage visitors and investors. Employing the temporal cliché writ large, Leggett wrote, "As one gazes into the colorful depths of Arizona’s Grand Canyon, it begins to dawn on the viewer that fifty years is but a fleeting instant in the eternity of Time. Here is a creation that took not centuries, not millenniums of time, but millions upon millions of these units men call 'years.' To us mortals there are normally allotted but three score and ten of these units, i.e. less than a century but more than enough to encompass the period of Arizona’s statehood."\(^{350}\)

---

\(^{348}\) *Arizona’s Golden Era: Arizona’s 50th*, 8, 9, 18.


assured the nation that Arizona had plenty of water to sustain its population growth, with no mention of the Colorado River Storage Project, Glen Canyon Dam, or the dams being considered near Grand Canyon. He did not explain how or why this statement is true.\textsuperscript{351}

The newcomer cliché finds space in Leggett’s article as well. “Since a majority of Arizonans are non-natives,” he wrote, “actually originating from all over the world, this makes for a cosmopolitan type of citizenry possessing few prejudices or provincialisms.” His concluding statement shouts from the page in all uppercase letters: “ARIZONA MAY NOT BE PERFECT ITSELF—BUT IT DOES SPOIL YOU FOR LIVING ANY PLACE ELSE.”\textsuperscript{352}

The tourist publication \textit{Arizona Guide} (a copy of which could be had for a dollar in many of the resort hotels in the state) supplemented its calendars and lists and nature articles with advertising, and employed the clichés of extremes, temporal and cultural, in its opening passage. “Arizona is worth knowing. It is a land of contrasts from forests of pine and fir in high mountain country to forests of cactus in sea-level deserts—from abandoned communities of pre-historic Indians to beautiful modern cities. The Old West still lives. Many ranches are owed by the families that carved them out of the frontier. Indians still live whose childhood memories are of a fugitive life avoiding U.S. troops.”\textsuperscript{353}

In another collaboration between boosters and advertisers, \textit{Pictorial America} published an Arizona fiftieth anniversary edition, celebrating the state in a 175-page magazine-size book with color photographs interspersed with information about
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towns, state history, and advertising. Part one includes full-page, full-color photographs of Arizona scenery placed between chapters of Arizona history, with prominently-displayed advertisements for Arizona’s businesses below each picture. The second half of the book is given to discussions of Arizona cities, alphabetically from Ajo to Yuma. On the first page Pollack asked, "What is Arizona?" He then lists, in paragraph form, dozens of things that Arizona is, separating the items by ellipses. Arizona is "land of towering peaks and outstretched deserts . . . last frontier of the Great West." Further on, Arizona is "where music is the clicking of Mexican castanets . . . the weird chant of the melancholy Indian peoples . . . and the pounding of hoofs on the range." And still further on, it is "a land whose vast panorama of color . . . beauty . . . and romance . . . no one book can completely portray. This is Arizona."  

CONCLUSION

At the time of its fiftieth anniversary, stories about Arizona were still dominated by white men writing about the state’s progress and possibilities, themes that had created and defined it for half a century and longer. In 1962, however, new voices were being heard, new words being written, and an Arizona very different from the clichéd ancient-modern, desert wasteland-verdant promised land was emerging. Joseph Wood Krutch’s desert works helped make Arizona’s natural landscapes part of the national debate on land use while simultaneously making words about that debate part of Arizona’s narrative landscape. Eliot Porter and David Brower’s The Place No One Knew set Glen Canyon as an example of what would be lost if the conservationists’ words went unheeded. The book, and other publications

---

about the place that followed, created a place being made and unmade, the lake becoming as the canyon disappeared, as Glen Canyon became Lake Powell. This Arizona story continues to be written.

Ann Woodin’s *Home Is the Desert* was a modern contribution to a long line of historical living-in-the-desert works. Juxtaposed with Helen Sekaquaptewa’s *Me and Mine*, the two serve as another example of the complexity of Arizona’s natural, cultural, and intellectual landscapes. Sekaquaptewa’s words at first may appear to be another in a series of Native American as-told-to autobiographies, but hers displayed a different perspective. Her words did not demonstrate an opposition to Anglo culture, but an embracing of it. Concurrently, there was little conflict within the author over Hopi culture; it was equally embraced. Instead, *Me and Mine* depicts a woman and a family who claim dual cultural citizenship. Yet, the book was still edited by an Anglo and filtered through the Anglo publishing apparatus. Two decades later, Native Americans would control their own Arizona stories and the means to publish them.

Reporter Gene Sherman’s *Los Angeles Times* articles provided an outsider’s perspective, an almost adversarial view, written for non-Arizonans. While the perception in these pieces was one man and one newspaper’s view, it may have represented the idea of Arizona for many people, and contributed to many others’ perception of the state. That Sherman failed to dig deeply or broadly created a shallow, narrow perspective of the place. Arizona’s own fiftieth anniversary publications presented the historic voice of Arizona—Anglo men—writing Arizona for the nation. Themes that had been dominant in Arizona’s narratives up to 1962 still found voice, still prevailed in these publications, but other voices were beginning to be heard. These new voices, new words, new stories, threatened this dominant
storyline and instilled a fear that found purchase in the 1980s with an effort to make English words the only official voice of Arizona.
In 1962, at its fiftieth year, Arizona’s population stood at 1.3 million. Twenty-five years later the population had nearly tripled, to over 3.5 million. In 1987 the phrase “Arizona Miracle” was no longer in vogue, but the conditions that gave rise to the moniker still prevailed. Arizona led the nation in creating new jobs and businesses, and in stimulating the growth of new companies. According to business analysts, Arizona “benefits from lower wages, warm climate and the surge in defense-related industries under the Reagan Administration.” The survey reflected each states’ economic successes (or failures) over a four-year period; Arizona’s job growth from 1984 to 1988 was over twenty-three percent, and the addition of nearly 1,800 new businesses with at least ten employees was the nation’s best. Fortyeight percent of Arizona’s jobs were in high-tech industries, “the kind of industries a Sunbelt state on the move wanted in the brutally competitive global economy of the late twentieth century.”

However, Arizona as the land of prosperity and opportunity was not the only narrative available to readers in 1987. Other narratives about Arizona revealed diversity and complexity. The seventy-fifth anniversary went nearly uncelebrated.

---


Arizona Highways included the traditional statehood stories in its February issue, as did the state’s newspapers on Statehood Day; the event earned no mention in the national press. The history department at Arizona State University sponsored an anniversary conference, providing a forum for scholars to look back and explore the state’s previous seventy-five years, but also to look forward at what the next twenty-five might bring. The conference resulted in a publication, perhaps the only book marking the date, Arizona at Seventy-Five; The Next Twenty-Five Years. Unlike the fiftieth and one hundredth anniversary publications, which were supported by advertising and contained articles lauding the state’s extractive industries and encouraging tourism and new business ventures, the publishing of Arizona at Seventy-Five relied on grants and donations, and the essays examined “the gap between image and reality,” the real place inhabited by real people rather than the image of the place portrayed in popular culture, illuminating an Arizona that readers of novels and newspapers rarely encountered.\(^{358}\)

At the time of its seventy-fifth anniversary, Arizona was a place beginning to be realized, to be known and understood more broadly. No longer the distant, isolated frontier or the young state miraculously growing, clichés that had defined and created it in words since statehood, in 1987 Arizona’s diverse cultural and natural landscapes were reflected in its written landscape, the multifaceted and multi-vocal place Arizona had always been was now revealed for readers.

In the 1980s Native American authors and poets wrote their own stories and published their own poetry and songs, reflecting Native American perspectives. No longer were Native Americans’ words subject to Anglo control and refracted through Anglo perceptions. In Arizona, publishers specializing in Native American works

facilitated an understanding of the state that had been missing. The Navajo Community College Press and the University of Arizona’s Sun Tracks series provided an outlet to Indian authors and stories that had been unavailable twenty years earlier, each publisher releasing several volumes at the time of the state’s seventy-fifth anniversary. However, the Navajo Community College Press obscured any lines between Anglo and Indian control, demonstrating the complexity of Arizona’s written landscape, with the books it chose to publish. Native American author N. Scott Momaday’s memoir *The Names* was reprinted in 1987, and poet Wendy Rose published several collections of her work during the decade. Both wrote about a connection to land and place that described their lives and experiences.

Reflecting a growing number of women authors, Barbara Kingsolver’s novel *The Bean Trees*, a book about a group of Tucson women affecting change in their community, was published in 1988 and was decreed Arizona’s most famous book by *Business Week* editors. Her nonfiction work *Holding the Line*, telling the story of the 1983 Phelps Dodge copper mines strike, followed a year later. Both books present an Arizona inhabited by strong women advocating for people who were unknown, unnoticed, and lacking power.

While state leaders continued to promote progress in the form of more growth and development, in both actions and words naturalists and environmentalists targeted that unrestrained growth and humanity’s careless, often willful, destruction of the natural landscape and resources. The process of recharacterizing Arizona as a place mindful of environmental change and humanity’s impact on the natural world that had begun in the 1960s with the Sierra Club’s *The Place No One Knew*, and Joseph Wood Krutch and Ann Woodin’s desert writings, accelerated in the 1980s. In

---

1987 *Arizona Highways* included articles addressing environmental concerns, in addition to its standard tourist fare. Naturalist Ann Zwinger wrote *The Mysterious Desert Lands*, an informational book laced with moving descriptions of the land and natural life within it. Edward Abbey's *One Life at a Time, Please* was published at the end of the decade, a collection of essays that reinforced his critical, action-driven environmentalism but also presented some surprises as he detailed his stance on immigration.

Arizona was no longer simply the place described by boosters and advertisers in their written words. It had never been solely that place. The diversity in the words written in the 1980s finally fully revealed the complexity of the place. Yet this diversity discomfited many Anglos. In that decade, as the state’s, and the nation’s, cultural landscapes became more diverse and polarized, groups worked toward moderating or silencing the many voices being heard and stories being told. English Language measures were introduced to amend the federal constitution and many state constitutions, including Arizona’s. In addition to the words of minority groups’ stories, the words imbedded in the discussions about language and the state’s Official English law presented a contentious, conflicted Arizona and became part of readers’ understanding of the state.

**NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESS BOOKS AND SUN TRACKS PUBLICATIONS**

Native Americans’ words and stories were not fully represented in Arizona’s written intellectual landscape until the 1970s. Before 1960 Anglo authors, editors, and publishers monopolized the publishing of Native American stories. Beginning in

---

the sixties, and accelerating in the seventies and eighties, Native Americans gained access to the non-Indian editors and presses to publish their own stories in their own words. By 1987 the Navajo Community College Press at Tsaile, Arizona, was publishing original and reprint publications about Navajo people and other tribes, and Sun Tracks, which began as a literary magazine published out of the University of Arizona’s American Indian Studies Program, became, in partnership with the University of Arizona Press, a publisher of book-length Native American titles.

The Native American publishing industry originated with various tribes and tribal members’ need for information. Vine Deloria, Jr. explained, “During the sixties and early seventies whenever Indians would gather together at conferences, the discussion would inevitably turn to the question of gaining access to information concerning programs, funding, and eligibility requirements.” At the same time, federal program managers sought ways to get information to the people whom they served. Out of this dual need rose an informal network of tribal newspapers and newsletters.361 As with non-Indian publishers, Native American presses developed an array of publications for a variety of needs—many tribes, publishing in different genres (tribal newspapers, community newsletters, literary magazines); publications

---

by tribes, schools, and advocacy groups; and for purposes such as news, education, and to provide employment information.

In Arizona at this time, two venues were established to publish manuscripts for and by Native Americans. Soon after its establishment in 1968 as the first tribally-controlled community college in the United States, the Navajo Community College (now Diné College) developed a press at its Tsaile, Arizona, campus. In 1971 a group of students at the University of Arizona in Tucson published the first edition of *Sun Tracks: An American Literary Quarterly*, a magazine dedicated to Native American creative endeavors.\(^{362}\)

The Navajo Community College Press published several books relevant to Navajo people in the 1980s. The books released as Arizona turned seventy-five, however, presented a confusing landscape of narratives—stories both by and about Native Americans—and reveal that the process of constructing the place that Native Americans knew as Arizona was still subject to Anglo influence. Three books demonstrate the continuum along which that influence could be found. *Southern Athapascan Migration, A.D. 200-1750* was a classic narrative about early indigenous people by an Anglo scientist. Similar to Edmund Nequatewa’s *Truth of a Hopi* and Helen Sekaquaptewa’s *Me and Mine, The Myth and Prayers of the Great Star Chant* was a Native American story with an Anglo editor; a white ethnographer collected the chants and stories, which were originally published by a museum specializing in Navajo ceremonial art. The editors of this book did collaborate with Navajo medicine

men, who were given credit throughout the book. Martha Blue’s *The Witch Purge of 1878* entwined Navajo oral history with Anglo documentary evidence to present a more complete picture of the witch purge events. The representation of Navajo Arizona for readers found in these three works still reflected various degrees of Anglo control of the storytelling and place-making processes.

*Southern Athapaskan Migration* by anthropologist and archaeologist J. Loring Haskell addressed the lack of synthesis he saw in the scholarly literature about the migration of indigenous people into the Southwest. This is a dry, scientific tome. For example, Haskell defined the “law of cultural systems” in a manner that brings to mind Joseph Wood Krutch’s rant against science. This law “is based on the recognition that all cultures are composed of three general classes of phenomena, vis., technology, social organization, and philosophy. Of these, technology is the most important and determines the content and form of the other two components.”

The book was entirely anthropological, with no references to Navajo or Apache origin narratives or traditional knowledge. Considering some of the science in the book, its reliance on “reexamining the osteological remains in light of current archaeological knowledge” for instance, it was remarkable that a Native American press published it. In addition to comparing skeletal remains, the author used North American language patterns to plot the Athapaskan migration, but the dense scientific language makes it nearly impenetrable for the lay reader. *Southern Athapaskan Migration* created for readers a Native American Arizona similar to the ancient Arizona described by archaeologists in the 1930s in their reports and the popular news stories drawn from them.

---
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Though published by the Navajo Community College Press, the songs and chants in *The Myth and Prayers of the Great Star Chant* were collected and edited by Anglos. David P. McAllester treated his subject, the oral histories of these chants, with respect and deference, explaining the backgrounds of the medicine men who performed the ceremonies, and including plates of the sand paintings that were an integral part of the ceremonies described. “For the Navajo, the interrelationships of stories, chants, and ritual express ideas that are experienced,” Rain Parrish, curator at the Wheelwright Museum, explained. Harmony and beauty are essential, vital, as is the “deep kinship we have with the earth,” and is exemplified in song: “Earth’s feet have become my feet by means of those I shall live on. / Earth’s body has become my body by means of this I shall live on.”  

One of the chants, the Prayer of Invocation and Liberation, called on Enemy Slayer, the son of Changing Woman and the Sun, to come to the aid of the person in need, and evokes the connection between harmony, beauty, and earth. “From the center of the earth, Naayéé’ Neezghání, using his dark staff, comes in to search for me; with lightnings [sic] flashing before him, with lightnings [sic] flashing behind him, he come in to search for me; Using a rock crystal and a talking k’eeťáán he comes in to search for me.”  

Like the Tohono O’odham songs in Ruth Underhill’s *Singing for Power*, the words of the songs belong to Native Americans but are presented by an Anglo editor.

---


Martha Blue’s short (thirty-five pages including references) history of the Navajo Reservation’s 1878 witch purge is less pedantic than *Southern Athapascan Migrations* and not as explicative as the Great Star Chant book; rather it is almost an outline. Blue collated oral histories collected from Ganado-area Navajos with Indian Service and military records of the time, in addition to utilizing correspondence between traders Charles Hubbell at Ganado and William Leonard at Fort Defiance, and Indian Agent John E. Pyle’s diary. “An ethnohistorical analysis” of the witch purge, an incident where Navajos killed other tribal members suspected of witchcraft, the book “chips [at] the historical view that Navajo leaders orchestrated it as part of their political gamesmanship.”

Blue compared the documents with the interviews, quoting Hubbell’s letter to Leonard of May 31, 1878, “There is a big row going on here, among the Indians, they just killed one of them and we are in danger of our lives . . . a big crowd just passed here and are going to fix themselves to go on a fight at Canon De Chelle [sic].” In 1970 Amos Johnson, a grandson of one of the participants, described the event this way in an oral history interview, “They lead him around there [Ganado Lake] for awhile and finally killed him by hitting him with an object.” Johnson explains the curse that Haloishjohn spoke before he was killed, “Hastiin Biwosi is our leader and we have buried some of your belongings, we have talked you into the ground, and now you will all die.”

Blue’s utilization of Navajo oral history provided depth to the shallow representations of the Navajo people found in the Federal Writers’ Project bulletins.

---
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and the *Arizona Guide* of the 1930s, and inserted the Navajo stories into Arizona’s narrative landscape where they had previously been invisible and unheard. *The Witch Purge* entwined Anglo documents (letters and diary) with Navajo oral history to expand the story of the witch purge and provided a deeper understanding than the version that relies on the Anglo documents alone. Blue compared the conclusions of the Anglo version and the conclusions resulting from the inclusion of Navajo oral history with a type of flower that blooms in bright sunlight, “The witch purge in the Anglo-American reports is like datura at night—small and shriveled. The Navajo accounts flesh out, like sun-opened datura, these dramatic incidents with a detailed chronology from a cultural perspective.”

The University of Arizona, through the Sun Tracks series, began publishing original works by Native American authors, as well as reprint editions by Native writers. When its first issue was published in August 1971, Sun Tracks became “one of the first publishing programs to focus exclusively on the creative works of Native Americans.” Students in the university’s American Indian Studies Program developed the literary quarterly, which would present their own contributions as well as work from well-known authors and artists. They chose the name of their journal from a poem,

> the Track of the Sun across the Sky leaves its shining message, Illuminating, Strengthening, Warming, us who are here, showing us we are not alone, we are yet ALIVE! And this Fire . . . Our fire . . . Shall not die!

Atoni (Choctaw) 1971

---
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When the series evolved to book-length projects in 1980, editor Larry Evers sought the assistance of the University of Arizona Press. Initially it was a reluctant partnership, the press declining with the explanation that it did not publish literature. However, its editors decided, “because the subject matter has to do with Indians, and anthropology is a strength of our list,” they could partner with Sun Tracks. Just as the stories of the Native American past were once found in natural history museums (as anthropology, not history), the press categorized Native American literature as anthropology. Evers explained the issue “pervaded university presses and much of the rest of the publishing world into the mid-1980s.”

In 1987 Sun Tracks published three volumes, one a book about Yaqui deer songs, another a collection of interviews of Native American poets conducted by Joseph Bruchac, and the third a reprint of N. Scott Momaday’s memoir, The Names (see next section in this chapter).

In the 1930s Anglo ethnologists collected and published Native American songs, such as Underhill’s Tohono O’odham book of songs Singing for Power, and edited Native American traditional stories such as Mary-Russell Colton with Edmund Nequatewa’s Truth of a Hopi. In the 1980s collaborations between Indians and non-Indians resulted in a more encompassing understanding of Native American ceremonies and songs, with the Native American voice preeminent. Yaqui Deer Songs is an authentic rendering of Native American oral tradition into the written word. The songs are presented in Yaqui and an English translation, and include historical context—the reason for or the event at which each song is sung.

