The Other Arizona, Redux

Thomas E. Sheridan

In 1871 an O'odham war party slipped north of the Salt River and attacked a group of Yavapais below Four Peaks in the Mazatzal Mountains. The Pimas killed most of the adults but took the children captive, including a little boy named Wassaja. They sold him to an Italian photographer named Carlos Gentile for thirty dollars, and Gentile renamed him Carlos Montezuma.

That name encompassed a world of changing meaning for Wassaja and Indian children like him. Gentile gave the boy his first name, but the second was generic Indian, harkening back to an Aztec past that had nothing to do with the Yavapais of central Arizona. Wassaja would never see his immediate family again. His mother was shot by army scouts while searching for her children. His father died on the San Carlos Reservation. His sisters were sold to a man who took them to Mexico. It was a time of diaspora and disintegration, when the Anglo world felt justified in taking Indian children away from their parents to "civilize" them. Wassaja grew up in Illinois and New York, far from his kinsmen and the sacred mountains of his people.

When he returned to Arizona thirty years later, Carlos Montezuma was a physician and a leader in the emerging pan-Indian movement. One of the first Native Americans to receive a medical degree, he spent seven years working for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) on reservations across the West. His experiences gave him an abiding contempt for the BIA and its reservation system. Like Booker T. Washington and other reformers of the era, Montezuma believed that Native Americans had to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and "press forward where the Indians ought to be—man among men." He advocated hard work and

Thomas E. Sheridan is research anthropologist in the Southwest Center and professor in the School of Anthropology at the University of Arizona.
The original version of this essay, "The Other Arizona," was published in *Journal of the Southwest* in Autumn 1994 and was drawn from Sheridan's *Arizona: A History.* This updated version is likewise drawn from his revised edition of *Arizona: A History,* to be published by the University of Arizona Press in time for Arizona's centennial, February 14, 2012.

Journal of the Southwest 53, 2 (Summer 2011) : 139–176

off-reservation boarding schools. He thought that reservations turned Indians into "idlers, beggars, gamblers, and paupers."

But Montezuma's own homeland began stalking him during the last two decades of his life. He returned to Yavapai territory for the first time in 1901 and met relatives like his first cousins Charles and George Dickens. They drew him into the struggle to create a Yavapai reservation at abandoned Fort McDowell on the Verde River. That battle eventually pitted Montezuma against both the BIA and the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, who wanted Yavapai water rights and who tried to have the Yavapais transferred to the Salt River Reservation, where the O'odham and Pee Posh, their ancestral enemies, held sway.

Montezuma never accepted the reservation system and continued to practice medicine in Chicago, but he also fought tirelessly for Indian land and water rights, realizing that without a land base, Native American societies would wither and die. He hated the BIA's power over Indian people, and he supported Indians who tried to preserve traditional ceremonies and political authority even though Montezuma, himself a devout Baptist, was profoundly ambivalent about "traditional" Native American culture. Ironically, his closest supporters among the Yavapais, Apaches, and O'odham were the traditionalists, who became known as "Montezumas" in the 1920s and 1930s.

By then, Montezuma himself was dead. In 1922 the combative "cast iron" doctor contracted tuberculosis. He published the last issue of his newsletter, *Wassaja*, in November, ending with an article called "The Indian Bureau—the Slaughter House of the Indian People." Then, in December, he pulled himself onto a train in Chicago and made the long trip home. George Dickens and his family built a brush shelter for him at Fort McDowell, keeping a fire going while Montezuma lay on a mattress on the winter ground. But even though he told them, "I'm cold. I'm going to die of cold in here!" he refused his doctor's request to move to a sanatorium. "I want to die like my ancestors did," he said. And so he did, on January 23, 1923.

The Yavapais buried Montezuma in the Fort McDowell cemetery, where Four Peaks dominates the horizon and the Verde flows through an enormous mesquite bosque nearby. His tombstone reads:

Wassaja
Carlos Montezuma, M.D.
Mohave Apache Indian

Those simple words capture Montezuma's strange, circular odyssey. In the 1980s, when Yavapais turned back yet another attempt to destroy their reservation by halting the construction of Orme Dam, one activist said, "I don't want to see the land where Montezuma is buried covered with water." The tombstone still stands.

Reservation Life in Arizona

All the other Native Americans of Arizona endured similar conflicts and contradictions as they made the transition from independence to reservation life. To talk of a "reservation system" itself is to credit U.S. Indian policy with more logic than it deserves. The creation of Arizona's twenty-one Indian reservations proceeded sporadically and haphazardly over 119 years. The first was the Gila River Indian Community, established in 1859. The last was the Pascua Yaqui Reservation, established in 1978. Reservations today range in size from the enormous Navajo Nation, which covers nearly 16 million acres and is the largest reservation in the United States, to the tiny Tonto Apache Reservation, which occupies 378 acres south of Payson.

After the disastrous attempt to resettle all Western Apaches, Chiricahua Apaches, and Yavapais on the San Carlos Reservation in the 1870s, however, the government did establish most Arizona reservations within the homelands of the people themselves. The huge Tohono O'odham (2,774,390 acres) and Navajo reservations encompassed significant portions of those territories. Yavapais, in contrast, received only small enclaves at Fort McDowell, Camp Verde, Middle Verde, Clarkdale, and Prescott. But even when the size of the reservations was substantial, the government often withheld crucial resources from their inhabitants. The Gila River Indian Community was enlarged several times until it contained 372,000 acres. But the Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh living there spent more than a century trying to recover the water of the Gila that was being diverted upriver. The Arizona Water Settlement Act was not signed into law until 2004, and the tribe is still fending off lawsuits and waiting for the system to be built to deliver its 653,500 acre-feet of water to the reservation.

Even after the boundaries of most reservations had been fixed, the BIA continued to move people around with little regard for cultural or linguistic affinities. A case in point was the Colorado River Reservation, created in 1865. Most of the inhabitants were Mohaves, but the reservation was also open to other tribes living along the Colorado, including the Chemehuevis, who spoke a Shoshonean rather than a Yuman language. The original reservation embraced about 75,000 acres. It was later enlarged to 268,691 acres, most of which are in Arizona. Because there were fewer than one thousand Mohaves and only about two hundred Chemehuevis living there, however, the government decided to fill the desert lowlands with other people. The process began during World War II, when nearly eighteen thousand Japanese American Nisei were interned at a camp named after Charles Poston, the "Father of Arizona." At its height, Poston was the third largest city in Arizona—a boomtown built on wartime fears—until Japanese relocation ended in 1945.

Not long after the Nisei left, the BIA asked the Colorado River Tribal Council to allow Hopis and Navajos to resettle on the reservation, because their reservations were running out of good land. Under pressure, the council agreed, and in 1947 seventeen Hopi families arrived to farm alfalfa along the Colorado. More Hopis and Navajos followed until the Mohaves, fearful that they would lose control of the council, denounced the colonization program and called for its termination. It ended in 1957, but fourteen years later, Navajos still constituted 8.6 percent and Hopis 7.4 percent of the reservation's population.

Resettlement was just one manifestation of the insensitivity of many BIA programs. Another was the boarding school system. Boarding schools operated according to the principle enunciated by Indian commissioner Thomas Morgan in 1889: "The Indian must conform to the 'white man's ways,' peacefully if they will, forcibly if they must." With proper Victorian contempt for non-Christian Indian culture, the BIA therefore tore thousands of Native American children away from their families and forced them to attend institutions like the Phoenix Indian School, which was founded in 1890 after Commissioner Morgan persuaded Phoenix residents that it was "cheaper to educate Indians than to kill them." Another incentive was the outing system, which placed Indian children in local businesses and gave those businesses a steady supply of cheap labor.

To do so, the Phoenix Indian School combined an emphasis on vocational training with detribalization and rigid military discipline. As soon as they arrived at the school, children were separated from other members of their tribe, forbidden to speak their native language, stripped of their traditional clothes, and organized into military companies where they were subject to corporal punishment. “I worked in the dining room, washing dishes and scrubbing floors,” recalled Akimel O’odham Anna Moore Shaw. “If we were not finished when the 8:00 a.m. whistle sounded, the dining room matron would go around strapping us while we were still on our hands and knees. . . . We just dreaded the sore bottoms.”

Not surprisingly, many Indian children resisted. Young boys formed tribal gangs and spoke their language whenever they were free from the supervision of boarding school personnel. Others, like Hopi Edmund Nequatewa, ran away and embarked on their own personal odysseys back to their homelands, odysseys that, in Nequatewa’s case, took him up the Verde Valley and across the Mogollon Rim on foot. Historian David Wallace Adams aptly characterized the intent of the boarding schools as “de-Indianization,” but Native American children subverted that process in countless ways.

Meanwhile, the government attempted to transform reservation Indians into property-owning farmers by passing the General Allotment Act in 1887. Also known as the Dawes Severalty Act, the law called for the division of reservations into private allotments that would be transferred to individual Indian families. “Surplus” lands could then be sold to non-Indians, a process that cost Native Americans 91 million acres between 1887 and 1934. In Arizona, allotment affected less than 3 percent of reservation land but caused numerous problems on the Yuma, Colorado River, San Carlos, San Xavier, Salt River, Gila River, and Navajo reservations, where it was applied. Most tribes fought the act, and in 1978, after decades of protest, the Quechans finally won back twenty-five thousand acres of their original reservation by arguing that they had agreed to allotment only under duress. Nonetheless, the Dawes Act severely weakened the principle of mutual agreement, the covenant between tribes and the federal government that supposedly guided U.S. Indian policy.

The Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) of 1934 was designed to restore that principle. The act was the brainchild of John Collier. Collier was a social worker in New York City who had become enchanted with the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and had developed a deep respect for Pueblo communalism, which he saw as an alternative to the alienation of modern capitalism. As executive secretary of the American Indian Defense Association, Collier condemned the BIA for suppressing Pueblo dances and demanded an end to allotment and the restoration of communal lands. When Franklin Roosevelt appointed him commissioner of Indian affairs in 1933, Collier made cultural pluralism and reservation self-determination the goals of his "Indian New Deal."

Despite such good intentions, however, the legacy of the Collier era was mixed. Arizona Indians eventually approved constitutionally based tribal councils that took more active roles in reservation affairs, but the constitutions were written by non-Indians and were based on the U.S. Constitution rather than on Native American legal and political traditions. In the case of the Hopis, the tribal council became a vehicle for the "progressives" and eroded traditional clan and village authority. Among the Tohono O'odham, the very notion of tribal organization was an alien concept imposed from above. "The 'tribe' which adopted a constitution in 1937 was really a group of Indians, speaking dialects of a common language, who in 1916 had come to share a common Indian reservation," anthropologist Bernard Fontana observed. "An overall chairman and political districts had been totally foreign to them." Tribal councils allowed Native Americans to exercise some control over education, health care, and economic development on their reservations, but they also factionalized many groups by creating bases of authority that had never existed before. Moreover, most tribal constitutions contained the clause "subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior." Not even Collier believed in full-fledged Indian sovereignty. In Fontana's words, "One might argue that IRA constitutions gave Indians the illusion of self-government."

The history of many Native American groups since then has been a struggle to turn that illusion into reality. In the process, issues of self-determination became entangled with issues of cultural identity and economic development. Indians were demanding greater sovereignty at a time when the federal government was exerting greater control over western resources, including those on reservations. That control drew Native Americans into another struggle—the struggle between the rural and the urban—escalating across Arizona and the West. The Indian wars forcibly incorporated them into an expanding nation-state with a racist ideology of Anglo superiority. BIA policies tried and failed to turn them into dark-skinned reflections of Christian, capitalist Anglo America. Now cities like Phoenix, Los Angeles, and Las Vegas wanted their water and fossil fuels so they could keep on expanding. Marginalized on isolated reservations for decades, many Indians in postwar Arizona found themselves straddling prime recreation areas or rich deposits of oil and coal.

That forced them to make hard choices about how they wanted to live in their homelands. It also made them players in a game to determine the future of the West itself.

Stock Reduction and the Creation of Navajo Dependency

No group illustrates the complexity of that struggle better than the Diné, or Navajos. After the Long Walk and the disastrous relocation at Bosque Redondo, the U.S. government allowed the Navajos to return to the Four Corners region in 1868. The government also replaced the herds of sheep and goats that Kit Carson's soldiers had slaughtered in 1863. During the next sixty years, both the Diné and their animals multiplied rapidly as they spread across the Colorado Plateau. Navajo herds numbered more than a million head by the early 1930s, reducing plant cover and eroding soil within five miles of Navajo fields, where most herds grazed. The traditional response to such localized environmental degradation was to move, but by then Anglo and Mexican stock raisers had leased or homesteaded most of the land around springs and seeps on the checkerboard lands along the Santa Fe Railroad. The BIA tried to enlarge the reservation by consolidating the checkerboard, but Anglo and Hispanic ranchers blocked its efforts. The government therefore decided that if the Navajos could not continue to expand, they had to learn to live within their means on the reservation itself.

That meant a drastic reduction in the size of Navajo herds. BIA officials believed that those herds were three times the size the range could sustain, so they decided to save the Navajos from themselves. Reservation superintendent E. R. Fryer compared the Diné to children who needed sterner rearing. "The youngster will not always understand a dose of castor oil may sometimes be more efficacious than a stick of candy," Fryer intoned. The need for stock reduction may have been evident, at least to government officials, but their arrogance and insensitivity to Navajo values and economic needs made the process a catastrophe for the Diné. The Long Walk was the first major trauma in Navajo-Anglo relations. Stock reduction was the second. Ironically, the individual who made stock reduction a reality was John Collier, formerly one of the BIA's harshest critics. In the eyes of many Navajos, Collier became the lying white man who, in the words of Navajo Ben Morris, stepped out of his car in Tuba City, dressed in black "like a big, black crow," and destroyed the old, independent Navajo way of life.

The government called stock reduction the Navajo Project, an elemental clash of cultures that revealed how poorly government officials, even sympathetic ones like Collier, understood the people they were trying to help. When the first phase of the program began in 1934, the Dust Bowl was the dominant metaphor for the ills plaguing the western United States. Farmers and ranchers had abused the land, and now the land was blowing away in huge black clouds or flowing out of the mountains and clogging the rivers. Controlling soil erosion therefore became an evangelical crusade—a grand experiment to prove that humans could restore as well as destroy nature—and the new Soil Conservation Service (SCS) developed its first demonstration project at Mexican Springs, in the eastern part of the Navajo Reservation. SCS personnel believed that Navajo grazing practices threatened that new icon of human progress, Boulder (now Hoover) Dam. If Boulder Dam silted up, the federal reclamation of the West would be a failure.

Most Diné did not buy the new conservation gospel and refused to believe that their sheep were the cause of the problem. If the soil was eroding, it was because the rains had failed. To the Navajos, stock reduction was unthinkable. Sheep were food, clothing, and the principal form of wealth among the Diné. They were also members of Diné households. "Everything comes from the sheep," said Old Man Hat, who told his daughter that they were her mother and father. "Stock reduction was self-destruction, likened graphically to cutting off one's arms and legs and head," historian Peter Iverson observed. In many respects, to be Navajo was to have sheep. Without them, a family was less than whole.

The existence of a bond between the Diné and their herds eluded most government officials. The first reduction took place in 1933 and 1934, when one hundred thousand sheep were purchased or slaughtered by the BIA. Pressure from wealthy Navajos led to 10 percent across-the-board rather than proportional cuts, which meant that families with big herds dumped their culls while poor Navajos lost vital producing animals. The second reduction was even more devastating. This time the government demanded that the Navajos get rid of one hundred thousand goats as well as fifty thousand sheep. Furthermore, they had to castrate the rest of their billy goats. To the government officials in charge of the project, goats were ravenous pests that destroyed the range. To the Navajos, however, they were sturdy beasts that survived hard winters better than sheep and provided meat and milk. The government was trying to protect an ecosystem and was arguing that stock reduction would improve herds and increase their marketability. The Navajos were trying to feed their families and stay alive.

Since poor Navajos depended on goats more than did rich Navajos, the second reduction decimated many of their herds, forcing them to eat their breeding stock and buy more food from trading posts. Then they had to watch helplessly as the government killed thousands of their beloved animals because there was no market to buy them and not enough water to keep them alive. "Scientific" range management, based on the assumptions of the market, collided with Navajo culture, which was rooted in a subsistence economy. In trying to save Navajo rangeland, the Navajo Project was destroying the livelihoods of many Navajo families without offering them a viable alternative to stock raising. According to Indian Service field representative Walter Woehlke, reduction helped create "a Navajo proletariat" while protecting a "Navajo aristocracy." It also burned memories of rotting carcasses into the minds of the Diné.

The first two mandatory reductions and a third voluntary sell-off failed to bring Navajo herds within the carrying capacity of the reservation. In 1936, 1,269,910 animal units remained on ranges that could sustain only 560,000, so the government called for a further reduction of 56 percent. The BIA divided the enormous reservation into eighteen grazing districts, or land management units, and placed a ceiling on the number of livestock in each unit. This time the goal of the reduction was to level wealth differences among Navajos as well as to reduce the number of animals on their land. As a result, the 1,448 stock raisers who were over permit lost most of their productive animals and saw their herds dwindle to the size of their poorer neighbors. Since a Navajo family needed about forty to fifty sheep per member to meet its subsistence needs, commercial stock raising became impossible, and most families could not even eke out a living with their remaining herds. Good science and good intentions on the part of government officials led to economic devastation and social disintegration among the Diné.

Many Navajos fought back, intimidating government officials, hiding their animals, and forming alliances with right-wing Anglo and Hispanic politicians who detested Collier. They also organized themselves into a shifting array of factions that politicized the Diné in a way they had never been before. The most prominent leader of the resistance was Jacob Morgan, a tribal councilman from Farmington who became a Protestant missionary. Like Carlos Montezuma, Morgan believed that Navajos had to educate themselves and assimilate into Anglo society. But while he may have accepted Christianity and boarding schools, he, like Montezuma, did not recognize the BIA's authority to determine the destiny of the Diné. In 1935, Morgan mobilized opposition to Collier's cherished Indian Reorganization Act, which called for the creation of constitutionally mandated tribal councils. Two years later he condemned the commissioner's attempt to create a hand-picked tribal council of traditional leaders from the grazing districts. His political agenda was complex, but in the eyes of many of his supporters, he symbolized resistance to stock reduction. That resistance won him the tribal chairmanship in 1938.

Creation of the Navajo Nation

Despite the efforts of Morgan and others, reduction continued. Between 1934 and 1946, Navajo herds declined from 1,053,498 sheep units to 449,000, a decrease of 57 percent. Before the 1930s, most of the Diné had led isolated and self-sufficient lives—lives in which the BIA and other government agencies were little more than distant shadows. After reduction, reliance on wage work and relief increased while self-sufficiency all but disappeared. No longer able to ignore the federal government or the outside world, many Navajos survived by working for the Civilian Conservation Corps or another government agency. The old life died with their animals, and many who had lost both sheep and status turned to spiritual sources of support, such as peyotism and the Native American Church.

