

The Practice of Everyday Colonialism: Indigenous Women at Work in the Hop Fields and Tourist Industry of Puget Sound

Paige Raibmon

In the late nineteenth century, thousands of Indigenous women journeyed hundreds of miles annually along the Pacific Northwest coast and converged around Puget Sound. They came to pick hops in the fields of farmers who occupied lands in western Washington (figures 1 and 2). These migrants did not look like modern factory workers, yet they were laborers in a late-nineteenth-century incarnation of industrial agriculture. They came en masse to harvest a cash crop destined for sale on the global market, a crop internationally sought as a preservative and flavoring for beer, a crop that could provide no sustenance to them or their families. Field workers were paid in cash wages, not in kind. This was no shop floor, but a labor hierarchy (both racialized and gendered) structured the conditions of their work all the same. From sunup to sundown, pickers performed specialized labor consisting of repetitive hand motions. They would often mind their children while they did so. No union represented them, but they were known to strike for wages. These women were also independent vendors and craft workers. On their way to and from the harvest, they sold baskets and mats, beadwork and carvings, clams, game, and skins and pelts. A tourist boom grew up around the Puget Sound hop harvest, and these Indigenous women were at the center of it.

Such women do not fit easily into the conventional categories of the labor movement or labor history, but they were workers in more than one sense of the

An earlier version of this essay was presented at “Labouring Feminism and Feminist Working-Class History in North America and Beyond: An International Conference at the University of Toronto” on September 29, 2005. Thanks to Franca Iacovetta, who extended the invitation to participate, and to conference delegates who offered their commentaries. In addition, I extend my appreciation for the valuable support, assistance, and suggestions of Courtney Booker, Alejandra Bronfman, Hart Caplan, Leon Fink, Joan Sangster, Dick Unger, and Dan Levinson Wilk. Research for this project was conducted with a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas, Volume 3, Issue 3
DOI 10.1215/15476715-2006-004 © 2006 by Paige Raibmon



Figure 1. Hop pickers on the Snoqualmie hop ranch, 1895. Women constituted the majority of the workforce. Image SHS 1052, Museum of History and Industry, Seattle.



Figure 2. Picking hops in the White River Valley, 1902. Children often worked or played alongside their mothers in the fields. Negative NA758, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle.

word. Despite, or in some ways because of, the heterogeneous nature of their work, observers have often failed to recognize these women as workers. Nineteenth-century observers did not see wage earners in an industrial economy. They saw romantic characters in a highly gendered colonial script about “vanishing Indians” and “squaw drudges.” For a long time, North American labor historians unwittingly followed suit, mirroring the exclusions of nineteenth-century vanishing Indian ideology. Labor historians may or may not have consciously eschewed the insidious gendered pairing of “lazy bucks” with “squaw drudges” that was widespread throughout the nineteenth-century colonial world. But they inherited the powerful colonial binary of “traditional” and “modern” and accepted the mindset that Indians belonged to the former category, workers to the latter.¹ Earlier scholars who did write about

1. Colleen O’Neill, “Rethinking Modernity and the Discourse of Development in American Indian History: An Introduction,” in *Native Pathways: American Indian Culture and Economic Development in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Brian Hosmer and Colleen O’Neill (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2004), 2–24.

Indian workers rejected the notion that there might be something culturally specific about them as *workers*.² The term *Indian worker* became an oxymoron.

It is long past time to recouple these words. If we fail to do so, we continue to mimic the gaze of nineteenth-century colonizers. Several scholars have already begun this important work. But, as they have shown, it is not enough simply to throw open the doors of labor history's union halls to Indian workers. Claims that these workers do not fit conventional categories of class and labor analysis are true.³ Divesting ourselves of our inherited colonial blinders requires more than a belated invitation to join the club. Thinking of Indian workers as a useful analytical category means rethinking many of the assumptions that previous labor historians took for granted.

This means, first of all, consciously rethinking, and in fact rejecting, the old binary of "traditional culture" and "modern labor." Indigenous workers across North America commonly engaged in so-called traditional and modern economies simultaneously. Participation in wage labor did not entail an end to patterns of resource harvesting that had defined these communities for countless generations, nor did Indigenous workers simply participate in parallel but unconnected economies. Hop pickers who wove baskets to sell to tourists were not unique. Many Indigenous workers took historically entrenched skills and adapted them for introduction into new capitalist markets. This "doorstep economy" helped Indigenous families survive under enormously difficult circumstances; at the same time, the commercialization of Indigenous products helped enable the survival of craft-based, and many women's, knowledge. When Indians traveled to work, they commonly did so in extended family groupings. Wage migrations facilitated visits between family members divided from each other by reserve/reservation and international boundaries. Migratory labor cycles could also offer relief from the intrusive interference of missionaries and Indian agents. To the frustration of officials, wages in their pockets did not turn Indian workers into assimilated subjects. Instead, workers frequently used income from "modern" wage labor to meet "traditional" obligations to kin and community and to invest in Indigenous economies. In short, Indigenous workers assigned their own meanings to wage work.⁴

2. Rolf Knight, *Indians at Work: An Informal History of Native Labour in British Columbia*, 2nd, rev. ed. (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1996), 20.

3. Stephen High, "Native Wage Labour and Independent Production during the 'Era of Irrelevance,'" *Labour/Le Travail* 37 (1996): 247; Hosmer and O'Neill, eds., *Native Pathways*, 16–17.

4. John Lutz, "After the Fur Trade: The Aboriginal Labouring Classes of British Columbia, 1849–1890," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, n.s., 3 (1992): 69–93; High, "Native Wage Labour," 243–64; Alice Littlefield and Martha C. Knack, eds., *Native Americans and Wage Labor: Ethno-historical Perspectives* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996); Brian C. Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace: Persistence and Innovation among the Menominees and Metlakatans, 1870–1920* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999); John Lutz, "Work, Sex, and Death on the Great Thoroughfare: Annual Migrations of 'Canadian Indians,'" in *Parallel Destinies: Canadian-American Relations West of the Rockies*, ed. John M. Findlay and Ken S. Coates (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), 80–103; Hosmer and O'Neill, eds., *Native Pathways*; Colleen O'Neill, *Working the Navajo Way: Labor and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005); Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Carol Williams, "Between Doorstep Barter Economy and Industrial Wages: Mobility and

In addition to developing our understanding of Indigenous meanings of work, it is also crucial to pay careful attention to the specificity of the colonial context in which Indigenous people labored. Having elsewhere explored the former, it is to this latter task that I turn in the pages that follow. Treating the postrevolutionary United States as a colonial setting is perhaps unusual but certainly not unprecedented.⁵ Claimed by two imperial powers—Britain and the United States—until 1846, Washington Territory was carved out of the previously existing Oregon Territory in 1853. Not incidentally, the growth of the hop industry around Puget Sound occurred during the years of Washington’s bid for statehood. Hops were among the resources that attracted settlement, investment, and eventually, in 1889, the favor of Congress. Much like British Columbia, its neighbor to the north, late-nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century Washington was in the throes of the most colonial of processes: the appropriation of land and resources and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. This was nothing new. Settler societies relied upon turning Indigenous properties into capital through alienating Indigenous people from the means of production. Marx termed this process “primitive accumulation.”⁶ Extraction of Indigenous labor was thus central to colonialism.⁷ Indigenous wage labor played an important role in the development of frontier, national, and global economies.⁸ Moreover, the massive transfer of wealth away from Indigenous communities was ever-present in economic exchanges between Indian wage-earners and their bosses. To be sure, Indigenous people often entered the wage economy for their own reasons and of their own volition. At the same time, however, it is undeniable that colonial usurpation of hereditary lands and resources steadily narrowed the range of Indigenous economic choices. It is thus, as one scholar argues, impossible to discuss Aboriginal labor *without* taking land claims into consideration.⁹ The histories of Indigenous labor under capitalism have everything to do with questions of capital, land, resources, and colonialism.

Adaptability of Coast Salish Female Laborers in Coastal British Columbia, 1858–1890,” in *Native Being, Being Native: Identity and Difference; Proceedings of the Fifth Native American Symposium*, ed. Mark B. Spencer and Lucretia Scoufos (Durant: Southeastern Oklahoma State University, 2005).

5. Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993); Antoinette Burton, ed., *Gender, Sexuality, and Colonial Modernities* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 3 and chap. 1.

6. Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, vol. 1 (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), pt. 8.

7. Adele Perry uses the extraction of labor and the appropriation of land to differentiate between different kinds of colonial enterprises. Adele Perry, “Reproducing Colonialism in British Columbia, 1849–1871,” in *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History*, ed. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 144.

8. Littlefield and Knack, eds., *Native Americans and Wage Labor*; O’Neill, *Working the Navajo Way*; Knight, *Indians at Work*.

9. Dianne Newell, review of “Aboriginal Workers,” *BC Studies*, no. 117 (1998): 78. Some scholars go so far as to claim that “wage employment is a historical measure of the degree of resource loss and dependency.” Martha C. Knack and Alice Littlefield, “Native American Labor: Retrieving History, Rethinking Theory,” in Littlefield and Knack, *Native Americans and Wage Labor*, 42. See also Cole Harris, *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2002).

Primitive accumulation was not simply the “base” from which subsequent economic transactions proceeded in a linear manner. It was instead an ongoing colonial process that informed the meanings of a multitude of daily practices, simultaneously acquiring meaning from those practices in return. Resisting the dichotomy between “material” labor and “ideological” images, I want to suggest an expanded conception of work, one that investigates the interpenetration of consumption and production. Such a perspective helps make visible what Michel de Certeau calls “errant trajectories,” the secondary levels of production embedded in consumption.¹⁰ By broadening our analysis to include the meanings and ramifications attached to all forms and traces of Indigenous labor within their colonial context, we can begin to grasp the incredible power of colonial discourse to enlist the work of unlikely laborers. This enlistment had little to do with individual intentions, nor was it the result of manipulation by some “invisible hand.” An innumerable cast of characters did the work of colonialism—often unwittingly—through the mundane practice of everyday life.¹¹ Personal acts of identity formation and breadwinning were incorporated within a double helix of consumption and production through which colonial modernity was constituted. Only by starting with this picture of colonialism from the ground up—with the minutia of daily acts—can we gain an understanding of colonialism as it appears from above.

I am interested in exploring the particular configurations of work, production, and consumption that accompanied the multiple manifestations of Indian women’s work in the hop fields surrounding Puget Sound. Indigenous hop pickers labored in multiple ways; colonizers reaped a multiple yield. The benefits to farmers who paid out wages to workers who brought in the harvest are the most obvious. But as pioneer agriculturalists whose efforts constituted a foundational moment of primitive accumulation upon which future generations of non-Indigenous society would build, theirs was a colonial project, one that, in a strange twist of irony, representations of Indigenous workers helped authorize. Long after hops were picked or a basket was woven, the labor of Indian women continued to do work in the world. Labor upon which workers relied to feed themselves and their families was reappropriated to do the work of bourgeois identity formation, wealth creation, and colonial legitimation. With respect to the fruits of Indigenous women’s labor, there were many stakeholders.¹² As I follow this labor through a variety of stages of consumption and production, I aim to suggest the remarkable range of possible stakes and meanings produced through Indigenous women’s work in this colonial setting. I begin with the direct sale of Indian labor in the hop fields and in the tourist economy. I then consider how that labor worked to produce race, class, and gender identities of those who consumed its

10. Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), xiii, xviii.

11. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, xi.

12. See also Jean Barman, “Aboriginal Women on the Streets of Victoria: Rethinking Transgressive Sexuality during the Colonial Encounter,” in *Contact Zones: Aboriginal and Settler Women in Canada’s Colonial Past*, ed. Katie Pickles and Myra Rutherdale (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 205–27.

products. In the final section, I sketch the manner in which representations of Indian laborers worked to narrate the overarching project of colonialism.

Hop Pickers: Migrant Workers in a Global Market

Pioneer settler Jacob Meeker cultivated the first hop vine in western Washington in 1865. It was his son, Ezra Meeker, however, who, over the next forty years, developed a small cutting from his father into a multi-million-dollar industry and a major selling point for regional boosters.¹³ Hop farming was a capital-intensive endeavor; in the 1870s, the cost of turning a single acre over to hops was close to \$200.¹⁴ Hop farming was also labor intensive. Hops required a small but constant amount of labor during the growing season, when they needed to be trained to tall poles between eight and sixteen feet high. But come late summer, each farmer urgently needed hundreds of workers to harvest the feather-light, sticky, yellow cones as soon as they ripened. A crop harvested quickly would be more uniform in color and flavor and thus more valuable. Just as important, mature hops left on the vine were vulnerable to overripening, frost, or mildew. Finding the necessary labor during harvest posed a problem for all farmers, even those with small farms. A single acre planted in hops averaged 1,600 pounds and in some years could yield as much as 3,000 pounds.¹⁵ No farmer could hope to bring in the crop without a large number of hired hands.

It was not just the threat of labor shortages that made hop farming risky. Even in years when the weather was kind, the crop bountiful, and the workers available, farmers were not guaranteed a profitable return. Hops grown in western Washington were a cash crop destined for breweries around the world. Like hop growers from New York, California, and abroad, local farmers sold their crop on a global market. International demand was inelastic, and another region's bumper crop could drive down prices so far that Washington farmers were better off leaving hops to rot on the vine rather than pay workers to harvest them. Such strategies helped farmers cut their losses during desperate times, but they spelled disaster for migrant hop pickers, who, after having traveled from afar, could find themselves stranded and scrambling to pay their passage home.¹⁶

Yet as with most risky capitalist endeavors, the threat of business losses was—at least for growers—balanced against the promise of potentially enormous returns. Just as growers suffered from gluts caused by bumper crops, they profited enormously when crops elsewhere failed and global supplies ran low.¹⁷ Knowing when to sell was another part of the business. In a given season, prices could fluctuate

13. Ezra Meeker, *Seventy Years of Progress in Washington* (Tacoma, WA: Allstrum, 1921), 183.

14. "A Puyallup Hop Farm," *Daily Pacific Tribune*, August 30, 1877.

15. Julian Hawthorne, *History of Washington: The Evergreen State, from Early Dawn to Daylight; With Portraits and Biographies*, vol. 2 (n.p.: American Historical Publishing, 1893), 470; Clinton A. Snowden, *History of Washington: The Rise and Progress of an American State*, vol. 4 (n.p.: Century History Co., 1909), 304.

16. This occurred, for example, in 1885. *Washington Standard*, August 7, 1885; Charles Moser, *Reminiscences of the West Coast of Vancouver Island* (Victoria, BC: Acme, 1926), 143–45.

17. *Washington Standard*, September 9, 1877.

from eighteen cents to more than a dollar a pound.¹⁸ Once he earned back his initial capital investment, the farmer's cost per pound raised was between seven and eleven cents.¹⁹ A modest profit thus seemed almost certain, and the possibility of tremendous profit was intoxicating. Not unlike gold prospectors, hop farmers hoped to get lucky and strike it rich.

Fortunes stood to be made, and they were. Despite pioneer hop farmer Ezra Meeker's admission that "none of us knew anything about the hop business," over the next forty years, hop farmers added more than \$20 million to Washington's economy.²⁰ Then, in the early twentieth century, tiny aphids devastated crops, effectively eliminating hop farms in western Washington. During the 1880s, however, Meeker's exports to England alone reached 11,000 bales and total sales of more than \$500,000.²¹ Successful farmers-turned-philanthropists helped to build some of Washington's early community infrastructure in the 1880s and 1890s: they funded the construction of churches, fraternal lodges, and orphanages.²²

Indigenous land and labor directly underwrote this remarkable prosperity in several ways. Most straightforward is the fact that the soil in which the hops grew was Indigenous territory. The "Steven's Treaties" signed in the 1850s with Indigenous peoples made it possible for settler-farmers to acquire free land in western Washington. In exchange for their land, Indigenous peoples received numerous promises, including uninterrupted rights to important resources both on and off reservation lands; for many tribes, the question of whether these promises were met is a matter before the courts today.²³ This original subsidy of free land was crucial to the hop industry's success. As Meeker noted, not only did western Washington hop farmers compete successfully in terms of quality (an essential factor, no doubt), they were able to do so "at a cost of production far below that of the older districts of the Atlantic States or of Europe."²⁴ Although he would not have put it in such terms, Meeker understood Marx's concept of "primitive accumulation." Meeker certainly realized that the cost of production would have increased dramatically had farmers been required to pay for the land. At the same time, this subsidy of free land was so thoroughly naturalized in Meeker's psyche as to not bear mentioning. It was practically invisible, simultaneously colonialism's best-kept and most public secret.

18. Clarence B. Bagley, *History of King County Washington*, vol. 1 (Chicago: S. J. Clarke, 1929), 408; Snowden, *History of Washington*, 4:203; Hawthorne, *History of Washington*, 2:469; *Washington Standard*, September 19, 1890.

19. Hawthorne, *History of Washington*, 2:470.

20. Ezra Meeker, *The Busy Life of Eighty-five Years of Ezra Meeker* (Seattle: Ezra Meeker, 1916), 227.

21. Meeker, *The Busy Life*, 226.

22. Greg Watson, curator, "'The Hops Craze': Western Washington's First Big Business," 1996, exhibition labels, Snoqualmie Valley Historical Society, North Bend, Washington.

23. On treaties in western Washington, see Alexandra Harmon, *Indians in the Making: Ethnic Relations and Indian Identities around Puget Sound* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), chaps. 3 and 8.

24. Meeker, *Seventy Years*, 183.

Like land, Indigenous labor enabled the hop industry's prosperity in some hidden ways. Many generations before the arrival of settlers, the Lushootseed created open "prairie" landscapes through careful and long-term fire ecology management.²⁵ The investors in the Snoqualmie Hop Ranch selected one such "natural prairie," as they mistakenly thought of it, for their hop farm, the largest in Washington and, according to some, the largest in the world.²⁶ Long before Indigenous women from diverse Pacific Northwest nations came to harvest hops, Lushootseed women had cultivated and harvested camas bulbs on that same land.²⁷ A crucial change overlaid this degree of continuity: camas cultivators had owned the means of production; hop pickers were in the process of being alienated from it. Oblivious to the land's history, the Snoqualmie investors nonetheless chose their site wisely. Clearing land was no easy task, especially for pioneers without experience in the Pacific coast rainforest.²⁸ Even after the trees were felled, one man with a horse and dynamite could take four hundred hours per acre to remove the stumps.²⁹ Would-be farmers selected the lands that could be most easily cleared for obvious reasons.³⁰

Wage labor, the most visible Indigenous contribution to the hop industry, followed in the wake of these hidden subsidies to colonial capitalism. Since the 1850s, Indigenous people from as far north as Alaska had traveled south to Puget Sound for a number of reasons, including the search for wages. Throughout the 1850s and 1860s, men found work in sawmills or on farms, and women worked as domestic help or in the sex trade.³¹ As the hop industry grew, it became an annual mainstay for thousands of these migrants. One estimate suggests that close to a quarter of all Indigenous people in British Columbia traveled to Puget Sound for the harvest season.³² Indigenous workers constituted the vast majority of the harvest season labor force, and of these, women outnumbered men. Depending on their age, children worked or played alongside their mothers, grandmothers, and aunts in the fields.

25. On fire ecology in the Pacific Northwest, see Robert Boyd, ed., *Indians, Fire, and the Land in the Pacific Northwest* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1999).

26. "Hops in Washington," *Pacific Rural Press*, January 3, 1891; Henry Emanuel Levy, "Reminiscences," 1843–1929, British Columbia Archives, Victoria, British Columbia; Ada S. Hill, *A History of the Snoqualmie Valley* (n.p., 1970), 59.

27. Coll-Peter Thrush, "The Lushootseed Peoples of Puget Sound County," American Indians of the Pacific Northwest Collection, University of Washington Digital Collections, content.lib.washington.edu/aipnw/thrush.html (accessed December 31, 2005).

28. Meeker, *Seventy Years*, 253.

29. Richard White, *Land Use, Environment, and Social Change: The Shaping of Island County* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980), 56.

30. John Muir, *Steep Trails*, ed. William Frederic Badè (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918), 183; White, *Land Use*, 37–38.

31. Lutz, "Work, Sex, and Death," 81, 84, 86–87.

32. "Annual report of W. H. Lomas to Superintendent General of Indian Affairs," August 7, 1885, vol. 1353, record group (hereinafter RG) 10, Department of Indian Affairs (hereinafter DIA), National Archives of Canada (hereinafter NAC), Ottawa; Jean Barman, *The West beyond the West: A History of British Columbia* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), 363.

Some men also picked hops, while others took work elsewhere on the farm or hunted and fished in the vicinity.³³ Whites and Chinese picked hops too, but there were never enough of them to do the job. Settlers also expressed, sometimes violently, a preference for Indigenous workers over Chinese ones; this preference sometimes held even when Indigenous workers demanded a much higher rate of pay.³⁴

Popular accounts often commented on the large numbers of women workers, commonly claiming that Indigenous women were harder, and thus more productive, workers than Indigenous men. As one local historian noted, “the Indian brave and his squaw—particularly the squaw—are the industrious and well paid pickers.”³⁵ Reportedly, even pregnancy did not slow them down. According to Ezra Meeker, who paid a dollar to employees who gave birth while working on his farm, new mothers were back in the fields within two days, babies at their sides.³⁶ Writers similarly stressed the fortitude of elderly women. According to one, “even old Indian women in their dotage and almost blind” picked 50 percent more per day than any white picker, man or woman.³⁷ Such simultaneously derisive and romantic characterizations were typical of how various agents of colonization—farmers, tourists, and writers alike—cast Indigenous women. Drinking from the deep well of the squaw drudge stereotype, they valued the work of Indigenous women and, in same moment, with the same rhetorical gesture, identified that work as synecdochic for everything that was wrong with Indigenous societies. Both parts of their contradictory utterances were necessary elements of this colonial discourse. They valorized Indigenous women because without them early capitalism in western Washington could not have prospered as it did. They enfeebled Indigenous women because without assurances of white racial and cultural supremacy, the moral authority and future success of the entire colonial enterprise was suspect.