---
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Yaqui deer songs belong to Arizona’s narrative landscape in their oral form. *Yaqui Deer Songs* the book is a Native American contribution to the written narrative landscape of Arizona; even as the authors recognized and emphasized the importance of oral tradition, the songs and explanations create for readers the Yaqui experience of Arizona and their representation of the place. Yaqui deer songs are traditional and contemporary, Larry Evers and Felipe Molina explained. The songs “continue to be sung in Yaqui communities in both Sonora and Arizona. These are translations from a living tradition which stretches back past the time the Spanish slave trader Diego de Guzman first encountered Yaquis in 1533 into time immemorial.”

Evers and Molina began the project in 1979. Molina was a native Yaqui speaker and a deer singer who lived in Yoem Pueblo, a Yaqui community between Picacho Peak and Marana, Arizona, who met Evers while studying at the University of Arizona. Evers was a native speaker of English who studied the Yaqui language with Molina but did not speak it. In discussing their collaboration, they explained, “The historically exploitative aspects of the relationship between Euroamericans and Native Americans, teachers and students, investigators and informants, employers and employees, all cast long shadows around our effort to make this a fully collaborative project. It would be arrogant for us to suggest that we have avoided them completely . . . we want to remind you that we have tried.” The authors did not want their collaboration to be confused with the earlier Anglo-Indian relationships found in older ethnologic works.

---
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Unlike *Singing for Power* and *The Myth and Prayers of the Great Star Chant*, the songs in *Yaqui Deer Songs* are presented in both Yaqui and English; the Native American language version is as important as the English language version. The songs bring forth the Yaqui place, stories and songs emanating from their experiences. For example, the song “Flower-Covered Fawn” is the first song of the *phako*, the ceremonial occasion. In his commentary Molina said, “In this song we talk about [the fawn] coming out to walk around and to play in an enchanted opening in the flower world. When I sing, my mind is always in the flower world. That is where I think the songs take place.”

Over there, in the flower-covered enchanted opening,
as he is walking,
he went out.
Flower-covered fawn went out,
enchanted, from each enchanted flower
wilderness world,
he went out.\(^{375}\)

As each song is set down, in Yaqui and in English, the flower world of the Yaqui singers is created for readers who would not otherwise have known it.

The Navajo Community College Press released books that complicated an understanding of Arizona by adding Native American stories while reinforcing a measure of Anglo control over those stories, and the Sun Tracks series expanded the available literature by Native American authors and poets. However, these narratives were but a small part of the available body of literature about Arizona and may not have reached a wide audience. Other Native American authors and poets writing about Arizona, and their words drawn from its landscapes, were better known and their works were consumed by a wide readership.
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\(^{375}\) Evers and Molina, “*Senu Tukaria Bwikami*, One Night of Songs,” in *Yaqui Deer Songs*, 89, 88.
THE NONFICTION OF N. SCOTT MOMADAY AND THE POETRY OF WENDY ROSE

During the 1980s N. Scott Momaday and Wendy Rose were part of a growing contingent of Native American authors whose works became well-known and widely read. Joseph Bruchac, a Native American poet and publisher, interviewed Momaday and Rose, among others. These interviews were published in the University of Arizona Press’s Sun Tracks series as volume 15, the second 1987 volume. Both Momaday and Rose contributed Arizona stories; each came to the place in a different way. Momaday spent much of his youth on the Navajo Reservation and knew that part of Arizona intimately. He paved the way for other Native American writers with his 1969 Pulitzer Prize winning novel *House Made of Dawn*.376 His novels, memoirs, and essays weave place, whether Jemez Pueblo in New Mexico or communities on the Navajo Reservation, into the fabric of living. His memoir, *The Names*, first published in 1976, was reprinted in 1987 in the Sun Tracks series as volume 16.

Rose did not live in Arizona; she visited the state as a child and college student. But she imagined Arizona, and the Hopi people she was descended from, as if she lived her whole life there. Rose wrote poetry as a Hopi woman unable to claim that identity and place officially because of tribal traditions. Rose’s poetry explored that dichotomy, as well as the challenges she encountered as a Native American anthropology student, and her anger at the treatment of Indian people by Anglo society.

---

In the 1930s Indian autobiography occurred in the as-told-to genre, ethnologists interviewing and collecting stories from Native informants, deleting and rearranging the words to appeal to Anglo sensibilities, and publishing the stories for Anglo audiences. *Survival This Way* is a thoroughly Native American endeavor. Bruchac conducted the interviews; the Native American poets’ words were transcribed as they were spoken, no reordering or leaving out to comply with Anglo tastes; and the volume was published in a venue specifically focusing on Native American creative work. The poets’ words in *Survival This Way* explained their relationships to the natural and cultural landscapes, adding the Native American dimension to the place for readers and portraying an Arizona unlike the place Zane Grey or J. B. Priestley, or even Joseph Wood Krutch described, rewriting the place that had been created in the Federal Writers’ Project narratives and early newspaper articles.

In the introduction to his interview with Momaday, Bruchac wrote, “Momaday has returned to the Southwest which is the backdrop for so much of his important writing. Few people have described that landscape and its people with such love and precision.”

Momaday defined (Bruchac’s word) a Southwest landscape for the readers of his poetry, explaining, “I think it’s a much more spiritual landscape than any other that I know personally. And it is beautiful, simply in physical terms. The colors in that landscape are very vivid, as you know, and I’ve always been greatly moved by the quality of light upon the colored landscape of New Mexico and Arizona.”

---
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Even as Momaday spoke of writing places into being, referencing "Man Made of Words" (see Prologue), he recognized the effect the place, its people and landscapes, had on his writing. "I would say that much of my writing has been concerned with the question of man’s relationship to the earth, for one thing," Momaday explained. "Another theme that has interested me is man’s relationship to himself, to his past, his heritage. When I was growing up on the reservations of the Southwest, I saw people who were deeply involved in the traditional life, in the memories of their blood. They had, as far as I could see, a certain strength and beauty that I find missing in the modern world at large."379

Poet Wendy Rose explored a different type of landscape with Bruchac—cities. On the evils of modern cities represented in her poetry, echoing Krutch and Woodin, Rose said, "I don’t see cities as evil first off. I don’t think there should ever be more than, at most, a couple of thousand people living in one unit. I think beyond that it is impossible to be governed with any sense of integrity when you don’t recognize each other and have no obligation to each other . . . I become intensely uncomfortable in cities and I see cities destroy people I love.” Rose also discussed Native American influences in her work and revealed the difficulty of classifying cultural influences. "I’m being fairly careful not to cite tribe here because I was born and grew up at a distance from my tribe,” she said, "so I’m trying to deliberately separate myself from saying Hopi literature or Miwok literature—my community is urban Indian and is pan tribal.”

Rose’s poetry explored this cultural heritage: half Indian, half Anglo, growing up in an urban community far from the reservation. On the topic of her family and identity, she explained, "I was in that situation where the white part of the family had absolutely no use for any other races that came into the family . . . The Indian
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half is in a situation where, among the Hopi, the clan and your identity comes through the mother, and without the Hopi mother it doesn’t matter if your father was fullblooded or not, you can’t be Hopi.” Rose’s words reveal an intricacy in relationships that had been absent in older, less-personal works about Native Americans rather than by them, complexities in the cultural landscape that had always been present but invisible to those who knew of the place only through stories written by and facilitated by Euro-Americans.

The University of Arizona’s reprint of Momaday’s memoir The Names followed the publication of Survival This Way. Much of The Names is stream-of-consciousness memory recording, as a child might remember, or an adult putting words to childhood memories. Momaday remarked on the power and magic of language and words. “Children trust in language,” he wrote. “They are open to the power and the beauty of language, and here they differ from their elders, most of whom have come to imagine that they have found words out, and so much of magic is lost upon them. Creation says to the child: Believe in this tree, for it has a name.” It is the learning of names, of words and language set down in long un-punctuated paragraphs, “fragmented and confused, images . . . which are mine alone and which are specially vivid to me” that pervade the book.

---
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Just as J. B. Priestley’s experiences in Arizona caused him to rethink American individualism, and just as the place drew out of Joseph Wood Krutch a conservation ethic, so did the place and Momaday’s experiences bring forth an idea of how words and place entwine. Bruchac asked Momaday about the magic of words in his interview for *Survival This Way*. “Words are powerful beyond our knowledge,” Momaday replied. “They are created in the imagination and given life on the human voice. You know, we used to believe—and I am talking now about all of us, regardless of our ethnic backgrounds—in the magic of words. The Anglo-Saxon who uttered spells over his fields so that the seed would come out of the ground on the sheer strength of his voice, knew a good deal about language, and he believed absolutely in the efficacy of language. That man’s faith—and I may say, wisdom—has been lost upon modern man.”383

Momaday was born in Lawton, Oklahoma, in 1934. His family lived on the Kiowa Indian reservation until he was two, when his parents went to work on the Navajo reservation. In Shiprock, New Mexico (*Naat’aaniineez*, Tall Chief, in Navajo), his father worked as a truck dispatcher with the Indian Services roads department and his mother as a switchboard operator at Shiprock Agency. Of the Navajo reservation and Oklahoma, Momaday wrote, “In my earliest years I traveled a number of times from Oklahoma to the Navajo reservation in New Mexico and Arizona and back again. The two landscapes are fixed in my mind. They are separate realities, but they are sometimes confused in my memory. I place my feet in the plain, but my prints are made on the mountain.”384

Place and language would be entwined for Momaday from the time he was a child. Whether told in Kiowa, Navajo, or English, the stories he heard were attached

to the land in that language. The family lived in Shiprock, in Tuba City and Chinle, Arizona, and on the San Carlos Apache Reservation in Arizona, during World War II. “But ‘home,’” Momaday explained, “was particularly the Navajo country, Diné bikeya. My earliest playmates and schoolmates were Navajo children and the children of the Indian Service employees. Just at the time I was learning to talk, I heard the Navajo language spoken all around me. And just as I was coming alive to the wide world, the vast and beautiful landscape of Diné bikeya was my world, all of it that I could perceive.”

Momaday brought Arizona into being for readers as he put into words a childhood memory about traveling on the reservation, first a memory of riding in his dad’s new green pickup, segueing into a winter night’s journey: “The little truck bounces over the dirt roads of the Navajo reservation, raises a great rooster tail of red dust. It is summer and there is a sharp glare on the sand, on the cottonwood leaves. There is a jolt which rattles my bones, and the buckboard bucks; snowflakes are whirling on the sharp wind. My mother and I hold on, on the way to Oraibi. The old man sitting above us is wearing gloves; he talks to the team and crouches in his striped blanket.” Momaday’s growing-up-in-Arizona stories were unlike Woodin’s descriptions of her sons’ desert childhood; though different, both sets of narratives construct Arizona for readers.

Momaday’s description of the desert in winter re-creates the experience in words, “Dawn is on the desert for a long time, and the air is clean and cold; it feels like frost, and it draws the skin tight about the hands and face. Look across the dunes wrinkled with light and shadow; the colors, before they deepen, are the colors
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of shells or of birds’ eggs.” In his description of Monument Valley, a place that bestrides the Utah-Arizona border and transcends political boundaries, Momaday involved all of the reader’s senses:

Monument Valley: red to blue; great violent shadows, planes and prisms of light. Once, from a window in the wall of a canyon, I saw men on horseback, far below, two of them, moving slowly into gloaming, and they were singing. They were so far away that I could only barely see them, and their small, clear voices lay very lightly and for a long time on the distance between us.

The valley is vast. When you look out over it, it does not occur to you that there is an end to it. You see the monoliths that stand away in space, and you imagine that you have come upon eternity . . . I believe that only in dîné bizaad, the Navajo language, which is endless, can this place be described, or even indicated in its true character. Just there is the center of an intricate geology, a whole and unique landscape which includes Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. The most brilliant colors in the earth are there, I believe, and the most beautiful and extraordinary land forms—and surely the coldest, clearest air, which is run through with pure light.

The reader can almost hear the men’s far-off song and feel the cold air as well as see the marvelous natural monuments. This was not Zane Grey’s hard, bereft landscape. The place Momaday described is life-filled and spirit-sustaining. With these words, this place became part of readers’ understanding of Arizona, broadening their perspectives.

Wendy Rose uses words in poetry to bring herself into being (“to name,” in Momaday’s words), to give existence beyond herself to her pain at being rejected by both sides of her family, her sense of belonging to a place and a culture she lived apart from, and her anger at what she and other Native Americans, present and past, endured at the hands of Anglo society. As Rose explored these issues in verse, she also created an Arizona in verse for readers.

Rose was born in 1948; her father was Hopi, her mother Anglo-Miwok. Her poetry claimed her Hopi ancestry and revealed her sense of abandonment by both
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sides of her family. "More than respect," she wrote, "I have needed to be claimed by someone as their own, someone who is wanted." As an adult she discovered her Anglo roots, Scottish and Irish. "This is not the heritage I would have picked—to be the daughter of the invaders. It is not where my sympathies lie," she confessed. However, "the colonizer and the colonized meet in my blood. It is so much more complex than just white and just Indian." That complexity can be found in her words, as she juxtaposes the various facets of her identity and through that exploration reveals the intricacies of Arizona’s, and the nation’s, cultural landscape where a Native American woman is "too dark to be Anglo, too white to be Indian," who grew up in an urban Indian community but felt connected to the Hopi Mesas, and who majored in anthropology so that she could write a dissertation about Native American literature. Because Rose’s reality was complex, so too was the place she constructed in her poetry.

Rose’s discontent in growing up in an urban Indian community is clear:

It is I in the cities, in the bars,
in the dustless reaches of cold eyes
who vanishes, who leans unbalanced

into nothing; it is I
without learning, I without song
who dies and cries the death-time,
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Who blows from place to place on creosote dust.\textsuperscript{392}

She felt disconnected from the people she claimed as hers, physically ("blown from place to place") and spiritually ("without learning" and "without song").

However, Rose is able to write about Hopi land and people as if she had been raised on the Hopi reservation. "Sipapu" speaks of traditional Hopi beliefs, written in a way that suggests emergence visually as well as with her word choice:

\begin{quote}
Hand by hand
bone by bone
dancing
on the ladder
like mosquitoes
climbing foot
by foot
heels hanging
impressions
of spruce
cut
into flesh\textsuperscript{393}
\end{quote}

Rose’s Home-going poems, published in \textit{Lost Copper}, documented her 1977 journey from California where her mother lived to the Hopi reservation and her father’s people:

\begin{quote}
Thirty years ago
a shred of brown cotton blew
from the cottonwoods
of Hotevilla; the sky lightened
to give it a passing to the west.
I remember: one lone Hopi
made it to the sea. It was 1947
\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots

California moves my pen
but Hotevilla dashes through my blood
like a great and
crazy dragonfly.\textsuperscript{394}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{392} Wendy Rose, “Vanishing point: Urban Indian,” \textit{Lost Copper}, 12.

\textsuperscript{393} Wendy Rose, “Sipapu,” \textit{The Halfbreed Chronicles}, 8–9.

Rose imagined a Builder Kachina, the title of this poem; it is not part of the Hopi tradition. She imagined it “based on the things my father really said to me . . . I’ve invented lots of Kachinas. I hope that it’s not thought of as too sacrilegious. But I’ve invented Kachinas that go into outer space. I’ve invented Kachinas that are in the ocean and a lot have appeared in the visual arts. This particular one appeared in poetry.” Like Edmund Nequatewa, Rose depicted religious aspects of her people in her writing, and like Helen Sekaquaptewa, she blended aspects of the traditional with the modern.

Rose also wrote about being an anthropology student, bringing the unique perspective of an Indian anthropologist to an Anglo-dominated discipline. She explained that her dissertation “involves a cultural-historical perspective on published literature by Native Americans. Such a degree should be, perhaps, granted by the English or Literature departments, but this is not the case . . . Native American Literature is not part of American literature.” Just as the University of Arizona Press agreed to publish the Sun Tracks books by classifying Native American literature as anthropology, Rose discovered that the University of California-Berkeley made the same categorization. During her first years in college in the mid-1960s, her archaeology classes “caused a crisis. It seems that I could feel the trowels, feel my bones smother in paper bags in a lab, become extinct in a museum display. Rather than peering down into the excavated pit, I found I was, instead, staring up at the


archaeologist from below.” Rose’s perspective was entirely opposite those of the archaeologists and popular publications creating an ancient Arizona in their reports and articles. She wrote these experiences into being in verse,

In this university
I am a red ghost
touching handprints
that gleam, bleached

There is somewhere
a woman
built from earthen blocks
who is not
specimen,
sideshow evidence
for “affirmative action.”

Rose reminds readers that the past inhabitants of Arizona were people, not specimens, and that connections exist between those early residents and Native Americans today.

As a writer of poetry, and as a person who studied literature in academia and wrote about literature in various venues, Rose declared, “My position is that all literatures may be viewed ethnographically. All literatures provide information about the culture of both writer and subject. All literatures are potential tools for the anthropologist—but not one literature more so than any other. Native Americans are not ‘more ethnic’ than Polish-Americans or Anglo-Americans; they simply may be called upon more often and more intensely to deal with their ethnicity. What literature is not ethnic? What person ‘has’ no ethnicity?”

Although the Anglo Arizona created in stories had been the dominant one for over a century, it was no
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more valid or real or important than the Arizona written about by Native Americans or Hispanics or even by the ethnic Russians who worked the sugar beet farms west of Phoenix. Rose’s poetry and essays presented another image of Arizona and added to the complexity of the state’s narrative landscape.

**ANN ZWINGER’S *THE MYSTERIOUS DESERTS*; EDWARD ABBEY’S *ONE LIFE AT A TIME, PLEASE***

Arizona’s population grew by nearly thirty percent in the 1980s; in 1987 the state was in the midst of a population increase second only to Nevada’s. The Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas absorbed much of that growth; the population of Maricopa County increased by over forty percent during the decade. Suburbs fanned out from central Phoenix and replaced cotton fields and citrus groves with single-family homes wedged together sardine-style, sometimes six or seven to an acre. Environmental quality concerns (groundwater depletion through suburban and industrial use and air pollution exacerbated by tens of thousands of daily commuters, for example) that had been the focus of conservationists for several decades became mainstream issues, and were reflected in the narratives about the place.

*Arizona Highways* supplemented its usual tourism and boosting articles with pieces describing the adjustments to these environmental concerns. Dennis B. Ferrell explained how municipalities adapted to groundwater regulations by increasing the use of effluent to irrigate parks and golf courses. Jan Barstad described Arizona ranchers embracing goat ranching and holistic resource management to mediate the
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effects of overgrazing. (Readers learn that goats prefer shrubs to grass and will forage on steep slopes, unlike cattle and sheep.) The appearance of these topics demonstrated the importance of such issues to the magazine’s readers. The editors did not take sides in the debates, however, instead choosing stories illustrating the resourcefulness of Arizona’s people and communities while remaining silent on the underlying reasons for the need of innovations, such as whether a desert landscape is a suitable environment for millions of people to inhabit.