One positive legacy of stock reduction was a growing demand for Navajo self-determination. Reduction forced many Navajos to confront the forces that were intruding on their lives. That intrusion intensified during World War II, when 3,600 Diné, men and women, served in the armed forces, and 10,000 to 15,000 others found off-reservation jobs on the railroads, as farm laborers, or in defense plants like the Navajo Ordnance Depot near Flagstaff. Navajos who fought in Europe or the Pacific returned to the reservation with the same mixed emotions of pride and anger felt by other Native American, Mexican, and African American veterans. The legendary Navajo Code Talkers, after all, had transformed their complex language into a military code the Japanese were never able to break. Discrimination and paternalism were even harder to swallow after the experience of national service.

When the war ended, however, off-reservation jobs dried up and prosperity collapsed. Between 1944 and 1946, Navajo per capita annual income fell from two hundred dollars to eighty dollars. The government provided relief to keep Navajos from starving, but more and more Diné were realizing that the tribe itself had to take charge of economic development on the reservation. By the 1950s the tribal council was meeting a hundred days a year rather than four. At a time when the Republican administration in Washington, D.C., was advocating the termination of Indian reservations, the tribal council was administering an ever-expanding bureaucracy that brought clinics, schools, police, and courts to many corners of the reservation.

It financed much of the development by leasing land to oil and gas companies, which paid the tribe $378,931 in 1950 and $34.8 million seven years later. The tribe also received substantial income from prospectors and mining companies during the uranium boom earlier in the decade. But the Navajos became more adept at securing federal funds as well, receiving $89 million through the Navajo-Hopi Long Range Rehabilitation Act, which Congress passed in 1950. Those monies built nearly seven hundred miles of roads on the reservation and increased school enrollment from 14,049 to 32,669 between 1952–53 and 1960–61. They also funded hospitals, water projects, and range improvements. In 1964 the Diné even wrested the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity (ONEO) away from the BIA and ran their own preschool program, youth corps, small-business development center, and community development project.

One of the architects of that takeover was Peter MacDonald, the executive director of ONEO. MacDonald had grown up speaking Navajo in the little reservation community of Teec Nos Pos, and during World War II he joined the Marines and served as a Navajo Code Talker. Then he graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a degree in electrical engineering and went to work for Hughes Aircraft in Southern California for six years. When he returned to the reservation, MacDonald was bright, young, ambitious, and completely at home in the Anglo world of big business and government bureaucracy. But he was also fiercely committed to Navajo self-government and the creation of the Navajo Nation, which became the tribe's official designation in 1969. The following year MacDonald won the office of tribal chairman. MacDonald urged his fellow Diné to throw off the "bonds of forced dependency," and said, "We must do better. We must do it in our own way. And we must do it now."

By the end of MacDonald's first term, those goals seemed more than political rhetoric. The Navajo Division of Education, established in 1971, extended the lessons of the Rough Rock Demonstration School across the reservation, bringing Navajo community control over other schools and Navajo Community College. The division also sponsored programs to train Navajo teachers and school administrators. Navajos entered the health care professions, becoming nurses, midwives, medics, technicians, and community health representatives. Medicine men were allowed in hospital rooms, while new medicine men were trained by an innovative program operated by the Rough Rock School.

MacDonald stimulated economic development as well, building on the achievements of his predecessors. Tribal enterprises like the Navajo Forest Products Industries nearly quadrupled their profits during the early 1970s. Navajos also owned a majority of the retail and wholesale enterprises on the reservation other than trading posts. Oil and gas revenues declined considerably, but the tribe mined and sold its first uranium in 1971 and entered into a joint venture with Exxon to extract more uranium in northwestern New Mexico in 1974. When MacDonald became chairman of the Council of Energy Resources Tribes (CERT), which he called a "domestic OPEC," in 1976, he also became the most powerful Indian leader in the United States. The Diné—more than 130,000 of them—were the largest tribe in North America. Moreover, they controlled some of the largest deposits of coal and natural gas in the United States. Far from being exotic curiosities or members of a marginal culture, the Navajos were central to the future of the American West. Their destinies mirrored the destinies of other rural westerners, including Arizonans, regardless of their ethnicity.

The Grand Plan and Its Discontents

What that mirror of destiny revealed was the enduring power of the city to sacrifice rural interests to urban goals. Despite attempts to diversify the economic base of the Navajo Nation during the 1970s and 1980s, most jobs and tribal revenues still came from the same two major sources of money and power that had dominated the West since the late nineteenth century: the U.S. government and extractive industries. It was a dilemma shared by rural people across the region, and it exposed the Diné, along with their Anglo and Hispanic neighbors, to a host of physical and psychological hazards most city dwellers did not face.

One of those hazards was the nature of the work itself. Running cattle was a dangerous occupation, fraught with head injuries and broken bones. Working in the mines could be even more perilous, especially if safety precautions were not observed. Fibrous lungs and cancerous tumors were two possible consequences of copper and uranium mining, not to mention cave-ins, explosions, and equipment failure. Miners made good money, at least by western standards, but they took big risks. Those risks often spilled over into the general population, giving the Diné a higher rate of cancer than the national average, especially in areas near uranium mines, where both miners and nonminers alike risked exposure to radioactive materials.

A second hazard lurked like fool's gold at the end of the rainbow. When properly managed, stock raising was a sustainable enterprise. Grasses recovered, and erosion could be controlled through rotational grazing and the regulation of livestock numbers. Once ore bodies had been mined out and oil fields depleted, however, the desolation of the bust followed the euphoria of the boom. Vital communities became ghost towns, and skilled miners and oil workers had to move on or settle for low-paying jobs. Extractive industries like coal and uranium mining also degraded the environment, ripping gashes in the landscape and spewing chemicals and particulates into aquifers and the atmosphere. In 1979, for example, the tailings dam of a uranium mill broke northeast of Gallup and poured a hundred million gallons of radioactive water into the Puerco River. It was the largest radioactive spill in the history of the United States, and it made Puerco water undrinkable for at least a generation. Because of such hazards, the Diné and other rural residents often faced one of the hardest of all choices: to remain in a place they loved, surrounded by friends and family but working at a job that leaves scars, or to abandon their homeland and migrate to the cities like everyone else. Many Navajos and other westerners chose jobs over the environment, accepting the scars. Meanwhile, the cities continued to glitter and grow.

The fuel for much of that growth came from Navajo coal. In 1957, Utah Construction and Mining, one of the fabled Big Six companies that had built Hoover Dam, leased twenty-five thousand acres in the northeastern portion of the reservation so it could strip-mine coal for fifteen cents a ton. At first, Utah Construction found no buyers, but then Arizona Public Service agreed to purchase the coal for $2.50 a ton. The utility company used it to fuel its Four Corners Power Plant near Farmington, New Mexico, which opened in 1962. It was the first stage in what came to be called the Grand Plan—the construction of a huge power grid to supply cities from Albuquerque to San Diego.

The energy was to come from two sources. The first were nuclear power plants along the California coast. Because nuclear power was supposedly a clean industry, there would be no pollution and hence no squawking from the urbanites the plants served. The second were the great coalfields of the Colorado Plateau. In order to finance, construct, and administer that regional power grid, twenty-three public and private utilities from California, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas joined together in 1964 to form the Western Energy Supply and Transmission Association (WEST), which later included federal agencies such as the Bureau of Reclamation. It was a new chapter in an old story—internal colonialism on a colossal scale. But this time the colonialists were not eastern or European capitalists but western utility companies—Southern California Edison, El Paso Electric, Arizona Public Service, the Salt River Project, Tucson Gas and Electric, Public Service of New Mexico, and many others. With characteristic western vision, or hubris, WEST intended to generate three times as much power as the Tennessee Valley Authority. Its job was to keep the water pumping, the factories rolling, the cities lit. It was the keeper of the flame. Without energy, the boom would collapse.

The second stage of the Grand Plan began in the mid-1960s, when Peabody Coal Company signed leases with the Navajo and Hopi tribal councils. Those leases gave Peabody the right to strip-mine 400 million tons of coal from forty thousand acres of land on the Navajo Nation and twenty-five thousand acres on the Navajo-Hopi Joint-Use Area. The land itself was on Black Mesa, an immense escarpment of piñon and juniper that rises in the north along Highway 160 and extends southward until it breaks into the long, narrow fingers of the Hopi mesas.

One of the key architects of the deal was Salt Lake City attorney John Boyden, a Mormon bishop who was hired as a land claims lawyer by the Hopi Tribal Council in 1950. Another was Norman Littell, the powerful legal counsel for the Navajo Nation. Boyden and Littell were rivals. Boyden had applied for the Navajo job that Littell had won, and the two lawyers represented tribes who had long feuded over Navajo encroachment on lands Hopis considered their own. But Boyden and

Littell also shared financial incentives, and a commitment to western growth, to see the Black Mesa coal deposits developed. In 1963, they negotiated the settlement of the *Healing v. Jones* court case that established the Navajo-Hopi Joint-Use Area and split mining revenues 50/50 between the two tribes. The Navajo tribal council approved Peabody's lease in 1964. The Hopi Tribal Council followed suit two years later. Both tribes agreed to sell their coal for 3.3 percent, roughly half what the federal government charged for mining on public lands. The lease was soon amended to allow Peabody to pump more than 4,000 acre-feet a year from Black Mesa aquifers at $1.67 per acre-foot, far below the commercial rate of $30 to $50 an acre foot.

To win Hopi support, Boyden had to pack the Hopi Tribal Council with members who wanted what Peabody had to offer. Many Hopis did not recognize the legitimacy of the tribal council. The Hopi Constitution also forbade the council from leasing or mining Hopi land without the approval of the Hopi people. Because many Hopis considered mining a desecration, Boyden turned to Stewart Udall, the Arizona congressman who had been appointed secretary of the interior by President Kennedy in 1961. Udall was torn between his love for the Colorado Plateau and his commitment to the Grand Plan. As opposition mounted to two proposed hydroelectric dams (Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon) in the Grand Canyon—the Sierra Club was running ads in the *New York Times* asking, "Should We Also Flood the Sistine Chapel So Tourists Can Get Nearer the Ceiling?"—Udall decided that building the Navajo Generating Station next to Glen Canyon Dam was the lesser of two evils. But the station needed Black Mesa coal, so Udall acceded to Boyden's request and granted the tribal council leasing authority. When Hopi village leaders challenged that authority, their lawsuit was dismissed.

