

Working Together

The Roles of Archeology and Ethnohistory in Hopi Cultural Preservation

T.J. Ferguson, Kurt Dongoske, Leigh Jenkins,
Mike Yeatts, and Eric Polingyouma

Through the acts and omissions of the United States, many of the aboriginal lands claimed and used by the Hopi Indians have been taken from them (Indian Land Claims Commission 1970). As a result, the Hopis today face a situation where they are concerned not only about the preservation of sacred areas, ancestral graves, and cultural sites on their own reservation, but also in other areas being developed where they have no jurisdiction. In response to this situation, the Hopi Tribe's Cultural Preservation Office has embarked on a vigorous attempt to use existing historic preservation legislation as a means to gain input into decisions made about the management of historic properties in a wide area of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah.

The Hopis, with a population of about 8,500, today occupy 12 villages on three mesas in a reservation in northern Arizona (Connelly 1979). *Tutsqwa*, the historic Hopi heartlands, covers a much larger area, beginning at *Tokonavi* (Navajo Mountain), and extending to *Öng-tupka* (Grand Canyon), *Koninhahawpi* (Point Sublime), *Tusaqtsomo* (Bill Williams Mountain), *Nuvatukyaovi* (San Francisco Peaks), *Yotse'hahawpi* (Apache Trail at head of Mogollon Rim), *Tsimontuqwi* (Woodruff Butte), *Sio Önga*, (Zuni Salt Lake), *Namituyqa* (Sanders), *Wukopacavi* (Ganado), *Qaö'uytaqtipu* (Burnt Corn), and *Looloma* (Kayenta) from whence the description returns to *Tokonavi*. These points are shrines on a religious pilgrimage undertaken to pay homage to all ancestral Hopi lands and several of the other sacred sites important to Hopi clans. The shrine areas thus do not constitute the boundaries of Hopi lands, only a symbolic representation of them. They represent the "plaza" of Hopi land. In addition to *Tutsqwa*, the Hopi Tribe is also concerned about cultural sites located in adjoining areas that were used and occupied by Hopi ancestors during a long period of clan migrations preceding the consolidation of the Hopi Tribe on the Hopi Mesas.

The efforts of the Hopi Tribe to participate in the decision-making process regarding impacts to their ancestral cultural sites coincides with a burgeoning movement in the field of historic preservation to consider traditional cultural properties as historic sites for the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as amended on October 30, 1992, and with efforts by federal and state agencies to begin implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA; P. L. 101-601) and parallel

Prologue

Aliksa'i! Listen! What follows is an account of the Hopi origin. The Hopis emerged into this, the Fourth World, from the *Sipapuni* in the Grand Canyon. Upon emerging, they encountered *Ma'saw*, the guardian of the Fourth World. A spiritual pact was made with *Ma'saw*, wherein the Hopis would act as the stewards of the earth. As a part of this pact, the Hopis vowed to place their footprints throughout the lands of the Fourth World as they migrated in a spiritual quest to find their destiny at the center of the universe. Hopi clans embarked on a long series of migrations that led them throughout the Southwest and beyond, settling for a time in various places. Following divine instructions, the Hopis continued their migrations until after many generations they arrived at their rightful place on the Hopi mesas.

During the period of migrations, the Hopi clans established themselves throughout the land by cultivating and caring for the earth. As directed by *Ma'saw*, the setting of Hopi "footprints" included the establishment of ritual springs, pilgrimage trails, shrines, and petroglyphs. As the Hopis migrated they left behind the graves of their ancestors, as well as ruins, potsherds, grinding stones, and many other artifacts to pay the mother earth for the use of the area, and as evidence that they had vested the land with their spiritual stewardship and fulfilled their pact with *Ma'saw*. These archeological sites today constitute monuments by which Hopi people verify their clan histories and religious beliefs. Archeological sites thus provide physical proof that the Hopis have valid claims to a wide region. Yes, this is the way it is. *Ta'ay, yanhaqam*.

state legislation (A.R.S. § 15-1631, 41-841 and 41-865). Implementation of NAGPRA and Section 106 of NHPA and its implementing regulation, 36 CFR Part 800, requires consultation with the Indian tribes and traditional religious leaders whose resources are subject to impact. The Hopi Tribe takes the opportunity and responsibility to consult seriously. Additionally, the Cultural Preservation Office believes that a true inventory and consideration of the effects of a proposed project on cultural resources cannot be obtained without ethnographic and ethnohistoric research to complement a standard archeological inventory. The experience of the Hopi Tribe is that for many projects a genuine consultation requires more than simply notification of a proposed impact from a land management agency via letter with a 30-day period for comment.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office uses information derived from archeology, ethnohistory, and interviews with elders to identify traditional cultural properties, evaluate potential impacts to these resources, and recommend appropriate mitigation measures. This information is then used in consultation with land management agencies. In this paper, we (1) describe how the consultation process at Hopi works, (2) discuss the perspectives of the Hopi Tribe on how and why archeological sites constitute traditional cultural properties, and (3) examine the goals of cultural preservation in relation to archeological and ethnohistorical research. The objective

(Ferguson—continued on page 28)

(Ferguson—continued from page 27)

of our paper is to describe the need and importance of the consultation process to give state and federal agencies and their research contractors a realistic idea of what the consultation process entails for the Hopi Tribe.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office was established as a tribal program in the Department of Natural Resources in 1988. It currently has a full-time staff of 11 people, including a director, a Tribal archeologist, two project archeologists, a media specialist, three Hopi research specialists, an administrative assistant, a transcriber, and several secretaries. On two projects, the Cultural Preservation Office has entered into a collaboration with the Institute of the North American West to obtain the services of a consulting ethnohistorian. The Cultural Preservation Office is dedicated to preserving the spiritual and cultural essence of the Hopi people. The mandate of the Cultural Preservation Office encompasses a variety of concerns, including archeology, ethnology, recovery of stolen sacred artifacts, and preservation of the Hopi language and farming technology. The program is supported through a combination of direct funding from the Hopi Tribe and supplemental funding from project sponsors who need the professional services it is uniquely capable of providing. With respect to archeology and ethnology, the Cultural Preservation Office is faced with a challenge of developing an appropriate means for the Hopi villages, clans, and religious societies to participate in program activities by contributing the esoteric, highly guarded information needed for management purposes.