Naturalist Ann Zwinger and environmental activist Edward Abbey both contended with the issues of conservation, preservation, and environmental degradation but each brought very different perspectives and tones to their writing. Zwinger facilitated understanding and appreciation with her lyrical and informational text, supplemented by her own illustrations. Abbey advocated an adversarial stance, pursuing an us-versus-them, by any means necessary activism in strident tones. But both agreed the issues are vital. In Zwinger’s words, “I suspect that the fierceness in our point of view may be much the same, we just go about it differently.” Zwinger and Abbey’s descriptions of Arizona and their narratives drawn from the state’s natural landscapes added to the body of literature about the place and brought a sense of urgency that readers might not have received from other representations.

Ann Zwinger did not set out to be a naturalist. An art history major, and graduate of Wellesley like Ann Woodin, at the time she commenced writing her first book she was a housewife and mother of three young girls. That book, Beyond the
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Aspen Grove, and her career as a naturalist, began as she made notes and sketches of the flora surrounding Constant Friendship, the family’s retreat in the Rocky Mountain’s Front Range near Colorado Springs. Also like Woodin, Zwinger’s book described her family inhabiting a wild area, albeit a high-mountain place rather than a desert. Zwinger’s method, however, was more analytical and encompassing than Woodin’s, incorporating botany and zoology into her narratives.

A writer whose words embraced equally the biology, zoology, and geology of a place, Zwinger’s work explored the natural world in places a varied as mountains above tree line (Land Above the Trees with Beatrice E. Willard, 1972) and canyons along river bottoms (Wind in the Rock, 1978). The story of her journey down Wyoming and Utah’s Green River, Run, River, Run: A Naturalist’s Journey Down One of the Great Rivers of the West, received the 1976 John Burroughs award.

“‘Naturalists are generalists,’ people who explore broad workings of nature,” Zwinger explained. Her examination of the four deserts of the American West was also an exploration of Arizona, the only state encompassing all four.

Desert is often the predominant image of Arizona, and often one that depicts a one-dimensional tract of sand. Zwinger’s desert book gave depth to that perspective. The Mysterious Desert Lands is a natural history of the Chihuahuan, Sonoran, Mojave, and Great Basin deserts. Like Glen Canyon and the Navajo people’s homeland, deserts know no political boundaries and their stories are shared, their narratives, like their natural landscapes, are of a piece. So, for example, while Zwinger writes about the Chihuahuan Desert based on an experience in west Texas, her words also describe the desert of a small southeastern corner of Arizona as well. Zwinger begins the story of the deserts’ natural history with the Chihuahuan Desert

in Texas, and takes the reader on a journey west and northwestward, through the stereotypical Arizona landscape of the Sonoran Desert, the sliver of the Mojave Desert in the state’s northwestern corner, and finally to the sagebrush-covered reaches of the Great Basin Desert, bordering Arizona’s northern edge.

Zwinger describes each desert’s geologic and natural history, both lyrically and scientifically explaining sediment and rocks, plants and animals. “The Chihuahuan is a rain-shadow desert,” Zwinger explained, “The Sierra Madre Oriental in Mexico . . . blocked the moisture-laden winds that had swept in from the Gulf of California and the Pacific Ocean, cooled them as they rose, and caught their precipitation on their western flanks. On the eastern side, the same winds compressed and heated as they descended, approximately four degrees Fahrenheit for every thousand feet, and arrived hot and dry. The rain-shadow effect is the most fundamental factor in creating the Chihuahuan Desert, causing a dry season that extends from late October in to early June.” Words that could be written in language as dry as the desert being described are instead infused with expression.

Describing the ever-present creosote, Zwinger illustrated in words,

> A breeze stirs the branches and the aroma swirls out of every leaf. I inhale that marvelous scent that graces the air, not cloying, not sweet, but resinous and clean. It’s what the world ought to smell like when it rains . . . I pull off one of the round white furry seed clusters and separate the five dark seeds. Although seeds could have reached southern Mexico and dispersed from there, there is also the possibility that they made the leap in one jump. The South American diploid is apparently self-compatible, so all that was necessary was one pioneer seed to sprout, mature, and self-fertilize.”

Like Momaday, Zwinger laced her descriptions with words that draw on all of the senses, bringing the Arizona desert to life for the readers.
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The Sonoran Desert, the region most associated with Arizona, is the state’s predominant desert landscape. Like other authors—Sharlot Hall, the Federal Writers’ Project writers, and Ann Woodin, for example—Zwinger depicts the Sonoran Desert’s unique yet stereotypical flora, writing, “It is the only North American desert with sizable ‘subtrees’ and treelike cacti, along with numerous deciduous and evergreen shrubs, and a marvelous variety of succulents. This particular assemblage of desert plants has been in place for only about four thousand years. An Egyptian ecologist, seeing the Sonoran Desert for the first time, exclaimed that this was not a desert at all but a veritable flower garden.” Like Hall and Arizona Highways articles, Zwinger emphasizes the beauty and life inherent in the state’s major desert landscape.

In writing about the human-caused changes in the Sonoran Desert, Zwinger employed strong imagery, a creating of Arizona that follows on Woodin and Krutch. Exploring along the San Pedro River east of Tucson, Zwinger rested in a bosque, “grateful to be out of the noonday sun. Black mesquite intertwine like Gothic tracery, the black trunks like ruins of ancient cathedral columns against brilliant emerald grass.” The bosques were disappearing because “a lowering water table from arroyo cutting has robbed them of their water, leaving graveyards of mesquite along the watercourses.” Zwinger wrote about a landscape marred by human use, or misuse, “If not sequestered in a national park or monument, the sparse plant growth of unprotected desert is frequently miserably overgrazed. One March night I camp in southern Arizona . . . I’ve thrown down a sleeping bag in some scruffy places in my life, but this cow pie-studded terrain is one of the dreariest. A landscape I know as so satisfyingly beautiful, so in balance, is here so tattered and beleaguered.”
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Zwinger described the stark difference between grazing and non-grazing areas in a story with an ironic twist. The Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge, an 860,000-acre tract along the Arizona-Mexico border established in 1939, is also part of the Barry M. Goldwater Gunnery Range. Grazing is not allowed within the gunnery range boundaries. “The landscape changes markedly the minute we enter the cloistered area,” Zwinger explained. “Although unmistakable desert in its openness, stalked with great regiments of saguaro and ocotillo, there are so many more plants, so much more variety in size and shape, such a wealth of colors, compared to the overgrazed area outside the fence.” This is the natural desert protected, as it were, from above (if one ignores the areas where the ordnance lands).

Just a sliver of the Mojave Desert lies in Arizona, a small area at the state’s northwestern corner. Zwinger described its creation with words that bring exactly to the mind’s eye what occurred: “Originally the Great Basin, Sonoran, and Mojave were a more or less homogeneous stretch of arid land. About two million years ago, the Mojave Desert uplifted as a block, rotated, and became a transitional desert, intermediate in climate and elevation.” The region of Arizona encompassed by the Great Basin Desert is also small, a section along the state’s north central and northeastern border. Often characterized as a cold desert, Zwinger’s Great Basin Desert was more nuanced, “Trapped in the interior of the continent, the Great Basin Desert suffers some of the most severe desert conditions in North America. Behind the rain shadow of the Sierra Nevada, barricaded from moisture coming in from the east by the Rocky Mountains, the Great Basin is an inland island desert. Although
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polar outbreaks bring temperatures below freezing, sometimes for extended periods, summer temperatures easily reach over one hundred degrees Fahrenheit. Like Ann Woodin’s perspective of northern Arizona’s landscape broadened as she and her husband flew over it, the nuances gained depth and became a textured, boundary-less landscape as Zwinger described the view from a plane:

From twelve thousand feet the Great Basin Desert has a past-finished aspect, as if all that could be done to it has been done, and now it is old and tired and worn-out, grizzled and gutted, faded and weatherbeaten. Sometimes the land has a worn velvet look, tucked with arroyos, pleated with mountains, a landscape seemingly without seasons or eternally half past autumn, a landscape left out to dry, forgotten, tattered with rain, wrinkled with sun, and yet, in a peculiar sense I cannot explain, always vital and never forlorn. Because big sagebrush is the same color winter or summer, the landscape has a changelessness that grants it an aura of stability.

It is this northern Arizona-southern Utah desert, changeless and stable, that drew Edward Abbey, and through his writing, readers learn that the land’s stability has one threat, humans.

Like Zwinger, Abbey did not intend to be a nature writer. He wrote compellingly about natural landscapes, and his words forcefully condemned human action against nature. Abbey became identified with, and his writings helped create, a militant environmentalism that found an outlet nationally in such groups as Earth First! A native of the Pennsylvania Appalachian Mountains, Abbey’s first trip West was in 1944 as a seventeen year old hitchhiking across the country before he was drafted into the army. On that trip he saw Grand Canyon, walking the last mile to the Rim, because it seemed “disrespectful, even irreverent, even blasphemous to ride to the edge of the Grand Canyon seated on one’s backside inside an
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upholstered, jiggling, clanking, mechanical contraption like the automobile." Abbey attended college at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque on the GI Bill at a time when the metropolitan areas of the southwest began to see the first waves of postwar growth and as the number of Americans traveling around the nation sightseeing increased. The ceaseless growth labeled by boosters and leaders as "progress" became a recurring theme in Abbey's work.

Abbey's two seasons as a ranger at Arches National Monument, in 1956 and 1957, became the raw material for his national success as a writer, as he turned his journals and experiences into Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness. Set in the canyon country of southeast Utah, the ideas and themes that became Edward Abbey hallmarks are found here. He begins Desert Solitaire in fine Krutch-like, nature-writer form—"It seems to me that the strangeness and wonder of existence are emphasized here, in the desert, by the comparative sparsity of the flora and fauna: life not crowded upon life as in other places but scattered abroad in spareness and simplicity, with a generous gift of space for each herb and brush and tree, each stem of grass, so that the living organism stands out bold and brave and vivid against the lifeless sand and barren rock"—and develops the themes of unrestricted development and "industrial tourism" that are found in many of his later works. His novel The Monkey Wrench Gang, first published in 1975, and like Desert Solitaire, reprinted in the 1980s, influenced environmental activists. The Monkey Wrench Gang
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follows a group of anarchists disgusted with industrial development as they act on their beliefs, and inflict damage on the timber industry, road and bridge builders, and dam construction on the Colorado Plateau. A story encompassing much of the Southwest, including Arizona, he continued to build on the themes of economic development and degradation of the natural world, this time in fiction.415

All of Abbey’s themes and arguments are brought together in a collection of his essays, articles, and speeches in One Life at a Time, Please. In the book he criticizes cows and overgrazing, condemns astronomical population growth and illegal immigration, and provides the transcript of his interview of Joseph Wood Krutch, one of the last Krutch gave. The theme of unhindered development defined as progress first seen in Desert Solitaire and acted upon in The Monkey Wrench Gang is addressed in an article written for Tucson’s Arizona Daily Star,416 and characterized Arizona as an example of what could happen when leaders are allowed to indulge their growth addiction.

In Desert Solitaire (1968) Abbey wrote, “There is no lack of water here, unless you try to establish a city where no city should be.” But hydroelectric dams, power lines, and canals were necessary, in the words of the water project promoters, “In anticipation of future needs, in order to provide for the continued industrial and population growth of the Southwest.’ And in such an answer,” Abbey writes, “we see that it’s only the old numbers game again, the monomania of small and very simple minds in the grip of an obsession. They cannot see that growth for the sake of


growth is a cancerous madness, that Phoenix and Albuquerque will not be better cities to live in when their populations are doubled again and again.\(^{417}\)

In *The Monkey Wrench Gang* (1975) he described his fictional character George Washington Hayduke returning "to the American Southwest he had been remembering, only to find it no longer what he remembered, no longer the clear and classical desert, the pellucid sky he roamed in dreams . . . The open desert was being scraped bare of all vegetation, all life, by giant D-9 bulldozers reminding him of the Rome plows leveling Vietnam."\(^{418}\)

And in the *Arizona Daily Sun* article “How Big Is Big Enough?” (1984) Abbey wrote, “Governor Bruce Babbitt tells us that by the year 2000, only sixteen years from now, Arizona will gain two million new residents . . . Tucson Mayor Lew Murphy—unable to conceal his smirking glee—predicts Tucson will become, within twenty years, a 450-square mile urbanized area . . . This, our leaders tell us, is good news. Growth is good, they say, reciting like an incantation the prime article of faith of the official American religion: bigger is better and best is biggest."\(^{419}\) As in *Desert Solitaire*, and reiterating an analogy he used often, Abbey stated, "The one disease to which the growth mania bears an exact analogical resemblance is cancer. Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell. Cancer has no purpose but growth; but it does have another result—the death of the host."\(^{420}\) For Abbey, the cities of Arizona were consuming the state like a cancer; this was the Arizona his words constructed.
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A surprise for many readers was Abbey’s stance on immigration, reflected in “Immigration and Liberal Taboos,” a revised reprint of an article published in the Phoenix New Times in 1983 titled “The Closing Door Policy.” Written at a time of increasing fervor over illegal immigration, and with minority voices being heard more loudly and in more venues (see following sections), and the growing perception that “American” society was at risk of being inexorably changed, and not for the better, Abbey’s article contributed to the cacophony of words surrounding issues of immigration, language, and race, that eventually culminated in Arizona with Proposition 106 and the Official English Amendment. The article was Abbey’s favorite in the One Life at a Time, Please collection.421

Abbey’s argument against immigration was primarily based on economics and environmental harm, and could be set in the context of immigration discussions in the twenty-first century as well: “The United States remains burdened with mass unemployment, permanent poverty, an overloaded welfare system, violent crime . . . plus the ongoing destruction of what remains of our forests, fields, mountains, lakes, rivers, and seashores . . . In which case it might be wise for us as American citizens to call a halt to the mass influx of even more millions of hungry, ignorant, unskilled, and culturally-morally-genetically impoverished people.”422

He appealed to a xenophobia present in the discussions, and railed against so-called anchor babies, “Can’t break up families, can we? They came to stay and they stay to multiply.” His words suggested that those brand new little American citizens drew the other family members across the border, like iron filings to a magnet. He explained why this “alien mode of life,” specifically Hispanic culture, did

421 See Abbey’s “Preliminary Remarks,” One Life at a Time, Please, 1–3.

not appeal to the majority of Americans, “Because we prefer democratic government, for one thing; because we still hope for an open, spacious, uncrowded, and beautiful—yes beautiful—society, for another. The alternative, in the squalor, cruelty, and corruption of Latin America, is plain for all to see.” Abbey was adamant that the United States could sustain no further population growth, and his was an equal-opportunity growth ban, against both natural population growth and immigration, legal or not. “The United States has been fully settled, and more than full for at least a century,” he declared.  

As naturalists, or environmentalists, Abbey and Zwinger appealed to different audiences, but both wrote of an Arizona, its and the nation’s natural landscapes, in need of protecting. Abbey’s position on immigration—while ostensibly involving the environmental issue that more people equals more growth, which equals more environmental catastrophe—surprised many environmentalists who agreed with him on other issues. However, Abbey’s was not a minority viewpoint in Arizona in the 1980s.

BARBARA KINGSOLVER, FICTION AND HISTORY

Kentucky native Barbara Kingsolver lived in Tucson for two decades, working as a science writer for the University of Arizona, where she earned her master’s degree; as a freelance journalist, writing Holding the Line, a history of the 1983 Phelps Dodge copper mine strike from the perspective of the women involved; and as a novelist, composing what Business Insider designated Arizona’s most famous book, The Bean Trees.  

Kingsolver’s main characters, in both novel and nonfiction,
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are women. She populated her work with the people society has overlooked or ignored—the abused, the homeless, orphans, and refugees. She gave equal space and value to Hispanics, those who have resided in the state longer than Anglo-Americans have inhabited it, and recent immigrants, both legal and not. Kingsolver’s 1980s Arizona books bring dimension to an already varied landscape, adding stories of strong women inhabiting a southern Arizona cultural landscape that relegates people like them, and those for whom they advocate, to the edges of society. With Kingsolver’s narratives readers learn about an Arizona different than the place found in the booster literature.

Both *Holding the Line* and *The Bean Trees* tell the stories of women making their way, and making a difference, in their communities and state. In her choice of topics and characters, Kingsolver contributed to the ongoing discussions about immigration, labor, ethnic interactions and racism, and women’s part in changing longstanding narratives about Arizona. *The Bean Trees*, which “was published to an enthusiastic reception” in 1988, received an American Library Association award. A year later *Holding the Line* was released “to less universal praise.”425

That *The Bean Trees* became the most famous book from Arizona (according to the *Business Insider* editors) indicates a wide readership, and thus it would have created in many readers’ minds Kingsolver’s version of Arizona. As J. B. Priestley used the Arizona desert to represent possibilities—just add water and watch it grow—Kingsolver’s Arizona desert is also a place for growth and beginnings. It is a place where Taylor Greer and her newly-acquired child Turtle settle after being uprooted from Kentucky and Oklahoma. It is a place where Lou Ann Ruiz reinvents
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herself as a working, single mom, and a place where Central American refugees begin new lives, conducted to safe havens by the immigration activist Mattie. The roots that all three women set down in the Arizona desert are symbolized by Kingsolver with the wisteria tree, the bean trees of the title, with its interconnected, symbiotic root system.

Like Priestley, and Zane Grey’s novels, Kingsolver wove descriptions of Arizona’s natural landscape into her story. “The whole Tucson Valley lay in front of us, resting in its cradle of mountains,” Taylor says. “The sloped desert plain that lay between us and the city was like a palm stretched out for a fortuneteller to read, with its mounds and hillocks, its life lines and heart lines of dry stream beds.” Taylor describes an approaching storm, and within her words Kingsolver revealed how perceptions are formed,

It looked something like a huge blue-gray shower curtain being drawn along by the hand of God. You could just barely see through it, enough to make out the silhouette of the mountains on the other side. From time to time nervous white ribbons of lightning jumped between the mountaintops and the clouds. A cool breeze came up behind us, sending shivers along the spines of the mesquite trees . . . What still amazed me about the desert was all the life it had in it. Hillbilly that I was, I had come to Arizona expecting an endless sea of sand dunes. I’d learned of deserts from old Westerns and Quickdraw McGraw cartoons. But this desert was nothing like that. There were bushes and trees and weeds here, exactly the same as anywhere else, except that the colors were different, and everything alive had thorns.”

This is the desert that Krutch and Woodin wrote about, and that Zwinger’s and Abbey’s readers knew.

The setting of the novel is the Arizona desert, the themes are those Arizonans were grappling with in the 1980s—race and immigration. Readers initially learn about an Arizona that is perhaps accepting of diversity, with Lou Ann’s description of Tucson’s cultural landscape. Her mother disapproved of Lou Ann’s husband, Angel
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Ruiz, “because he was Mexican, which didn’t make the slightest difference to Lou Ann. In Tucson, she tried to explain to her mother, there were so many Mexicans that people didn’t think of them as a foreign race. They were doctors, bank clerks, TV personalities, and even owned hotels . . . Mrs. Logan who lived in eastern Kentucky and had never seen a Mexican, thought Lou Ann was making this up.” Lou Ann’s grandmother does not like the husband either. “It’s a sin to work on Sunday. He ought to be home with his family on the Lord’s day,’ Granny Logan said, and sighed. ‘I guess I oughtn’t to expect better from a heathern [sic] Mexican.”  