Three decades later, Cherche Prezeau, one of law professor Charles Wilkinson's research assistants, made a startling discovery in the University of Utah archives. Correspondence and invoices in the Boyden Papers indicated that Boyden had secretly been working for Peabody between 1964 and 1971 while representing the Hopis. Time and again, Boyden convinced the Hopi Tribal Council to lease Hopi coal and water to Peabody at bargain basement prices. It was a flagrant conflict of interest—one that epitomized the exploitation of Native Americans by experts who were supposed to protect their interests.

Why did Boyden do it? Wilkinson does not believe it was "only for the money." "He [Boyden] certainly coveted his role as one of the main players in the Big Buildup that meant so much to Utah and the Southwest," Wilkinson concluded. Even more important was "his certitude, the absolute conviction that he knew what was best for society." The West needed to grow, and Hopi coal and water were vital to that growth, even if it meant plummeting aquifers and the loss of millions of dollars in revenue for the Hopi people.

So Peabody's giant shovels went to work, stripping away Black Mesa to open the arteries that gave the metropolitan West its transfusions of fossil fuel. The first flowed eighty miles north by conveyor belt and electric railroad from the Kayenta Mine to the Navajo Generating Station at Page, Arizona, the boomtown created by Glen Canyon Dam. The second slid down an eighteen-inch-wide, 274-mile-long pipeline in a slurry of coal and water (3.9 million gallons a day) from the Black Mesa Mine to the Mohave Power Plant on the Colorado River in southern Nevada. Ripped from the ground by enormous draglines, Diné and Hopi coal made the grid surge.

The Navajos received about $2 million annually in revenues from Peabody's leases. Several hundred Diné also worked in the coal mines. By the late 1960s, the Four Corners plant alone was spewing 1,032 tons of sulphur dioxide and 383 tons of fly ash a day into the atmosphere, more pollution than New York City produced during a twenty-four-hour period. Astronauts reported seeing the emissions from high in space. Like so many other western politicians, tribal leaders had struck a Faustian bargain that gave them short-term gains in return for long-term environmental consequences. Peter MacDonald even succumbed to the temptations of power and was convicted of conspiring to defraud the Navajo Nation of more than $7 million by accepting kickbacks from the purchase of the Big Boquillas Ranch. Development meant jobs, but it also meant falling water tables, ravaged landscapes, and corruption. San Diego, Phoenix, and Las Vegas were importing cheap electricity and exporting strip mining, pollution, and a few million dollars a year in leases and wages. From Black Mesa to Caesar's Palace, that exchange epitomized the enormous inequities of the modern West.

Not all tribal members agreed that the benefits were worth the cost. Many Navajos vehemently protested uranium mines and coal gasification plants. They also demanded concessions—more jobs, renegotiated leases, higher revenues, the restoration of strip-mined land and depleted aquifers—from the giant corporations, like Peabody, Texaco, Phillips, and Exxon, that were extracting their resources. In 1978 a group of

Diné even occupied the largest pump station of the Aneth oil field in southeastern Utah and shut down all drilling for seventeen days. The debate over development bitterly factionalized both tribes. Many tribal leaders believed that coal, oil, and uranium had to be exploited in order to lower the tremendous rates of unemployment on the reservations and to provide desperately needed revenue to run tribal health and social service programs. But others saw energy development as a desecration of Mother Earth and filed a series of unsuccessful lawsuits to shut down the Peabody coal mines.

In 1987, there was another round of negotiations between the Hopis and the Navajos and Peabody Coal. Royalties on the sale of coal increased to 12.5 percent and on water to six hundred dollars an acre-foot for the first 2,800 acre-feet pumped from the N-Aquifer and three hundred dollars an acre-foot above that. But once again, their fiduciary agents betrayed the tribes. Secretary of the interior Daniel Hodel met secretly with a close friend who represented Peabody. Other coal leases granted 20 percent royalties, which the assistant secretary of the interior had recommended. Hodel instructed his assistant to leave the rate at 12.5 percent. When the Navajos eventually found out about Hodel's deception, they calculated that the lower royalty rate had cost the Nation as much as $600 million in lost revenues and sued the federal government for damages. The U.S. Ninth District Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the Navajos, but in 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the lower court. It did so on the narrowest of legal grounds that no specific statute mandated the secretary of the interior to obtain current market value for Indian resources. When the suit made its way back to the Supreme Court in 2009, the court reaffirmed its earlier ruling. Justice Antonin Scalia wrote the unanimous decision "that the tribe's claim for compensation fails. This matter should now be regarded as closed." No one disputed that Secretary Hodel had not represented the best interests of the Navajos.

Despite those setbacks, however, opponents of Peabody won a few victories. Growing concerns about the drawdown of the N-Aquifer beneath Black Mesa mobilized Hopis and Navajos to form grassroots organizations like the Black Mesa Trust and Black Mesa Water Coalition. According to reports by the Natural Resources Defense Council, water levels in monitoring wells had fallen as much as one hundred feet, while discharge from sacred springs along Black Mesa's southern escarpment had declined by 10 percent. Meanwhile, environmental groups like the

Grand Canyon Trust were filing lawsuits under the Clean Air Act to reverse the pollution that shrouded the vistas of the Grand Canyon and Monument Valley in a dirty haze. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) declared Mohave the dirtiest coal-generating plant in the western United States, emitting as much as forty thousand tons of sulphur dioxide each year. On December 31, 2005, the Mohave plant shut down because its majority owner, Southern California Edison (56 percent), decided that pollution-control devices required by a 1999 settlement with the EPA would be too costly to install. The Salt River Project, which owned 20 percent of the plant, tried vainly to attract other utility companies, but in 2009, the plant was permanently decommissioned. The slurry line that carried coal to the plant no longer sucked water from the N-Aquifer beneath Hopi ground.

The closure tore the Hopi tribal government apart. Supporters of Peabody, like tribal council member Nada Talayumptewa, claimed that the decommissioning of Mohave cost four hundred Hopi jobs and $7 million annually in tribal revenue. "Coal is the resource of the tribe that needs to be developed," Talayumptewa told a reporter from the *Arizona Republic* in 2009. "Without that income, the Hopis will become a ward of the U.S. government." Former tribal chairman Vernon Masayesva countered on spiritual grounds: "The unusual drought we are experiencing is caused by the way we are misbehaving. We are wasting water. We are allowing our coal to be burned and turned into toxic waste." When Ben Nuvamsa was chosen tribal chairman in a special election in 2007, Peabody supporters on the tribal council stripped him of his duties and forced him to resign. The council also dismissed Hopi judges reviewing the controversy, leaving the tribe temporarily without a judicial branch.

Then, in 2010, administrative law judge Robert Holt of the Department of the Interior revoked Peabody's permit to expand its Black Mesa Mine. He did so because the U.S. Office of Surface Mining (OSM) under the Bush administration had violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by failing to provide a Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Kayenta Mine supplying the Navajo Generating Station was not affected by the decision. In response, the Hopi Tribal Council passed a resolution banning environmental groups and "on-reservation organizations sponsored by or affiliated with the groups" from the Hopi reservation. Navajo Nation president Joe Shirley supported the Hopi Tribal Council, angered by a similar decision that blocked the proposed Desert Rock Energy Project that would have constructed a huge coal-fired power plant in the Four Corners region. Both Shirley and the Hopi Tribal Council claimed that the environmental organizations threatened the sovereignty of their peoples. Nuvamsa dismissed those concerns. "The opposition to the environmental groups is not an issue of compromising sovereignty," he said. "It is an issue of corporate and financial greed."

Sovereignty and the Growing Economic Power of Arizona Tribes

Factionalism among the Hopis is often presented as a longstanding division between "friendlies" or "progressives" who favor modernization and "hostiles" or "traditionalists" who cling to the old ways. But the political and moral landscape of reservation life has always been more complex than that simplistic division. A century ago, many Hopis resisted the forced removal of their children to off-reservation boarding schools. In the winter of 1894, the U.S. government even imprisoned nineteen Hopi men from the pueblo of Orayvi on Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay for nearly a year. Later, some Hopis refused to recognize the legitimacy of Hopi tribal officials after BIA Director John Collier's Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 called for tribes to write constitutions and create governments modeled after the United States. Each Hopi pueblo is autonomous, selecting its own *kikmongwi*, or village chief. But tribal leaders like Vernon Masayesva or Ben Nuvamsa straddle the so-called "progressive-traditional" divide. They are trying to bring jobs and the benefits of the modern world to their reservations without sacrificing the cultural identities or natural resources of their peoples. At times it must seem like walking a tightrope over the Grand Canyon on a windy day.

One of the major challenges facing tribal leaders is asserting sovereignty over tribal affairs. Many Native Americans believe they have an inherent right to make their own decisions about their societies and their homelands. In their eyes, they never surrendered these rights when they entered into treaties with the United States. They consider themselves sovereign nations dealing with another sovereign nation. The U.S. Supreme Court, in contrast, has ruled that Congress has "plenary power" over Indian nations based on the doctrine of discovery. According to that doctrine, the "discovery" of the Americas gave European conquerors legal title to the land and sovereignty over its inhabitants. In other words, might makes right.

How those doctrines are interpreted depends on the political climate in Washington. During the 1950s, the federal government tried to sever its obligations to Indian tribes and terminate reservations. After President Nixon repudiated termination in 1970, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 encouraged tribes to take more control of reservation school systems and social services. Many tribal leaders have responded to such vacillating federal policies by assuming greater sovereignty in practice if not in law.