Much of the esoteric information needed by the Cultural Preservation Office is embedded in clan history or the ceremonial knowledge of Hopi religious societies. Clan history is ritual knowledge and is rarely shared legitimately with other clans, much less with non-Indians. The actions of early anthropological researchers such as Voth (e.g., 1901, 1903, 1905; 1912), Fewkes (e.g., 1897, 1898, 1906), and Stephen (e.g., Stephen 1936; Fewkes and Stephen 1892), and subsequent violations of researcher/informant confidence at Hopi have contributed to the current guarded context of research at Hopi. The Hopis objected to much of this research at the time that it was conducted but had no way to control it. The legacy of this past research has left many Hopi people suspicious of scholarly research. The cautious attitude of these tribal members affects many of the activities that the Hopi Cultural

Preservation Office needs to undertake while documenting concerns about historic sites and traditional cultural properties. To address these concerns, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office decided that direct involvement of Hopi elders from the Hopi villages was the way to make current research more acceptable.

The Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team

A Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team was established in 1991 to guide and assist the research activities of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. This advisory team currently consists of 18 men representing virtually all of the Hopi villages and a number of prominent clans, priesthoods, and religious societies. The organization and functioning of this advisory team is a significant accomplishment because it includes representatives from autonomous villages that decline to send representatives to the Hopi Tribal Council and that do not otherwise participate in the activities of the centralized Hopi tribal government.

The Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team holds regular monthly meetings where a wide range of topics are discussed, and special meetings are conducted to consult on specific issues. Field trips are made as needed to inspect project areas and evaluate Hopi cultural sites; recent trips have included the Grand Canyon National Park, Glen Canyon Dam Recreational Area, Arizona State University's Roosevelt Dam Platform Mound Project, Bureau of Reclamation's Horseshoe and Bartlett Dam Projects, Petrified

Forest National Monument, Aztec Ruin, and Mt. Graham. When more intensive field investigations are required, a subset of the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team is generally appointed to undertake this work, including river trips through the Grand Canyon and field surveys for the Salt River Project Fence Lake Mine Project. Field visitation is a critically important means to contextualize project impacts and evaluate resources. It also provides an opportunity to identify traditional cultural properties that archeologists may have overlooked or not recognized during cultural resource surveys.

The members of the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team hold distinguished positions of authority within the traditional social structure of their villages, but their participation on the committee is a secular activity that is not a part of their regular religious responsibilities. Since participation in the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team meetings and field trips takes these men away from farming and the other productive activities in which they would otherwise be engaged, the policy of the Hopi Tribe is to provide an honorarium for the time



Representatives from the Acoma, Hopi, and Zuni tribes during consultation meeting with Salt River Project, the Bureau of Land Management, and the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office about proposed treatment of human remains on the Fence Lake Project. Photo by T.J. Ferguson, Institute of the North American West.

they spend on Cultural Preservation Office activities. Some of the funding needed to support the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team is provided directly by the Hopi Tribe; other funding is made available by project sponsors.

With regard to the funding of the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team, the attitude of many land management agencies and outside researchers is a source of consternation to the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. The members of the advisory team are all experts in Hopi culture, and they possess information needed by land management agencies to fulfill their legislative mandate for historic preservation and NAGPRA related consultation. The Cultural Preservation Office therefore values their contribution in the same way that it values the contribution of any specialist or expert.

Unfortunately, many federal and state bureaucrats and archeologists do not view traditional learning with the same value as western education. This view is demonstrated in the double standard that has been commonly applied in ethnohistoric research. The people who actually have most of the knowledge are the least likely to be viewed as "educated" and therefore are the least likely to be compensated for their knowledge. It is the anthropologists and historians who use this same information, gained through informants, who receive compensation for the "knowledge." This situation stems from a number of historical prejudices. First is the traditional view some scholars hold that Native Americans are the subject of research not active participants in research as cultural experts in their own right. This view objectifies people and reduces them to data, and some anthropologists refuse to pay for "data." Second is the lack of recognition afforded to traditional forms of education as an alternative but equally intensive and valid means to gain knowledge as that provided by western schools. Finally, there is the belief of many federal and state bureaucrats that traditional cultural properties are of greatest concern to the Native Americans who use them, and that these Native Americans should therefore be willing to volunteer their time and knowledge to protect them.

This last belief might be valid if an undertaking that would impact a resource were controlled by Native Americans, but this situation is the exception rather than the rule. Rarely will a Native American group propose an action that will knowingly destroy a resource that has cultural value for them. More often it is the case that impacts are related to federal, state, and private agencies pursuing their own agendas for development. Requesting that tribes volunteer information in this context is similar to extortion in that tribes are coerced into providing free information because it is in their "best interest" to protect resources of value to them.

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office thinks this situation is analogous to that of archeologists who also have an interest in cultural resources. Archeologists are no longer asked to donate their time to undertake routine procedures to locate and evaluate cultural resources in areas being developed or to mitigate the adverse impacts of land modifying projects on those resources. Professional archeologists established the need to be paid for this work three decades ago. The

Hopi Tribe thinks the emerging federal and state requirements for consultation with cultural advisors and tribal elders need to be similarly funded.

The size of the Hopi Cultural Advisory Task Team brings up an important point in relation to the symposium for which this paper was prepared, entitled as it was, "Take Me to Your Leader." Many federal agencies have a misperception that there is a single political or religious leader they can contact to undertake consultation. A tribal organization with a single leader was imposed upon the Hopi people through the implementation of the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. This act established a centralized tribal government based on that of the United States, incorporating a democratically elected Chief Executive Officer (i.e., the Tribal Chairman) and legislature (i.e., the Tribal Council). This form of governance, however, does not incorporate a centralized source for traditional knowledge which is still held and transmitted within clans and religious societies at Hopi.