Early in the novel, then, it is the outsiders who are racist.

However, at the time Kingsolver was writing the novel Arizonans were debating the merits of an English-only amendment to the state’s constitution that would make English the official language of the state and local governments, and require all business done by any of the government entities to be conducted in English (see next section). While never mentioned in *The Bean Trees*, the intolerance and fears that produced the Official English amendment are part of the story. In one scene Taylor and Lou Ann host a dinner party, attended by a Guatemalan refugee couple. “I work with a very kind family who speak only Chinese. Only the five-year-old daughter speaks English. The father has her explain to me what I must do,” Estevan says. Another neighbor, Mrs. Parsons, “muttered that she thought this was a disgrace. ‘Before you know it the whole world will be here jibbering and jabbering till we won’t know it’s America . . . They ought to stay put in their own dirt and not come here taking up jobs.” Taylor is appalled. “I wanted to scream at her: This man you are looking at is an English teacher . . . But Estevan didn’t seem perturbed, and I realized he must hear this kind of thing every day of his life.”
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exchange illuminated the real lines each side drew in the debate and illustrated for readers an Arizona citizenry struggling with the issues. The multicultural landscape, always present but until recently often silent and invisible, was now evident in the written words about the state, all sides embroiled in heated debates about multilingualism.

In *The Bean Trees* Kingsolver made the debate personal, showing the effects of immigration policy on her characters, and entwined immigration and place. That connection, and the effect the first has on the idea of the second, is revealed in a conversation between Taylor and Estevan as they drive across the Southwest toward Oklahoma. “After a while Estevan said, ‘What I really hate is not belonging in a place. To be unwanted everywhere.’ I thought of my Cherokee great-grandfather, his people who believed God lived in trees, and that empty Oklahoma plain they were driven to like livestock. But then, even the Cherokee Nation was *someplace*.”

*The Bean Trees* has a happy ending—Taylor adopts Turtle, and Estevan and his wife find sanctuary in Oklahoma. In Arizona though, the debate over immigration continued, resulting in policy changes detrimental to immigrants and non-English speakers, and an Arizona deemed by some to be Anglo-centric and intolerant.

Kingsolver’s nonfiction *Holding the Line* tells the story of labor and mining in Arizona in the 1980s. On July 1, 1983, miners belonging to thirteen different unions working at the Phelps Dodge copper mines at Clifton-Morenci, Douglas, and Ajo went on strike. The communities are separated by over three hundred desert miles (Clifton and Morenci are northeast of Safford; Ajo is west of Tucson, about halfway to the California border; and Douglas is over one hundred miles south of Tucson on Arizona’s border with Mexico), but were connected by their dependency on Phelps Dodge and by their initial steadfast commitment to their position against the
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company. Most of the publicity, and Kingsolver’s book, focused on the Morenci and Ajo mines. The dispute centered on a cost-of-living allowance that the unions stated was necessary, and that other mining companies in the state had accepted. Phelps Dodge refused to include the provision and also wanted to lower the base pay for beginning miners. The strike would ultimately last two and a half years and result in the decertification of the unions. This book may have been readers’ first knowledge of Arizona mining, or the only account from the strikers’ perspective; depending on which version was read—newspaper accounts and Phelps Dodge press releases or Kingsolver’s book—a different Arizona was portrayed.

Kingsolver covered the strike from its beginning as a freelance journalist and became acquainted with the strikers and picketers, especially the women, on her many visits to the towns. Her coverage of these strikers’ stories earned her an Arizona Press Club award for feature writing in 1986. Holding the Line is the result of her reporting, a book focusing on the women in these small mining towns, and provides a perspective different from the one portrayed in newspaper accounts.

Arizona’s strong labor provisions in article 8 of the constitution had been weakened considerably by the addition of article 25 in 1946, which made Arizona a right-to-work state, limiting union influence.

Kingsolver witnessed things she had never seen before or had ever heard of. "People were being jailed for simply calling a neighbor 'scab,' helicopters and squads of men with hefty-looking automatic weapons were coming in to break the strike, and strike supporters were answering back with extraordinary resistance. A fair number of the faces and hands on the strike’s front lines belong to women.” She continued, “I have left out much about the men. Their struggle was parallel to that of the women, equally difficult and often equally heroic, and their stories are not less deserving of an audience.\textsuperscript{432}

*Holding the Line*, like *The Bean Trees*, tells the story of a place being acted upon by women. While the Associated Press’s Arthur H. Rotstein reported that the police fired tear gas into a crowd of strikers “after carloads of copper workers were pelted with rocks,” and, the police stated, “somebody threw a Molotov cocktail,” Kingsolver writes the story from the strikers’ point of view. “When the National Guard and riot troops from Arizona’s Department of Public Safety (DPS) were summoned to occupy Clifton and Morenci, no one expected the strike to last much longer. The women organized rallies, pickets, and more rallies. They were tear-gassed and arrested. They swore and screamed and sometimes threw rocks, and *always* they showed up for the picket.” A DPS officer’s comment illustrated the importance of the women’s role, “If we could just get rid of these broads, we’d have it made.”\textsuperscript{433}

\textsuperscript{432} Kingsolver, *Holding the Line*, ix-x; xi. Sadly, Kingsolver had to justify leaving out men, even though rarely has justification been necessary when leaving out women.

Just as she wove description of the Arizona desert into her social commentary in *The Bean Trees*, Kingsolver also illustrated the story of the copper strike with description, such as this of the mine, creating a landscape both awful and strangely beautiful: "In the open-pit mine in Morenci, Arizona, the steady motion of mechanized shovels raises a yellow haze of fine dust. Yielding 290,000 tons of metal in a good year, it is the most productive copper mine in North America. The smokestacks of the copper smelter rise like a pair of giant horns out of the mountain's granite pate. Below the horned promontory, the earth's entrails are laid open in a pattern of circular, descending steps, exposing the strangely delicate colors of a mountain's insides: lavender, pink, and blue-grey."434

In addition to telling the women's story, Kingsolver explored the racism exhibited by the mining companies, conditions that had existed since the early days of statehood, a very different portrayal than those about mining found in the *Arizona Guide* and the state's fiftieth anniversary publications. "Payroll records of the Jerome-Verde Copper Company show that in 1916, a better-paid Mexican laborer typically received about nineteen dollars for a six-day week, before hospital and store deductions. Employees with English surnames, listed as 'miners' rather than 'laborers,' were paid thirty-three dollars for the same week's work," Kingsolver discovered.435 The racism did not end as the state matured. "As late as the 1960s, segregation was absolute, extending to housing, schools, movie theaters, and social clubs. The first interracial couple in Morenci—a white woman who married a Mexican man—couldn't rent a house for decades. As one woman who grew up there put it, 'There was a separate everything.'"436 Said Carmina Garcia, whose "roots in the area
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are deeper even than P. D.’s copper veins, ‘Sometimes people will say, “Go back to Mexico,” you know. What they don’t understand is that we were always here, even before it was Arizona.’

As in The Bean Trees, the themes in Holding the Line were injustice and intolerance told in the women’s stories. Unlike the Bean Trees, the copper strike story had a less-than-happy ending.

While Kingsolver’s portrayal of the miners was sympathetic to their cause, newspaper coverage made the miners’ struggle a harder sell. Readers of the Washington Post, for example, learned that Phelps Dodge lost seventy-four million dollars the year before the strike, “the worst year in its history” and quoted Arizona’s governor Bruce Babbitt saying the strikers “threatened to roll over the security guards like so many tenpins” when the company began hiring new workers. Readers were told of the toll the strike is taking on the miners, ”They come into my office and cry . . . they have insomnia, they have depression. We had a case of suicide not long ago,” said Dr. Jorge O’Leary, a Phelps Dodge-employed physician who was fired for supporting the strikes.

The coverage changed somewhat after the June 30, 1984, riot, an event marking the one-year anniversary, and blamed on the strikers and picketers but actually initiated by the DPS riot troops. Kingsolver described the events leading up to the melee, which began as a peaceful rally in the park, with families and picnic lunches. After most of the strike supporters went home, about forty people remained on the picket line waving signs and shouting insults at the replacement workers during the shift change. A strong police presence was evident, but the picketers remained peaceful and allowed traffic to flow. However, one picketer, ”slapped the fender of a [DPS] sedan with his open hand,” and at that moment the DPS teams
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descended on the group, “down the hill, around the bend in the highway marched a full formation of two hundred riot troops with helmets, gas masks, and shield.” People began to crowd the highway and the police fired tear gas into the crowd and nearby buildings.\(^{439}\)

Rotstein’s AP article stated, “Riot-equipped police, saying they were assaulted with a Molotov cocktail, fired tear gas canisters into a crowd.” Tucson’s *Arizona Daily Star* pressed the DPS director, Ralph Milstead, about the presence of the riot troops when the strikers had done nothing illegal. “The riot did not start at 5:45 p.m., June 30. It started July 1, 1983, when the strike first began,” Milstead said. He believed DPS needed to act before dark, certain the strikers would have caused trouble if the police had not dispersed the group.\(^{440}\) The confrontation was ostensibly preemptive, DPS acting before the strikers did. The strike described in most newspaper articles presented one side of the story, Kingsolver’s the other side. Readers of one or the other would have opposing views, of both the strike and the state’s reaction to it.

On the themes found in her books, Kingsolver said, “When I write a novel, I’m not thinking, ‘Now how can I get the political themes into this?’ I just write the novel. It grows out of the world I live in. And the world I live in happens to be full of sexism and racism and screwed up immigration policies and people who use power against other people in unjust ways. If I lived in another world I would write an entirely

\(^{439}\) Kingsolver, *Holding the Line*, 158.

\(^{440}\) Rotstein, “Tear Gas Fired”; “The Anatomy of a Riot,” *Arizona Daily Sun*, July 8, 1984, quoted in Kingsolver, *Holding the Line*, 159. The strike lasted over two years, culminating in union decertification but also the closing of the Phelps Dodge Morenci smelter. In three separate civil cases, the strikers sued the State of Arizona and Phelps Dodge, alleging not only that they had done nothing wrong but that the strikers themselves had been wronged. All three suits resulted in judgments in favor of all the plaintiffs. See Kingsolver, *Holding the Line*, 193.
different kind of novel.\footnote{Quoted in David King Dunaway and Sara L. Spurgeon, \textit{Writing the Southwest} (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 103–104.} This was the Arizona Kingsolver portrayed, a more diverse representation of Arizona than many of the narratives created for readers in the first seventy-five years of its existence as a state.

\textit{THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, ARTICLE 28, OFFICIAL ENGLISH}

In 1988 Arizona voters narrowly approved a citizens’ initiative making English Arizona’s official language, with the words of Proposition 106 becoming article 28 of the state’s constitution.\footnote{Final results: Yes, 50.50%; No, 49.50%, Arizona Department of State, Office of the Secretary of State, “State of Arizona Official Canvass—General Election—November 8, 1988, \url{http://azsos.gov/election/1988/General/Canvass1988GE.pdf}. The Arizona Supreme Court ruled the amendment unconstitutional ten years later in Ruiz v. Hull; in 2006 voters in Arizona again approved an Official English measure.} Arizona was not the first state to pass an Official English measure. Ten states had designated English as their official language by 1988. Nor had the effort to make English the only language of the land been confined to the states. An English Language Amendment to the United States Constitution was submitted in Congress several times during the decade of the 1980s. But Arizona’s law was the most restrictive to that time. Just as the words written about the constitutional convention in 1910 created an image of Arizona for readers, the words written about Proposition 106, on both sides of the issue, as well as the words of the amendment itself, became part of the narrative landscape of the state and defined it in its seventy-fifth year. As minorities gained access to the means of communicating their own words and stories, including access to print media, other groups took steps to restrict, and in some cases deny, that ability.\footnote{States where English had been designated as the official language by 1988 were Arkansas, California, Indiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Carolina,}
Proponents of the Official-English law argued, with phrases that became talking points in the English-only movement, that English is the nation’s “common bond“ and the primacy of English is being eroded by a plethora of foreign-language media outlets accessible over the airways and at newsstands, and by federal and state governments acquiescing to non-English speakers and providing multilingual information and ballots. These only slightly-veiled racist justifications for the law were bolstered by a paternalistic, good-for-the-people reason: non-English speakers are left out of American society—economically and culturally—when they cannot speak English. Allowing for multilingualism, supporters of the amendment believed, rendered the need to learn English unnecessary, and resulted in foreign-language speakers refusing to learn it.

Opponents of the measure insisted an Official English Amendment was unneeded, arguing that English was not in danger of being usurped as the language of government, commerce, or even of most of society. While the amendment backers claimed to want more foreign-language speakers to speak English, the measure did nothing to encourage English-language learning. Even more dangerous, opponents argued, the law encouraged citizens to police each other, to assure only English was spoken or printed at every level of government, creating an environment of conflict, the opposite of Official English supporters’ stated goals. According to the election publicity pamphlet, Official English “could outlaw essential multilingual public service information such as pamphlets informing non-English speaking parents how to enroll their children in school.”

South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Official English was on the ballot in Arizona, Colorado, and Florida in 1988; the measures passed in all three states.

^444 Arizona Department of State, Office of the Secretary of State, “The Choice Is Yours,” Arizona Publicity Pamphlet, Jim Shumway, compl., General Election, November 8, 1988, at Arizona Memory Project,
Titled “English as the Official Language,” the text of Proposition 106, which would become article 28 of Arizona’s constitution, would depict Arizona as a place unfriendly to all who spoke other languages, even if that was not the law-crafters’ intent. It addressed the role that the state government should play as the protector and enforcer of English as the written and spoken means of communication in and by the state. “The English language is the official Language of the State of Arizona,” the first section stated. This rule applied to the ballot; public schools; the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; “all political subdivisions, departments, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities of this State”; all government officials and employees while doing the state’s business; and included local and municipal governments.\(^{445}\)

As if the English language was in danger of becoming a dead language, section two required that the state government “and all political subdivisions of the State shall take all reasonable steps to preserve, protect, and enhance the role of the English language as the official language of the State of Arizona.”\(^{446}\) Section three prohibited the use of any other language by the state except to comply with federal law (such as providing English as Second Language teachers in schools), to teach foreign language as part of an education curriculum, for protection of public health and safety, and to protect criminal defendant or crime victim rights.\(^{447}\) The final


\(^{446}\) Constitution of the State of Arizona, article 28, section 2.

\(^{447}\) Constitution of the State of Arizona, article 28, section 3.
section gave the right to sue under this amendment to anyone "who resides in or does business in the State."  

The Official English movement was a national effort to assert and codify the primacy of the English language in America. Locally (within Arizona) the English-only measure was advocated and advanced by Arizonans for Official English; however, the Washington, DC, lobby group U.S. English backed the Arizona group. The stated mission of U.S. English was to “maintain the blessing of a common language, and to reverse the spread of foreign language usage in the nation’s official life.” One of its objectives was the adoption of a constitutional amendment establishing English as the official language of the United States. A primary talking point of the movement, one that was utilized in the Arizona campaign, asserted, “A common language is necessary to preserve the basic internal unity required for political stability and national cohesion.” The words drawn up by a national lobbying group and utilized by the local Arizona groups became part of Arizona’s narrative landscape just as the words of the statehood fight did.

---

448 Constitution of the State of Arizona, article 28, section 4.


450 “Fact Sheet: English Language Amendment,” available from U.S. English, quoted in Tarver, 234.
An English Language Amendment (ELA) was introduced at the national level in several sessions of Congress during the 1980s. One of the ELA’s chief sponsors, California Senator S. I. Hayakawa, co-founded the group U.S. English with John H. Tanton when he left Congress in 1983. Arizona Senator John McCain testified against the ELA amendments in a hearing before the House of Representative’s Judiciary Committee and brought an Arizona perspective to the national debate. He stated that the amendments “fragmented and divided ethnic communities in my State . . . they believe, many minorities in this country, not just Hispanic, but Indian—Native Americans as well, that this amendment is a direct assault on their ability to preserve their culture and heritage.” These arguments were also advanced within the state to protest Proposition 106.

U.S. English brought Official English to Arizona after its overwhelming 1986 victory in California. The group’s Stanley Diamond explained that Arizona was a priority, stating, “There does seem to be sufficient interest, and not only interest, but

---

451 The text of the English Language Amendments was simple. Section 1 usually stated that the English language would be the official language of the United States, section 2 that Congress would have the power to enforce the article. For a discussion of ELA, see Joseph Leibowicz, “The Proposed English Language Amendment: Shield or Sword?” *Yale Law and Policy Review* 3, no. 2 (Spring 1985): 519–550.

452 Tanton also founded the Federation for American Immigration Reform. FAIR’s purpose is to lobby for stricter immigration laws, a connection that understandably made immigration activists skeptical, and has been designated a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center. See Southern Poverty Law Center, “Federation for American Immigration Reform,” http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-files/groups/federation-for-american-immigration-reform-fair (accessed November 2013).

an intense interest, in Arizona.” Senator Peter Kay introduced an Official English Amendment in the Arizona state senate in 1987. Addressing Kay’s position, the editors of the *Phoenix Gazette* wrote, “On this issue, Kay is wrong. On this issue, Gov. Evan Mecham, who opposes English-only as an unnecessary slap at Mexican Americans, is right. Equally encouraging is that conservative Sen. Tony West voted against Kay, his longtime legislative ally, on the resolution.”

Citing the controversy his proposal had created, Kay withdrew the amendment from consideration, thus prompting ELA supporters to begin an initiative drive to place the amendment on the ballot. Responding to the several states considering Official English measures that year, the *Gazette* editors wrote, “Yet in a handful of American legislatures, English is supposedly drowning under the recent brown wave.” They assured their readers, “No one argues that learning English is not important to immigrant groups . . . There are plenty of incentives to learn the language. English needs no constitutional appendage to survive.” However, famous Arizonan Barry Goldwater agreed to serve as the honorary chairman of Arizonans for Official English. “Senator Goldwater is Mr. Arizona,” said Robert D. Park, chairman of Arizona’s Official English group. Goldwater explained, “You live in this country, you speak English, you live in Mexico, you speak Spanish, and if you live in France, you speak French.”

---


455 “English Is Numero Uno,” *Phoenix Gazette*, March 9, 1987. However, Governor Mecham did oppose the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday. (A year later Mecham would be indicted and impeached on grounds of financial improprieties.)


457 “English Is Numero Uno.”

458 “Goldwater to Assist Bid.”
In response to the Official English drive in Arizona, State Representative Armando Ruiz announced the creation of the Arizona English Coalition with plans “to ensure people with limited English proficiency are not barred from full participation in the economic and political processes of the state and union.” The group proposed an initiative that would bar people from filing lawsuits to block bilingual education programs and other non-English services, in direct conflict with the wording in the Official English initiative, which not only permitted but encouraged such actions in section 4.459

Responding to the assertion by Arizonans for Official English that the heritage of English as America’s “common bond” was threatened or under attack, editors at the Arizona Republic wrote, “C’mon now, America’s heritage is as strong as ever, and has always been based on cultural diversity. And don’t believe it when they tell you that ‘English in a fundamental sense is US’ as in us, not U.S. They are wrong.”460 Words on both sides of the debate created opposing images of the state for readers, liberal and un-American or conservative and racist; taken all together the narratives depicted a tumultuous place.

