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Chapter One: Study Overview

As part of its ongoing consultation responsibilities under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq., Nov. 16, 1990), the National Park Service (NPS) contracted with the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA) at the University of Arizona (UofA) under Cooperative Agreement Number H1200040002 to continue cultural affiliation investigations for the Flagstaff area National Monuments (NM): Sunset Crater Volcano NM (SUCR), Walnut Canyon NM (WACA), and Wupatki NM (WUPA). This document was preceded by and builds upon a review of existing cultural affiliation related documentation in the National Park Service’s Flagstaff and Regional Offices (Toupal and Stoffle 2001), and a traditional use study (Toupal et al. 2004).

Background

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was passed in order to provide a mechanism by which federally recognized tribes could request repatriation of particular cultural items from museums and federal agencies, specifically human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Regulations (43CFR10) provides additional guidance including definitions of cultural affiliation, the types of evidence to be considered in making cultural affiliation determinations, and considerations about the quality and quantity of evidence needed.

According to the regulations, a Native American tribe is culturally affiliated when “a relationship of shared group identity ... can reasonably be traced historically or prehistorically between members of a present-day Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and an identifiable earlier group.” The relationship of shared group identity is represented by a preponderance of evidence that leads to such a conclusion (43CFR10.2(e)). The evidence should be based on any of ten types of data: anthropological, archeological, biological, folkloric, geographical, historical, kinship, linguistic, oral tradition, or other expert opinion (43CFR10.14(e)).

As a standard of proof, a preponderance of evidence is considered to be that of greater weight or more convincing nature (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition). A finding of cultural affiliation, therefore, should be based upon the totality of the circumstances and evidence pertaining to the connection between the tribe and the material being claimed. A finding of cultural affiliation should not be withheld if gaps in the record exist (43CFR10.14(d)), consequently, tribes claiming cultural affiliation do not have to establish their claim with scientific certainty (43CFR10.14(f)).

The definition of cultural affiliation, the types of evidence, and the concept of preponderance are not without problems. Since any finding of cultural affiliation can have profound influence in real-world affairs, determining and evaluating claims of affiliation, or relationship with place, require careful attention to all types of evidence as well as traditional
knowledge (Gaff 2005). While reliance on archaeology and biology (genetics) often are tempting, both sciences are prone to misuse and/or misinterpretation (Dongoske et al. 1997; Gaff 2005; Shelton et al. 2000).

Dongoske et al. (1997:604-605) describe affiliation as more dynamic than what the sciences of archaeology and genetics tend to present. They explain the development of the Zuñi culture as simultaneously involving the archaeological cultures known as the Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hohokam. The Zuñi see ethnicity as being expressed more in religious beliefs and language than in material culture. For the Zuñi people “cultural, ethnic, and tribal affiliations [are] not necessarily synonymous with archaeological cultures. …[Tribes] can have equally valid cultural affiliation to an entire archaeological culture area, certain portions of that area at different times, specific sites, or even just certain cultural items.”

Shelton et al. (2000) explain the dynamic nature of affiliation with aspects of kinship that complicate biological evidence. They challenge the perceived conclusiveness underlying genetic data, which have the potential to diminish other types of evidence. Cultural rules about marriage, traditions of intermarriage, and adoptions create culturally affiliated people who have no biological evidence of affiliation. As Todd (2005:48) puts it, “ancestry does not equal identity.” Genetic data, consequently, is of limited usefulness in affiliation determinations.

Oral histories, on the other hand, can offer persuasive evidence of affiliation (Bohnert 2000; Gaff 2005), particularly those involving migration stories that include identification of places and other people encountered during the journey as in the Hopi and Zuñi traditions (Dongoske et al. 1997), and some Navajo accounts (Bohnert 2000). Since tribal people record their ancestry in oral traditions about their migration through, and use and occupation of identifiable lands, their age-old accounts can be visualized with contemporary technologies such as geographic information systems (GIS) (Shelton et al. 2000).