Hopi accounts of clan migrations relate that the ancestors of the Hopis passed through many areas of the Southwest during the peregrinations that led to the gathering of clans on the Hopi mesas. During these migrations, each clan followed its own unique route and established its own history. The Hopi people refer to these ancestors as the *Hisatsinom*. The Hopi people know that the area occupied by the *Hisatsinom* transcends the culture areas defined by archeologists, i.e., some *Hisatsinom* lived in the Hohokam area of southern Arizona during the migratory period, while others resided in the Mogollon and Fremont areas as well as the Colorado Plateau. The prehistoric cultural constructs and culture areas defined by archeologists play an important role in contemporary archeological theory, but they constitute foreign concepts in the Hopis' understanding of the past. The Hopis know that prehistoric peoples were not as tied to the constraints of geography as the theory of archeological culture areas suggests. During the migratory period people were very mobile and moved over great distances. The knowledge and history obtained by each clan during its migration is specific to that clan, and constitutes esoteric information that should not be shared with other clans. Consequently, the process of acquiring information for legal and management purposes is complex and time consuming, requiring consultation with many people.

Consultation with the Hopi Tribe by governmental agencies or contractors should be initiated through a letter, addressed to the Tribal Chairman, presenting the relevant information concerning the proposed development and requesting information about any concerns the Hopi Tribe may have. The consultation process should be initiated as early as possible during project planning since efforts by the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office to acquire the relevant information may be time consuming. Federal and state agencies should not assume that consultation will consist of a single exchange of letters or that a lack of response during a 30-day consultation period constitutes concurrence by the Tribe. Unless consultation is initiated early enough in project planning to allow for sufficient flexibility, an adequate consultation cannot be achieved and compliance with the intent of the historic preservation law cannot be realized. Consulting

(Ferguson—continued on page 30)

agencies should be prepared to accept the fact that even with a sizable and well organized Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team, some projects will require input from additional Hopi people before relevant knowledge can be collated for cultural resources management.

Examples of Research Projects for Consultation

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has worked out a protocol for combining archeological and ethnohistorical research in conjunction with participation and review by the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team on two large projects. One of these projects is the Glen Canyon Environment Studies (GCES) sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation to study the environmental impacts relating to the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam. The Hopi Tribe is a cooperating agency in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on the operations of Glen Canyon Dam. This is a multifaceted effort that also incorporates primary research in the form of an archeological survey of the Little Colorado River Gorge, and ethnographic and ethnohistorical research on the Hopi use of the Grand Canyon.

The second project is research conducted with the Institute of the North American West for the Salt River Project's (SRP) Fence Lake Mine and Transportation Corridor Project in New Mexico and Arizona. In this project the Hopi Tribe conducted an extensive ethnohistorical investigation of traditional cultural properties in or near the proposed SRP coal mine near the Zuni Salt Lake in New Mexico and along an associated transportation corridor from the coal mine to the Coronado Generating Station in Arizona.

Archeological Sites as Traditional Cultural Properties

For the purposes of implementing the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, traditional cultural properties are defined as historic sites that are important because of "their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in the community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community" (Parker and King n.d.) To qualify as historic sites eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places traditional cultural properties must exhibit four attributes: an age greater than 50 years; existence as a tangible property; integrity in relationship to the transmission and retention of cultural beliefs or the performance of ceremonial practices; and integrity of condition wherein their traditional cultural significance has not been reduced through alteration of location, setting, design, or materials. Consultation to identify and evaluate traditional cultural properties should play a key role in the historic preservation compliance process. If state and federal regulators determine traditional cultural properties to be eligible for the National Register, the impact of a project on these sites must be considered and this process provides an opportunity to protect the site.

The Hopis have many different types of traditional cultural properties, including shrines, sacred sites,

springs, resource collection areas, and geographical landforms with place names that commemorate events in Hopi prehistory or history. From the Hopi perspective, every ancestral archeological site is also a traditional cultural property. This is because ancestral archeological sites are tangible monuments validating Hopi culture and history and the Hopi's covenant with *Ma'saw*. As such, archeological sites play a central role in the transmission and retention of Hopi culture. Moreover, every prehistoric Hopi village also has a village shrine associated with it that retains contemporary religious significance. The Hopi Tribe's definition of ancestral archeological sites as traditional cultural properties was derived from consultation with the Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team. During this consultation, the standard definition of traditional cultural properties was read and discussed by the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team in the context of a specific set of archeological sites in the SRP Fence Lake Mine project area. The criteria for the eligibility of these sites for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places were also reviewed, and Hopi Advisors decided archeological sites were eligible under the criterion (a): they are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Hopi history (i.e., clan migrations); under criterion (b): they are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (i.e., the Hopi ancestors); under criterion (c): they are a portion of a larger entity that is significant (i.e., clan migrations); and under criterion (d), in that they have yielded or have the potential to yield information pertinent in prehistory and history.

Some of the archeologists working for regulatory agencies stated at the outset of consultation with the Hopi Tribe that they did not think the definition of traditional cultural properties was intended to be applied so broadly to all ancestral archeological sites. In their view, the conception of traditional cultural properties had targeted a different set of cultural sites not usually recorded by archeologists. In the absence of any other means of management the Hopis are glad to see these other cultural sites managed as historic properties. Taking the definition of traditional cultural property as published in Bulletin 38 (Parker and King n.d.) at face value, however, they decided that it also applies to all ancestral archeological sites. This application is an example of different special interest groups interpreting the same language in very different ways.

Archeologists should realize that their interpretation of the language in federal guidelines, rules, and regulations is sometimes not the only or even the best interpretation. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has been successful in convincing all parties to the consultation process that their definition of archeological sites as traditional cultural properties is culturally valid. This definition means, of course, that the Hopis now expect to be consulted about the treatment plan for mitigation of adverse impacts to those archeological sites so classified.

[Editor's note: To my knowledge, no decision has been made by the Keeper of the National Register about the Hopis' position that all *Hisatsinom* sites (Anasazi, Hohokam, Mogollon, and Fremont archeological sites) are eligible for the National Register under all criteria of 36 CFR 60.4. Regardless of the outcome on this issue, the Hopi have been and will continue to be consulted about treatment plans for Section 106-

related mitigation of adverse impacts to any archeological sites that they wish to be consulted about. Acceptance or rejection by regulatory agencies of the notion that all archeological sites are traditional cultural properties will not have any affect on the Hopis' opportunities for consultation, since these sites are already recognized as historic properties and the Hopi are already identified as interested persons. If all prehistoric archeological sites are found to be eligible under criteria (a), (b), and (c), the difference, as the following section makes clear, will be not in consultation opportunities, but in decisions about mitigation of adverse effects.]