The role of the English language in Arizona had been debated during the constitutional convention. A proposition requiring all underground workers (miners) to speak English, a proposal favored by the labor coalition, was debated. Delegates feared that its specific language, “aliens, who cannot speak the English language,” was in conflict with the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. “Here it was plain that the object of the measure was the exclusion of foreigners whom the


460 “U.S. Doesn’t Need an Official Language.”
government itself admits,” stated several members of the convention. The committee of the whole added the word “intelligently” to the end of the statement.\(^{461}\) This proposal did not become part of the final document, and until 1988 the State of Arizona had no position on the nature of the English language.

When Arizona voters received their information pamphlets for the 1988 general election they read statements from prominent Arizonans and groups for and against the Official English Amendment. The Legislative Council (a legislative committee that provides nonpartisan research and analysis) concluded, "The Proposition would require this state and all cities and counties to act in English and no other language. To be valid, all governmental documents would have to be written in the English language only."\(^{462}\)

Creating an Arizona for Arizonans in the "for" and "against" narratives, the pamphlet implicitly asked residents in which place they would like to live. Legislative Council arguments favoring Proposition 106 reiterated standard U.S. English and Arizonans for Official English rhetoric, stating, "The State of Arizona is at a crossroads. It can move towards the fears and tensions of language rivalries and ethnic distrust, or it can reverse this trend and strengthen our common bond, the


English language.”[^463] The Legislative Council argument opposing Proposition 106 determined the measure “will not preserve English as our common language. Instead it will undermine the efforts of new citizens of our state to contribute to and enter the mainstream of American society . . . English is now and will remain the language of Arizona. Ninety-eight percent of Americans are fluent in English.” The Legislative Council opinion also countered the pro-Official English, patriotic-sounding words about “American heritage,” stating, “This Proposition will not help or prompt anyone to learn English. It will not improve human relations. It will not lead to a better state . . . It is unnecessary, counterproductive and, in the most fundamental sense, un-American.”[^464]

Arizonans for Official English Chairman Park presented that group’s pro-approval arguments, writing, “Official sanctioned multilingualism causes tension and division within a state.” Park also provided an economic argument for the proposition, claiming that it would promote “a more efficient and cost-effective government.”[^465] In a joint statement, Carl J. Kunasek, Arizona Senate president, and Representative Dave Carson argued that English was recognized as the language of “unity and prosperity.” They wrote, “Due to a trend toward official multilingualism, our great unifying force—the use of the English language—is eroding, and our nation is becoming a people separated by, instead of unified by, language.”[^466] The president of U.S. English, Linda Chavez used scare tactics to push for approval, “Unless we become serious about protecting our heritage as a society of various cultures bound by a common language, we may lose a precious resource that has helped us forge a

[^463]: Ibid.

[^464]: Ibid., 26–27

[^465]: Ibid., 27.

[^466]: Ibid., 28.
single people from so many diverse elements." The misconceptions and lack of understanding in the Official English position is reflected in this statement; it failed to acknowledge the diverse cultures and experiences of minorities in the assertion that only an English-language heritage was worth protecting and the idea that American society was “a single people.” As for maintaining a common language, codifying an English-learner program and appropriating funds for it would accomplish much more than an English-only measure would.

Phoenix Mayor Terry Goddard and Arizona Governor Rose Mofford’s statements were included in the voter pamphlet section against approval of Proposition 106. Armando Ruiz, the chairman of Arizonans Against Constitutional Tampering and the founder of the Arizona English Coalition wrote a succinct and all-encompassing statement asserting on several grounds that the proposition was a lie, including, “It is a lie because it pretends that it will cause more people to learn English. Yet it contains absolutely nothing to provide that education. The key to English proficiency is education for youngsters in non-English speaking households and for adults who have never mastered the language. Prohibiting government workers from communicating in any language other than English simply excludes these people from participation in society.” Proposition 106 passed by a one percent margin. The Arizona now codified in its constitution, the words contained in the state’s foundational document in 1988, characterized a place fearful of its own multicultural citizenry and restrictive in its response.

---

467 Ibid.

468 Ibid., 32, emphasis in original.
CONCLUSION

The Arizona reflected in written narratives in its seventy-fifth year was a more complicated place than the one portrayed at previous twenty-five year anniversaries. The addition of Native American authors’ and poets’ work to the body of written words about and enabled by Arizona revealed relationships and stories that had always existed but had been invisible and unavailable to the majority of the reading public. The Arizona characterized in words in 1987 better represented the state’s population with contributions by women and minority authors. Environmentalists and naturalists contributed works that contradicted booster and state leadership narratives; this Arizona was not a natural landscape with resources provided solely for humanity’s use and extraction, but rather a place that required responsible action for preserving those resources.

The diversity reflected in the intellectual landscape of the 1980s, particularly in the language, caused a strong reaction resulting in the public approval of an English Language Amendment to Arizona’s constitution, making English the official language of Arizona. The permanence of diverse words and stories did not cause an eventual acceptance on the part of people who felt threatened, or believed somehow America was threatened, by such diversity. Though declared unconstitutional a decade later, the Official English measure was approved by voters once again in 2006.

The support for English-only laws and strict immigration policies would be reflected in Arizona’s narratives in its next twenty-five years. Business and state leaders would have to contend with words depicting the state as intolerant and racist, even as they sought to promote continued growth and investment. The booster element, reflecting positions and cliché ingrained for decades, was again prominent as the state prepared for its one hundredth anniversary celebration. Many
of the words emanating from Arizona at its one-hundredth year reflected the place it
had been, while minority and environmentalist voices strived to continue
conversations focused on what the state could and should be.
EPILOGUE:
POINTS OF DEPARTURE, 2012

In 1912, two hundred thousand people lived in Arizona, clustered in a few population centers—Prescott, Flagstaff, Phoenix, Tucson—and scattered across its rugged landscape. At the state’s centennial year, its population had grown to more than six and a half million, over fifty people per square mile if they spread out evenly across deserts and mountains and forests. Nearly a third of those millions of people identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino, and over a quarter of Arizona’s population spoke a language other than English at home.469

Arizona’s narratives reflected this diversity. Early forms of literature—pioneer memoirs, cowboy stories, and booster tracts—were still being read a hundred years later, and descendants of pioneers wrote fondly of their parents’ good old days, business leaders and politicians enthusiastically boosted their state, and Anglo advocates campaigned for Official English. Descriptions of Arizona’s varied natural landscape still appeared in nearly every publication, the ubiquitous soliloquy to saguaro cactus; the insistence that Arizona is not all desert, with the largest yellow pine stand in the world to prove it; the cliché of temporal extremes, oldest natural landscape, youngest state; and descriptions of thunderstorms, because in a land of little water an outpouring of the life-giving substance is cause for remark. But the landscape of written words had been transformed with narratives that better represented the population, with women, Native Americans, and Hispanics increasingly contributing to the body of literature about and enabled by the place.

The complexity of the state’s cultural landscape realized in the literature of the 1970s and 1980s continued to be reflected in the stories about and brought forth from the place in the first decade of the twenty-first century. The lens had been refocused to expose the words that had been neglected or invisible.

An Arizona that had been defined and created in words written by politicians, boosters, environmentalists, and poets, in forms as varied as essays, court documents, novels, and magazine articles, in 2012 was still being fashioned from these same types of words and similar sources. Groups and individuals still used words to emphasize their own perceptions of Arizona, what it was or should be, the diversity of the cultural landscape reflected in the variety of perceptions and the many genres that were used to move those viewpoints forward. The narratives that seem the strongest and the voices that sound the loudest now, standing as we are in the midst of them, may recede or become silent with the passing of time, may not be the words that stand out or endure when the historian in 2037 looks back at the intellectual landscape of the one-hundredth anniversary year. But the narratives of 2012’s Arizona will be the foundation on which the next stories are formed.

Viewing the Arizona narratives of 2012 at only a two-year remove does not provide a broad enough temporal span to select historically enduring works. But a 2012 body of literature is present and can be compared with the narratives of the past. At this moment, wherein these words cannot yet be considered history, the primary addition to representations of Arizona occurs as a new medium for communicating the narratives. The Internet is now often the primary source of information about Arizona. The website truesnow.org, for example, contains a library’s worth of material regarding the fight over Snowbowl and skiing on northern Arizona’s San Francisco Peaks. Truesnow.org’s stance against snowmaking on the Peaks contrasts with Arizona Snowbowl’s promotional website (“In a high desert
state at low latitude the art of snowmaking becomes a saving grace. As the Internet adds countless layers of information about Arizona, it seems to instantly create worlds of Arizonas, and reveal Arizonas worlds apart.

In the first decade of the twenty-first century Jeannette Walls, Arizona native and granddaughter of early pioneers, told her own and her grandma’s stories of life in Arizona, adding new narratives to the many already written about inhabiting the place. Author Luis Alberto Urrea recounted a different way of inhabiting the desert as he tells the true and tragic story of Mexican migrants perishing in the desert. Arizona was created in words by the state government in another Official English amendment and its Senate Bill 1070, a restrictive anti-immigration law. The Arizona centennial book Arizona: 100 Years Grand was a limited edition only available for purchase online, thus designating its readers, the consumers of its version of Arizona, as Internet users with credit cards. Many of the forms that the 2012 narratives take and the themes the words address are similar to, and consistent with past stories. Yet new narratives emerge, revealing an Arizona many readers had been unaware of, a state unlike the one portrayed in official and boosting literature.

NATURALISTS, ENVIRONMENTALISTS, AND TRUESNOW.ORG

Words about Arizona have often reflected and revealed residents’ perceptions of and ideas about its natural landscape. From early tracts boosting the state’s vast mineral resources to current email blasts announcing protests against mineral extraction, the natural landscape and words about it have shaped perspectives. In the mid-twentieth century, conservationists’ Arizona narratives influenced conversations about land use. In Voice of the Desert naturalist Joseph Wood Krutch

declared an ethics of caring for the natural world beyond conservation, writing, “To live healthily and successfully on the land we must also live with it. We must be part not only of the human community, but of the whole community; we must acknowledge some sort of oneness not only with our neighbors, our countrymen, and our civilization but also some respect for the natural as well as for the manmade community.”\textsuperscript{471}

Ann Woodin’s Arizona desert home enabled a similar philosophy. “The land is something to be cherished, something to be admired as well as used, something to be passed on to the future,” Woodin wrote. “If we destroy it, whether a forest or a desert or a river, we destroy much of what makes life worth living. More than that, we destroy the source of our inspiration.”\textsuperscript{472} Two decades later, as Arizona’s leaders exuberantly pushed development, environmentalist Edward Abbey wrote about that attachment to growth, stating, “Growth, for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell. Cancer has no purpose but growth; but it does have another result—the death of the host.”\textsuperscript{473} Ann Zwinger echoed that belief, commenting on an overgrazed portion of the Sonoran Desert, “A landscape I know as so satisfyingly beautiful, so in balance, is here so tattered and beleaguered.”\textsuperscript{474}

In the 1980s Native American writers’ increased access to the mechanisms of publishing provided the means for presenting their words absent the Anglo filter. The growth of the Internet as a communications tool in the late twentieth century provided previously inaccessible words to the world and offered a means by which any voice could be heard and any story could be told, including those of the

\textsuperscript{471} Krutch, \textit{The Voice of the Desert}, 194.

\textsuperscript{472} Woodin, \textit{Home Is the Desert}, 236.


\textsuperscript{474} Zwinger, \textit{The Mysterious Desert Lands}, 94.
environmentalists. In 2012 the website truesnow.org provided access to all manner of information relating to the controversial snow-making venture on Arizona’s San Francisco Peaks, in forms as varied as PDFs of court documents to articles written by an anonymous author identified as Zen Pathfinder. At the time of Arizona’s fiftieth anniversary in 1962, a debate about humanity’s place in and use of the natural world was enjoined in the discussion surrounding Glen Canyon Dam and the flooding of a singular, remote landscape—“So a steel gate dropped, choking off the flow in the canyon’s carotid artery, and from that moment the canyon’s life force ebbed quickly.”475 In 2012 a similar question of use and misuse again pitted conservationists and environmentalists against private developers and their government allies. In this fight, Native Americans and businesses also took prominent, and opposing, sides.

Rather than a canyon that relatively few people had or would ever visit, this controversy centered on the mountain that anchors the landscape of northern Arizona, visible for hundreds of miles, and sacred to the Indian tribes who live on the Colorado Plateau. Water was still the tool employed to destroy, but rather than the flooding of a landscape, the point of contention was the spraying of manmade snow created from treated wastewater, effluent, over the slopes of Snowbowl, the ski area that has occupied the southeastern side of the mountain for decades. The intent of the various owners of the ski area to develop a profitable ski resort on national forest land outside Flagstaff has been an issue since the 1960s when the first extensive expansion was proposed. But the use of effluent to produce snow was an especially egregious act of desecration to those who honor the mountain as sacred and respect the natural world. Over the years numerous lawsuits have been filed, re-filed, decided (alternately in favor of both sides), appealed, and settled. What began as a

475 Porter, The Place No One Knew, 8.
focus on tribal religious rights and the preservation of a fragile high mountain ecosystem has become a question about the properties of the manmade snow itself, and the effects of effluent snow on human health.

Truesnow.org is a doorway into the literature about the issue, a place to find information presented as both audio-visual and textual content. The site contains video documentaries about the effects on fish of effluent released into rivers, press releases from groups protesting the construction of pipelines and chairlifts, maps of the current ski area and the proposed expansion, and before and after photographs detailing the clear-cutting of trees along the pipeline route. Truesnow.org is a doorway into the literature about the issue, a place to find information presented as both audio-visual and textual content. The site contains video documentaries about the effects on fish of effluent released into rivers, press releases from groups protesting the construction of pipelines and chairlifts, maps of the current ski area and the proposed expansion, and before and after photographs detailing the clear-cutting of trees along the pipeline route.476 A virtual library, True Snow provides access to government and court documents, articles and calls for action posted directly on the website, and newspaper articles reposted or linked from other websites. With one click a reader is exposed to and can consume thousands of words about the Peaks controversy. The most persistent message on the True Snow website, ever present even when a visitor selects a document to read (the reader must scroll down past the message), declares, "No to Poison Snow—Not on the

476 Truesnow.org contains no information about who created or maintains the site, although an article posted on the website contains a reference to “Rudy Preston, founder of True Snow” (Zen Pathfinder, “Arizona Snowbowl Violates City Permit and State Law, Complaint Filed,” December 26, 2012, truesnow.org). Zen Pathfinder wrote many of the articles posted on the site, but again, no information about that person is available on the site. The most recent posts are dated at the end of December 2012. A visitor to the Save the Peaks Coalition website, savethepeaks.org, once the hub of online activity for the Save the Peaks effort, now finds a page of graphic art with a note at the bottom in very fine print, "check truesnow.org for more." A Protect the Peaks website, unaffiliated with any particular group, according to its “About” page, is a community website, a place “for people to post any and all news about the San Francisco Peaks and the destructive activities of Arizona Snowbowl Ski Resort” (“About,” protectthepeaks.org). The Indigenous Action Media website provides a forum and support for issues that impact indigenous communities. The Save the Peaks effort is highlighted at indigenousaction.org. See also Unsettling America: Decolonization in Theory and Practice, “Protect the Peaks,” unsettlingamerica.wordpress.com/solidarity-projects/protect-the-sacred-san-francisco-peaks/ (accessed January 19, 2014).
Peaks—Not on the Mesa! Water is Life. While the goal has not changed—an end to artificial snowmaking and Snowbowl expansion in the short term, and complete eradication of the ski resort from the mountain eventually—the focus has changed. The San Francisco Peaks are still sacred and fragile, however the stories now being told by ski area opponents seek to draw new supporters with an emphasis on public health and centered on the ramifications of the production of snow from wastewater. Arizona as an environmental battlefield, where the war against wanton extraction of resources, unrestrained population growth, and thoughtless encroachment of wild places has been waged for decades, is well-documented in the narratives available at truesnow.org. The new material adds to the representation of the San Francisco Peaks as sacred and fragile the image of the mountain as a frozen toilet bowl.

ARIZONA IN VERSE, SHONTO BEGAY, “THE VIEW I HAVE FROM HERE”

For centuries Arizona’s natural and culture landscapes have inspired words told and written in verse. The earliest inhabitants sung songs in their languages, songs that were eventually written down, translated into English, and interpreted by Anglo ethnographers and editors. In 1938 ethnographer Ruth Underhill described the saguaro fruit harvest and ensuing ceremony and translated the Tohono O’odham songs to bring the rain,

Wind came, clouds came.
I sat above them. Underneath, the mirage glittered.
Rain fell,
The mirage was gone.478

In the 1980s, Indian singers published their own English translations of their songs. Yaqui tribe member Felipe Molina interpreted and translated a book of Yaqui deer

477 truesnow.org.
songs, including this piece that reveals the place the deer singers enter when they sing,

Over there, in the flower-covered enchanted opening . . . Flower-covered fawn went out, enchanted, from each enchanted flower wilderness world, he went out.  

In the state’s namesake poem, Sharlot Hall proclaimed men’s dominance over the land in an effort to prove the readiness of the citizens to become a state, writing,

The men who from trackless forests and prairies lone and far Hewed out the land where ye sit at east and grudge us our fair-won star.  

Wendy Rose, a Hopi woman who had never lived on the Hopi Mesas, but whose blood flowed from that place, wrote,

California moves my pen but Hotevilla dashes through my blood like a great and crazy dragonfly.  

In 2012, among the government documents and articles and calls to action posted on and linked to at truesnow.org, a prose poem by artist Shonto Begay gave voice to the San Francisco Mountain,

I have a view. All about my footing, veins of pathways from the center, like pesky mosquitoes upon your shoulders. They fill their bladders with my potentials, their essentials. Empty patches upon my blanket, a measure of your wants. There is a tear, a loosening of fabrics upon my back. The cold and bitter wind that once begged in vain for shelter from itself, it invades the sanctity of warmth . . .

---


Impatience of the natural and seasonal cycles. Desperate dance at loss of songs and prayers frays my edge. My children’s prayers, too, are drowned out in their disturbances. Your sense of justice prevails for now. Yes, I have this vision. Now clouded with tears, I pray for yours.  

The mountain watches the clear cutting upon its slopes (“empty patches upon my blanket”), the making of wastewater snow (“impatience of the natural and seasonal cycles”), and the blatant disregard for Native American religious practices (“children’s prayer drowned out”). Yet rather than condemning outright, the author prays for increased vision for the desecrators, an opening of eyes to the wider picture, to a broader perspective. Each of these poems about Arizona, all containing words about the same state and influenced by the same natural landscapes, write a different place into being for readers.

**INHABITING ARIZONA, JEANNETTE WALLS, AND LUIS ALBERTO URREA**

Throughout Arizona’s one-hundred-year history many writers have told stories about inhabiting the place. Written by women and men, Anglo, Indian, and Hispanic, the words describe the natural landscapes and remark on the cultural landscapes. During the Great Depression, trader Hilda Faunce described the desert of the Navajo Reservation she came to love, “There was color in the desert itself, not in vegetation, but in the very earth and rocks. In the afternoon sun the reds and blacks and blues had seemed unreal enough; but I would never have believed, had I not seen them, what they could be in the light of the sunset.” In that same decade English novelist and playwright J. B. Priestley observed the Arizonans around him, narrowly tailoring his perspective to describe only the Anglo communities he visited, and only the people with whom he interacted, “How had they achieved this

---


483 Faunce, Desert Wife, 67.
appearance of happy equality? There are not many of them, and they all live very
close to the desert and the mountains, and might still be called pioneers. There are
no great inequalities of income or privilege.”  