Perhaps the most visible example is Indian gaming. In 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Bryan v Itasca County* ruled that states had no regulatory authority over Indian tribes. Tribes in Florida and California soon opened high-stakes bingo parlors, which the states tried to shut down. The tribes sued, lower courts supported them, and in 1987, the Supreme Court in *California v. Cabazon Band* declared that only the federal government had the right to regulate Indian gaming. One year later, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), a compromise crafted by Arizona congressional leaders John McCain and Morris Udall along with Senator Daniel Inouye of Hawaii. IGRA reaffirmed the tribes' sovereign right to run Class II gaming like bingo or poker and created a National Indian Gaming Commission to oversee such operations. But tribes could only operate Class III gaming—casinos with games of chance like blackjack or roulette—if they negotiated intergovernmental compacts with the states in which they lived.

With a regulatory structure in place, Indian gaming skyrocketed. In 1988, the year IGRA was passed, Indian gaming grossed about $110 million. By 2009, that figure had soared to $26.5 billion, down $0.2 billion from the year before because of the recession. Of the 565 federally recognized tribes in the U.S., 233 (41 percent) ran gaming operations.

In Arizona, the percentage was considerably higher; by 2008, sixteen of the twenty-two tribes engaged in gaming, operating nineteen casinos and several other gaming facilities. Nineteen tribes, including several which have not yet established gaming operations, belong to the Arizona Indian Gaming Association, which strives to support tribal self-reliance through gaming. After voters passed Proposition 202 in 2002, tribes signed new compacts with the State of Arizona in return for contributing a portion of their gaming revenues to the Arizona Benefits Fund. The general fund is distributed among four individual funds: instructional, trauma/emergency services, tourism, Arizona wildlife conservation, and problem gambling. By 2008, total contributions amounted to more than $378 million. Twelve percent of net gaming revenues are also shared with cities, towns, and counties in the state. Indian gaming clearly provided enormous benefits to Arizona.

IGRA mandated that gaming revenues could only be used to fund five areas: tribal government operations, welfare, economic development, charitable organizations, and to compensate non-Indian governments for services to the tribes. Not surprisingly, gaming revenues were not evenly distributed among tribes; in 2004, the fifty-five largest operations in the United States, most of them near big cities, raked in 70 percent. Nonetheless, gaming tribes experienced higher rates of per capita income, employment, and education, and decreasing rates of poverty, than nongaming tribes. Surrounding non-Indians also benefitted from Indian gaming operations, because many casinos employ non-Indians as well as tribal members. In Arizona, Indian gaming generated more than twelve thousand jobs in 2008, only 43 percent of which were filled by Indians themselves.

Despite these positive effects, Indian gaming sparks considerable controversy, even within reservations. One of the biggest concerns is the impact of per capita (per cap) payments to tribal members, which only about 25 percent of the gaming tribes make. Some believe that per caps discourage tribal members from staying in school or finding jobs, simply transferring patterns of dependence from the BIA to the tribes. In response, a number of tribes are linking per caps to school attendance. The Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, northeast of Phoenix, began deducting one hundred dollars for missing class or showing up late from the per cap accounts of teenagers and their parents in 2002. Within three years, graduation rates rose from 40 to 70 percent.

One of the fundamental conclusions of the Harvard Project on American Indian Development, which has been studying political and economic conditions on Indian reservations since 1987, is that sovereignty matters. Native nations do much better managing their natural resources, stimulating economic development, and providing health care and other social services when they make decisions themselves rather than letting the BIA do it for them.

A good example is the White Mountain Apache Tribe, which anchors the economy of east-central Arizona. The tribe runs Sunrise Park, the state's largest ski resort, as well as Hon-Dah Resort-Casino. Located in the heart of the White Mountains, its 1.6 million-acre Fort Apache Reservation also offers some of the best fishing and hunting in Arizona. The White Mountain Apache's Wildlife and Outdoor Recreation Division has been involved in the restoration of several endangered species, including the Apache trout and the Mexican gray wolf. It also runs a trophy elk hunt, whose permits sell for eighteen thousand dollars apiece plus a three thousand dollar trophy fee. With over one hundred Rocky Mountain bull elk in the Boone and Crockett Record Book, this carefully managed program is the most successful trophy elk hunt in the world. Because of these achievements, the White House showcased the tribe as an outstanding example of conservation partnerships at its Conference on Cooperative Conservation in 2005.

Before the second-largest wildfire in Arizona history consumed 467,000 acres in 2002 (the Wallow Fire eclipsed it in size in 2011), however, the economic foundation of the White Mountain Apaches was its Fort Apache Timber Company. But the Rodeo-Chediski "Monster," with its 45-mile-an-hour wind gusts and its flames roaring three hundred feet into the air, scorched half the reservation's timberland (281,000 acres) and shut down its two sawmills, throwing 450 people out of work. Rodeo-Chediski forced the Apaches to shift from timber production to forest restoration. Between 2002 and 2009, the tribe replanted 1.5 million seedlings, carried out comprehensive erosion control on the burned lands, and continued to thin unburned forests. Like logging communities across the West, the White Mountain Apaches learned the hard way that a century of fire suppression had transformed the ponderosa forests of the Mogollon Rim from open galleries to fuel-choked conflagrations waiting to happen.

Rural Life in Twentieth-Century Arizona

In some respects, the struggles of the Diné, the Hopis, or the Apaches during the twentieth century were unique to Native Americans living on reservations. But the struggle to survive in the countryside was one they shared with rural people across the West. Whether a worker was a Navajo coal miner on Black Mesa, a Mexican copper miner in Clifton-Morenci, an African American lumber mill worker in McNary, or an Anglo logger in Flagstaff, he or she was performing a hard task for a huge company. Working conditions and job security depended on corporate decisions and global laws of supply and demand, and workers had very little control over either domain.

Even then, such workers were the lucky ones. Many rural inhabitants did not have steady, good-paying jobs. As a result, poverty, out-migration, and high rates of unemployment characterized much of rural Arizona, not just Indian reservations. Yet the commonalities between rural Indians and rural non-Indians were rarely recognized. Instead, most non-Indians continued to stereotype Indians in profoundly ambivalent ways. Romantic images of proud Navajo sheepherders butted up against meaner images of drunks stumbling across the streets of reservation border towns like Flagstaff and Winslow. Neither image captured the reality of most Diné lives.

When those realities are revealed, however, the lives of rural Navajos and other northern Arizonans do not seem so different. After more than three decades of studying Navajo medical problems, physician Stephen Kunitz and anthropologist Jerrold Levy decided to test the common assumption that the rate of alcoholism was much higher among the Diné than the non-Indian population. To do so, they compared Navajo mortality rates from cirrhosis of the liver, suicide, homicide, and traffic accidents—so called alcohol-related pathologies—with death rates among their non-Indian neighbors in rural Arizona and New Mexico.

What Levy and Kunitz found was a regional rather than an ethnic pattern. In 1987 and 1988, the average annual death rate from cirrhosis was 35.2 per 100,000 among Anglos in the rural Southwest. Among Navajos, it was 22.4 per 100,000. The rate of homicides was 15.9 among Anglos and 14.9 among Navajos, while the suicide rate was 54.5 among Anglos and 29.9 among the Diné. Navajos exceeded Anglos in only one mortality statistic: deaths from motor vehicle accidents, which was 87.1 among Anglos and 129.9 among Navajos. The higher rate among the Diné may have been due to poorer driving conditions, greater distances traveled, and much less access to emergency medical care on the reservation itself. In other words, Navajos were less likely to drink themselves to death, kill themselves, or kill others than non-Indians in the rural Southwest.

What was important was the cultural geography of the Southwest itself. To put their study into a national perspective, Kunitz and Levy examined alcohol-related mortality rates in different parts of the country. The South, with an average alcohol-related fatality rate of 57.9 per 100,000, was more dangerous than the North (44.8), but the western mountain states were even more deadly, with a rate of 65.9. Among the rural populations of the mountain region, the southern states of Arizona and New Mexico outranked the northern states of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming (25.1 per 100,000 versus 11.6 for cirrhosis, 72.5 versus 44.1 for motor vehicle accidents, 18.0 versus 6.1 for homicides, and 38.9 versus 29.6 for suicides). Regardless of whether they were Indian or non-Indian, people in the rural Southwest were more likely to destroy their livers or die violent deaths than people in other areas of the nation. Comparing Navajos to national norms reinforced stereotypes of drunkenness and self-destruction, but those stereotypes evaporate when the Diné are viewed alongside their neighbors.

Perhaps the biggest similarity in the lives of rural people, however, was the role of the federal government. During the twentieth century, the government expanded its authority over Indian education, Indian health care, and above all Indian resource use. But non-Indian ranchers, loggers, and other rural inhabitants experienced similar encroachments. The problems were complex, but they rested on one simple fact. Nearly 71 percent of Arizona (51.4 million acres out of 72.7 million) was controlled by Washington, D.C. Arizona's twenty Indian reservations encompassed nearly 27 percent of the state (19.6 million acres). The state's seven national forests occupied 11.4 million acres (15.7 percent), and its national parks accounted for 2.4 million acres (3.4 percent). The Bureau of Land Management exercised jurisdiction over an additional 12.8 million acres (17.5 percent), with other federal agencies dividing about 1.5 million acres (2 percent) among themselves. Finally, the Department of Defense held 3.6 million acres (5 percent) as military bases, bombing ranges, and proving grounds. Private individuals or corporations, in contrast, owned only 16 percent (11.7 million acres) of Arizona, with the state possessing the remaining 13.2 percent (9.6 million acres), most of which was leased as grazing land.