The Role of Archeology

Conventional archeological culture history (Adams 1978; Brew 1979) has focused on the Hopi's relations to archeological sites on or near the Hopi Indian Reservation. While these sites are obviously significant to the Hopi Tribe, Hopi concerns for *Hisatsinom* archeological sites extend over a much wider region as discussed above. Professional archeologists on the staff of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office play an important role in identifying *Hisatsinom* archeological sites.

On the Hopi Indian Reservation, the professional staff conducts archeological inventories and prepares reports that meet the standards of cultural resources management. Special attention is given to locating traditional cultural properties as well as more conventionally defined archeological sites. In a recent survey of 24.4 miles along State Highway 264, conducted for the Arizona Department of Transportation, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office located 48 archeological sites and 19 traditional cultural properties (Yeatts and Dongoske 1993). Ethnographic interviews and archival research identified an additional four traditional cultural properties that had been destroyed during prior road construction. Potential impacts to orchards and farming areas that are culturally important to the Hopi people were also identified.

This highway survey exemplifies the difficulty in classifying and managing historic properties. The categories of archeological sites and traditional cultural properties are not mutually exclusive and one site may exhibit characteristics that allow its classification in both categories. Many resources that archeologists readily recognize as "archeological sites" are also eligible for the National Register of Historic Places as traditional cultural properties using the criteria as interpreted in Bulletin 38 (Parker and King n.d.). Similarly, many "traditional cultural properties" also have archeological manifestations.

The dual classification of sites can create a management dilemma. For instance, the Hopi Tribe simultane-

ously wants to enter archeological site data into the archives maintained by the Arizona State Museum and not to reveal the location of certain traditional cultural properties. When a location is classified as both an archeological site and a traditional cultural property this is problematical. The description and location of archeological sites in site forms and technical reports may inadvertently reveal information about an associated traditional cultural property, even if specific information about that traditional cultural property is withheld. Classification of a historic property as being eligible for the National Register only under criterion (d) may facilitate a management decision to mitigate adverse impacts to the property through scientific data recovery.

If the site is also a traditional cultural property, such as a shrine, however, then there can be no real mitigation of an adverse impact to it, and its destruction may have a deleterious effect on Hopi culture. Ignoring the qualities of a site that make it a traditional cultural property therefore creates problems in appropriate management. The Hopi Tribe is currently seeking an appropriate resolution to this research and management dilemma.

For projects conducted by other agencies outside of the Hopi Indian Reservation, the professional archeologists on the Cultural Preservation Office staff review the cultural resource survey reports to collate data and summarize that information for review by the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team. For instance, a recent National Park Service archeological survey of 255 miles

along the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon documented a total of 475 sites (Fairley et al. 1991), of which 235 were deemed to be *Hisatsinom* sites of concern to the Hopi Tribe. Archeological surveys of the SRP Fence Lake Mine and Transportation Corridor Project identified about 600 archeological sites, the majority of which are prehistoric puebloan sites deemed to be *Hisatsinom* by the Hopi Tribe. The services of professional archeologists are essential in sorting through the voluminous information pre-

sented in technical cultural resources management reports. Without these services the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office would suffer from information overload.

Some archeologists believe that Indians may be interested in preserving archeological sites that are traditional cultural properties, but that they are not interested in archeology *per se*, i.e., the discipline that scientifically studies material culture. At Hopi, however, people are interested in archeology. Hopi elders want to know what types of data archeologists collect and how archeologists

(Ferguson—continued on page 32)



Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team members Eldridge Koinva, Bryan Tyma, Eric Polingyouma, and Dalton Taylor review ethnohistoric report for the SRP Fence Lake project, February 22, 1993. Photo by T.J. Ferguson, Institute of the North American West.

use these data to reach conclusions. Many Hopis engage in a sophisticated intellectual exercise wherein they compare archeological findings to their own system of knowledge. Points of congruence between the two systems of knowledge are often explained in terms of Hopi ritual knowledge (*wuknavoti* and *wimi*, see Dongoske et al. 1993). For instance, Hopi prophecy states there will be a time when even the ashes left by Hopi ancestors will be used to prove their claims. Hopi cultural advisors are quick to make the connection between this prophecy and floatation analyses of hearth contents for macrobotanical studies that are a standard technique in archeological data recovery.

In general, archeologists have applied an inconsistent use of Hopi knowledge in the interpretation of the archeological record. For instance, archeologists have been quick to pose the questions of "What happened to the prehistoric Pueblo people? Where did they go?" The Hopis know where the prehistoric Pueblo people went—to the Hopi mesas, among other places. At the same time, many of these archeologists use the Hopis in an ethnographic analogy to interpret architectural function and label archeological features. Many of the terms and concepts used by archeologists derive from the Hopi lifeway, e.g., *kiva* and *Katsina*. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office thinks that the discipline of archeology would benefit if archeological theorists would more rigorously and consistently research and use Hopi understanding of the prehistoric cultures of the Southwest.

When development threatens ancestral archeological sites, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office always recommends these resources be preserved and protected from damage. It is difficult for a Hopi to ever recommend the destruction of an ancestral archeological site. However, the Hopi Tribe recognizes that while its consultation allows it a role in the decision making process, it is not actually charged with making final decisions about the management of sites outside of their jurisdiction. While the Hopi Tribe does not condone the destruction of ancestral archeological sites, it will recommend measures to mitigate adverse impacts to sites that other people have decided to destroy. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office recommends that archeologists scientifically study sites slated for destruction to provide a documented record of their existence. Many Hopis think a written record of archeological sites is better than no record at all. The written record will provide documentation of the monuments of the Hopi territorial domain as they once existed so that memory of them will not be entirely lost once their physical manifestation is gone.

Osteology and Reburial of Human Remains

The remains of ancestors buried in archeological sites are of special concern to the Hopi Tribe. These ancestors are of great significance in the Hopi religion, and the Hopi people feel strongly that their physical remains need to be treated with respect. From the Hopi perspective the only proper disposition of disturbed or excavated ancestral human remains and their associated funerary objects is reburial.