Invocations of the squaw drudge often implied the image of the lazy buck. As one writer put it: “Indians make the best pickers, and among the Indians the klootchman ranks supreme. She picks hops while the lazy, indolent brave plays cards or lounges in the shadow of his rakish tepee. His great delights are in card playing and pony racing.”³⁸ Such accounts applied the non-Aboriginal categories of “home”

33. Harriet U. Fish, “Andy Wold’s Tales of Early Issaquah,” *Puget Soundings* (1983): 7, 11.

34. “Good for ‘Lo,”” *Washington Standard*, September 11, 1875, 2; *Washington Standard*, September 9, 1877, 4; *Report of the Governor of Washington Territory, 1888* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1888), 48–53; *Seattle Mail and Herald*, September 21, 1901; Kenneth Tollefson, “The Snoqualmie Indians as Hop Pickers,” *Columbia* 8 (1994–95): 39–44.

35. Hawthorne, *History of Washington*, 2:228.

36. Ezra Meeker quoted in Bagley, *History of King County Washington*, 135. For another example of settlers expecting childbirth to be easy for Indigenous women and for an example of women who traveled to the hop fields with their families but did not work in the fields while pregnant, see Williams, “Between Doorstep Barter Economy,” 21, 25.

37. Susan Lord Currier, “Some Aspects of Washington Hop Fields,” *Overland Monthly*, 2nd ser., 32 (1898), 543.

38. J. A. Costello, *The Siwash: Their Life, Legends, and Tales: Puget Sound and Pacific Northwest* (Seattle: The Calvert Co., 1895), 164.

and “work” to Indian families. They feminized Indian men by situating them within what white Americans largely assumed to be the Indian approximation of the woman’s domestic sphere, the tepee. The image of Indian women working in the hot sun while Indian men lounged in the shade highlighted the dissonance of this gender inversion. This emasculation of Indian men went hand in hand with an emphasis on the morally suspect nature of the activities they did in lieu of work. Missionaries, journalists, and amateur ethnographers alike portrayed hard-working Indian women as enablers of Indian men and their idle natures. Writers in tune with the work ethic of Protestantism suggested that the inactivity of these men rendered them vulnerable to drinking, gambling, and other vices. Squaw drudges who failed to embody the proper gendered division of labor were implicitly to blame for both their own oppression and men’s dissolution.³⁹

With such invocations, late-nineteenth-century colonizers around Puget Sound revealed the genealogical connections to countless generations of their colonial forebears. Reports of the strength and endurance of colonized women around the world—Africa, Australia, America—had for centuries served the twin purpose of racializing populations and justifying domination of them. The supposed ability to endure childbirth painlessly had featured in European narratives of non-European women since the sixteenth century. These commentaries on women’s labor were about economic labor, too. African women’s imperviousness to the pain of childbirth, for example, became a racialized marker that excluded them from the Christian genealogy derived from Eve’s original sin, placing them beyond the bounds of the European, and in a broader sense human, family. This dehumanization rhetorically justified the forced extraction of their labor.⁴⁰

Perhaps such age-old stereotypes about the strength and fortitude of colonized women influenced hiring practices, or perhaps the sight of Indigenous women in

39. “Siwashes Again Seek the Street,” *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, May 31, 1904; Myron Eells, *Ten Years of Missionary Work among the Indians at Skokomish, Washington Territory, 1874–1884* (Boston: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, 1886), 53–54; Costello, *The Siwash*, 62.

40. Jennifer Morgan, “‘Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder’: Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology, 1500–1700,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 54, no. 1 (1997): 167–92. On other invocations of the squaw drudge stereotype, see David D. Smits, “The ‘Squaw Drudge’: A Prime Index of Savagism,” *Ethnohistory* 29, no. 4 (1982): 281; Rayna Green, “The Pocahontas Perplex: The Image of Indian Women in American Culture,” *Massachusetts Review* 16 (1975): 698–714; Patricia Grimshaw, “Maori Agriculturalists and Aboriginal Hunter-Gatherers: Women and Colonial Displacement in Nineteenth-Century Aotearoa/New Zealand and Southeastern Australia,” in *Nation, Empire, Colony: Historicizing Gender and Race*, ed. Ruth Roach Pierson and Nupur Chaudhuri (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998), 32–38; Margaret D. Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters: Feminism and Pueblo Cultures, 1879–1934* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 34–35; Paige Raibmon, “Naturalizing Power: Land and Sexual Violence along William Byrd’s Dividing Line,” in *Seeing Nature through Gender*, ed. Virginia J. Scharff (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003), 20–39. The notion that white men needed to “save brown women from brown men” was a common colonial trope. Gayatri Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1988), 297.

fields ignited them. Regardless, Indigenous women made up the majority of the picking force. They traveled to Puget Sound with their extended families and, in some cases at least, took charge of deciding when and where a family would accept work.⁴¹ This was an important decision because conditions on different farms varied. Some farmers paid pickers' way to the fields from Seattle, a trip that could be quite costly. Access to fresh produce and groceries could not be taken for granted and was another consideration. The quality of living conditions in the hop camps also mattered. With hundreds or sometimes thousands of pickers crowded together in temporary camps, sanitation was always a potential problem.⁴² Epidemic diseases spread easily among workers and took a particularly high toll on children and infants who were born in the hop camps.⁴³ In 1884, for example, a bereaved father stated that his infant son had died of exposure. Some of the other workers, however, were suspicious that the father had murdered the baby and had threatened to kill the mother.⁴⁴ Regardless of the truth in this particular case, the incident reminds us that in selecting where to camp and work, women must have also done their best to take the physical safety of themselves and their children into consideration.

In most years pickers could afford to be choosy about where they worked. Demand for labor often exceeded supply. Farmers competed for workers more than workers competed for jobs, often bidding up the price of labor in the process.⁴⁵ Migrants located work and obtained knowledge about conditions through word of mouth, kinship networks, and recruitment calls. Farmers sometimes wrote to Indian agents, asking them to send a certain number of workers by a certain date; often they invited the same workers back annually. George and Mary Stiltamult began picking hops for Alderton farmer William Lane sometime before 1888. By 1891, Lane valued their work so much that he wrote offering them cash bonuses if they would return.⁴⁶ Farmers also hired Indigenous men to recruit workers from their extended

41. Canada, DIA, Annual Report (hereinafter AR) 1886, *Sessional Papers*, 1887, no. 6, 92; Edward Sapir and Morris Swadesh, *Nootka Texts: Tales and Ethnological Narratives* (Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, 1939; New York: AMS, 1978), 151.

42. Myron Eells, *Indians of Puget Sound: The Notebooks of Myron Eells*, ed. George Pierre Castile (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985), 270; Thomas Leadman, "Ledger," 1904, White River Valley Historical Society, Auburn, WA; Arthur Wellington Clah, "Journals," September 6, 1899, reel A-1707, NAC; Canada, DIA, AR 1890, *Sessional Papers*, 1891, no. 18, 105; "Great Influx of Indians," *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, September 10, 1899.

43. Canada, DIA, AR 1888, *Sessional Papers*, 1889, no. 16, 100; E. Meliss, "Siwash," *Overland Monthly*, 2nd ser., 20 (1892): 502; Bagley, *History of King County Washington*, 135; Jack R. Evans, *Little History of North Bend-Snoqualmie, Washington* (Seattle: SCW Publications, 1990), 2; [Charlie Meshel] to W. H. Lomas, October 31, 1889, vol. 1336, DIA, RG 10, NAC; Charlie Meshel to W. H. Lomas [ca. November 1889], vol. 1336, DIA, RG 10, NAC.

44. Father L. Eusfen to W. H. Lomas, November 6, 1884, vol. 1331, DIA, RG 10, NAC; W. H. Lomas to Father L. Eusfen, December 3, 1884, vol. 1353, DIA, RG 10, NAC.

45. "Hop Fields of the Puyallup and White River," *West Shore* 10, no. 11 (1884): 345.

46. C. O. Bean to W. H. Lomas, July 17, 1889, vol. 1336, DIA, RG 10, NAC; C. O. Bean to W. H. Lomas, August 17, 1889, vol. 1336, DIA, RG 10, NAC; W. Lane to W. H. Lomas, August 21, 1888, vol. 1335, DIA, RG 10, NAC; W. Lane to W. H. Lomas, July 26, 1891, vol. 1337, DIA, RG 10, NAC.

circle of kin and community.⁴⁷ Given their strength of numbers in the fields, Indigenous women must have also done this work, although I have found no record of them being paid for it in this period.⁴⁸ A Haida woman named Emma Levy almost certainly recruited workers. She was sister-in-law to Henry Levy, part owner of the vast Snoqualmie Hop Ranch. It was Henry who claimed responsibility for recruiting the close to fifteen hundred seasonal workers that the ranch needed, but it was Emma who had the necessary kinship network to draw from. It seems unlikely that the Haida workers at the Snoqualmie Hop Ranch arrived without her involvement.⁴⁹

A gendered labor hierarchy structured pickers' work in the fields. Farmers typically hired Indigenous men as managers. These "hop bosses" helped arrange pickers' transportation, supervised pickers in the field, and oversaw conditions in the camps. The work could be extremely lucrative, sometimes bringing a daily salary three times what most pickers would earn and, in addition, a hefty bonus for ensuring that enough pickers arrived on time.⁵⁰ Indigenous men also worked in the coveted position of "pole puller." Below the hop boss in rank and salary, pole pullers performed the crucial task of uprooting the towering poles, heavy with ripe hops, and laying them horizontally on the ground so that pickers could set to work. When pickers finished with one pole, they called for the pole puller and waited for him to come select and uproot another pole for them. Pole pickers could play favorites by choosing which picker to help next or by giving the most densely laden vines to certain pickers. Such favoritism sometimes played out along tribal lines. On the Snoqualmie Hop Ranch, the farm in which Emma Levy's brother-in-law had an interest, it was, perhaps not surprisingly, the Haida who seemed to have the upper hand. A Tsimshian man who worked there recorded in his diary his frustration because Haida men had a monopoly on the plum pole-puller positions and consistently favored Haida workers in the field. Competition between Haida and Tsimshian workers in Puget Sound mirrored labor relations in the Skeena River fishing industry hundreds of miles north, where Haida fishers complained that the Tsimshian enjoyed privileged conditions of employment and higher wages.⁵¹ The dynamics of these workplace relationships mattered because pickers were paid a piece rate for their labor. Accordingly, male pole pullers had significant control over the productivity and, by extension, income of female pickers. Indigenous women who picked hops worked at the bottom of a multilayered, male hierarchy that subordinated them not only to white farmers and white farm hands, but also to Indian hop bosses and pole pullers.

47. June Collins, "John Fornsby: The Personal Document of a Coast Salish Indian," in *Indians of the Urban Northwest*, ed. Marian W. Smith (New York: AMS, 1949), 330.

48. In later decades, some Makah women worked as labor contractors. Elizabeth Colson, *The Makah Indians: A Study of an Indian Tribe in Modern American Society* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 165.

49. Levy, "Reminiscences," 13; Arthur Wellington Clah, "Journals," August 31, 1897, reel A-1713, NAC; Joyce Walton Shales, personal communication.

50. Collins, "John Fornsby," 330; Leadman, "Ledger."

51. Dianne Newell, *The Tangled Webs of History: Indians and the Law in Canada's Pacific Coast Fisheries* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 81.