At the time of Arizona’s fiftieth anniversary Joseph Wood Krutch wrote naively
about his inhabitation of the desert north of Tucson, “I was fortunate in that I was a
writer who did the desert no harm even when it was the subject of my writing.
Physically, I have left it no less beautiful than it was.”  

At the same time, Ann
Woodin explained evolving perceptions of living in the desert, “A less esoteric
attitude toward the desert is embodied by such adjectives as hot, dry, hostile, and
lifeless. This is how most people who reside in more benign surroundings think of it,
and why they naturally recoil from it. Once this was how I thought of it.”  

Hopi
tribe member Helen Sekaquaptewa compared the way she and her family lived with
that of her Hopi neighbors, belying the perception that because she and her husband
were educated in Anglo boarding schools and sent their children to off-reservation
schools, they were no longer traditional Hopi, “While my neighbors were buying
white flour and later bread at the store, I ground the corn for our bread on the stone
mata and matake [sic].”  

In the 1980s author and poet N. Scott Momaday
recounted living on the Navajo Reservation as a child in this description of northern
Arizona, “The little truck bounces over the dirt roads of the Navajo reservation,
raises a great rooster tail of red dust. It is summer and there is a sharp glare on the
sand, on the cottonwood leaves.”
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At the turn of the twenty-first century, Jeannette Walls and Luis Alberto Urrea wrote about Arizona from their unique perspectives, from lives lived very differently than the those explored in narrative thus far. Born in Phoenix, Walls spent her early childhood roaming the desert as her parents moved from place to place, often living out of their car or in abandoned buildings at mining camps and ghost towns as Walls’s father took odd jobs and mined for gold to finance his drinking habit and the glass castle he promised his daughter they would build. “We moved around like nomads,” Walls writes. “We lived in dusty little mining towns in Nevada, Arizona, and California. They were usually nothing but a tiny cluster of sad, sunken shacks, a gas station, a dry-goods store, and a bar or two . . . The more desolated and isolated a place was, the better Mom and Dad liked it.”

Luis Alberto Urrea, born in Tijuana, Mexico, and a self-described son of the border, whose father is Mexican and mother is American, is “inspired by this cross-cultural upbringing and unique perspective of life on both sides of the border.” Both authors’ stories reflect the diversity of Arizona’s cultural landscape.

Walls’s first memoir, The Glass Castle, was a New York Times bestseller; the editors of the New York Times Book Review named her second book, Half Broke Horses, a biography of her grandma written as a memoir in the first person, one of the ten best books of 2009. Though her childhood may have been different than
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others’ stories of inhabiting the desert, Walls too, describes the landscape graphically, “Mom had grown up in the desert. She loved the dry, crackling heat, the way the sky at sunset looked like a sheet of fire, and the overwhelming emptiness and severity of all that open land that had once been a huge ocean bed. Most people had trouble surviving in the desert, but Mom thrived there . . . I loved the desert too.\footnote{Walls, \textit{The Glass Castle}, 21.}

Readers of Walls’s second book, the memoir-styled story about Lily Casey Smith, had met Grandma Smith in \textit{The Glass Castle} when the Walls family stayed at her home in Phoenix, “Grandma Smith was a West Texas flapper who loved dancing and cussing and horses,” Walls writes. “She was known for being able to break the wildest broncs and had helped grandpa run the ranch up near Fish Creek, Arizona.\footnote{Ibid., 99.} Raised on a West Texas ranch, Grandma Smith lived alone in Chicago in the early 1920s, taught school in rural northern Arizona, and earned a teaching degree at Arizona State Teachers College in Flagstaff. Subtitled “A True-Life Novel,” Walls writes in the first person, in her grandma’s voice, with dialogue and details based on family stories Walls has heard but not from Smith, who died when Walls was a child. In Walls’s telling, the people are real, and the stories are ones she has heard all of her life, but she determines that the most compelling way to tell the story is as a work of fiction. Momaday’s memoir \textit{The Names} similarly recounts conversations and events that occurred before he was born; he calls his account “an act of imagination.”\footnote{Momaday, \textit{The Names}, front matter.}

Many stories set in northern Arizona encompass the land north of Grand Canyon, the Arizona Strip. Lily Casey Smith was often assigned to teach at schools in
this area; its remoteness is clear as Walls has her describe the drive from the ranch near Ash Fork in Arizona, west and then north through Nevada and Utah, to turn back south into Arizona and the Strip. Walls describes the natural landscape of the region, as has Zane Grey and Edward Abbey. “The Arizona Strip was desolate but beautiful country,” Grandma Smith explains. “There were grassland plateaus where distant mountain sparkled with mica, and sandstone hills and gullies that had been carved into wondrous shapes—hourglasses and spinning tops and teardrops—by wind and water. The sight of all that time-worn stone, shaped grain by grain over thousands and thousands of years, made it seem like the place had been created by a very patient God.”

Similar to Barbara Kingsolver’s work, Walls writes about women’s experiences from the perspective of strong women affecting change in their communities and within their families. The women in Kingsolver’s *The Bean Trees* raised children and worked full time as single mothers, rescued orphans and gave sanctuary to Guatemalan refugees, and fought against the racism and discrimination found in their southern Arizona community. In *Holding the Line*, Kingsolver described how the women organized rallies and pickets, were tear-gassed and arrested, and “always they showed up for the picket.” Despite irregularly attending school during a childhood of wandering in the Arizona desert, Walls graduated from Barnard College and became a gossip columnist and reporter in New York City before retiring to full-time novel writing. Lily Casey Smith left her family’s West Texas ranch as a young woman not yet graduated from high school and became a schoolteacher and rancher in northern Arizona. Walls translates her childhood experiences—a nomadic,
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homeless existence on the desert—and the stories she heard about Grandma Smith’s hardworking, community-building life into contrasting Arizona narratives (yet with the eventual personal success of both women), with the state’s natural and cultural landscapes serving as backdrop.

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, Arizona became known as a place inhospitable toward Hispanics, especially those suspected of crossing the border by other than legal means. Urrea’s nonfiction account of the May 2001 tragedy in which twenty-six Mexican immigrants were lost in the southern Arizona desert is a different perspective on inhabiting the desert. *The Devil’s Highway* was a finalist for the 2005 Pulitzer Prize for nonfiction and a Kiriyama Prize winner.

“In the desert,” Urrea writes, “we are all illegal aliens.” This statement gives pause and requires reflection. The Tohono O’odham people, who centuries ago learned to live with minimum rain and maximum heat, and the ancient Hohokam who dug canals to irrigate crops and built dwellings with feet-thick walls, perhaps belong to the desert. But most modern humans, who inhabit the desert in air-conditioned buildings and cars, and draw more and more water out of aquifers and manmade catchments, are alien to the environment. As Urrea tells the story of the Mexicans abandoned by the men (called coyotes) whom they paid to lead them safely across the border, readers ensconced in temperature-controlled living rooms become less comfortable. This is an Arizona many readers did not know.

Urrea describes the desert as a nature writer might. “Dawn offered an astonishment of birds. In the scrub and mesquite hollows, there were more songbirds than could be heard in the Rocky Mountains,” Urrea explains, describing the men’s early morning journey, before they discovered they were lost. “Crows,

sparrows, mockingbirds. The cactus wren would have been making his small noises as he went about his business . . . The almost cool air hugging the hardpan, not yet ignited by the white flames of the sun, felt blue. It moved slowly with the last stalling breezes of night.\(^4^9^8\) Benign, pleasant, making even crueler what happened to the walkers as the days passed and the sun scorched and consumed the land and men.

The coyotes had told the men nothing, and the walkers did not know what to expect. "They thought they were going to jump a big fence and hide in trees as helicopters bore down," Urrea writes. Instead they plowed through ankle-deep sand, ran down into a dry wash and up the short three-foot bank on the other side, and "stepped over a dropped and rusted barbed wire fence. 'Los estados unidos, muchachos,'" the coyotes told them. "Cutting through this region, and lending its name to the terrible landscape, was the Devil’s Highway, more death, another desert. They were in a vast trickery of sand."\(^4^9^9\) The Devil’s Highway, that legendary barren track, took them north into Arizona, "their feet crunched on the grit of the desert, and the plants began to tear at their arms and legs."\(^5^0^0\) They were abandoned, and later found, some still alive, in the desert mountains of the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge and the south end of the Barry Goldwater bombing range.

Urrea provides the backstory to this disastrous incident, the reason these men were desperate to get across the border, that is also part of the backstory to the immigration story more generally: economic and social conditions in Mexico at the turn of the twenty-first century offered little hope and facilitated a growing crisis. "Prices kept rising, and all families, mestizo and Indian, Mexican and illegal,

\(^4^9^8\) Ibid., 116.

\(^4^9^9\) Ibid., 103; 4.

\(^5^0^0\) Ibid., 105.
Protestant, Catholic, or heathen, were able to afford less and less,” Urrea explains. “Families continued to grow. The gringos and the missionaries and even the government representatives from Mexico City told them to stop procreating. It was simple: too many mouths caused hunger. But the Pope ordered them to continue being fertile—even condoms were wicked. And in the economy of hunger, which the fat men of the government did not understand, more mouths meant more chances to survive . . . If one out of five died, that still left four to grow up and begin to work.”

The lure of money to feed families, clothe children, and repair houses is enough to draw waves of people into the desert, risking their own lives for the hope of providing better lives for those they leave behind in Mexico.

Urrea’s book—its depiction of Arizona’s laws and governments, of Mexico, and of the people who do little to help the immigrants, before and after they cross the border—is an indictment of humanity. This is the United States-Mexican border in 2004, when the book was published: “Since that May of 2001, the filth and depravity of the border churns ahead in a parade of horrors. The slaughtered dead turn to leather on the Devil’s Highway, and their brothers and sisters rot to sludge tucked in car trunks and sealed in railway cars. The big beasts and the little predators continue to feed on the poor and innocent.”

The Devil’s Highway is a true story that reads like fiction, but wholly unlike Grey whose stories are all about good men who overcome the wilderness and triumph over bad men in the end. The walkers on the Devil’s Highway in this narrative overcome neither. Urrea’s work is similar to Oliver La Farge’s fiction in its unromanticized portrayal of tragedy, and like Kingsolver, Urrea provides the other side of the story, the story belonging to the powerless. Urrea’s words about border
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crossings and the people who attempt them create a place many readers know little about, and what they do know often reflects a viewpoint contrary to Urrea’s.

Like Momaday, Urrea writes about the importance of words, words that bring identity, place, and events into being. Urrea writes, “Words are the only bread we can really share. When I say ‘we,’ I mean every one of us, everybody, all of you reading this.” Words create home, he explains, “Home isn’t just a place, I have learned. It is also a language. My words not only shape and define my home. Words—not only for writers—are home . . . ‘Hispanics’ are immigrants in our own land.”

Urrea speaks directly to the English-only advocates, describing a sign he saw at a televised protest, “It said: America for Americans. A nearby man held up a sign exhorting the universe to speak English or go home. The official language of the United States.” He follows with a list, several pages long, of “English” words of Spanish origin. The list includes obvious words like coyote and adobe, but also words like alfalfa and beef jerky. “You don’t believe me about beef jerky do you? I find it a little hard to believe, my own self. What’s more American than a hunk of jerky . . . the word is an Americanized version of the Spanish term for jerked meat, charqui. I don’t know what we’re going to do. Forget about purifying the American landscape, sending all those ethnic types packing back to their homeland . . . The humanoids are pretty bad, but how will we get rid of all those pesky foreign words debilitating the United States?”
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Regardless of the non-English words populating the English language, and despite the state’s first English-only measure being struck down by the Arizona Supreme Court in 1998, Official English proponents forged ahead with another amendment in 2006, placing Proposition 103 on the ballot that year. The Arizona Supreme Court had ruled in a unanimous decision that the 1988 measure violated the First Amendment and Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution because it “adversely affects non-English speaking persons with regard to their obtaining access to their government and limits the political speech of elected public employees,” and “by denying persons who are limited in English proficiency, or are entirely lacking in it, the right to participate equally in the political process, the Amendment violates the constitutional right to participate and have access to government, a right which is one of the fundamental principle[s] of a representative government in this country.”506 Those words in the Arizona Supreme Court decision became part of the narrative landscape of Arizona, but the proponents of English-only sought to erase them.

The 2006 version of the Official English Amendment contained many of the same provisions as the 1988 version, stating “the Official Language of the State of Arizona is English,” and that it is the role of government to “preserve, protect, and enhance the role of English.” The text of the amendment mirrored the rationale of the old measure and added the charge that governments promoted division in acquiescing to multilingualism: “Throughout the history of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of differing backgrounds has been the English language . . . In recent years, the role of the English language as a common
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language has been threatened by governmental actions that either ignore or harm the role of English or that promote the use of languages other than English in official governmental actions, and these government actions promote division, confusion, error, and inappropriate use of resources.”507 Once again amendment writers based their words on the mistaken ideas that the English language was threatened and that using other languages created disunity.

The Legislative Council analysis, provided to voters in the Voters Guide, determined that, among the similarities to the original law, “Proposition 103 would prohibit discrimination against a person because the person uses English in any public or private communication,” an offense, persecution for speaking English, with no historical base in reality. State Representative Russell Pearce argued for the measure writing, “Had our government catered to each new group of immigrants by using their language instead of English, there would never have been any incentive to truly become American.” The “groups” in Arizona to which he referred had been residents of Arizona longer than English speakers. Akimel O’odham tribe member Chris Milda reminded citizens, in response to the overturning of the first English-only amendment, “Legislators and popular media persist at overlooking . . . that English is not even the first, original language of the Southwest in the first place. O’odham, Hopi, Navajo, and Apache languages—just to name a few—are the original languages of this region.”508

Writing against the law, State Representative Steve Gallardo challenged the hypocrisy of the measure’s advocates, “Arizonans should learn English. Learning


English will help them achieve the American dream. However, at this same election, the legislature hypocritically also asks you to vote on another measure (Proposition 300), which restricts the ability of adults to take classes to learn English.” Employing the same language that opponents of the measure had used nearly twenty years earlier, Michael J. Valder and Eric Ehst of Arizona Advocacy Network wrote, “The legislature [stated] that the government should encourage greater opportunities for individuals to learn the English language . . . Unless and until we adequately fund classes for English language learners, this recommendation is hollow at best.”

The results for the 2006 election represented a resounding defeat for advocates of a multilingual society. All of the propositions aimed at restricting the rights of the undocumented and non-English speaking residents passed, each with over seventy percent of the vote. Proposition 100, preventing bail for people in the United States illegally who were charged with a serious felony offense (which the legislature defined to include actually being in the country illegally), passed with seventy-eight percent; Proposition 102, stating “illegal aliens” could not receive punitive damages in civil lawsuits, passed with seventy-four percent; Proposition 300, the above-referenced measure that denied public funding to undocumented immigrants passed with seventy-one percent; and Proposition 103, the Official-English amendment, passed with seventy-four percent of the vote, twenty-five points higher than in 1988. All of these laws defined Arizona officially as anti-immigration, anti-non-English speaking, and ostensibly anti-Hispanic.

Against this backdrop of successful restrictive measures, in 2006 Rep. Pearce introduced a bill to make being in the country illegally a state crime and to permit
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law enforcement officers to question individuals’ immigration status. Governor Janet Napolitano vetoed that bill.\footnote{Alia Beard Rau, “Arizona to Defend Immigration Law,” \textit{Arizona Republic}, April 22, 2012. See also ABC News Staff, “Timeline: Story of Controversial SB 1070,” June 25, 2012, abc15.com/dpp/news/state/timline-story-of-controversial-sb-1070 (accessed January 6, 2014).} Elected to the state senate in 2008, Pearce introduced the bill again in January 2010. Known widely as Senate Bill (or SB) 1070, this measure passed both houses of the state legislature, and was signed into law by Governor Jan Brewer in April 2010. The words of the bill, added to the already prevalent perception of Arizona as a place hostile to minority groups, particularly Hispanics, demonstrated that a hierarchy of narratives about Arizona still existed—despite stories about border crossers dying in the desert and families being separated because of members’ legal status, the words of SB 1070 prevailed.

The intent of the law was made at the outset, declaring, “The legislature finds that there is a compelling interest in the cooperative enforcement of federal immigration laws throughout Arizona. The legislature declares that the intent of this act is to make attrition through enforcement the public policy of all state and local government agencies in Arizona. The provisions of this act are intended to work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry and presence of aliens and economic activity by persons unlawfully present in the United States.”\footnote{Arizona State Senate, 49\textsuperscript{th} Legislature, Second Session, 2010, Senate Bill 1070, Sec. 1. “Intent.”} The law would allow a law enforcement officer, “without a warrant [to] arrest a person if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed any public offense that makes the person removable from the United States,” and makes it illegal “to transport or move an alien in this state . . . if the person knows or recklessly disregards the fact that the alien has come to, has entered, or remains in
This last caused some consternation among suburban carpool parents who wondered whether they could be arrested for driving neighborhood children to school.

In May 2010, ten individuals and fourteen organizations, including labor, religious, and civil rights groups, filed a lawsuit challenging SB 1070. U.S. District Court Judge Susan Bolton’s July 2011 injunction preventing some of the law’s provisions from going into effect was upheld by the 9th Circuit Court in April 2011. On June 25, 2012, the United States Supreme Court struck down key portions of the law, including the provision that made it a state crime for immigrants to not have federal documentation, another that made it a state crime for undocumented immigrants to seek work, and a third that allowed warrantless arrests. The Court upheld the provision allowing law enforcement officers to check “immigration status in certain circumstances,” the popularly termed papers-please section titled “Enforcement of Immigration Laws.”

Since 2012, the strident nature of Arizona’s immigration laws has been softened in the courts. Judge Bolton ordered that the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR, see chapter four) and the Immigration Reform Law Institute (FAIR’s affiliated legal organization), two groups that helped Pearce craft SB 1070, must provide to the law’s challengers the emails, letters, and memos sent to the lawmakers during the bill-drafting process. Attorneys for the two groups had argued that turning over the correspondence would interfere with their First Amendment rights to communicate with legislators. Bolton said nothing in the law
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“protects from public view communications with public officials in their official capacity about a matter of public concern.” The ruling “covers more than just the communications about SB 1070. Challengers also want to see emails and other documents related to crafting various other prior measures dealing with illegal immigration in the years before SB 1070 was adopted.” Judge Bolton called these communications “‘part of the historical background’ of the enactment of SB 1070 and therefore relevant to determining whether that law violates constitutional rights of equal protection.” It will be for the historian of 2037 to determine if the words in Bolton’s decision present a change in the overall tone in this matter, and to decide if the hierarchy of narratives about and originating from this state has been reordered.