The federal government was therefore patron, partner, overseer, or antagonist in most rural people's lives. During much of the century, stock raisers and timber companies wielded considerable influence within many federal agencies and the state legislature, but explosive urbanization after World War II produced strong counterforces, which exercised more and more influence over federal resource policies. Ranchers, loggers, and miners no longer had free rein to run cattle, cut trees, build roads, kill predators, or blast holes in the ground. Instead, they had to compete with other constituencies—hunters, fishermen, hikers, and environmentalists—who had their own ideas about how to utilize the land. The city dwellers of Phoenix, Tucson, and their satellites did not share the same concerns as rural people, and they competed ever more relentlessly for critical resources, including government funds, business development, and access to federal lands. Whether they were running their homes on electricity generated by Hopi and Navajo coal or telling government agencies what rural people could and could not do with the countryside, city dwellers were subordinating rural Arizona—the other Arizona—in ways that would have been inconceivable a century before.

The Ranchers

Perhaps the best example of this trend is the controversy over ranching on public lands. Ranchers pioneered the Hispanic and Anglo occupation of Arizona. Miners were restricted to ore bodies, farmers to the few rivers and streams flowing across the state, but stock raisers ran their cattle and sheep almost everywhere. In many rural areas, they were the most stable part of the cultural landscape, stringing fences, building windmills, developing water sources. They established the most far-flung settlements. Not a corner of Arizona escaped their herds.

Ranchers also epitomized the West's most cherished self-image: the rugged individualist who battled wild beasts and wilder country to supply a nation with beef or wool. But there was a contradiction lurking within the symbolism. Because most of their animals ranged across public lands, the freedom of the ranchers always depended on the actions of the government. At the beginning of the century, preservationists fought conservationists to remove cattle and sheep from forest reserves. They lost, but ninety years later radical environmentalists were plastering "Stop Welfare Ranching" and "Cattle-Free in '93" bumper stickers on road signs across the West. Once ranchers and cowboys had been the country's heroes. By the 1990s they were being reviled as environmental scourges. More and more people were talking about removing livestock and reintroducing wolves and prairie dogs on public lands.

As chapter 7 revealed, the tragedy of open access on the open range grazed Arizona to the nub during the late nineteenth century. Livestock numbers had to be limited, and there were only two ways to do it. In Texas and Nebraska, local laws permitted ranchers to buy extensive tracts of land, so the range became privatized. In Arizona and other western states, however, the federal government retained control over most of the public domain, so the range was carved into exclusive grazing allotments granted to individual ranchers for specified periods. Allotment on the public domain took place in two phases: during the creation of the national forests in the early 1900s and on remaining federal lands after the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934. Exclusive grazing leases also embrace most state trust lands (8.5 million of 9.5 million acres), which were established by the act of Congress creating the Territory of Arizona in 1863 and expanded by the Enabling Act granting Arizona statehood in 1912. The era of the open range was over as thousands of miles of barbed wire separated allotments from one another.

Today, most ranches in the western United States—and all but a few land-grant outfits in Arizona—are mosaics of land tenure. They consist of deeded lands that usually originated as homesteads, federal allotments on national forest and BLM lands, and leases on state trust lands. Despite multiple jurisdictions, however, those mosaics are operated as economic units; the value of a ranch is based on its grazing leases as well as on its private lands. When ranchers apply for bank loans, the entire ranch is put up as collateral. When ranches are sold, the buyer purchases both grazing leases and deeded lands.

Such a system can be a regulatory nightmare, pitting ranchers against federal and state land managers who determine stocking rates and enforce other restrictions on land use. Not surprisingly, ranchers have often fought to change or manipulate the system. During the early 1940s, Nevada senator Patrick McCarran, an ally of the ranchers, conducted an investigation of the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior's Grazing Service, the predecessor of the Bureau of Land Management. The investigation drove a wedge between the two agencies and weakened the resolve of many federal administrators to enforce or reduce grazing permits. As World War II intensified, however, Forest Service officials opposed efforts to increase grazing, arguing that unrestricted expansion during World War I had denuded the range and resulted in a postwar collapse of the livestock industry. They also initiated new reduction programs, even though some local Forest Service employees as well as stock raisers resisted those changes. In January 1947, the fiftieth annual convention of the American Livestock Association met in Phoenix and passed a resolution demanding that Forest Service ranges be transferred to the Department of the Interior or sold to private individuals. Ranchers wanted to reverse federal policies by transforming grazing permits from privileges granted by the government into legal rights held by the ranchers themselves.

Critics of the livestock industry counterattacked, noting that BLM grazing fees were about one-seventh of those on national forests. In an influential series of articles in *Harper's* magazine, historian Bernard De Voto exposed the inconsistencies of the stock raisers, who cloaked themselves in the mantle of free enterprise while calling for government-funded range improvements and tariff barriers against foreign beef producers. Many sportsmen, who wanted wildlife to flourish on public lands, joined De Voto's crusade, as did foresters and farmers concerned with watershed management. By the 1950s the alliance was strong enough to defeat several bills that would have weakened federal control of grazing lands, even though those measures were supported by the Eisenhower administration. In 1960, Congress even passed the Multiple Use–Sustained Yield Act, which declared that the national forests "shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife, and fish purposes." National forests became the "Land of Many Uses," not just the preserve of loggers and stockmen.

The rise of the modern environmental movement reduced the power of the ranchers and loggers even further. Passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1970 and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in 1973 gave environmentalists legal grounds to sue federal agencies if they failed to carry out environmental assessments or to mitigate human impacts, including grazing, on the critical habitat of threatened or endangered species. Ranchers, in contrast, had no legal seat at the table unless they countersued, which few of them had the resources to do.

By the 1990s, both industries were under attack. Charles Wilkinson called them "the lords of yesterday." Economist Thomas Powers blamed them for "lost landscapes and failed economies" and envisioned "post-cowboy economics" as the rural West transitioned from extractive to service industries. Multiple use often degenerated into a zero-sum game, where ranchers, loggers, sportsmen, and environmentalists squared off against one another while federal agencies, understaffed and underfunded, spent more time responding to lawsuits than managing public lands. All too often, the result was agency gridlock and bitter polemics as the different interest groups demonized one another as "welfare ranchers" or "tree-huggers." In the words of political scientists R. McGreggor Cawley and John Freemuth, "Indeed, the logic of a zero-sum game encourages the various participants to concentrate their energies on the task of blocking the moves of their opponents rather than on seeking to establish a common ground upon which compromises could be constructed."

One glaring example in Arizona was the case of *James K. Chilton, Jr. v. the Center for Biological Diversity.* Jim Chilton was a fifth-generation rancher who also ran a financial consulting company in Los Angeles. His father and brother operated the Diamond Bell Ranch west of Tucson, and the family expanded their Chilton Land and Cattle Company by purchasing the Arivaca Ranch to the south. They added the 21,500-acre Montana Allotment on Coronado National Forest in 1991. The Chiltons prided themselves on being good land managers, and Forest Service monitoring data showed that the range condition of the Montana Allotment had improved from "poor" to "high good" between 1984 and 1996, even though 1995–96 was the beginning of a prolonged drought and the driest period on record for the Arivaca region.

Despite such progress, the Tucson-based Center for Biological Diversity sued the Forest Service over the Montana Allotment, arguing that grazing endangered the threatened Sonoran chub (*Gila ditaenia*). Ironically, thanks to the sound range management of the Chiltons, the minnow had expanded its known range in the United States by swimming downstream from Mexico along California Gulch, an ephemeral stream that dries up completely every year. The center claimed that the Chiltons' cattle were degrading the Montana Allotment, and published twenty-one photographs on its website purporting to show such damage.

The Chiltons responded by hiring range scientists Jerry Holochek and Dee Galt to assess their range. Holochek and Galt, who had been employed by the Forest Service to get bad stock raisers off the land, concluded that the Chiltons were "responsible, ecologically sensitive ranchers." Holochek, senior author of *Range Management: Principles and Practices*, the leading text in the field, called the recovery of the Montana Allotment "one of our greatest success stories."

Chilton and his lawyers then rephotographed every location on the center's website and filed a defamation suit against it. Four of the spots were not even on the allotment. The rest were either hunters' campsites, old mining roads, or small patches of bare ground which, when rephotographed in panorama, revealed landscapes in healthy condition. The coup de grace was Photo 18, which showed a meadow supposedly trampled by cattle. The photographer, a member of the center, admitted during the trial that several hundred people including himself had attended a May Day campout there several days before he took the shot. In 2005, a jury in Pima County Superior Court found that the center had made "false, unfair, libelous and defamatory statements" against Jim Chilton in a press release and on its website. Because the judge in the case ruled that Chilton was a public figure (his wife, Sue, was chairman of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission at the time), the jury had to conclude that the center acted with "actual malice" rather than negligence. The jury determined that it did, awarding Chilton one hundred thousand dollars in actual and five hundred thousand dollars in punitive damages. Punitive damages can only be awarded when a jury finds that the conduct in question is "willful, malicious, or fraudulent." The center appealed the verdict to the Arizona Court of Appeals and the Arizona Supreme Court, both of which upheld the award.

By then, many environmentalists as well as ranchers were sick to death of litigation and confrontation. All across the West, community-based collaborative conservation groups (CBCCs) sprang up to move beyond the zero-sum game and find common ground. The granddaddy of rancher-led CBCCs was the Malpai Borderlands Group, founded in 1993 at Warner and Wendy Glenn's Malpai Ranch in southeastern Arizona. The primary ecological goal of the Malpai was to restore fire to their ranges in order to reverse the invasion of woody shrubs like mesquite that were crowding out native grasses. The primary political goal was to bring ranchers, environmentalists, and scientists together to form a "radical center" that would wrest the debate away from extremists and carry out conservation on "working wilderness," not just protected areas.