Pickers could expect to earn around a dollar for filling a large box with hops, and most pickers, after they grew accustomed to the work and learned a few tricks of the trade, could fill one box a day. The most important trick they learned was to fill a number of smaller baskets first, transferring them only after they had enough small containers to fill the large boxes that were the scale of pay. Workers who made the mistake of picking directly into the large boxes soon learned that the fluffy hops on the bottom compressed beneath the accumulated weight of those on top. This made it nearly impossible to fill a box and could reduce the worker's wage by 50 percent or more. Experienced women knew to bring baskets that they had woven with them for this purpose. In so doing, they combined their craft labor with their wage labor. They were well aware of their value to farmers once the harvest had begun; a work stoppage of even a few hours could cut profits dramatically. If workers felt the farmer was taking advantage of them, by increasing the box size without increasing the piece rate, for example, they would strike, often to good effect.⁵² There was no picking and thus no pay on rainy days.

Hop Pickers: Craft Workers and Entrepreneurs in a Tourist Economy

The structure of the late-nineteenth-century Pacific Northwest coast labor market presented Indigenous women with the opportunity to earn money as hop pickers. In parallel fashion, the structure of the colonial imaginary presented them with the opportunity to earn money as vendors, photographic subjects, and craft workers. Where farmers saw field hands when they looked at Indigenous migrants, white sightseers and tourists saw vanishing Indians. These contradictory views did not need to be reconciled with one another; they could “cohere in contradiction,” often within a single individual.⁵³ The romantic imaginings of observers were in sharp contrast to the material reality of wage laborers tied to a global market, but these imaginings were powerful enough to create a market in artifacts related to the Indigenous hop pickers.

A tourist industry shadowed the hop harvest from the early 1870s.⁵⁴ By the end of the century, the hop season in Puget Sound had earned a national profile as a tourist attraction through attention received from writers such as John Muir and popular publications like *Harper's Weekly*.⁵⁵ As the hop season began with the arrival of Indigenous migrant workers, residents of towns and cities in western Washington embarked on mini migrations of their own to rural areas where they would view the spectacle of “authentic Indians.” Other tourists came from farther afield. Hundreds of visitors a day descended upon the hop-growing regions. They traveled by carriage and interurban passenger trains. Entrepreneurs built hotels near the hop fields to

52. *Washington Standard*, September 15, 1877; “Hops Steady and Firm,” *Puyallup Valley Tribune*, September 26, 1903.

53. Dick Hebdige, “The Function of Subculture,” in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. Simon During (New York: Routledge, 1999), 441–50.

54. *Pacific Tribune*, September 18, 1874.

55. Muir, *Steep Trails*, 256; “Hop-Picking in Puyallup,” *Harper's Weekly* 32 (1888), 795, 801; W. H. Bull, “Indian Hop Pickers on Puget Sound,” *Harper's Weekly* 36 (1892), 545–46.

accommodate tourists interested in more extended rural retreats.⁵⁶ An urban arm of this tourist industry developed as Indigenous women paused in Seattle and Tacoma on their ways to and from the hop fields. Contemporary descriptions treated migrant hop pickers on city streets as picturesque additions to the urban landscape.

Local Indigenous women also populated city streets, of course. But contemporary newspapers devoted inordinate amounts of attention to hop picker vendors. Urban residents' fascination with these migrant Indians arose in the same decades that urban settlers displaced the people who were indigenous to the territory on which the city stood. As residents of Seattle linked the visible presence of Indians with the itinerancy of hop pickers, they imagined the city as a place that Indians moved through rather than as a place where they lived. The visibility of migrant hop pickers and the invisibility of local Indigenous people were mutually constituted.⁵⁷

Migrant hop pickers might have been alternately amused and annoyed at being treated as tourist attractions. Regardless of their personal reaction, most Indigenous women were not in a position to decline the dollars that tourists wanted to spend. Indigenous women who came to pick hops typically brought a winter's worth of skilled, artistic labor: baskets, mats, beadwork, needlework, and carvings. They sold their wares on street corners and doorsteps.⁵⁸ As one Seattle pioneer remembered, in late fall, the homeward-bound hop pickers "would line the sidewalks, the women displaying some of the finest needlework and beadwork, blankets and baskets one ever saw."⁵⁹ Dismissively dubbed as curios, such objects were widely sought by tourists, who would pay anywhere from 25¢ to \$3 for a basket.⁶⁰ These prices were poor remuneration for the hours, effort, and expertise invested in a finely woven basket. Yet at a time when settler usurpation of Indigenous land and resources was accelerating, and when standing all day in the fields was valued at one dollar, curio selling was good business.⁶¹

56. "A Western Hop Center," *West Shore* 16, no. 9 (1890): 137–38; "Hops in Washington," *Pacific Rural Press*, January 3, 1891; *Pacific Tribune*, September 18, 1874; "Hop Picking," *Washington Standard*, September 24, 1886.

57. "Great Influx of Indians," 6; "Indians Returning from Hop Fields," 16; Bull, "Indian Hop Pickers," 546. On the persistence of Indian residents in Seattle, see Coll-Peter Thrush, "The Crossing-Over Place: Urban and Indian Histories in Seattle" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 2002).

58. Mamie Ray Upton, "Indian Hop-Pickers," *Overland Monthly*, 2nd ser., 17 (1891): 164; Hill, *A History of the Snoqualmie Valley*, 161; Williams, "Between Doorstep Barter Economy," offers further details about the broader entrepreneurial economy of Indigenous women.

59. *Told by the Pioneers: Reminiscences of Pioneer Life in Washington*, vol. 3 (Olympia: Washington Pioneer Project, 1937), 59; Costello, *The Siwash*, 165; "Indian Life on Seattle Streets," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, December 10, 1905.

60. "Hurrah for Puyallup," flyer, 1901, negative 1903.1.60, Washington State Historical Society, Tacoma; "At the Indian Village," *Puyallup Valley Tribune*, September 19, 1903. For an etymological analysis of the term "curiosity" in the imperial context of the Pacific, see Nicholas Thomas, *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 126–51.

61. This was likewise true elsewhere. See, for example, Williams, "Between Doorstep Barter Economy," 17; Patricia Jasen, *Wild Things: Nature, Culture, and Tourism in Ontario, 1790–1914* (Toronto: Uni-

Late-nineteenth-century tourists wanted to purchase images as well as objects. Photographs, stereographs, and postcards were popular souvenirs. Professional and amateur photographers often paid Indigenous hop pickers for posing—indeed, the “subjects” often insisted on it.⁶² Compared to the many hours it took to fill a box with hops, let alone to weave a basket, a dollar for a split-second’s pose must have seemed like a boon.

Indigenous women in the hop fields thus sold their labor several times over. As pickers, they sold their summer’s labor directly to the farmers. As weavers, they sold their winter’s labor to the tourists. And given that photographs provided income and attracted tourists who might eventually purchase curios themselves, the act of posing ought to also be viewed as labor. The money that women earned from the tourist economy was often crucial to their family’s well-being. The income from wages was significant, but, given the vicissitudes of weather and global markets, it was probably less reliable than income from the tourist economy. Whenever the hop harvest failed, and particularly when such failure coincided with a poor salmon run, income from the tourist industry could be all that stood between a woman’s family and a hungry winter.⁶³

Producing Women Producing Identity

The multiplicity of Indigenous women’s labor produced more than hops, curios, and photographs. Women’s labor was enlisted in the ongoing production of the class, race, and gender identities of those who consumed its products. Production and consumption are thus inextricably connected: through the act of consumption, products in turn became productive. When labor history focuses exclusively on production, it artificially severs the two categories and obscures the dynamic and mutually constitutive relationship between them. In the simplest sense, the labor of workers produces products—hops or baskets, for example—and the consumption of products, in turn, produces a need for labor. But there is more to it. Products carry, transform, and multiply meanings as they circulate through different contexts. Products do work in the world. Often, they do the work of colonialism. They do so not as pure abstractions but as the material traces of workers’ effort. The physical labor—picking or weaving for example—is thus drawn out over space and time into additional cycles of continuous production. “Everyday life invents itself,” notes de Certeau, “by *poaching* in

versity of Toronto Press, 1995), 97; Livingston F. Jones, *A Study of the Thlingets of Alaska* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1914), 85.

62. Carolyn J. Marr, “Taken Pictures: On Interpreting Native American Photographs of the Southern Northwest Coast,” *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 80 (1989): 61; Margaret B. Blackman, “‘Copying People’: Northwest Coast Native Response to Early Photography,” *BC Studies*, no. 52 (Winter 1981–82): e 88, 107. See also Carolyn J. Marr, “Photographers and Their Subjects on the Southern Northwest Coast: Motivations and Responses,” *Arctic Anthropology* 27, no. 2 (1990); Lindsay Batterman, “Kwelth-Elite, the Proud Slave,” *Overland Monthly*, 2nd ser., 33, no. 198 (1899): 536.

63. Moser, *Reminiscences*, 143–45. On the importance to Aboriginal women of income from selling curios, see Williams, “Between Doorstep Barter Economy.”

countless ways on the property of others.”⁶⁴ With each additional “product”—difference, politics, or power, for example—the original act of labor is reappropriated and grows increasingly alienated. Following the “social life of things,” as Arjun Appadurai neatly put it, unravels the trajectories of Indigenous women’s work that produced not only commodities, but also imperial meanings and collective identities.⁶⁵

For example, Indigenous women’s labor helped transform hops from plant on the vine to internationally circulating commodity. As commodity, hops were destined for brewers around the world. At the point of consumption, whether in the United States, Britain, or Canada, drinking beer, particularly in pubs, had long been a reference point for class, gender, and racial identities. Various configurations were contradictory and changed over time. As historians have shown, male drinking was a “potent badge of masculine identity” at the same time as it destabilized the masculinity of men who imbibed to an extent that undermined their ability to fulfill the breadwinner role. As working-class women in the early twentieth century increasingly claimed public spaces for themselves, they used the grammar of male drinking as they began to frequent beer parlors, reconstituting those spaces in the process. Women in the temperance movement deployed drinking as a foil for enacting identity in a different fashion. In each instance, however, the supposed maleness of public beer consumption remained an important point of reference.⁶⁶ Hops themselves had a more specific meaning within the imperial context. As historians of British brewing note, “wherever British settlers colonised land, in the East and West Indies, in America, in Ireland and eventually in Australasia, a demand for the native drink of their homeland was established.”⁶⁷ British brewers thus wanted a beer that would not spoil on long journeys to tropical colonies. The creation of India pale ale, a brew in which a high hop and alcohol content act as preservatives, met this need and enabled

64. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, xii; emphasis in original.

65. Arjun Appadurai, “Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value,” in *The Social Life of Things*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 3–63. Fred R. Myers, “Introduction: The Empire of Things,” in *The Empire of Things: Regimes of Value and Material Culture*, ed. Fred R. Myers (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 2001), 3–64.

66. Catherine Gilbert Murdock, *Domesticating Drink: Women, Men, and Alcohol in America, 1870–1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 4; Elaine Frantz Parsons, *Manhood Lost: Fallen Drunkards and Redeeming Women in the Nineteenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); Kathy Lee Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in Turn-of-the-Century New York* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986); Roy Rosenzweig, *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870–1920* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Craig Heron, *Booze: A Distilled History* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003); Valerie Hey, *Patriarchy and Pub Culture* (London: Tavistock, 1986); Robert Campbell, *Sit Down and Drink Your Beer: Regulating Vancouver’s Beer Parlours, 1925–1954* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); Mark Edward Lender and James Kirby Martin, *Drinking in America: A History* (London: Macmillan, 1982); Perry R. Duis, *The Saloon: Public Drinking Culture in Chicago and Boston, 1880–1920* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983).