**Boosting Arizona, Arizona: 100 Years Grand, and Centennial Publications**

At the same time SB 1070 was being debated and passed, the Arizona Centennial Commission was working on a plan for the celebration of the state’s one-hundredth anniversary of statehood. In a letter from the commission, the Arizona Centennial 2012 Foundation, and the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission to “Fellow Arizonans,” the groups declared that the centennial is a time for “the new Five Cs”: commemoration, celebration, collaboration, community, and cooperation. In the midst of a decade of legislative English-only and anti-immigration priorities, the top item on the centennial groups’ “Values” list was “Inclusiveness—The Centennial will embrace all citizens for the vital contributions


they have made to our state over the last 100 years and the critical role they must continue to play for a successful future.”\textsuperscript{518} The process of organizing the centennial celebration seemed totally divorced from what was occurring on a policy level, with each portion of government operating in separate spheres and unaware of what the other was doing—the state legislature enacting discriminatory and divisive measures at the same time state commissions charged with planning the centennial celebration proclaimed inclusiveness and community.

The centennial plan’s ”Why Celebrate” page mirrors words from past anniversary publications, especially the \textit{Arizona Days and Ways Magazine} fiftieth anniversary book. Recall the words of Governor Paul Fannin in that 1962 publication, “Arizonans have been men and women of rugged adventurous spirit, befitting their ‘frontier spirit,’” and the words of Valley National Bank President Herbert Legget in the \textit{Arizona Highways} fiftieth anniversary edition, all uppercased for emphasis, “ARIZONA MAY NOT BE PERFECT ITSELF—BUT IT DOES SPOIL YOU FOR LIVING ANY PLACE ELSE.”\textsuperscript{519} In the 2012 \textit{Centennial Plan} the Centennial Commission declared, “Arizona was founded on rugged individualism matched with hard work and vision. It was this indomitable spirit that shaped and molded our state into the place we now call home.”\textsuperscript{520} Once again the words of an anniversary publication reflected only one version of the forming of the place.

Written by Lisa Schnebly Heidinger, the great-granddaughter of T. C. Schnebly who named the town of Sedona after his wife, \textit{Arizona: 100 Years Grand was the official book of the Arizona centennial (according to its subtitle). The book is

\textsuperscript{518} Ibid., 3.
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an encyclopedia-like volume, one hundred entries (one for each year of statehood),
each in a two-page layout complete with photographs. Entries include famous
Arizonans; well-known and lesser-known events; and Arizona natural landscapes,
towns, and national monuments. Many of the entries contain quotes, none of which
are cited, and the book contains no bibliography or reference section.

Unlike the 1962 Arizona Days and Ways anniversary edition, this book
contains no advertising. Comments by the author indicate all time and services were
volunteered, however until recently the book could be purchased on its own website
for $39.99, with “a portion of the price” underwriting the centennial celebration.521
Like the 1962 anniversary publication, much of 100 Years Grand is promoting
Arizona. For example, the entry for 1952 describes the Arizona-Sonora Desert
Museum as "The desert, only better. It’s what the desert would be like if the whole
world were safe, comfortable, and interesting with little effort on our part. Which is
kind of the point: to introduce people to the wonders, beauties, and mysteries of the
arid landscape that may look desolate, but brims with life and growth."522 The 1935
entry for Sky Harbor Airport declares, “Few designs crafted by humans are as lovely
and lyrical as an airplane lifting off solid ground. Sky Harbor, sometimes changing
position in the ranks of busiest airports but always in the top ten, affords more
opportunities to see that gliding lift than most . . . Sky Harbor bills itself as

521 The Arizona: 100 Years Grand website, az100yearsgrand.com, has been
commandeered by Highgate Cross, a graphic design company located in Illinois. The
book is still available at Amazon.com, used for $46, and at the Barnes and Noble
website, used from $50 to $416 (the higher priced issues to benefit Friends of the

522 Lisa Schnebly Heidinger, Arizona: 100 Years Grand (Phoenix, AZ: Arizona
Historical Advisory Commission, 2011), 98.
‘America’s Friendliest Airport,’ and the volunteer navigators in purple shirts go a long way toward supporting the title.\textsuperscript{523}

Descriptions in \textit{100 Years Grand} of Arizona’s natural landscapes evoke words that others have written. The Grand Canyon entry, for example, contains elements that bring to mind John Wesley Powell’s geologic descriptions of Grand Canyon and Eliot Porter’s descriptions of Glen Canyon: “One of the true wonders of the world, the Grand Canyon is alone in its geographic splendor. Some of Nature’s finest work is on display here, created by her artists: water, wind, and time . . . Going down the river, the canyon’s geology falls open like an easily read book. It shows a thousand faces, from wide expanses with sandstone cliffs near Marble Canyon, to black glistening walls that loom high and close along the Inner Gorge.”\textsuperscript{524}

Heidinger misses opportunities to reveal layers of Arizona’s cultural landscape in the same way she does with the natural landscape of Grand Canyon. An entry for Saguaro National Monument provides nothing about O’odham songs or saguaro fruit harvesting celebrations. Instead a two-sentence paragraph makes any such use a thing of the past: “Saguaro offered much to indigenous people. For centuries they harvested the seeds to eat and feed animals and the fruit to make preserves or wine [emphasis added].”\textsuperscript{525} The Tohono O’odham people still mark the seasons with song, and saguaro fruit harvesting continues.
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\textsuperscript{525} Ibid., 59, emphasis mine. Heidinger promotes the “Centennial Review Board” in the acknowledgements. This is not an official board, rather it is a group of volunteers she assembled to review her work. "She not only did extensive research but she created a review board to help her decide what would make it into the book. The review board was composed of eighteen people all from different walks of life" (Alexandra Ghiz, “Arizona Native Writes Book on Arizona’s Centennial” Arizona Sonora News Service, February 8, 2012, arizonasonoranewsservice.com/stories/34-stories/178-woman-writes-book-on-arizonas-centennial [accessed January 5, 2014]). The board consisted of eighteen members; fifteen are Anglo, the youngest
The *Arizona Highways* “100-Page Centennial Issue” represented the state at one hundred for readers nationally and internationally. The magazine describes an ideal Arizona (according to its editors and the Arizona Department of Transportation) as opposed to the Arizona found in Urrea’s work or created by SB 1070 and the English-only Amendment. Similar in content and layout to the past anniversary editions, the issue holds nothing new, no twenty-first century take on the state’s one-hundred-year history. Instead, the issue contains reminiscences by Sandra Day O’Connor and Hugh Downs, a timeline and 1912 map, “100 Years in Pictures,” and an article by Arizona native Marshall Trimble, folksinger, humorist, and official state historian.

“Arizona: 100 Years and Counting” is pure Marshall Trimble, reflecting his love of Arizona and his trademark wit. “Arizona is a great place to live, work, and play,” Trimble writes. In one paragraph he employs many of the familiar boosting phrases and clichés, including the standard humor about the state’s heat, “The state is blessed with a moderate climate, open spaces, a lower cost of living, natural beauty, an abundance of natural resources, respected institutions of higher learning, and lower risk of natural disasters. Topographically, Arizona ranges from alpine mountains to lush deserts with every life zone in between. And despite the heat, even the desert can boast of having four seasons: 1) almost summer, 2) summer, 3) still summer, 4) Christmas Day. Yes, it does get a little warm in the Sonoran Desert, but remember: It’s a dry heat.” This article could have been written and published in any of the last one hundred years. It is vintage Arizona boosting.
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CONCLUSION, WHITHER ARIZONA?

All of the words about Arizona, all of the narratives in its one-hundred-year history as a state, came from the words that preceded them, from the stories told before. They have created Arizona for readers at each moment in time, and continue to re-create Arizona as they are read and reread. Arizona’s narratives and its natural and cultural landscapes entwine, each affecting and changing the other; the relationship is not static. The words from each twenty-five year anniversary discussed in this study are connected to words already written about Arizona in the past, and they too become the next layer, the foundational words that the next stories will come from. The 2012 narratives may be the final word now, but they are only the middle words in a long chain of narratives that continues on, words creating stories creating Arizona daily.

Exploring Arizona narratives involves examining where these words come from and how they provide a basis for understanding Arizona today. Studying the process by which places bring forth narratives, and how stories write Arizona into being enables an understanding of the place being written about, and also can contribute to an understanding of how the words chosen and the stories told in specific circumstances influence perceptions of place. Paradoxically, a writer cannot control what becomes of the story, the perceptions, places, and events it creates and influences, once it is written down. Arizona’s stories demonstrate that many writers have discovered this truth. As they continue to tell their stories—Native American singers and poets translating their verses into English, and residents of the border publishing unvarnished narratives about the effects of immigration policy, and women writing their stories of strength and overcoming—Arizona’s written landscape will continue to change and reflect that diversity. Will these words change the place, and will the place change the words? Will complex narratives from diverse voices
change policy? Or, as the complexity of the cultural landscape is indelibly written into narratives, will people who feel threatened by that diversity use their own words to silence those voices? With whom will the power of words rest in Arizona in 2037?

Of course, politicians and all groups with goals to affect public policy employ words to move their agendas forward. Often they use misleading and hyperbolic words. Asserting in pamphlets that the English language is under attack to push for an Official English amendment, declaiming in press releases that undocumented border crossers are “illegal” people to justify restricting their civil rights, publishing articles decrying as governmental intrusion the setting aside of pieces of land to preserve the natural landscape, all of these policy-making words have created Arizona. The Arizona of 2012, written into being over the previous one hundred years, may be the rugged desert hills covered with wildflowers that readers learn about in the pages of their February issues of *Arizona Highways*. 2012’s Arizona is also the undocumented border walkers’ desert death trap, the city planners’ empty desert development opportunity, and the environmentalists’ degraded and dying desert landscape, all words set down in other narratives and available to the same *Arizona Highways* readers. Anniversary publications, portraying only one version of the state’s creation story, with each installment a reproduction of the previous anniversary’s words, insidiously write an unchanged Arizona into being, the same place in that moment that it has always been (as framed by these writers), told in the voice of Anglo settlers and boosters. Each of these narratives creates an Arizona; the place that becomes real to readers depends on which stories they read.

So, whither Arizona? What to make of a place that produces a rich body of literature written by a diverse citizenry but is also a state that restricts access to government to those who speak a single language? How does one describe Arizona: a rugged landscape that raises up strong men who overcome it, or a desolate
wasteland that kills men who try to cross it? Is Arizona defined as a place where natural resources are readily available for extraction, or where humanity is quickly destroying the land that sustains it, and seeking to restrict access to what is left of untrammeled Arizona?

WORDS UNENDING

I am still a student of Arizona stories. Like her great-granddad, my teenage daughter is a wonderful storyteller. As she tells stories about Arizona’s past to the children with whom she crafts valentines while volunteering at Phoenix’s Heritage Square, she is speaking into being the place for these kids. And as I listen to my daughter and her friends tell their own stories, multiracial, multilingual, multilayered narratives unencumbered by the notion that such diverse stories threaten order or unity, I am a witness to the next layer of Arizona’s narratives forming. I see the words becoming double-helix chains, creating new Arizonas as my daughter chooses from and adds her own words to the vast array of stories laid out on, emanating from, and attached to the land. Hers and her friends’ words, entwined with the words of the past, create new perceptions of Arizona, words still bringing the place into being, and influence my perceptions of the place. The future Arizona will be created from, built on, fashioned out of, these narratives told about it and enabled by it today.
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APPENDIX

LITERATURE REVIEW
Scholars have examined the role words and narratives have played in creating an idea or understanding of a place, and have studied how places foster or enable narratives written about them. They have written intellectually dense articles examining why place and landscapes should be considered at all, while also remarking on the simplicity and primacy of the human relationship to the natural world. Authors use natural landscapes as settings for their words and as characters in their stories. However, all of these writers, whether scholar or literary author, whether implicitly or in bold language, fuse the natural world and the human place in it and regard this relationship as essential.

Patricia Nelson Limerick, Peter Wild, and Marcus Alexander Burtner employ words as a lens to study place creation and narratives about a place, examining how deserts influence and affect writers who are writing about that natural landscape. In *Desert Passages: Encounters with the American Deserts* Limerick explores the history of attitudes about the desert through the lens of eight Anglo men’s descriptions of and narratives drawn from deserts. The writers demonstrate “attitudes that responded to concrete actual places and led to actions that directly affected those places.” Of a writer’s perceptions of a landscape and how attitude influences that view, she writes, “In matters of landscape, one man’s ‘ugly picture’ could well be another man’s ‘improvement.’” Limerick groups her writers into two categories; first, authors whose narratives occur earlier in time and display attitudes of dislike for the unimproved desert, and second, those who write from the turn of the twentieth century, with attitudes of appreciation for natural desert environments.

---


Limerick places naturalist Joseph Wood Krutch and environmentalist Edward Abbey in this second group of writers. However, just as many writers could have been found in the second half of her timeline who believed the desert was improvable (see Arizona business leaders’ boosting literature and Floyd Dominy’s *Lake Powell: Jewel of the Colorado*, for example).

Wild’s *The Opal Desert: Explorations of Fantasy and Reality in the American Southwest* is a study of words written about the desert and focuses on the process authors use to write about that landscape. Wild divides his authors into two groups as well, the “fabulists” and the realists. The fabulists are the writers moved and affected by the desert emotionally, whose narratives arise from their experiences and interactions with the landscape; Edward Abbey is placed in this group. The realists are the authors writing less emotionally and more descriptively about the place; they are also affected by the environment, but in less sensational ways, and include Joseph Wood Krutch and Ann Zwinger. In a recent dissertation, “Crafting and Consuming an American Sonoran Desert,” Burtner writes about the “production and consumption of meaning and the definition of a desert region.” He utilizes written works to examine the defining and imagining of the Sonoran Desert.

Henry Nash Smith analyzes literature to uncover how the myth of the West, the idea of American agrarian tradition meets frontier, formed. *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* is an example of how a place, a big place, became an idea that was perceived and advanced through writing. Smith finds perception revealed in descriptions, for example this from John Filson in *The
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*Discovery, Settlement, and Present State of Kenucke* [sic] (1784): “A rapturous picture of luxuriant Nature—a country ‘like the land of promise, flowing with milk and honey, a land of rooks of water . . . a land of wheat and barley, and all kinds of fruits . . . you shall eat break without scarceness, and not lack any thing in it,’ under mild skies where no infectious fogs nor pestilential vapors spread disease.”\(^{531}\) As descriptions of Arizona in my study demonstrate, little has changed in the place-boosting literature, wherever the place being described, from the late eighteenth century to the twentieth, or even the early twenty-first century.

Smith states, “The capital difficulty of the American agrarian tradition is that it accepted the paired but contradictory ideas of nature and civilization as a general principle of historical and social interpretation. A new intellectual system was requisite before the West could be adequately dealt with in literature or its social development fully understood.”\(^{532}\) As seen in the narratives about and enabled by Arizona, this duality, in Arizona several dualities, continues as the place is written into being. How do they, these dual places that are the same place, exist concurrently? They coexisted with little trouble until they met, clashed, as happened in twenty-first century Arizona, where minority groups and environmentalists’ words come into direct competition with booster and dominant society groups’ words. In *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*, Leo Marx examines examples of the American pastoral ideal, attitudes or perceptions revealed in literature as authors reacted to industrialization. Marx’s analysis also reveals duality, that of nature (the New World) as paradise and as hell;\(^{533}\) similarly Arizona’s

---


\(^{532}\) Ibid., 305.

natural landscape has been described in dualities of extremes, creating the images of many Arizonas.

H. Roy Merrens explores how the landscape of colonial South Carolina was described. In “Image and Image Makers in Colonial South Carolina,” Merrens analyzes several ways of portraying the colony in words and what the words reveal about the landscape. He categorizes writers as promoters, officials, travelers, natural historians, and settlers; not only are the descriptions important, but the reasons for writing are necessary to understand the making of colonial South Carolina. Merrens explains, “What is needed is a clear recognition of the different origins and purposes of the contemporary descriptions.” While Merrens discusses the genres and the words used to describe South Carolina, he does not explore how the natural landscape influenced the narratives, or that different stories created different representations of South Carolina for readers. The words still create particular colonial South Carolinas for readers, three hundred years later.

Several collections about writing and place explore the influence of words on the perception of place. The essays in Old Southwest, New Southwest examine how perception is effected by a landscape and is revealed in stories about a place, and how the place is changed by those stories. In “The Author as Image Maker for the Southwest,” Arrell Morgan Gibson provides a chronological journey through written words about the Southwest, demonstrating how writers from early Spanish explorers to the environmentalists of the 1970s described the places and influenced how that region was perceived and used. For example, in the early twentieth century Indiana Senator Albert Beveridge’s articles in national magazines and speeches on the Senate floor “were seasoned with vile references to the Southwest heartland—a

community of ‘backward areas,’ each ‘stifled by their Spanish heritage,’—not equal in intellect, resources, or population to the other states in the Union,’ their principal handicap that they were not ‘sufficiently American in their habits and customs.’” But after World War II, “The nation’s perception of the Southwest has shifted from wasteland to a new frontier where one may find the good life . . . the Great American Desert became the Sun Belt, the nation’s great settlement reserve for refugees from the Frost Belt.”

This evolution of perception is evident in Arizona’s written narratives as well. The essay “Angles of Vision: Enhancing Our Perspectives on the Southwest” explores how ethnicity affects perception of place. Janice Monk and Vera Norwood compare descriptions of the Southwestern landscape written by Chicana and Anglo women to learn how gender and ethnicity, among other factors, shape perspectives of place. They conclude that ethnicity is a deciding factor in how the landscape was portrayed.

While I agree that ethnicity is an important aspect in forming perception, I believe multi-generational residency is also important; this factor remains unaddressed in the essay. What do Anglo women born in the Southwest who are second, third, forth generation residents of the place write, or Hispanic women born and raised in Los Angeles or Miami? Not only does it matter where the writer is standing, but also where he or she came from.

_Northern Lights_ is a collection of essays about a place, the West, by writers who reside there. The essays connect the place, how the writers perceive it, and the words they write about it. Their words are influenced by the place and they in turn influence people’s thinking about the landscape. Editors Deborah Clow and Donald Arrell Morgan Gibson, “The Author as Image Maker for the Southwest,” in _Old Southwest, New Southwest: Essays on a Region and Its Literature_, Judy Nolte Lensink, ed. (Tucson: The Tucson Public Library, 1987), 32, 35.

Snow state, “People in the West see things differently than people anywhere else. It’s a way of sensing things, a way of carrying the landscape inside, of moving through days the way rivers move through canyons and mountain valleys.”

However, many people of varying regions, population centers, and topographies see things differently, yet even as they write about the writers in this collection, these editors evoke the landscape they are discussing.

Russell Martin and Marc Barasch’s *Writers of the Purple Sage* is a collection of pieces by Western writers; some of the writers are native to the West and some are, as the editors call them, immigrants. Unlike the authors of “Angles of Vision,” the editors here make connections between place, multi-generational residency, and language, of being native to a place and how the native represents the place. Native writers (those born in the place they are writing about) often treat the landscape as a character, not simply a setting. According to the editors, “The immigrants care about the landscape, to be sure, but within the context of their fiction the land is much more often simply a setting than a pervasive character in itself.”