Soon groups like the Diablo Trust in Flagstaff and the Altar Valley Conservation Alliance west of Tucson followed in the Malpai's footsteps, creating partnerships with federal and state agencies and environmental groups like The Nature Conservancy. Both the Malpai and the Alliance developed fire management plans for enormous regions. Natural fires were allowed to burn; prescribed fires were lit when conditions were right. In the Malpai area alone—a 1,250-square-mile pyramid of land encompassing the southeastern corner of Arizona and the boothill region of New Mexico—fires spread across more than 300,000 acres. The Baker II fire in the Peloncillo Mountains was the largest prescribed burn in the United States, covering 46,458 acres in 2003. Ranchers were pioneering a major paradigm shift in land management: as long as private property was not threatened, fires were seen as natural disturbances rather than threats in grassland ecosystems, as necessary as rain to promote rangeland health.

The Loggers

Unfortunately, it took nearly a century of fire suppression to learn that lesson in western forests. When the Santa Fe Railroad sliced across northern Arizona in 1880, it paralleled the largest stand of ponderosa pine in the world. That forest looked much different than it does today. Instead of "doghair thickets" of dense growth, ponderosas with diameters of twelve inches or more occurred in densities of eight to fifty-one trees per acre. Low-intensity forest fires maintained the forest's open, parklike structure, creeping along the ground and burning seedlings, shrubs, and native grasses every five to eight years. Fires thinned young trees but caused little harm to the older "yellow-bellies," the great orange-barked ponderosas that towered majestically across the Mogollon Rim.

Since most of that stand undulated across high plateaus rather than mountainsides, its trees were relatively easy to cut and haul away. During the late nineteenth century, logging therefore became one of Arizona's most important extractive industries. Chicago lumberman Edward Ayer's mill in Flagstaff and smaller mills in Williams and other communities spit out hundreds of thousands of ties to build the transcontinental railroads and the American-owned Mexican Central Railroad. Ayer also shipped millions of board feet to Los Angeles, New Mexico, and the mines of southern Arizona. Between 1882 and 1886, when he sold his sawmill to Denis Riordan, Ayer's company cut nearly 54 million board feet of timber. As with copper and cattle, the railroad was the wood-ribbed key that unlocked the exploitation of Arizona's vast timber resources.

It was slash-and-burn timber cutting in those days. In 1878, Congress passed the Timber Cutting Act, which gave western pioneers, including Arizonans, the right to "fell and remove timber from the public domain for mining and domestic purposes." That same year the Timber and Stone Act authorized forested land to be sold for $2.50 an acre in 160-acre parcels to homesteaders so that they could have a wood lot in addition to their 160 acres of cultivated land. The laws were ostensibly designed to promote western settlement, but they actually profited speculators and the owners of big lumber companies, who secured hundreds of thousands of acres through front men and fraud. Companies spread the word that they would buy timberland from "entrymen" who filed for it under the Timber and Stone Act. According to the commissioner of the General Land Office in 1882, "depredations upon the public timber by powerful corporations, wealthy mill-owners, lumber companies and unscrupulous monopolists . . . are still being committed to an alarming extent." Illegal timber cutting was rampant. Loggers often set fire to the younger "blackjack" trees in order to clear their way to the yellow bellies. Every tree was toppled, even though many were left to rot where they fell.

Federal legislation eventually tried to curb such exploitation by passing the General Revision Act of 1891, which gave the president the power to create national forest reserves. Between 1893 and 1908, Teddy Roosevelt and his predecessors set aside more than 13 million acres, or about 73 percent of Arizona's forestland. Loggers as well as ranchers, especially smaller operations that relied on the public domain, opposed the reserves. A few large loggers, in contrast, initially supported them. A case in point was Denis Riordan and his brothers, who ran the biggest timber company in northern Arizona. "Upon the rational use of our forests will depend the happiness, welfare, and may I say the absolute existence of any large population in the territory," Riordan piously intoned. But even though he sounded like a high-minded eastern conservationist, Riordan's words cloaked a subtle and calculating business mind. His Arizona Lumber and Timber Company controlled the timber rights on nearly all the land—868 sections, or 556,000 acres—owned by the Santa Fe Railroad. The Riordan brothers also held the option to cut all the timber on 238 sections owned by the Aztec Land and Cattle Company. Because he felled private rather than public timber, Riordan figured that locking up timber on the forest reserves would eliminate much of his competition and increase his monopoly over the logging industry in northern Arizona.

Southwest Forestries, the Fortune 500 giant that dominated Arizona's logging industry after World War II, took Riordan's strategy several steps further and learned how to monopolize the timber on Forest Service lands as well. Southwest's original base of operations was the White Mountains, the last expanse of virgin timber in the state. During the late nineteenth century, loggers cut the forests along the railroad first. Saginaw and Manistee, a Michigan-owned firm that was Riordan's biggest competitor, rapidly "liquidated the timber resource" of Tusayan National Forest (later renamed Kaibab) around Williams, according to a later Forest Service supervisor. By 1907, when Arizona's national forests ranked fourth in timber production in the country, the vast stands of Coconino National Forest southeast of Flagstaff were providing 50 to 75 percent of the state's yield. But the Forest Service wanted to thin the forests of the White Mountains to encourage new growth, and the agency also realized that expansion of the timber industry was the surest way to increase its own budget and power. In 1912, then, the Forest Service and the commissioner of Indian affairs put 600 million board feet up for sale in a region that later would become part of Sitgreaves and Apache National Forests and the Fort Apache Indian Reservation.

It was an enormous contract, and it enraged the Riordan brothers and the executives of Saginaw and Manistee, who hated the thought of more competition and argued that the market was glutted. An early venture failed to raise the necessary capital, but in 1917, Thomas Pollock, a Flagstaff banker and one of Riordan's fiercest competitors, formed the Apache Lumber Company and snared the "Apache" contract. Pollock built a sawmill at the little settlement of Cooley just inside the reservation. Then he constructed a seventy-five-mile narrow-gauge railroad from Holbrook to the mill site so that he could ship his lumber out of the mountains. By 1919 both the mill and the railroad were running, but the costs were staggering, and the timing was bad. World War I ended, and the demand for lumber declined. Pollock's financial empire, like that of the Babbitts and other northern Arizona entrepreneurs, drowned in debt during the postwar depression.

The Cady Lumber Company, a Louisiana operation owned by William Cady and James McNary, resuscitated the White Mountain timber industry in 1923. Cady and McNary subscribed to the "clear cut and clear out" philosophy; they made a fortune in the South but ran out of timber in ten years. In 1924, then, they loaded not only their machinery but most of their workers and their families onto railroad cars and moved them from Louisiana to the White Mountains on two long trains. It must have been a strange sight to the few cowboys and Apaches who saw the trains arrive. More than eight hundred men, women, and children—most of them African Americans—suddenly descended on Cooley, turning the little western logging camp into a southern segregated community almost overnight. Renamed McNary, the camp soon had an Anglo neighborhood known as Hilltown and a black neighborhood called Milltown, or the Quarters. The Quarters sprawled around the mill on lowlands, where pools of water often collected and stagnated. African Americans had their own school, their own cemetery, and even their own Masonic lodge. They also lived in leaky, drafty shacks with no indoor plumbing or running water. Paying a low southern wage scale and operating according to typical Jim Crow principles, the Cady Lumber Company recreated a little piece of the Old South in the Arizona high country.

For the next two decades, McNary, who soon eased Cady out, wheeled and dealed to keep the company afloat. His efforts failed in 1930, when the company went into receivership, but McNary reorganized the venture five years later with a little help from his friends at the Standard Oil Company of California and the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads. Even in its new incarnation as Southwest Lumber Mills, Inc., however, McNary made sure his workforce remained southern in wages if not in origin. During the late 1930s, New Deal reformers in the Forest Service tried to pressure western logging companies to match the wages of the Pacific Northwest, where common laborers made 42.5 cents per hour. McNary, whose labor force was 25 percent Anglo, 25 percent African American, 25 percent Mexican, and 25 percent Indian, argued that Arizona labor was similar to southern labor—less skilled and less efficient than the predominantly Anglo workforce in the Northwest. His argument prevailed, and in the Ninth District of the Forest Service (Arizona, New Mexico, and southern Colorado), timber companies continued to pay the southern scale of 25 cents an hour.

But even with victories like that one, Southwest might have followed Cady Lumber into bankruptcy if World War II had not driven up the demand for lumber. McNary got his first big break when he secured a loan from the federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The loan gave him the funds he needed to build a railroad into the heart of the White Mountains, southeast of McNary, where Mount Baldy, the Apaches' sacred peak, towered over a lush forest of pine, spruce, and Douglas fir. McNary began building the railroad in 1944. When it was completed two years later, it ended at a new logging camp called Maverick, which was snowbound for several months each year. By then, Southwest had nearly exhausted its old Apache contract and needed the new timber to keep the McNary mill in operation. Once again, McNary had to cut a complicated deal with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to log both national forest and reservation land.

Several years earlier, McNary scored another coup by pressuring Congress to pass the Haugen-McNary Act. Named after its cosponsors, Congressman Gilbert N. Haugen of Iowa and Senator McNary, the legislation allowed a few large lumber companies in the United States to corner the contracts to cut timber on "sustained-yield units" in the national forests. Even though most of the contracts were enormous, they were not subject to competitive bidding. The one granted to Southwest in 1949 guaranteed the company 61 million board feet a year for thirty years in Coconino National Forest. McNary, who parted his wavy hair down the middle, Calvin Coolidge style, had long been active in Republican politics. He also served as president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and was a member of the board of directors of the National Association of Manufacturers. Those political and business contacts helped him push the bill and win the contract. Big business had found another way to make a fortune on federal lands in Arizona.