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act protects Indian graves on federal and tribal land, and its implementation necessitates consultation with Native American groups claiming cultural affinity to the people buried in those graves. NAGPRA also requires the repatriation of human remains and associated grave goods on federal or tribal lands to tribes with valid claims, if they so request. The regulatory procedures to implement NAGPRA are still being developed, but it is clear that the research and consultation required for NAGPRA substantially overlap with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, since both federal laws often pertain to the same sites.

The issue of cultural affinity, as defined in NAGPRA, raises questions about how that affinity is determined. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office realizes that it is one thing to claim cultural affinity and that it is another thing to prove affinity through objective scientific study. There are also different levels of cultural affinity of interest to the Hopis. At a general level the Hopis are concerned about all *Hisatsinom* human remains. *Hisatsinom* remains can often, but not always, be identified through their associated archeological context, i.e., by association with puebloan architecture and certain types of pottery. No osteological analysis is required for this type of identification. Some Hopis are also interested in the genetic affinity between different tribes in the Southwest and what this means for prehistoric migrations. In addition to affinity, the age, sex, and pathologies of disinterred human remains are deemed to be important variables, as well as the nature of associated funerary objects, which may indicate whether an individual held a special social status (e.g., a priest) that would warrant a specific treatment. Nondestructive osteological analyses and studies of artifacts are seen as appropriate means to collect the data of interest to the Hopi Tribe.

The Hopi men on the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team want to make informed decisions regarding what they think are appropriate archeological or scientific techniques for the study of human remains. As part of the consultations for the Fence Lake Mine Project, SRP facilitated a meeting where Dr. Charles Merbs, a physical anthropologist from Arizona State University, reviewed for the Team the state of the art of osteological analyses and what can be learned using various methods and techniques. This allowed the Hopis to develop recommendations on the appropriate level of osteological analysis for any human remains recovered during the Fence Lake Mine Project with an understanding of what can be learned and how that knowledge can be gained. For instance, some Hopis think their interest in tribal affinity and clan migration might be productively pursued through genetic studies that entail destructive analysis of human remains, and they are willing to consider this as an analytical option. Other Hopis have a more conservative view, however, and think that such analyses, while interesting, would be culturally inappropriate. The important point here is that the Hopi cultural advisors are willing to listen to archeologists and physical anthropologists present research designs that address specific sets of data in terms of specific problems of mutual interest to anthropologists and Hopis, and then make their recommendations on the basis of the informa-

tion presented to them as tempered by their cultural values.

Archeologists can conceptually reduce human remains to archeological resources (i.e., artifacts) and make decisions about sampling a number of archeological sites in a project area, leaving many sites containing human graves to be destroyed without any data recovery. Hopis, however, apply different, more humanistic values, and when consulted have recommended that every ancestral grave in the direct impact zone of development be located and moved out of the project area and safely reburied as close as possible to its original location. For the Hopis, reinterment of human remains is the only acceptable mitigation measure for the disturbance of graves because of the Hopi concepts of death. Hopis believe that death initiates two distinct but inseparable journeys, i.e., the physical journey of the body as it returns to a oneness with the earth and the spiritual journey of the soul to a place where it finally resides. A disruption in the physical journey by the excavation and removal of human remains interrupts and obstructs the spiritual journey. This creates an imbalance within the spiritual world and hence the natural world.

The Hopis have a reburial ceremony that they conduct when ancestral human remains recovered in archeological work are reburied. Several elders on the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team have traveled extensively to conduct the appropriate rituals as needed on a wide range of recent projects.

Role of Ethnohistory

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office uses ethnohistory in conjunction with archeology as another means to collect the information it needs to consult with land management agencies. The ethnohistoric research supported by the Hopi Tribe entails the collection and analysis of information from archival sources, published literature, and oral history interviews. The published literature on Hopi is extensive (Laird 1977), but the information in this literature is not always accurate from the Hopi perspective. Consultation with Hopi elders is needed via formal interviews to verify published information or correct it where it is erroneous. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office prefers to tape record and transcribe oral history interviews to build a body of documentation for their internal archives. This procedure allows oral history interviews to be referenced and cited in the same scholarly fashion as written sources.

The oral history interviews and ethnographic research sponsored by the Cultural Preservation Office are conducted under a "need to know" basis where only that information needed for management purposes is made available for research. The basic questions pertaining to historic preservation include the antiquity of use of a traditional cultural property, the general way the resource functions to retain or transmit the cultural identity of the Hopi community, and whether it has integrity of condition wherein the traditional cultural significance has not been reduced through alteration of location, setting, design, or materials. Answers to these questions do not generally require esoteric

aspects of rituals to be divulged. Many interviews are conducted entirely in Hopi, and only portions of the interview are transcribed or summarized in English. There is a filtering process that works to keep esoteric information from being needlessly divulged. The concern for confidentiality is not only to keep esoteric information from non-Indians, but also to safeguard it within the Hopi Tribe from other clans or villages that are not supposed to be privy to that information.

The ethnohistoric research conducted by the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office uses documentary sources to help to fill in the gaps in knowledge maintained through oral history. During the consultations concerning the SRP Fence Lake Mine Project, for instance, there were no Hopi elders available who knew the entire route of the pilgrimage trails that run from the Hopi Mesas to the Zuni Salt Lake in New Mexico. Recent pilgrimages have been conducted using pick-up trucks traveling via modern roads. Even though the route of the old trails was not precisely known, these trails are still significant traditional cultural properties. The shrines and offering places along the trails are still used in prayers, and the trails have not lost their cultural significance even if their physical location is not well-known. For this reason, the Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team thought it was important to locate the old pilgrimage trails and determine how these would be impacted by the SRP project. An ethnohistorical research strategy was developed using oral history interviews, review of published literature, analysis of aerial photographs and remote sensing, and extensive field work to identify the location of the pilgrimage trails. Using this combination of techniques, the precise location of one pilgrimage trail and the general locations of two other trails were determined.

Ethnographic research to document contemporary Hopi values and beliefs about archeological sites and traditional cultural properties is another important component of ethnohistoric research. This information provides the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office with the documentation it needs to consult with regulatory agencies and help evaluate historic properties in terms of the criteria for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.