67. T. R. Gourvish and R. G. Wilson, *The British Brewing Industry, 1830–1980* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 169.

English sailors and colonists the world over to sip a piece of home.⁶⁸ As they imbibed this safe alternative to local water supplies, they affirmed their Englishness, their loyalty to Empire, and their “clubbability.” When natives drank beer, they staked a claim to respect, civilization, and the privileges embodied by English masculinity. Still other narratives surrounded moments when beer was served across the divides of race and class: by servant to master, by Englishman to native chief, by native man to English official. Regardless, drinking beer in the English colonies was a performance of English identity.⁶⁹ Consumption of hoppy beer was a small, seemingly innocuous activity, but the accumulation of such activities constituted the practice of everyday life. Indigenous women’s fieldwork thus contributed to the production of disperse and disparate identities. Traces of their labor were extended across North America, Britain, and the globe, where they became productive of colonial identities.

Whereas hops as product circulated within masculine spaces of public alcohol consumption, the curios produced by migrant women acquired meaning within the feminized spaces of domestic life. Because hops were a raw ingredient in a complex brew, Indigenous women’s labor was invisible to those who consumed the final product. The opposite was true, however, with products of the tourist trade: it was the visibility of Indian women’s work that gave the objects value and, in turn, enabled the work they did in the world. Women were the main consumers of the tourist economy’s wares, including curios, photographs, cabinet cards, postcards, and stereographs. As commodities, these objects carried a host of meanings as they circulated within and helped produce discourses of domesticity, taste, and distinction. Simultaneously, they produced discourses of colonialism. As with hop pickers, craft workers labored on as the products of their work moved through space and time.

Collecting was a respectable pastime for white, middle-class, Victorian women, and the collection of Indian curios was particularly popular in the late nineteenth century. As one promotional brochure from 1906 succinctly put it: “No home is complete now-a-days without a neat and artistically arranged Indian basket corner.”⁷⁰ Curiosi-

68. The East India Company began exporting heavily hopped India ale to the colonies in the 1780s. The brew became popular overseas and in Britain between 1840 and 1900, the “golden age of British beer drinking.” R. G. Wilson, “The Changing Taste for Beer in Victorian Britain,” in *Dynamics of the International Brewing Industry since 1800*, ed. R. G. Wilson and T. R. Gourvish (New York: Routledge, 1998), 97, 99. Late-nineteenth-century British brewers often used imported hops in making India pale ale, which required higher-quality hops than other, less heavily hopped beers. Thus, it is quite likely that hops from Washington made their way through Britain to the tropics. Margaret Lawrence, *The Encircling Hop: A History of Hops and Brewing* (Sittingbourne, Kent: SAWD, 1990), 21.

69. See, for example, George Orwell, *Burmese Days* (1934; repr., New York: Harcourt Brace, 1962); Mrinalini Sinha, “Britishness, Clubbability, and the Colonial Public Sphere,” in Ballentyne and Burton, *Bodies in Contact*, 183–200.

70. Lloyd W. MacDowell, *Alaska Indian Basketry* (Seattle: Alaska Steamship Company, 1906). See also George Wharton James, “Indian Basketry in Home Decoration,” *Chautauquan* (1901): 619–24. On tourist art, see Ruth B. Phillips, *Trading Identities: The Souvenir in Native North American Art from the Northeast, 1700–1900* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998); Molly Lee, “Tourist and Taste Cultures: Collecting Native Art in Alaska at the Turn of the Twentieth Century,” in *Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds*, ed. Ruth B. Phillips and Christopher B. Steiner (Berke-

ties, bric-a-brac, and knickknacks from subject peoples were more than simple markers of white, middle-class domesticity; they were constitutive elements of it. The gendering of this domestic sphere as female dated to the so-called separate spheres ideology of the early nineteenth century, which located its notion of “true” womanhood within the private space of the home. Bourgeois respectability and true womanhood were mutually constituted through domesticity.⁷¹ But, as numerous historians have demonstrated, the boundaries of the supposedly separate spheres were notoriously unstable. The “cult of true womanhood” privileged women’s moral authority, and although rhetorically confined to the private sphere, in practice, it observed no such bounds. Middle-class women transformed normative ideals about true womanhood and separate spheres by using them to enter public arenas. Such actualizations of middle-class womanhood were simultaneously constituted through class and race. As Christine Stansell has shown, when bourgeois life flourished, “it was the ladies who expanded on its possibilities and the working women who bore the brunt of its oppressions.”⁷² This was doubly so. Needleworkers, domestic servants, and Indigenous craft workers—frequently racialized, as Irish biddy or squaw drudge, for example—all labored to enable the “physical basis of gentility.”⁷³ Moreover, the public arenas that middle-class women entered were often the private homes of these working women.⁷⁴

ley: University of California Press, 1999), 269–73; Jonathan Batkin, “Tourism Is Overrated: Pueblo Pottery and the Early Curio Trade, 1880–1910,” in Phillips and Steiner, *Unpacking Culture*, 282–97; Molly H. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace: Gender, Art, and Value in the American Southwest* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001). Collecting could be identified as a male or a female activity. The professional or connoisseur collector was often assumed to be male. In contrast, women who collected were cast as hobbyists, amateurs, or tourists. Women’s taste in such matters was characterized as less discerning than that of the male expert, whose guidance women required. Leah Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest: Persistent Visions of a Primitive Past* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996), chap. 3; Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 151.

71. Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789–1860* (New York: Knopf, 1986), xii.

72. Stansell, *City of Women*, xii.

73. Stansell, *City of Women*, xiii. On labor, women, race, and ethnicity, see also David M. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Alice Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work: A History of Wage-earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982); Susan Anita Glenn, *Daughters of the Shtetl: Life and Labor in the Immigrant Generation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990); Nancy Green, *Ready-to-wear and Ready-to-work: A Century of Industry and Immigrants in Paris and New York* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Tera Hunter, *To ‘Joy My Freedom’: Southern Black Women’s Lives and Labors after the Civil War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); A. K. Sandoval-Strausz and Daniel Levinson Wilk, “Princes and Maids of the City Hotel: The Cultural Politics of Commercial Hospitality in America,” *Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 25 (2005): 160–85.

74. Stansell, *City of Women*; Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874–1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Sarah Deutsch, *No Separate Refuge: Culture, Class, and Gender on an Anglo-Hispanic Frontier in the American Southwest, 1880–1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*; Myra Rutherdale, *Women and the White Man’s God: Gender and Race in the Canadian Mission Field* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2002). On the public display of Indigenous home life see Paige Raibmon, “Living on Display: Colonial Visions of Aboriginal Domestic Spaces,” *BC Studies*, no. 140 (2003–4): 69–89.

The hop field tourist economy put the domestic spaces of migrant workers on display. Viewing and assessing migrant Indian women's labor and lives became one of the pleasurable acts of public consumption through which women constituted themselves as modern. When women purchased items from Indian vendors, they expanded the public spaces of women's consumption from department stores to street corners and field sides.⁷⁵ Figure 3, taken outside a Seattle department store, captures the vibrant and dynamic public culture of female consumers. The tourist experience and its souvenirs were testimonials to the increasing visibility and respectability afforded to certain forms of certain women's mobility. In juxtaposition to the perceived itinerancy of migrant Indian workers, tourist travel was a marker of taste and privilege.

The freedom, adventure, and mobility of tourism could be celebrated and enshrined back home in the respectable woman's parlor. In Europe and North America, collecting has a long history as part of what James Clifford glosses as "the deployment of a possessive self."⁷⁶ In late-nineteenth-century America specifically, home decoration was one of the many mundane domestic practices through which women articulated their identities and by which others judged them.⁷⁷ Photos, postcards, and stereographs graphically illustrated the ground that women covered in their travels. Exotic curios displayed the worldly sophistication, civilizational privilege, and good taste of those who owned and arranged them. Indian labor—live in the fields or by proxy in the home—was constitutive of bourgeois identities.⁷⁸ Collecting Indian objects could put women in the company of anthropologists, elevating them from the oft-derided status as shoppers.⁷⁹ As with imported household goods, Indian curios

75. An impressive literature exists on women, gender, and the consumer economy. See, for example, Susan Porter Benson, *Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers, and Customers in American Department Stores* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986); Rudi Laermans, "Learning to Consume: Early Department Stores and the Shaping of Modern Consumer Culture (1860–1914)," *Theory, Culture and Society* 10 (1993): 79–102; Elaine S. Abelson, *When Ladies Go A-Thieving: Middle-Class Shoplifters in the Victorian Department Store* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Peiss, *Cheap Amusements*; Kathy Peiss, *Hope in a Jar: The Making of America's Beauty Culture* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998); Nan Enstad, *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure: Working Women, Popular Culture, and Labor Politics at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Catherine Cocks, *Doing the Town: The Rise of Urban Tourism in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Kristin Hoganson, "Cosmopolitan Domesticity: Importing the American Dream, 1865–1920," *American Historical Review* 107 (February 2002): 55–83, www.historycooperative.org/journals/ahr/107.1/ahr102000055.html (accessed January 16, 2006); Nancy Martha West, *Kodak and the Lens of Nostalgia* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000), chap. 4. On women's transformations of public space in another context, see Sarah Deutsch, *Women and the City: Gender, Space, and Power in Boston, 1870–1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

76. James Clifford, "Objects and Selves—An Afterword," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking Jr. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 238. See also Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984).

77. Hoganson, "Cosmopolitan Domesticity," par. 5. See also Rutherford, *Women and the White Man's God*, 88–96.

78. Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest*, 126.

79. Mullin, *Culture in the Marketplace*, 30–31.



Figure 3. Vendor selling handmade items on Seattle street corner. Purchasing Indigenous artifacts was part of the public culture of non-Indigenous women's consumption. Image 83.10.7.929, Museum of History and Industry, Seattle.

could also fit within cosmopolitan constructions of self and nation.⁸⁰ Or, when cast as the products of “native-born, true Americans,” Indian baskets could become reference points within an alternate and more parochial articulation of national style and nationhood.⁸¹ Regardless, the products of Indian women's labor were terrain for other women's self-expression.

80. Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” pars. 36, 41–47.

81. James, “Indian Basketry in Home Decoration,” 619; Hoganson discusses oppositional trends to cosmopolitanism but does not consider the role that Indian arts might have played therein in “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” pars. 51–54.