McNary retired as president of Southwest Lumber in 1949 and as chairman of the board a year later. His successors, a group of Texas investors headed by Jim Ben Edens, went him one better. In 1952 they orchestrated the fabled Colorado Plateau Contract, which gave Southwest the exclusive right to cut pulp trees in five national forests in Arizona and New Mexico. Pulp trees were trees too thin to be turned into lumber, trees that had sprouted like weeds after the Forest Service suppressed the fires that would have naturally thinned the forests. With an estimated yield of 3 billion board feet over thirty years from the "tamed forests," Southwest built a huge pulp mill in Snowflake and paid a dollar a cord until the Western Forest Industries Association cried monopoly and forced the Forest Service to increase the rate. It was the largest federal timber contract outside Alaska, and it catapulted Southwest, now called Southwest Forest Industries, into the Fortune 500, where it ranked 412th in 1984.

By then the McNary mill had burned down, but bigger mills in Flagstaff and Eagar turned logs into lumber with sophisticated machinery run by computer. Southwest employed more than four hundred Arizonans and six thousand people nationwide. It also contracted with many independent loggers and truckers, spreading its money and extending its control across eastern and north-central Arizona. With its pine-paneled headquarters in Phoenix, Southwest dwarfed Kaibab Industries and other timber companies in Arizona. It ran enterprises in twenty-three other states as well, selling more than a billion dollars' worth of lumber, newsprint, and other wood products a year.

Like copper mining, the timber industry favored a few big companies rather than many small ones. Logging, milling, and transportation costs were too high for small enterprises to afford unless they subcontracted with the larger firms. But the huge size of most Forest Service contracts dictated the scale of the industry as well. Like the National Park Service, which encouraged the Santa Fe and Fred Harvey monopoly over tourism at the Grand Canyon, the Forest Service found it easier to deal with a few efficient and reliable giants than dozens of small wildcat operations. Political pressure was also a factor: Congress determined the Forest Service's budget, and big companies had clout in Congress. The Forest Service may have established its right to regulate timber cutting on the national forests, but it had to accommodate big timber companies in the process.

In Arizona that process resulted in the most intensively harvested national forests in the United States. According to a study conducted by journalist Ray Ring for the *Arizona Daily Star* in 1984, the rate of timber cutting on Arizona's national forests between 1908 and 1983 was more than twice as high as that in Oregon, the second most voracious logging state. That rate averaged nearly 1 percent of the timber inventory each year, compared with about 0.5 percent in Oregon and 0.4 percent in Montana. Even though its total amount of forestland was much smaller than that in Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, or California, Arizona led the United States in timber production from national forests in 1925 and 1933. Until 1950, in fact, Arizona's national forests yielded more timber than the immense national forests in Montana.

By the 1990s, however, environmental laws, fire suppression, and changes in the industry itself caught up with Arizona's timber companies. In 1998, Arizona produced 81 million board feet, the lowest figure since World War II. That represented a precipitous 80 percent decline from the late 1980s, when about 400 million board feet were harvested each year. Total sales dropped to $29.2 million, 10 percent of what they had been in the late 1970s, when Southwest Forest was monopolizing northern Arizona's timber production.

The reasons for the demise blurred the lines between "human" and "natural" causes. The biggest drop occurred in Arizona's national forests, which plummeted from 350 million board feet to 50 million board feet per year during the 1990s. In 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed the Mexican spotted owl as threatened; two years later, a federal judge issued an injunction prohibiting any new timber sales on federal lands until a recovery plan for the owl was put in place. The injunction lasted more than a year, with harvests on Arizona national forests sinking to 28 million board feet in fiscal year 1996. Eight sawmills shut down while the other six slowed production. Only the Fort Apache Timber Company was operating large mills, and tribal forests were producing 68 percent of Arizona's sawlogs.

Then the Rodeo-Chediski fire gutted the forests of the White Mountain Apaches in 2002. The inferno was the last nail in the coffin of Arizona's timber industry. Like the sheep herds that used to migrate from the Salt River Valley to the Mogollon Rim every summer, logging trucks barreling down forest roads joined that spectral parade of Vanished Arizona, receding into archives. Apaches became restoration specialists, not loggers.

Rodeo-Chediski symbolized more than a century of forest mismanagement and fire suppression. In 1904, the U.S. Geological Survey had surveyed the ponderosa forest around Flagstaff and concluded that because of overcutting and overgrazing, there were not enough seed trees left "to restock the denuded areas." Augustus "Gus" Pearson, who became the first director of the Forest Service's Fort Valley Experiment Station near Flagstaff in 1908, struggled in vain for a decade to regenerate the forest. But two years of heavy precipitation dramatically changed the equation. In 1918, ponderosas produced a huge seed crop, which quickly germinated into stands of seedlings "dense as the hair on a dog's back" after three-and-one-half inches of rain fell in May 1919. Nature was trying to bring the forest back.

Nature should have been allowed to burn those doghair thickets and thin the forest as it had always done. By then, however, the fledgling Forest Service had been seared by the Great Fires of 1910. That summer in the northern Rockies, millions of acres of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon combusted "with the sound of a thousand trains rushing over a thousand steel trestles," in the words of historian Stephen Pyne. "The young U.S. Forest Service had the memory of the conflagrations spliced into its institutional genes, shaped as profoundly by the Great Fires as modern China by the Long March," Pyne continued. "Out By Ten" became the agency's mantra; any fire spotted the day before had to be smothered by the next morning. Smokey Bear drummed it into the heads of the American public that all wildfires were voracious monsters that consumed wildlife habitat and turned beautiful vistas into visions of the apocalypse. The rapid industrialization of logging on federal lands after World War II reinforced that message; forest fires were bad for business as well as hunting and recreation.

So the ponderosa seedlings grew into doghair thickets in the decades that followed. Densities of small-diameter trees rose steeply, reaching one thousand per acre or more. Those trees not only increased the fuel loads of western forests but provided a ladder on which fires could climb into the crowns of the tallest and oldest trees. The slow-burning, ground-hugging fires of the past flared into "crown fires" like Rodeo-Chediski, which turned huge swatches of forest into ashes and charred stumps.

The Exurbanization of the Rural

The collapse of the timber industry cost thousands of jobs in northern Arizona. But the economies of towns like Flagstaff, Williams, Snowflake, and Payson had long since changed by the time the sawmills shut down. As the populations of Phoenix and Tucson exploded after World War II, thousands of city dwellers headed for the mountains to escape the heat. Prescott—prewar Phoenix's traditional playground—attracted some of those desert refugees, but the biggest boom occurred on the Mogollon Rim, which Zane Grey had immortalized more than a generation earlier in novels like *Under the Tonto Rim*. A few hardy souls braved the old dirt road from Phoenix to Payson during the 1940s and 1950s, but the trickle became a flood in 1959, when the final paving of Highway 87—the Beeline Highway—was completed. Suddenly, relief from summers in the Valley of the Sun was less than two hours away, and the cabin craze gobbled up just about every piece of private land above five thousand feet. Ranchers sold off homesteads that had been in their families for generations. Real estate developers mounted nationwide promotional campaigns to attract the crowds. Soon summer visitors outnumbered old-time residents as the serious business of extraction took a back seat to the more lucrative business of land speculation and recreation.

In the process a fine, wild, close-knit way of life died as thousands of people streamed up the Beeline each weekend in a crowded ritual of escape. Payson became the gateway to the Mogollon Rim and the White Mountains, changing from a sleepy little cow town to a crowded commercial hub. In 1940 the *Arizona Republic* noted that the town had two saloons, two stores, two cafes, one street, and 750 people. Prohibition was over, but residents still remembered Payson whiskey with great fondness and claimed that at least twenty bootleggers had fired up their stills in the surrounding hills. By 2000, however, 13,620 people lived within the incorporated town alone, with several thousand more in Star Valley, Pine-Strawberry, Beaver Valley, Kohl's Ranch, and other Payson satellites.

The most telling sign of change was the August Doins, which had started as a local rodeo in 1884. By the 1940s the August Doins had developed into the August Celebration, with slot machines, all-night dances, high-stakes poker games, and legendary horse races down Main Street. Twenty years later, sponsored by the Payson Chamber of Commerce, it became the Payson Rodeo with formal rodeo grounds and professional cowboys rather than "local waddies." Deputy sheriffs still had to break up fights and lob tear gas into bars, but the crowds were outsiders rather than Tonto Basin residents. The rodeo had become a tourist attraction instead of a local celebration of ranching life.

Similar changes were taking place in Pine, Heber, and the communities of the White Mountains such as Show Low, Pinetop, Snowflake, and Greer. Phoenix had engulfed the agricultural communities of the Salt River Valley, and now it was urbanizing the forest towns by turning them into summer extensions of itself. Shopping centers crowded out general stores. Motels, restaurants, and convenience stores proliferated. Summer cattle ranges, like Houston Mesa northeast of Payson, were sliced into subdivisions like Mesa del Caballo. Even the lumberjacks and ranchers themselves were now considered local color rather than leading citizens.

It was the exurbanization of the rural—the latest stage in a process that was shifting the state's political, economic, and ideological center of gravity from the countryside to the city. In 1900, 84.1 percent of Arizona's population dwelled in rural areas. By 2009 the proportion had more than reversed itself, with metropolitan areas claiming 90 percent of all Arizonans (6,595,778), leaving only 10 percent (668,977) in the countryside. There were still a few pockets of the old Arizona left, but the rest of the state had become a Sunbelt society—urban, mobile, often rootless. Arizona society was a society in constant flux.

The more the crowds came and went and the faces changed, the more the Other Arizona became the city's metaphorical backyard. Sometimes it was a secret garden, wild and tranquil, where the city could find refuge from itself and enjoy strange plants and animals it had banished from its own space. At other times it was a playground where the city could race its boats across the water or spin its off-road vehicles in the dirt. It was also a place to dump discarded or noxious things and to carry out tasks city dwellers did not want to see or smell. The Other Arizona was by turns recreational, utilitarian, and aesthetic. But it was almost always subordinate to Urban Arizona. ✜