Cultural Preservation vs. Historic Preservation

The Hopi Tribe approaches the research needed for consultation with regulatory agencies from a perspective of cultural preservation, yet the framework within which this work is conducted is one of historic preservation. While there is a substantial overlap in these two pursuits, there are also important differences that need to be considered in the design of appropriate research and the dissemination of results. A basic concern is the fact that preservation of Hopi culture requires that esoteric religious information remain secret. The historic preservation compliance process, however, requires documentation of Hopi values and beliefs in order to assess the historical character of properties in relation to the eligibility criteria of the National Register. There is a potential conflict here.

This issue was resolved on the research conducted for the SRP Fence Lake Mine Project and the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies by the project sponsors allowing

(Ferguson—continued on page 34)

(Ferguson—continued from page 33)

the Hopi Tribe to collect all the cultural information it needed for its own purposes and then subsequently decide what information would be released to the project sponsor and state and federal regulators. By guaranteeing the confidentiality of esoteric information and by directly participating in the research, the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office is able to successfully balance cultural preservation with historic preservation and help agencies satisfy their federal mandates.

Review of Research Reports

The Cultural Preservation Office has implemented an intense review process to ensure that esoteric or privileged information not needed for management purposes is not inadvertently released to sponsors and historic preservation regulators. Project reports are read in draft form by the Director and staff of the Cultural Preservation Office and then submitted for review by the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team. This is a time-consuming process, and the internal review schedules following Hopi logic do not always coincide with the schedules of project sponsors.

The final review of the ethnohistoric report for the Fence Lake Mine Project, for instance, was initiated six months after the draft report was completed, and at the same time the report was released for review by the state and federal regulators. The actual review by the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team entailed reading virtually the entire report out loud in both English and Hopi. English words and cultural resources management concepts were defined and discussed when these were not readily understood, and there was detailed discussion of all the information, recommendations, and conclusions in the report. The primary concern was that all of the information in the report be accurate, and the contemporary knowledge of the cultural advisors was used to verify the anthropological data in the report in this regard. Another concern was whether or not the information in the report should be restricted to use by the sponsor and regulators or whether it should be released to the public.

The Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team review took six full days and involved working groups ranging in size from 12 to 22 people. Those people at the review sessions who are quoted or cited in the report gave their explicit permission to be identified by name as the source of information. Similar permission from those people who were not able to attend the meeting was obtained by reviewing the report with them in private. The intense level of scrutiny to which the SRP report was subjected guarantees both that the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team fully understands the information contained in the report, and that it contains no erroneous information.

Accommodation of Academic and Hopi Values in Dissemination of Knowledge

After review of the SRP Fence Lake Project ethnohistoric report, the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team recommended that the Cultural Preservation Office only release this information to the project spon-

sor and the state and federal historic preservation regulatory agencies. The Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team did not feel comfortable with releasing this information to the public where it would be available for scholarly research conducted outside the auspices of the Hopi Tribe. The Cultural Preservation Office is thus releasing the final report in a limited distribution with the caveat that it cannot be copied or used for scholarly purposes unrelated to project management without the written permission of the Hopi Tribe. The Hopi Tribe's right to restrict their report was guaranteed in the contractual arrangements with SRP and the Institute of the North American West through which the work was undertaken.

There is some irony in the restriction of ethnohistoric reports prepared by the Cultural Preservation Office, given that these reports draw upon past anthropological work that would not be available if it had been similarly restricted. The restriction of reports may result in that information not being readily available to Hopis for use in future projects. Quite honestly, restriction of reports creates a tension between the professional ethics of the anthropologists employed by the Cultural Preservation Office who are expected to disseminate the results of their work to other scholars and the cultural ethics of Hopi tribal members to not divulge information. This tension is diffused by open discussion of the issue between the Hopis and their non-Indian employees and consultants and by an ongoing evaluation of the respective goals of cultural preservation and scholarly research. It is also mitigated to some extent by that fact that some publication of activities of the Cultural Preservation Office has been deemed appropriate and approved (Dongoske et al. 1993; Ferguson 1992).

Hopi people use archeology and ethnohistory to verify their own beliefs and to enrich their personal understanding of their place in the universe. Archeologists have a less personal and more abstract interest in adding to the general store of knowledge and reaching scientific or historical conclusions that are of interest to them professionally. These two objectives are not mutually exclusive, of course, but their joint accommodation is still being worked out. That this is the case is not surprising given that the Cultural Preservation Office is still a relatively new institution in the Hopi Tribe, working in a largely uncharted cross-cultural context. Perhaps in time the Hopis will decide that cultural resource management projects provide an appropriate means for the Hopi Tribe to advance scholarly knowledge as well as their self-defined preservation goals.

Consultation with Sponsors, Regulatory Agencies, and Other Tribes

The Cultural Preservation Office and Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team have benefited from a number of meetings with regulatory agencies where state and federal responsibilities were explained in relation to the historic preservation compliance process. For people who have not been formally inculcated into the sometimes arcane rules and regulations of historic preservation, the compliance process can be bewildering and confusing. Effective consultation at Hopi is dependent upon the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team understand-



Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team members consult with Salt River Project archeologist Dr. Judy Brunson about an archeological site that the Hopi tribe considers to be a traditional cultural property, August 7, 1991. Photo by T.J. Ferguson, Institute of the NorthAmerican West.

ing exactly what they are consulting about. For the Fence Lake Mine project, a series of informative meetings were held with SRP, representatives of the Arizona and New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officers, and the Bureau of Land Management. The Cultural Preservation Office held additional consultation meetings with the various Hopi villages and other local groups to share information about the project and to seek advice as to how to proceed. A total of 27 consultation meetings were conducted for the SRP Fence Lake Mine Project. Similar meetings concerning the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies have been held with the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service.

Presumably these meetings have laid the groundwork so that such intensive consultation on the compliance process will not be needed on every future project. The fields of historic preservation and cultural resources management are dynamic, however, and as new laws are passed, and as management agencies develop new ways to implement existing rules and regulations, there will be a continuing need for educational meetings.

In formal consultation for NAGPRA and the National Historic Preservation Act, the Hopi Tribe has explicitly stated that its participation in the compliance process does not imply endorsement or support of a particular development or project. The Hopi Tribe's interest is in trying to protect as many cultural sites as possible, not in facilitating their destruction through new development.