This terrain was accessible to women with a wide range of economic means. The tourist economy attendant to the hop harvest was part of the broader postbellum expansion of tourism in the United States that made travel accessible beyond the upper echelons of the very rich. Although the wealthy still rode out to the hop fields in private carriages, for example, less affluent sightseers partook in the spectacle by riding the inexpensive interurban electric cars that connected the city with the rural hinterland.⁸² Souvenirs such as baskets, postcards, and photographs were similarly available at a wide range of prices and qualities. Whether they were subject to race, class, and/or gender subordinations in other contexts, the owners of such objects could find common affiliation, through consumption, with a dominant nation.⁸³

With the help of Kodak cameras, female tourists not only consumed souvenirs, they produced them. Kodak marketed its product to the increasing numbers of women travelers through its spokesperson, “the Kodak girl,” who urged women to “take a Kodak with you” or to “Kodak, as you go.”⁸⁴ The “Kodak girl” was emblematic of the “New Woman,” independent and on the move.⁸⁵ That so many female “Kodak fiends,” as they were called, shot photographs of Indians was no accident. In so doing, they literally framed their own privileged status in relation to the women on display. In opposition to the squaw drudge who was forced to labor, women behind the camera were united as consumers of leisure; ethnic and class differences among Kodak girls were momentarily excluded from the shot. Indian women’s work could reflect and enable the self-actualizations of bourgeois women and women with bourgeois ambitions alike.⁸⁶

Female consumers in the hop-picking tourist economy incorporated Indian women and their commodities into broader patterns of mobility and consumption—a mutual dialectics of moving out and drawing in—through which they fashioned themselves. Using the idiom of taste, they articulated communities of consumers that were as likely to cross as to constitute class, race, and gender divisions. As scholars have shown, such communities could mobilize along conservative or progressive lines.⁸⁷ Regardless of whether social distinctions were shored up or papered over, it

82. Earl Spencer Pomeroy, *In Search of the Golden West: The Tourist in Western America* (New York: Knopf, 1957), 123. See also Carlos A. Schwantes, “Tourists in Wonderland: Early Railroad Tourism in the Pacific Northwest,” *Columbia* 7, no. 4 (1993–94): 28. The round-trip fare from the city of Tacoma to the hop-growing region of Puyallup, for example, was 25¢. “Flyer, 1901,” negative 1903.1.60, Washington State Historical Society, Tacoma.

83. I expand here upon Hoganson’s point made in specific relation to the subordination of women. Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” par. 36.

84. West, *Kodak and the Lens of Nostalgia*, 23, fig. 29, pls. 1 and 2.

85. West, *Kodak and the Lens of Nostalgia*, chaps. 2 and 4.

86. In the Southwest context, Margaret Jacobs has shown how Indian domesticity served as a foil for white feminist self-expressions and explorations that ranged from the assimilationist to the cultural relativist. Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*.

87. Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” par. 47; Enstad, *Ladies of Labor*; Dana Frank, *Purchasing Power: Consumer Organizing, Gender, and the Seattle Labor Movement, 1919–1929* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Peiss, *Hope in a Jar*.

was Indian women's labor—as materialized in the tourist economy and in souvenirs—that did the work.

Consuming Women

Contemporary viewers ascribed meaning to the consumption patterns of non-Indigenous women; they did the same for the consumption habits of Indigenous women. As Leah Dilworth has noted for the American Southwest, tourists enjoyed the freedom to fashion any number of roles for themselves, whereas Indians were “always caught in the trap of visibility.”⁸⁸ The rationale that transformed Indigenous laborers into spectacles recognized no distinction between public and private acts or space. It swept the personal consumer choices of Indigenous women into the whirlwind of colonial spectacle. Although female tourists' consumption consecrated bourgeois womanhood, Indigenous women's personal habits were judged in journalistic and tourist accounts to be sorely lacking. Viewers read Indian women's consumer choices as markers of immutable difference. Indigenous women were depicted as so different as to be barely women at all.

Homeward-bound hop pickers purchased a vast array of items, including ploughs, sewing machines, stoves, and furniture. But no category of goods earned as much attention in newspapers and magazines as female fashion. Accounts stressed the impulsiveness of Indigenous consumers, clearly portraying Indian women as lacking in self-control: “On their return from the hop fields . . . money is plenty with them, and they do not scruple to spend it for anything which may attract their attention in the store windows.”⁸⁹ Indigenous women were said to be easy prey for “unscrupulous” salesmen who attracted their eye and their money by displaying “left-over hats trimmed gaudily with left-over ribbons” in shop windows.⁹⁰ In such accounts, ribbons in particular were positioned as sirens for migrant women. The supposedly irresistible draw of such a frivolous, almost childish, product told readers that these women were slaves to their passions. Reportedly there was little check on these whims because contemporary portrayals held that Indigenous women controlled their own earnings.⁹¹ This may or may not have been so in any given situation, and there is no evidence that Indigenous women squandered their hard-earned money. Regardless, the assumption facilitated a contrast with accounts of white families' shopping habits, which portrayed white women consulting and deferring to their husband's judgment.⁹²

88. Leah Dilworth, “Tourists and Indians in Fred Harvey's Southwest,” in *Seeing and Being Seen: Tourism in the American West*, ed. David M. Wrobel and Patrick T. Long (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001), 158.

89. Bull, “Indian Hop Pickers,” 546.

90. Meliss, “Siwash,” 503.

91. Canada, DIA, AR 1886, *Sessional Papers*, 1887, no. 6, 92; El Comancho, “The Story of the Hop Vine,” *Westerner* 16 (1914): 4.

92. *Told by the Pioneers*, 3:59. Even as they stood for modern consumers, white women could also be represented as impulsive. Laermans, “Learning to Consume,” 94–96.

Not only were the goods that migrant women purchased frivolous, they were, according to accounts, invariably “colorful.” Writers thus implicitly reminded readers of the racialized identity of these consumers. The *Seattle Mail and Herald* was typical in its claim that the “Siwash has many weaknesses. The one particular and noticeable among the females is the love of bright ribbons. The old women go barefoot, but the younger generation wear shoes—but they must be yellow shoes. Ordinary black shoes are not bright enough for a Siwash.”⁹³ Some writers singled out the red tones of the Indian fashion palette. A journalist for *Harper’s Weekly* fashioned a literary parallel between the hop season’s “ruddy-faced invaders” and the “gaudy bits of raiments on the old, flaming red blankets on the young maids, and strange misfits on the children.”⁹⁴ Self-styled amateur ethnographer J. A. Costello claimed that “on her [labelle klooitchman] is lavished all the fashion and vermilion of the sweet society of the natives.”⁹⁵

A writer for the California-based magazine the *Overland Monthly* inscribed race and erased womanhood in a slightly different manner when she likened Indigenous women to trees in the forest that changed colors with the seasons:

A one-color toilet never satisfied the taste of the dusky daughter of the forest. A blue skirt, green waist, brightly striped shawl, and a red handkerchief on the head comprise a stylish outfit for winter. Summer may see a pink or blue print, scant of measure both as to length and width, a hat trimmed expressly to suit Siwash taste, and ribbons of contrasting colors about the neck, waist, and wiry hair.⁹⁶

She thus excluded Indian women from membership in a number of communities at once. Whatever their pretensions to womanhood, their garish taste excluded them from the bourgeois community of female consumers. Their conspicuously “wiry hair” shut them out of any community with whiteness or Anglo-Saxon privilege. And their kinship with nature even questioned their membership in the human community.⁹⁷ These exclusions were not so much linear as overlapping. The dehumanizing naturalization of Indians was also about class and race, for example. Other working-class and nonwhite groups also had a long history of being seen as close to nature. Bourgeois women, typically were seen as more natural than their bourgeois male counterparts, but their refined taste distinguished them from these “colorful” shoppers.

93. *Seattle Mail and Herald*, November 29, 1902. See also “Siwash Village on Tacoma Tide Flats,” April 15, 1907, *C. B. Bagley Scrapbooks*, vol. 9, p. 26, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle.

94. Bull, “Indian Hop Pickers,” 546.

95. Costello, *The Siwash*, 66. Bridget Heneghan claims that the colors of commodities were more broadly recognized as markers of race, class, and gender identities and exclusions. Bridget T. Heneghan, *Whitewashing America: Material Culture and Race in the Antebellum Imagination* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2003).

96. Meliss, “Siwash,” 503.

97. In the late nineteenth century, Western conceptions of nature had come to be seen largely in oppositions to the human. Indians remained situated as “natural” beings in the Western imagination, however. For a discussion of the implications of this phenomenon in relation to hop pickers in the Puget Sound region see Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 124–29.

These naturalized representations of Indian consumers circled easily back upon other racialized stereotypes. One local historian, for example, reflected on the postharvest shopping habits of an Indigenous family in order to resurrect the time-worn image of the squaw drudge in need of salvation from her state of uncivilized oppression.

It is a sight worth pausing to contemplate on the streets of Tacoma or Seattle to watch the Indian with his family—squaw, papoose, and minor bare-footed responsibilities—as they plod the streets “doing their trading” on their return from the hop-picking. The buck loads the squaw with their purchases until she resembles an overweighted express wagon rather than a female. She is simply extinguished with his selections, while he, in all the dignity of forest manhood leads the little procession gallantly carrying a blanket if there is no place left to hang it in the submissive concentration of ugliness who plods patiently in his rear.⁹⁸

In service of the squaw-drudge image, this writer made the uncommon rhetorical move of turning Indian men into the shoppers.

Contemporary accounts spent considerably less time scrutinizing Indigenous men’s identities as consumers than they did women’s. Indigenous men did not entirely escape ridicule for how they dressed, but the tone was decidedly different. As one account held, although “the tawny brave . . . himself is no more discriminating in his taste than his half-civilized sister . . . in the nature of men’s clothing, he cannot help looking better dressed than she.”⁹⁹ Even as this writer directed a forgiving condescension toward Indigenous men, he captured the misogyny that characterized descriptions of women’s consumption.

These representations cruelly mocked Indigenous women for being, in the eyes of settlers, poor mimics of white, middle-class womanhood. They constituted a form of discursive violence, and enduring their blows was the price Indigenous women paid for accessing the lucrative tourist dollars.¹⁰⁰ There is much here that we might recognize as the colonial ambivalence discussed at length by Homi Bhabha. Viewers derided Indigenous women for being “almost the same but not quite.”¹⁰¹ Viewers invariably treated the Indigenous women as mimics of whiteness, despite the

98. Hawthorne, *History of Washington*, 2:228.

99. Meliss, “Siwash,” 503.

100. Andrea Smith argues for an extended conceptualization of violence as the overarching trope of American Indian women’s experience with colonization. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End, 2005). For similar examples of ridicule directed at supposed “mimicry,” see Karen Dubinsky, “Local Colour: The Spectacle of Race at Niagara Falls,” in Ballantyne and Burton, *Bodies in Contact*, 72; Barman, “Aboriginal Women on the Streets of Victoria,” 220. On the civilizational valence of Indigenous women’s dress in the North see Myra Rutherdale, “‘She Was a Ragged Little Thing’: Missionaries, Embodiment, and Refashioning Aboriginal Womanhood in Northern Canada,” in Pickles and Rutherdale, *Contact Zones*, 228, 230, 239.

101. Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 86. Indigenous men were also labeled mimics: “The son dresses in flashy clothes, smokes a cheap cigar, wears the white man’s shoes and apes his manners.” “Siwash Village on Tacoma Tide Flats,” 9:16. Bhabha’s work refers explicitly

fact that there is nothing inherently “white” about ribbons or hats of any sort. Viewers also treated these women as mimics of womanhood. They were not quite white, nor were they quite women. Accounts often omitted the term *woman* altogether, falling back instead on the Chinook jargon term *kłootchman* or the more wide-spread epithet *squaw*. Writers characterized Indian women as “stolid,” “stoic,” “sluggish,” and nearly inanimate “ornaments,” barely capable of displaying human emotion or attending to the “papoose” in the crooks of their arms.¹⁰² In denying the existence of these women’s emotional lives, accounts situated them in opposition to the emotionality of so-called real women, like those who tastefully consumed the products that they produced. Moreover, by transforming Indigenous domestic practices (including shopping) into public spectacles, viewers denied Indigenous women the privilege of another key marker of respectable womanhood: the right to inhabit a private sphere. Unlike white women’s identities, which were produced and performed through the consumption of “Indian” objects, Indigenous womanhood was itself consumed by cross-racial consumption. This simultaneous production and consumption of differentiated womanhood worked in the service of inscribing racial hierarchy.¹⁰³

This discourse of ridicule situated Indigenous women who wore “white” clothes as racial and gender cross-dressers. In terms of both race and gender, colonial viewers believed Indigenous women were attempting to be something they were not. When performed intentionally, cross-dressing can provide access to empowerment and social approval, but even then does not guarantee it.¹⁰⁴ In this case, cross-dressing was not a defiant assertion of agency, ambivalence, or resistance. Instead, it was a label projected onto Indigenous women by those who denied the possibility that Indigenous women could shop and dress *without* reference to colonial taste and desire.

to “mimic men.” For commentary on the racial exclusivity of Bhabha’s perspective and an elaboration of it, see Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

102. “Indians Returning from Hop Fields,” October 1, 1906, *Seattle Post Intelligencer*; “Siwashes Again Seek the Street,” *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, May 13, 1904; *Seattle Mail and Herald*, November 29, 1902.

103. On mimicry and racial hierarchy see Dubinsky, “Local Colour,” 69, 72; and Sarah Carter, “Two Acres and a Cow,” *Canadian Historical Review* 70, no. 1 (1989): 34–35.

104. On cross-dressing, see McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 65–69, and chap. 3; Judith Halberstam, “Mackdaddy, Superfly, Rapper: Gender, Race, and Masculinity in the Drag King Scene,” *Social Text* 52/53 (1997): 104–31. Racial cross-dressing had long been a component of the construction of American identity. See Eric Lott, *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Eric Lott, “White Like Me: Racial Cross-dressing and the Construction of American Whiteness,” in Kaplan and Pease, *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, 474–98; Phillip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998); Alan Trachtenberg, *Shades of Hiawatha: Staging Indians, Making Americans, 1880–1930* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004). For a powerfully intentional decision by an Indigenous woman to dress with and against dominant racializations of particular forms of dress see Carole Gerson and Veronica Strong-Boag, “Championing the Native: E. Pauline Johnson Rejects the Squaw,” in Pickles and Rutherford, *Contact Zones*, 49–50, 52, 55. For an interesting discussion of British women’s adoption of fashion and food from India see Nupur Chaudhuri, “Shawls, Jewelry, Curry, and Rice in Victorian Britain,” in *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*, ed. Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 231–46.

This implied assignation of cross-dresser limited Indigenous women's actions to the narrow frame of mimicry. It relegated Indigenous women to the realm of reaction and denied them the possibility of action. If Victorian dress signified modern whiteness, then Indian women who adopted it were, by definition, mimics. But this reading only works if we accept that Indians were, again by definition, traditional and not modern. In fact, Indigenous women migrants lived lives that gave the lie to colonial binaries every day. They integrated traditional prerogatives and priorities into their hop field migrations; they participated simultaneously in the potlatch economy, the curio business, and the global market.¹⁰⁵ They did so not out of strategic defiance of colonial categories, but, more straightforwardly, because their lived experience defied those categories.

Producing Colonialism

The social life of things is political, Appadurai insists.¹⁰⁶ For the products of hop pickers' labor, this was true on at least two levels. For one, they were articulated to and through the personal politics of privilege, identity, and self-differentiation discussed previously. At the same time, they were constitutive of a broader politics of colonial hegemony. The inordinate amount of attention paid to Indigenous hop pickers and curio producers was part of a much broader nineteenth-century culture of spectacle that privileged "seeing as believing." The advent of mass tourism, the popularity of world's fairs and expositions, and the growth of department stores offered spectators cum consumers the privileged opportunity to participate in racialized discourses of modernity and progress.¹⁰⁷ This culture of spectacle acquired particular meaning within the context of nascent capitalist development and Indigenous dispossession occurring throughout western Washington. When trained on Indigenous women—whether as producers or consumers—this invasive ethnographic view reproduced boundaries between colonizer and colonized, legitimized colonial structures of authority, and attracted economic investment. Questions of propriety were intimately linked to questions of property.¹⁰⁸

The racist and misogynistic accounts of Indian women—the squaw drudge, the undiscerning consumer, the emotionless mother—constituted colonial evaluations of Indigenous domesticity. Narratives of domesticity were crucial signifiers through-

105. For an elaboration of how hop pickers incorporated Indigenous priorities into their seasonal migrations see Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, chap. 5.

106. Appadurai, "Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value," 57. See also de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, xvii.

107. Tony Bennett, "The Exhibitionary Complex," in *Representing the Nation: A Reader*, ed. David Boswell and Jessica Evans (London: Routledge, 1999), 332–61; Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, chap. 2; Dubinsky, "Local Colour," 67–79; Laermans, "Learning to Consume," 89–98; William R. Leach, *Land of Desire: Merchants, Power, and the Rise of a New American Culture* (New York: Pantheon, 1993); Trachtenberg, *Shades of Hiawatha*, chap. 5.

108. Himani Bannerji, Shahrzad Mojab, and Judith Whitehead, eds., *Of Property and Propriety: The Role of Gender and Class in Imperialism and Nationalism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 4.

out much of the colonial world, and so too around Puget Sound.¹⁰⁹ Long conceptualized in opposition to the notion of the public or political, the domestic, as Amy Kaplan importantly notes, is also a category that must be examined in relation to the foreign. “Manifest Domesticity” and Manifest Destiny were contemporaneous phenomena, and both were implicated in the racialized processes of national expansion and demarcation of the foreign.¹¹⁰ As U.S. national borders encircled them, American Indians had been made foreigners in their own homelands. Federal law had ascribed to Indian tribes the ambiguous status of “domestic dependent nations.”¹¹¹ The so-called “Northern Indians” from British Columbia who migrated to the Washington hop fields were doubly foreign.¹¹² It was, after all, partly the foreignness of their producers that transformed handmade Indian objects into collectibles. Diverted into women’s homes, tastefully displayed traces of foreign savagery functioned within what Appadurai calls an “aesthetics of decontextualization.”¹¹³ There, they helped establish the home as a civilized refuge at the same time as they spoke to the domestication of their makers. Curios were miniaturized markers of the shift in American consciousness that increasingly saw Indians as pacified rather than threatening.¹¹⁴ As one advocate of “Indian basketry in house decoration” noted, “it is no fad that makes us seek to know something of the art-life and expression of the people whom we are thrusting to the wall after dispossessing them of the home of their forefathers.” Indians were the “native-born, true Americans,” but they were not the Americans of the future.¹¹⁵ The displacement of the objects thus mirrored the displacement of their producers. At the same time, curio displays also aestheticized the domination that underwrote colonialism. As romanticized products of handwork, seen in juxtaposition to the products of industrialism, they facilitated an image of benign or even beneficent imperialism.¹¹⁶ Domesticity’s economy of taste effectively enlisted female consumers and tourists into the work of empire.¹¹⁷ As Kaplan provocatively puts it, “domesticity makes manifest the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race, while Manifest

109. John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992), chap. 10.

110. Amy Kaplan, “Manifest Domesticity,” *American Literature* 70 (1998): 581–606.

111. David E. Wilkins, *American Indian Sovereignty and the U.S. Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997).

112. *Washington Standard*, August 15, 1879; “The Letter of the Law,” *Victoria Daily Colonist*, August 25, 1892; *Told by the Pioneers*, 2:116, 133.

113. Appadurai, “Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value,” 28.

114. Philip Deloria dates this shift to the 1890 massacre at Wounded Knee. Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004), 15–51. See also Dilworth, “Tourists and Indians in Fred Harvey’s Southwest,” 192, and *Imagining Indians in the Southwest*, 163.

115. James, “Indian Basketry in Home Decoration,” 619.

116. Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” par. 28. See also Phillips, *Trading Identities*, 198–212; Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest*, 126, 144–45; Leah Dilworth, “‘Handmade by an American Indian’: Souvenirs and the Cultural Economy of Southwestern Tourism,” in *The Culture of Tourism, the Tourism of Culture: Selling the Past to the Present in the American Southwest*, ed. Hal K. Rothman (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 105.

117. Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity,” pars. 26 and 35; Jacobs, *Engendered Encounters*, 35; McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 34; Phillips, *Trading Identities*, 198–212.

Destiny becomes in turn a condition for Anglo-Saxon domesticity.”¹¹⁸ The example of Indian women’s craft work in the tourist market is a powerful illustration of Appadurai’s point that “diversions” of things, such as baskets, for example, are always morally ambiguous and sometimes morally shocking.¹¹⁹ The suspect in this case, however, is not any individual consumer. Manifest domesticity was not, as Kaplan rightly argues, a question of individual morality.¹²⁰ Nor, I would add, was it particularly a matter of individual intention. Instead, it had much more to do with the centripetal, transformative power of colonialism to incorporate the chaos of everyday practices and marshal the social life of things into doing its work.

Like curios, domestic scenes of migrant hop pickers functioned as part of broader colonial narratives about race, labor, and capital. An article from the *Seattle Mail and Herald* is exemplary. It presented migrant Indian workers as an obvious tourist attraction: “What phases of local color are to be found on Seattle’s water front! The return of the Siwashes from the hop fields furnishes a pathetic as well as picturesque etching of life.” Any group of Indians might have presented a colorful sight, but significantly, and, as in many other accounts, these Indians were hop pickers. The draw for tourists, settlers, and investors was thus one and the same. The article went on to wax in familiar fashion on the “colorful” character of the workers’ domestic scene: “All ages and conditions of the tribes are in evidence, from the dusky baby to the wrinkled old dame who had imbibed too freely of ‘fire water,’ and who jabbered in Siwash dialect to the crone beside her. . . . Men women and children were huddled in groups of wild confusion of color and attitude.”¹²¹ Crucially, and not unlike the world’s fairs to which such scenes bore uncanny resemblance, this was a spectacle with a pedagogical point. This self-styled social commentator insinuated that these women and their families could never measure up to bourgeois standards of respectability and civilization. The “wild confusion” of this domestic scene may have been picturesque, but it was not what middle-class viewers recognized as a proper family home. Transformed into a public display, viewers found this domestic scene rife with what Anne McClintock calls the “iconography of domestic degeneracy.”¹²² What looked picturesque from afar turned ugly as the distance between viewer and viewed lessened:

118. Kaplan, “Manifest Domesticity,” 597.

119. Appadurai, “Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value,” 27, 28.

120. Kaplan, “Manifest Domesticity,” 583. Jane Haggis, “Gendering Colonialism or Colonising Gender? Recent Women’s Studies Approaches to White Women and the History of British Colonialism,” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 13, nos. 1/2 (1990): 105–15. A rich literature exists on women’s relationship to imperialism and colonialism. See, for example, Chaudhuri and Strobel, eds., *Western Women and Imperialism*; Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History* (New York: Verso, 1992); Antoinette M. Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865–1915* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Clare Midgley, ed., *Gender and Imperialism* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1995); Pierson and Chaudhuri, eds., *Nation, Empire, Colony*; Burton, *Gender, Sexuality, and Colonial Modernities*; Bannerji, Mojab, and Whitehead, eds., *Of Property and Propriety*; Philippa Levine, ed., *Gender and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Pickles and Rutherford, eds., *Contact Zones*; Ballantyne and Burton, eds., *Bodies in Contact*.