Scholars have explored the connection between words and landscape, words creating the landscape as they describe the place, and the landscape as influencing the words writers choose. In *Mapping the Invisible Landscape* Kent Ryden uses case studies of specific places to explore “the words that we impose on the landscape.” He describes landscape as a palimpsest, a “layered accumulation” of meanings over

---


538 Russel Martin and Marc Barasch, *Writers of the Purple Sage: An Anthology of Recent Western Writing* (New York: Penguin books, 1984), xviii. This applies to writers of other regions and countries as well. In a 1960 *New York Times* article, Lawrence Durrell, a British author, responded to charges that he wrote as if landscape was more important than characters, stating, “I have evolved the private notion about the importance of landscape, and I willingly admit to seeing ‘characters’ almost as a function of landscape.” Quoted in *Spirit of Place: Letters and Essays on Travel*, Alan G. Thomas, ed. (New York: Dutton, 1969), 156.
time. On the importance of words, Ryden believes, "To capture and express that sense, that complex intersection and interaction of geography and mind, we need art—specifically the art of words." His invisible landscape refers to "meanings, memories, and associations that are tied to the landscape." These are things the local farmer or miner would see attached to the place that give it meaning, but things a visitor, an outsider, would not notice or recognize. Ryden believes a visitor sees only the scene and judges it solely on that merit. I would argue that this is not the whole picture. The place acts on the visitor as well as on the resident, and the visitor judges the landscape based on his or her own experiences and perspectives, just as the mountaineer or the farmer or the miner does. Not only does a place have an invisible landscape, but also we each bring our own ideas and perceptions when we come to a place.

The essays in Richard V. Francaviglia and David E. Narrett’s book seek to "define and interpret the powerful visual and verbal images that have come to characterize the Southwest." Essays on the Changing Images of the Southwest explores how images—written and visual—of the Southwest changed over time. However, the authors do not link image to context; they do not consider the author, artist, or audience perspective.

In A Place Called Grand Canyon: Contested Geographies Barbara J. Morehouse examines “how society and space have interacted to make and remake the place called 'Grand Canyon.'” She focuses on the conflicts that have been written onto this landscape, stating, "How people such as ranchers, miners, loggers, recreationists, environmentalists, American Indians, and others define contested

---

539 Kent Ryden, Mapping the Invisible Landscape: Folklore, Writing, and the Sense of Place (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1993), xiv, 14, 41, 50.

territory and resources makes a big difference in the language they use and the actions they take.”

John Warfield Simpson’s collection of essays *Visions of Paradise* discusses authors, lawsuits, and places in Ohio. His is a declension narrative; he believes, “We are creating an American landscape sadly devoid of significant meaning, symbolism, and local identity. Diversity and richness are lost in the proliferation of autonomous places.”

A recent work, Peter Friederici’s edited collection of oral histories, contains “accounts that show how individuals have understood their place during their time.” In emphasizing the importance of words to landscape, Freiderici states, “Change happens, unstoppably, irrevocably: it is written not just on but in the land.”

Emily W. B. Russell’s *People and the Land through Time: Linking Ecology and History* is a science book that encourages historical thinking. She is an ecologist explaining to other scientists how they can use history to understand environments. Her purpose is “to stimulate further research on the role that history, specifically human history, has played in shaping communities, ecosystems, and landscapes and conversely, the role that changing environments have played in human history.”

Russell explains that history, examined through the lens of words, is useful to ecologists because “reconstructing the past to evaluate its effects on present ecosystems . . . requires the integration of a wealth of diverse information. Written

---


records document past human activities as observations of the natural world by literate people.”

Keith H. Basso explores Western Apache language, its ties to the landscape and the history of the people in *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Landscape, language, and history weave together to form Western Apache identity; Basso’s purpose is to reveal and explain the connectedness of Western Apache language, place, and culture. The names of the places evoke the stories of the past, centering the people morally and anchoring their identity to the landscape. Basso’s obvious yet profound observation that “placeless events are an impossibility; everything that happens must happen somewhere” reinforces an emphasis on and a need for place-centered and -specific study.

Joni Adamson explores how words are used in connection with the environment and how meanings vary. *American Indian Literature, Environmental Justice and Ecocriticism: The Middle Place* “is about the search to find ways to understand our cultural and historical differences and similarities sufficiently that we might come together in the ‘middle place.’” The middle place is “that contested terrain where interrelated social and environmental problems originate.”
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545 Keith H. Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 86. Would this morality, acquired from these stories, be transferable to other people, non-tribal members? I am thinking about Old Testament law and how it applied to Jewish people, but others could adopt it. I have thought that if we all spoke the same language, at least some sort of fundamental understanding would be possible. For example, Anglos would know the stories on the Apache landscape if both peoples spoke the same language. But would the stories and the resulting connections be exclusively for the Western Apache people, regardless of a shared language?

revealed in literature, and it is in literature that understanding might be found. Claudia Sadowski-Smith explores the effect that the landscape of national borders has on literature. She considers words, primarily in contemporary fiction, grown out of a landscape of borders, and how those borders influence fiction. Two dissertations explore Arizona, or regions therein, using perception as a frame. Sam Schmieding writes about the Colorado Plateau as sacred space. He explores perception and place in the context of constructing the sacred in the plateau region.\(^\text{547}\) In “Reading Maps, Writing Landscapes,” Dori Griffin examines the words and images on maps, most with a tourism theme, that have created Arizona for the maps’ users. While the place is Arizona, the writing is cartography, and Griffin demonstrates that the written landscape is not confined to literature.\(^\text{548}\)

My study is also part of a body of literature that explores place creating more broadly. While words are the lens through which I view that process, others have employed other methods to study place making. Yi-Fu Tuan’s *Topophilia*, his term for the bond between people and place, examines that bond manifested in how people view their environment. For example, “A geography textbook might describe New Mexico as essentially a semiarid country with patches of real desert and islands of cool moist, forest-clad mountains. The Spaniards and the early Anglo-American visitors perceived very differently,” as did the Navajo and Zuni, whom Tuan includes in this discussion. But perception can change over time, as Tuan’s New Mexico example demonstrates. “The New Mexican landscape . . . was once judged


‘disgusting,’ ‘sickening,’ and ‘monotonous,’” Tuan concludes, “Now the state claims to be the ‘Land of Enchantment.’”

Like Ryden, Tuan discusses the insider-outsider dichotomy, the differing perceptions of visitor and resident. “The visitor’s evaluation of environment is essentially aesthetic,” Tuan states. “The outsider’s enthusiasm, no less than his critical stance, may be superficial . . . [Although] obviously the visitor’s judgment is often valid.” Differences in how a visitor and resident think about a place is inherent. However, a visitor’s perception is not necessarily only aesthetic or superficial, nor a resident’s without aesthetic qualities. What was the place that had been created in the mind the visitor before he arrived at the place? What had she read about it, heard about it, seen of it in pictures? Sometimes these words create very deep perceptions, such as in Luis Alberto Urrea’s *The Devil’s Highway*.

The essays in Leonard Engel’s book *The Big Empty* seek to understand the significance of landscape portrayed in words, both spoken and written, but they also address the reciprocal relationship between land and writer or storyteller. In “Shaping and Being Shaped by the Land,” Barbara Allen states, “The stories westerners tell not only *express* a sense of place, they also *shape* it.” Allen explores the process of creating place orally, in words spoken rather than written. Elsewhere she writes, “To hear a story about a place is to expand our own perception
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550 Ibid., 64, 65.

of the place, to deepen its meaning beyond our own experience. Expanding perception of place occurs through both oral and written words.

Anne F. Hyde discusses the significance of viewpoint in “Cultural Filters: The Significance of Perception in the History of the American West.” She explores audience responses to descriptions, stating that perception “denotes both firsthand observations of Americans who viewed the West for the first time in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the responses of readers or viewers to those firsthand accounts or images.” She examines how people’s perceptions shaped the West and how their perceptions were shaped by the place they wrote about, “Working like filters on a camera lens, cultural expectations, biases, and ideology affected what people saw and what they recorded for others.” These expectations and biases can be found in words about and enabled by Arizona as well.

Stephen J. Pyne examines the process of a place becoming as he explores how views about Grand Canyon evolved over time in *How the Canyon Became Grand*. Perceptions influence perceptions, creating the idea of Grand Canyon. “It [the scene at Grand Canyon] has meaning,” Pyne writes, “and that meaning depends less on the scene’s physical geography than on the ideas through which it can be viewed and imagined.” His is a study of “how each of the handful or hundreds of peoples who saw it refracted the scene through the prism of their aesthetic sensibilities or positioned it within their own moral geographies.” Stephen Sloan writes about place in “Negotiating a Sense of Place in the Salt River Valley,” and examines
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553 Anne F. Hyde, “Cultural Filters: The Significance of Perception in the History of the American West,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (August 1993): 352.

residents’ views of the landscape of the Valley, and how and why these changed over time. In discussing perception, he writes, “A place is perceived differently by different communities simultaneously and can also be culturally reconceived by the same community over time. Embracing a historical perspective on sense of place is essential to fully understanding what it means to know a place and the people that reside there.” Sloan’s use of the word negotiate implies an interaction with an already existing, unchanging place, acting with and on a landscape that the settlers did not create. However, as Pyne’s work reveals, place and people do interact, both continually changing in the process, perception creating place and place creating perception.

William L. Lang examines what he terms “sensitivity to place” in the essay “From Where We Are Standing: The Sense of Place and Environmental History.” This sense is “the focus on the participants’ perceptions and understandings of their surroundings and the role those perceptions and understandings play in human choices.” This is important, Lang believes, because “Knowing the context and content of descriptions of place makes it less likely that we will misunderstand human actions and reactions and their relationship to environmental change.” In Geography and History Alan R. H. Baker explores the use of perception for framing landscape studies, writing that landscape is a “holistic concept” and “understanding the visible appearance of places and their representation in words (prose and poetry), in


pictures (for example, in maps, paintings, and photographs), numbers and even in sounds has been among the objectives of a wide variety of scholars and artists."\(^{557}\)

Scholars and writers have explored perception both as that gained from natural landscapes and as directed toward those places, through lenses other than words, but still perception influencing and being influenced by landscape. D. W. Meinig suggests that scenes can be viewed through a number of different lenses; he identifies and names ten. Meinig defines landscape as "that stretch of country as seen from a single point," but offers that landscape is more than that, stating, "Any landscape is composed not only of what lies before our eyes but what lies within our heads." However, he separates humanity and nature. Meinig states, “The works of man are paltry compared with nature, which is primary, fundamental, dominant, enduring . . . it is an old and deeply rooted view which separates man and nature."\(^{558}\) Taking an opposing view in an article about landscape and history, Leslie Marmon Silko places human beings within the landscape. The perceiver is part of the landscape, she believes, writing that the dictionary definition, "‘a portion of territory the eye can comprehend in a single view’ does not correctly describe the relationship between the human being and his or her surroundings. This assumes that the viewer is somehow outside or separate from the territory he or she surveys. Viewers are as much a part of the landscape as the boulders they stand on."\(^{559}\)

Alan R. H. Baker and Gideon Biger’s collection of essays *Ideology and Landscape in Historical Perspective* explores different landscapes using ideas and


perceptions as the themes. The introduction sets the theoretical foundation for the essays; the editors explain, “A landscape is a resultant of attitudes and actions; but to the extent that actions are themselves outcomes of attitudes, the latter deserve—but by no means always been granted—privileged status over the former in historico-geographical studies.” They note that ideas mold the landscape and in turn are shaped by the landscape: “the relationship is reciprocal.” The essays, in Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso’s Senses of Place explore the meaning of place. For the scholars included in this volume, part of that exploration, “is ethnographic, its primary purpose being to describe and interpret some of the ways in which people encounter places, perceive them, and invest them with significance.”

Recently, exploring the perception of place is a frame archaeologists have employed. The key to understating place for these archaeologists is meaning; when we understand the meaning given to a place we will better understand the people who perceive it. Ruth M. Van Dyke phrases the reciprocal relationship between landscapes and people this way: “Landscapes both create and reflect ideas we hold about ourselves and our societies, our worldviews and our ideologies.” Meaning infused into a landscape makes it a place. Van Dyke explains, “Places are made . . . We construct landscapes as we live them, building meaning out of our own experiences, as well as the stories, traditions, and past experiences of others.” In “The Archaeology of Meaningful Places,” Brenda J. Bowser and Maria Nieves Zedeño also explore how people assign meaning to places. “Place is a juncture where
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562 Ruth M. Van Dyke, The Chaco Experience: Landscape and Ideology at the Center Place (Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007), 4, 238.
environment, people, and meaning converge at multiple scales,” they write, “and, in
the process, create a record of human behavior, perception, and cognition.” Browser
and Zedeño’s “environment, people, and meaning” are what I have termed natural,
cultural, and intellectual landscapes. Bowser and Zedeño believe, and as my study
demonstrates, “Places and the landscapes that contain them are multilayered; each
layer, in turn, represents a particular realm of experience and cognition.”
Archaeologists look for meaning in material culture, in the cultural landscape;
meaning can also be discerned from literature, in the intellectual landscape.

Rather than examining the meaning of an archaeological place to past
residents and present inhabitants, *Prehistory, Personality, and Place* explores how
landscape can influence archaeologists, in this case how Emil Haury was affected and
influenced by archaeological sites in the White Mountains and along the Mogollon
Rim. Jefferson Reid and Stephanie Whittlesey restate for archaeologists the
reciprocal relationship between humans and landscape, “We are convinced of the
power of place to shape personalities and cultures.” They write, “People interact with
places, and by these interactions, the ways they view their natural and social
environments, and their spiritual connections with the land and its inhabitants, they
create cultural landscape. In turn, people are shaped by these places of their own
creation.” Reflecting on meaning found in the archaeological places, they determine,
“Places are not simply construction of topography and sky, water and vegetation,
animals and stone. Places are created by human practice, intention, belief, and
cognition.” People give a landscape meaning and create place. In explaining the
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563 Brenda J. Bowser and Maria Nieves Zedeño, “The Archaeology of
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564 Jefferson Reid and Stephanie Whittlesey, *Prehistory, Personality, and
Place: Emil W. Haury and the Mogollon Controversy* (Tucson: University of Arizona
meaning of archaeological places from the perspective of a Hopi archaeologist, Kyle Balenqua describes what ancient places mean to modern Hopi people. He says, “From a Hopi perspective, meaning of place is also embedded in the emotional and spiritual realms of human existence.” The archaeological landscape contains the footprints of the ancestors.\textsuperscript{565}

Many authors and scholars exemplify the importance of the entwined nature of narrative and place by the manner in which they tell their stories. Whether they are writing history or historical geography, memoir or manifesto, the landscape pervades their narratives. For example, Ross Santee writes about the White Mountain and Mogollon Rim regions of Arizona in \textit{Apache Lands}. Even though the landscape is never specifically described, it is always present. In \textit{Named in Sky and Stone} Gregory McNamee has brought together descriptions of Arizona’s natural landscapes, words written by many authors. Edward Abbey’s purpose in writing about southeastern Utah in \textit{Desert Solitaire} is “to create a world of words in which the desert figures more as medium than as material.”\textsuperscript{566} The Sangre de Cristo Mountains of New Mexico are an actor in William Eno DeBuys history of the region. He writes, “Until I understood something of the influence of the land, I could not begin to understand the people whose lives and history bound them to it.”\textsuperscript{567}

Michael P. Conzen’s \textit{The Making of the American Landscape} is a collection of essays exploring the story of the “building and rebuilding, of the continuous tinkering


and refurnishing, of [Americans’] home in North America.” In explaining the need for landscape history, Conzen says it “gives precedence to time as the key element in landscape formation. Each generation has inherited a landscape shaped in certain ways, and has added its own distinguishing traits while modifying or removing others as it is succeeded by the next generation.”\(^{568}\) A collection of J. B. Jackson’s essays and articles, *A Sense of Place, a Sense of Time* explores his belief that sense of place is “something that we ourselves create in the course of time . . . the result of habit or custom.” For example, in his essay “Seeing New Mexico,” in that state, and in the entire Southwest I would argue, unlike the eastern section of the country where vegetation covers ruins, “history remains exposed for all to see. Our landscape is everywhere spotted with ruins—ruins of ancient towns, ruins of shepherders’ shelters built over a decade ago.”\(^{569}\) With that description he emphasizes that the landscape was not only created hundreds of years ago but also a decade ago, and is being created now.

William Wyckoff’s *Creating Colorado* is an example of viewing history through geography, or geography through history. This book explores “Colorado localities and how they have evolved [with a] selective view of the past, one that concentrates on Colorado as a place.”\(^{570}\) He examines regions within a state. Henry Glassie’s *Passing the Time in Ballymenone* explores a region within a country. Glassie’s focus is the relationships of place, landscape, history, and a people in Northern Ireland.\(^{571}\)

---


Maurice Beresford’s *History on the Ground* and *Time and Place* are explorations of urban, local, place, and landscape history using English landscapes as case studies. According to Beresford, “With documents, books, and travel the historian is thrice armed in his perpetual war against oblivion, and the intellectual journey is always triangular: from field to archives, from archives to libraries, and from libraries to the field.” In his histories of the Llano Estecado (*Caprock Canyonlands*) and what he terms the Near Southwest (*Horizontal Yellow*), Dan Flores writes of the human interaction with landscape through time. On the connection between landscape and perception, he writes, “Everything we take in, from subtle socialization to outright manipulation and all between, gives us learned preferences in everything, and that includes landscapes and places.”

Several scholars contributed to my evolving philosophy of the narrative landscape; of place creating with words, words writing a place into being; and of natural and cultural landscapes entwined with the written word, each contributing to the creation of the others. In “The Temporality of Landscapes,” Tim Ingold seeks a “dwelling perspective,” a combining of a strictly naturalist and a strictly cultural view of landscape. “Landscape is never complete,” Ingold writes, “neither ‘built’ nor ‘unbuilt,’ it is perpetually under construction.” Ingold discusses the role of stories in developing a dwelling perspective, “Telling a story is not like weaving a tapestry to cover up the world, it is rather a way of guiding the attention of listeners or readers.”

---


He believes temporal lines are drawn too firmly, stating, “The present is not marked off from a past that it has replaced or a future that will, in turn, replace it; it rather gathers the past and future into itself, like refractions in a crystal ball.” Examining the written narratives about and brought forth from natural and cultural landscapes reveals this phenomenon; my study demonstrates that past words about a place, present words about it, and words that will continue to create it, are all met at the current moment.

Trevor J. Barnes and James S. Duncan take a theoretical approach to studying place in *Writing Worlds*, a collection of essays that engage in a discussion of Paul Ricoeur’s assertion that the world is like a text, and apply that argument to landscapes. A landscape “is a social and cultural production,” the editors write. “Thus a landscape possesses a similar objective fixity to that of a written text. It also becomes detached from the intentions of its original authors, and in terms of social and psychological impact and material consequences, the various readings of landscapes matter more than any authorial intentions. In addition, the landscape has an importance beyond the initial situation for which it was constructed, addressing a potentially wide range of readers.” This is perception writ large. No one can control how a landscape is perceived once it exists, whether natural or cultural or the landscape of stories, neither those who construct it nor those who write about it.

---

574 Ingold, “The Temporality of Landscapes,” 152, 162, 153 (emphasis in original).

575 Ibid., 159 (emphasis in original).