All traditional cultural properties of concern to the Hopis can be reduced to historic sites for purposes of management. This is not an entirely satisfying procedure, however, because for the Hopis the real significance of many of these cultural properties is as sacred sites. The Hopis recognize, however, that under existing federal laws sacred sites have less protection than historic sites. Since all Hopi shrines and religious practices were established in ancient times and are integral in the transmission and retention of Hopi culture, these sacred sites meet the criteria for classification as traditional cultural properties. The conceptual and legal reduction of sacred sites to historic sites is pragmatic

management, but it is nonetheless an emotionally difficult process for tribal elders engaged in the consultation process.

The Hopis realize they share a cultural affinity to many *Hisatsinom* archeological sites with other Pueblos and non-Puebloan tribes. There is thus a need to consult with these tribes as well as state and federal regulatory agencies, especially with regard to the proper treatment of human remains and funerary objects. On the Fence Lake Mine Project, SRP sponsored a series of historic meetings between the Acoma, Hopi, and Zuni Tribes that allowed tribal elders to discuss their concerns and recommendations with each other in a forum that facilitated a uniform set of recommendations for the proper disposition of human remains and grave goods under the provisions of NAGPRA. The knowledge that what the Hopi Tribe was recommending to SRP with respect to treatment of the dead did not conflict with what the other pueblos were recommending allayed many anxieties. The inter-tribal meetings of the Pueblo tribes was thus in everyone's best interest.

Suggestions for Future Consultation

Based on the experience of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, the following suggestions can be made concerning future consultations regarding NAGPRA and NHPA compliance.

- Initiate consultation as early as possible in the project planning and development process. Do not expect any meaningful results from sending an anthropologist unannounced to the tribe half way through the project.
- Try to coordinate consultation for traditional cultural properties with that for NAGPRA to make best use of the effort it takes to contextualize the project and evaluate impacts.
- Allow adequate time for review of all aspects of the project, including technical reports. Tight bureaucratic schedules may not be culturally appropriate or practical in consulting with tribal elders.
- Do not make the mistake of assuming that a lack of response in a 30-day period following the initiation of consultation means that the tribe has no concerns or is in concurrence with the project.
- Sponsors should be prepared to support the costs associated with consultation. This includes the time of the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team as well as travel expenses to inspect project areas and conduct field evaluations of traditional cultural properties.
- Sponsors should attempt to accommodate a request from the tribe to employ particular ethnographers or historians in the research needed to complete consultation. It takes a long time for researchers to earn the trust of tribal elders. Use of professional scholars who have already gained this trust will result in a more efficient and comprehensive research program.
- Sponsors and regulators should be prepared for meetings in which many cultural issues are discussed at length. The relevance of all these issues to a particular project may not be obvious to sponsors or regulators, but their full consideration may be essential using Hopi standards of logic and ethics.
- Regulators need be honest in their assessment of the potential to protect traditional cultural properties so that the cultural advisors they consult are not misled into thinking that everything they deem important will be

(Ferguson—continued on page 36)

saved. The efforts of the New Mexico and Arizona State Historic Preservation Offices in this regard have been laudable.

- Sponsors and regulators should recognize that it may be pragmatic and necessary to reduce sites whose highest values stem from religious use to the lesser status of historic properties for management purposes, but this is an emotionally painful and sometimes confusing process for cultural advisors. Non-Indian participants in the consultation process need to retain an anthropological perspective that there are many different ways to view a cultural site and that multiple perspectives may need to be applied simultaneously.
- Sponsors and regulators need to carefully word discussions with cultural advisors so that they are not misled into thinking that consultation is the same as making a management decision. Exactly who is going to make management decisions needs to be clearly explained at the outset of consultation.
- Cultural triage (Stoffle and Evans 1990), i.e., the ranking cultural sites in terms of significance and selecting a subset of those sites for preservation, is a non-Hopi concept. Decisions about what resources to sacrifice to facilitate development are the responsibility of land managers not Indian people. Keep in mind that decisions in medical triage are made by doctors not patients. Indian values on traditional cultural properties should be duly considered, but it is unfair to ask a native religious leader to make a decision, and therefore assume responsibility, for the destruction of any traditional cultural property.
- The consultation process may be more time-consuming and require more effort than a federal or state agency may anticipate at the outset. Be Patient! Adequate consultation may require federal representatives to visit the tribe and, with permission from tribal authorities, seek out individuals who may have the necessary knowledge. All tribes do not have the response capabilities or network that the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has developed, and adequate consultation with these tribes may require a greater effort on the part of federal agency. Once a federal agency has established this communication network with a tribe, however, future consultation should become easier and more efficient. Above all maintain an open and honest communicative relationship.

Prospects for the Future

Archeological research concerns the Hopis, particularly when their ancestors are the subject of that research. The findings of archeologists are important and have real impact on how the Hopis perceive themselves. The destruction of archeological sites by construction projects, land development, or scientific excavation is of great concern, in part because the record established by their ancestors is obliterated. Consultation with Hopis and Hopi participation in research will help to ensure that Hopi perspectives and concepts are incorporated into the written record that will remain after archeological sites are destroyed. Beyond consultation, the Hopis want to be treated as peers in archeological research projects so that their knowledge, values, and beliefs are regarded with the same respect that archeologists afford one another when there are differences in research methods and interpretation of the archeological record. The Hopis do not, however, want to impose their sacred knowledge indiscriminately on the archeological record or to con-

strain archeological interpretation unfairly. They do not want to censor the ideas of archeologists, nor do they wish to impose research designs on archeologists.

Not all information should be divulged, however, and not all archeological research is suitable for direct involvement of Hopi tribal members (e.g., osteological analysis). No universal written guidelines exist that define what is appropriate research or what research is appropriate for Hopis to participate in. Decisions about the appropriateness of research depend on a number of variables, including the nature of the project, the project research design, the project personnel, and the goals and objectives of the research. It is almost certain that Hopi standards for what constitutes appropriate research and how that research should be conducted will evolve in the future as archeological method, theory, and techniques develop, and as the Hopis see a need to obtain new information about their past.