121. *Seattle Mail and Herald*, October 6, 1906.

122. McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 53.

It was a gay, pretty picture until one drew near, then the dirty unsanitary condition of these human beings and their surroundings grew revolting. Many of the younger members of these tribes have been partially educated, and their attire modernized—yet the question comes; “What has higher education accomplished for these children of the wild, and were they not better as a class in primitive days?”¹²³

Those cast as actors in this scene lived their domestic lives outside the proper bounds of home and thus were cast as homeless. Their private possessions on public view manifested their dispossession. Such accounts positioned Indigenous people as eternally distant from modernity and underscored their inevitable difference as “colorful Indians.” As the viewer drew physically closer, the cultural and racial distance increased.

Emphasis on clear boundaries is particularly important when difference cannot be reliably discerned. Elsewhere, representations of domestic inferiority functioned to mark the Irish and other subordinate groups whose difference was hard to spot with the casual eye as “white negroes.”¹²⁴ A similar process was under way here too. The high numbers of white men who married and had children with Indigenous women in the Northwest meant that, although settlers felt sure that Indians were not white, they could not be sure that they would know one when they saw one.¹²⁵

The significant role played by Indigenous workers in the settler economy further threatened to undermine easy distinctions between Indian and white workers. If Indigenous people labored just like white settlers, wherein lay the justification for denying them equal rights? The rhetoric of difference inscribed in accounts of “colorful” human spectacle preempted such questions by denying that Indigenous migrants were workers at all and insisting that they were, above all, “Indians.” Mirroring the specialization of Indigenous field labor, this rhetoric defined a highly specialized and segmented role for Indigenous people in modern capitalist society. They could engage modern capitalism, but they could not be *of* modern capitalism.

McClintock’s notion of “white negroes” is doubly useful in this context, because the specter of slavery lurked in the background of more than one account of labor on the western frontier. J. A. Costello, for example, linked an almost excruciatingly picturesque description of Indian hop pickers to a revealing nostalgia for the antebellum South. He began by describing the harvest scene: the “hop field is redolent of perfume and melody. The fields are alive with pickers; the air is joyous with sound. There is a richness and coloring in the surrounding which form a perpetual delight. There is a novelty to the beholder and a rurality of scene so peculiar,

123. *Seattle Mail and Herald*, October 6, 1906.

124. McClintock, *Imperial Leather*, 53. See also Arjun Appadurai, “Dead Certainty: Ethnic Violence in the Era of Globalization,” *Public Culture* 10 (1998): 225–47.

125. Jean Barman, “What a Difference a Border Makes: Aboriginal Racial Intermixture in the Pacific Northwest,” *Journal of the West* 38 (1999): 14–20; Alexandra Harmon, “Lines in the Sand: Shifting Boundaries between Indians and Non-Indians in the Puget Sound Region,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 26 (1995): 429–53; Harmon, *Indians in the Making*, chap. 2.

that makes one feel as if they were in some enchanted country.” As he continued, he starkly revealed the interpenetrations of leisure-time viewing, racial domination, and labor market concerns: “If you have never witnessed a season of hop picking you have missed a rare old time-treat which has its equal only in the maple woods of the East during sugar making time, or in the co’n shuckin’ days of old Kentuck, ‘when the mast am fallin’ and the darkies am a singin’ and racoon and possum am simmerin’ in the pot.’”¹²⁶ Hop pickers were not slaves, and most tourists probably did not make a conscious comparison to the plantation South. But nostalgia for simpler, easier times was in the air in the final quarter of the nineteenth century. And visitors inhaled a healthy lungful of that nostalgia when they breathed the country air of the hop fields. There, amid the towering vines, they could imagine that they saw a laboring population grateful for the work that they had, one that would neither rise up in civil war nor join in the labor revolts of the 1890s.¹²⁷

In a different context, the sight of hundreds or thousands of amassed Indians or workers, let alone both, could easily strike fear into potential settlers and investors. But here, domestic scenes of happy families reassuringly blended the safety of home into the potential hotbed of the racialized workplace. When the *Washington Standard* depicted a familial scene of pickers, the absence of a young and vital male figure—father, brother, uncle, or son—was noticeable:

There was noticed in many instances an entire Indian family gathered around a box hard at it [picking hops]. There would be the old bent and aged patriarch who had seen the snows of many winters and along side of him the child, and variously disposed, children of larger growth, all picking hops. Some squaws worked with their papooses strapped to their backs, while others let the little urchins play around them.¹²⁸

The implications of domestication in this scene are unmistakable. Many photographers framed their work in similar terms.¹²⁹ The prominence of children and women (see figures 1 and 2) suggested a docile and compliant workforce. Women workers posed without the company of young men evoked the squaw drudge; children hard at work indicated that they had inherited their mothers’ work ethic and would enable a stable labor supply of labor into the future. Images of aged workers (such as the postcard in figure 4) were likewise suggestive of weak and pliant natures. Too old and frail to put the land to what settlers recognized as “proper,” “civilized” use themselves, they could nonetheless labor and thus consolidate primitive accumulation.

126. Costello, *The Siwash*, 163. On Indian hop pickers as picturesque see also Joe Smith, “The West’s Great Harvest,” *Seattle Mail and Herald*, October 21, 1905; “Picturesque Hop Pickers,” *Puyallup Valley Tribune*, September 10, 1904, 1; “At the Indian Village.”

127. This phenomenon was more broadly apparent across the American west. See Dilworth, *Imagining Indians in the Southwest*, 148–49.

128. “Hop Picking,” *Washington Standard*, September 24, 1886.

129. See, for example, negatives NA661, NA4093, and NA758, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle; negatives SHS 1,052 and 90.45.11, Museum of History and Industry, Seattle, WA.



Figure 4. Postcard of hop pickers, 1906. Such images suggested that the Indigenous workforce was compliant and docile. Negative NA4093, Special Collections, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle.

These accounts and images took the labor of hop pickers and turned it toward the work of colonialism. Needless to say, such domesticated representations had little if anything to do with Indigenous realities. One example, perhaps, will suffice. The man on the right in figure 4 is Pliday or “Friday” Consauk from the Upper Skagit. Pliday is remembered in the oral history for his legendary ability to haul enormously heavy loads—not of hops, but of fish. More than a simple sign of physical strength, this was a signifier of power in a much broader sense. It evidenced his masculinity, his care for his family, and his ability to provide. His willingness to establish relationships with settlers was no marker of subjection or submission.¹³⁰ Yet domesticated representations of Indigenous hop pickers suggested that, rather than active (and potentially troublemaking) subjects, these workers were passive (and spectacular) objects. Too young, old, frail, or maternal to resist the sweep of capitalist development, they were, remarkably, strong enough to work long days. They were the ideal labor force.

An important trait of this “domesticated” Indian labor force was its willingness to move on after the harvest.¹³¹ Settlers and investors wanted a flexible labor force that was there when they needed it, and one that made no demands on the employer

130. Bruce Miller, personal communication via e-mail, January 25, 2006.

131. Alicja Muszynski argues that industrial wages paid to Indigenous workers were inversely correlated to the strength of Indigenous economies. If she is correct, low wages rather than a simple marker of the superexploitation of Indigenous workers ought to be read, instead, partly as an indicator of Indigenous economic persistence and independence. Alicja Muszynski, *Cheap Wage Labour: Race and Gender in the Fisheries of British Columbia* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), chap. 3.

once the work was done. Costello offered his reassurance on this matter in verse: “There’s dusky maids / In pinks and plaids,” he began, before continuing with predictably derogatory descriptions of Indigenous domesticity, and then, referring to Ballast Island, where many Indigenous migrant workers camped, he concluded in the following way:

When picking’s o’er
 We’ll have no more
 The smell that comes from Ballast isle;
 Glad then my eyes
 My spirits rise,
 For they’ve gone back to their paradise.¹³²

Other writers used less poetic forms to express similar messages about the flexible nature of the Indigenous labor force. When *Harper’s Weekly* ran a piece that attempted to lure hop farmers to the Puyallup valley, it did so with promises of great wealth, picturesque scenery, and a ready supply of Indian labor that “melted away” at season’s end, not unlike the snow on the Northwest’s famous mountains. The illustration that accompanied the article superimposed a domestic scene of the hop pickers’ camp—filled with women and children—on top of an image of workers picking in the fields. In the upper-right-hand corner of the image, canoes paddled off peacefully into the distance, just as the article promised.¹³³ Boosters for the Seattle, Lake Shore, and Eastern Railway sent a similar message when they chose a drawing of children picking hops as an illustration for the prospectus they published to attract financial backing (figure 5). The image, simply captioned “Indians gathering hops, Washington Territory, On line of Seattle, Lake Shore and Eastern Railway,” assured potential investors that the line would be well positioned to make money on a number of levels at once. Farmers would use the line to get their crop to market. Tourists would travel the line to watch the pickers. Pickers themselves would move on when the harvest was done.¹³⁴ A healthy return on investment seemed overdetermined.

A dizzying array of “errant trajectories” spun out from the original production of hops and tourist goods. These products carried the labor of Indigenous women with them as they went on to produce and transform meaning. Non-Indigenous people

132. Costello, *The Siwash*, 162.

133. *Harper’s Weekly*, October 20, 1888; negative NA 4015, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle.

134. R. H. Ruffner, *A Report on Washington Territory* (New York: Seattle, Lake Shore and Eastern Railway, 1889), plate facing p. 74. Trains both enabled and mediated tourist experiences. Dilworth, “Tourists and Indians in Fred Harvey’s Southwest,” 156–57; Carlos Schwantes, “No Aid and No Comfort: Early Transportation and the Origins of Tourism in the Northern West,” in Wrobel and Long, *Seeing and Being Seen*, 135–40; Carlos Schwantes, “Tourists in Wonderland,” 30; Edwin L. Wade, “The Ethnic Art Market in the American Southwest, 1880–1980,” in Stocking, *Objects and Others*, 167–91. On the streets of Victoria, British Columbia, the sexual labor of Indigenous women similarly generated economic profits for white businessmen. Barman, “Aboriginal Women on the Streets of Victoria,” 214–15.

Figure 5. Illustration of hop pickers from promotional material for the Seattle, Lake Shore and Eastern Railway. Such images helped in the industrial development of western Washington state. From R. H. Ruffner, *A Report on Washington Territory* (New York: Seattle, Lake Short and Eastern Railway, 1889), plate facing p. 74.



reaped a multiple yield from Indigenous workers: directly from those who sold their labor and indirectly from the images of those same workers. Indigenous women's labor was multiply appropriated. There is no doubt that many Indigenous women sustained themselves and their families with the resulting income, income that was much needed at a time when their lands, resources, and cultures were under threat. In exchange for the opportunity to work in the industrial and craft economies, colonial society extracted a high price from Indigenous women. Hops and tourist goods, in turn, became raw materials for the production of numerous manifestations of bourgeois identity. Such processes of identity formation were political as well as personal. Settlers, tourists, photographers, boosters, investors, and farmers alike circulated images of domesticated Indigenous workers, many of them women, most of them feminized. They enlisted these images to advertise the availability of cheap capital and docile labor, to undermine Indigenous people's hold on land and resources, and to promote the industrial capitalist development of Puget Sound. Consumers of Indian images cast the Indian hop picker as the poster child for the industrial development of the region. And for her work in this role she certainly never was paid. ▣