Cooperative research ventures between the Hopi Tribe and anthropologists in the future may serve to identify and advance mutually beneficial research interests. This means that archeologists should not be discouraged if the Hopi Tribe does not choose to support their proposed research at the present time. Archeologists working with ancestral Hopi archeology should continue to consult with the Hopi Tribe to explain what they are interested in researching, how this research can be conducted, and what will be learned. In the future, the Hopi Tribe may support research that is not considered appropriate today.

Conclusion

Cultural preservation is important to the Hopi Tribe. As Vernon Masayesva, Chairman of the Hopi Tribe, remarked at the 1991 Hopi Cultural Preservation Day, it is true that,

"early in life . . . when we are taught to plant, the elders would tell you that if you want to plant a straight row of corn, you have to first pick where you are going to be going, where you wish to end up at. And then you start planting, but every so often you have to look back. Because it is what happened that tells you where you are at, and where you are going. So, when we talk about cultural preservation, it's just not because we want to save something, I think it's because we don't want to forget who we are as Hopis. That we don't want to ever forget our responsibilities, and our traditions and values—all of those things that make us different in many ways from other cultures. And this is why cultural preservation . . . is very important. Because you will never know who you are unless you know where you came from. You never know where you are going unless you understand where you have been."

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office thinks that archeology, ethnography, and ethnohistory have important roles to play in Hopi cultural preservation, and that the research needed to supply the information needed for consultation with state and federal regulatory agencies will result in lasting benefits for the Hopi people.

References

- Adams, Charles E.
1978 *Synthesis of Hopi Prehistory and History*. Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff.

Brew, J. O.

1979 Hopi Prehistory and History to 1850. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 514-523. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 9, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

Connelly, John C.

1979 Hopi Social Organization. In *Southwest*, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 539-553. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 9, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

Dongoske, Kurt, Leigh Jenkins and T. J. Ferguson

1993 Understanding the Past through Hopi Oral History. *Native Peoples* 6(2): 24-31.

Fairley, Helen C., Peter W. Bungart, Christopher M. Coder, Jim Huffman, Terry L. Samples, and Janet R. Balsom

1991 The Grand Canyon River Corridor Survey Project: Archaeological Survey along the Colorado River Between Glen Canyon Dam and Separation Canyon. Glen Canyon Environmental Studies Technical Report. Ms. on file, Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City.

Ferguson, T. J.

1992 Public History, Private History and Archaeology in Research of Hopi Traditional Cultural Properties. Paper presented at the Western History Association, 32nd Annual Conference, New Haven, CT.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter

1897 Tusayan Katchinas. In *15th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1893-1894*, pp. 245-313. Government Printing Office, Washington.

1898 The Winter Solstice Ceremony at Walpi. *American Anthropologist* 11(3):65-87 and (4):1101-115.

1906 Hopi Shrines near the East Mesa, Arizona. *American Anthropologist* 8:346-375.

Indian Land Claims Commission

1970 *Hopi Tribe v. the United States of America*, Dockets 196 and 229, Opinion on Title, June 29, 1970, and Findings of Fact, June 29, 1970. (Also published in *Hopi Indians*, 1974, Garland Publishing Company, New York, pp. 387-424.)

Laird, David W.

1977 *Hopi Bibliography*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Masayesva, Vernon

1991 Remarks of Vernon Masayesva, Chairman, The Hopi Tribe, 1991 Hopi Cultural Preservation Symposium, September 19, 1991. Transcribed by T. J. Ferguson from a tape recording made by Merwin Kooyahoema of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. Ms. on file at Cultural Preservation Office, Kykotsmobi, Arizona.

Patricia L. Parker, and Thomas F. King

n.d., *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. National Register Bulletin 38, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C

Stephen, Alexander M.

1892 The Lá-lā-kōn-ta: A Tusayan Dance. *American Anthropologist* 5(2):105-129.

1936 *Hopi Journal of Alexander M. Stephen*. Edited by Elsie Clews Parsons. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 23, New York.

Stoffle, Richard W. and Michael J. Evans

1990 Holistic Conservation and Cultural Triage: American Indian Perspectives on Cultural Resources. *Human Organization* 49(2):91-99.

Voth, Henry R.

1901 *The Oraibi Powamu Ceremony*. Field Columbian Museum Publication No. 61, Anthropological Series Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 64-158. Chicago.

1903 *The Oraibi Summer Snake Ceremony*. Field Columbian Museum Publication No. 83, Anthropological Series Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 63-358. Chicago.

1905 *The Traditions of the Hopi*. Field Columbian Museum Publication 96, Anthropological Series, Vol. 8. Chicago.

1912 *The Oraibi Marau Ceremony*. Field Museum of Natural History, Publication No. 156, Anthropological Series Vol. 11, No. 1.

Yeatts, Michael and Cindy Dongoske

1993 An Archaeological Inventory of SR264 from the County Line to SR87. Ms. on file at the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Kykotsmobi, Arizona.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the Hopi Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team in guiding all aspects of our work in Hopi cultural preservation. In particular, we thank Leslie David, Alton Honanie, Valjean Joshevama, Eldrige Koinva, Jerry Lacapa, Delfred Leslie, Frank Mofsie, Gilbert Naseyouma, Autsin Nevayakewa, Owen Numkena, Harold Polingyumtewa, Simon Polingyumtewa, Bert Puhuyestewa, Abbott Sekaquaptewa, Eugene Sekaquapetewa, LaVern Siweumtewa, Dalton Taylor, Byron Tyma, Martin Talayumtewa, and Harlan Williams. Our colleagues on the staff of the Cultural Preservation Office deserve credit for helping to develop the ideas presented in this paper, including Kathy Johnson, Noreen Kootswatewa, Merwin Kooyahoema, Lee Wayne Lomayestwa, Ambrose Namoki, Sr., Ruby Navasi, and Susie Pooyama. The Cultural Preservation Office would also like to thank the Bureau of Reclamation's Glen Canyon Environmental Studies and the Salt River Project for their generous support of many of the program activities discussed in this paper.

T.J. Ferguson is an archeologist with the Institute of the North American West in Tucson, AZ; Leigh Jenkins is the Cultural Preservation Officer for the Hopi Tribe and a tribal member; Kurt Dongoske and Mike Yeatts are with the Cultural Preservation Office of the Hopi Tribe in Kykotsmobi, AZ; and Eric Polingyouma is a member of the Hopi Tribe.