Based on these critiques of types of evidence and recommendations from the previous Flagstaff monument studies (Toupal and Stoffle 2001; Toupal et al. 2004), this report does not emphasize archaeological and biological evidence. Suggested references (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and materials provided by the Hualapai and Yavapai-Prescott tribes provide additional anthropological and oral tradition evidence for consideration with other types of evidence.

**Geographic and Cultural Focus**

The three Flagstaff area national monuments are located northeast and southeast of Flagstaff, Arizona (Figure 1). While the elevation at Flagstaff is 7,000 feet, the surrounding terrain ranges from 4,600 feet to over 12,000 feet on Humphreys Peak. The range of elevation contributes to a wide variety of ecosystems that are reflected at the three park units, each of which has a distinct geologic and ecological character.

As part of the San Francisco Peaks volcanic field, Sunset Crater Volcano is the youngest of the 500 to 600 volcanic cones in this field, and rises 1070 ft. to an elevation of
3030 ft. (Linford 2000). When it erupted between 1040 and 1100 (Elson 2004), it spread lava, ash, and cinders over 800 square miles of northern Arizona (Houk 1992). In 1930, President Herbert Hoover declared Sunset Crater and 3,040 surrounding acres a National Monument (Presidential Proclamation No. 1911, 46 Stat. 3023) in order to protect the sensitive geologic features of the area. Other significant features of the park include the Bonito Lava Flow, the Cinder Hills, Lenox Crater, hornitos, squeezeups, lava tubes, and an ice cave (National Park Service - SUCR 2001). Pockets of pine (*Pinus* spp.), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and woody and herbaceous vegetation can be found interspersed with the volcanic features.

Walnut Canyon comprises 3600 acres that include six miles of the twenty-mile long canyon for which it is named. The monument was established by President Woodrow Wilson (Presidential Proclamation No. 1318, 39 Stat. 1761) on November 30, 1915, to preserve the prehistoric ruins of ancient cliff dwellings and to properly manage the cultural and natural resources of historic, social, and scientific interest. Carved by Walnut Creek over 60 billion years, Walnut Canyon is lined with limestone ledges over sandstone walls that support ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) and Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) on the north-facing slopes, and piñon pine (*Pinus edulis*) and juniper (*Juniperus spp.*) on the south-facing slopes. The canyon bottom supports a rich riparian community that includes Arizona walnut (*Juglans major*), box elder (*Acer negundo*), New Mexico locust (*Robinia neomexicana*), aspen, cottonwood (*Populus spp.*) and canyon grape (*Vitis arizonica*) (Brandt 1997; National Park Service - WACA 2001).

Wupatki National Monument was established as a two-piece park unit in 1924 by President Calvin Coolidge (Presidential Proclamation No. 1721, 43 Stat. 1977) to preserve the prehistoric pueblo ruins. Several acreage and boundary adjustments (Presidential Proclamation No. 2243, 1937; Presidential Proclamation No. 2454, 1941; Public Law 87-134, 1961; Public Law 104-33, 1996) resulted in the consolidation of the non-contiguous
The largest of the three park units, Wupatki occupies approximately 35,422 acres of high desert that encompasses grasslands, mesas, buttes, red sandstone, and volcanic hills. The area supports a wide variety of desert plants including yucca (*Yucca baileyi*), Mormon tea (*Ephedra viridis*), and sagebrush (*Artemisia spp.*).

The Flagstaff area has an extensive history of cultural diversity. Archaeological characterizations place the Anasazi, Cohonina, Sinagua, and Mogollon cultures in and around the area for hundreds of years before European contact (Colton 1939; Duff 2002; Gumerman and Skinner 1968; Kroeber 1935; Pilles 1993; Plog 1979; Reed 1940; Steward 1941; Woodbury 1979). Early contact period (16th century) accounts identified Yavapai, Hualapai, Havasupai, and Hopi people with references to Southern Paiute and Apache peoples in the Flagstaff area (Bartlett 1942; Braatz 1999a; Brugge 1965; Forbes 1960; Goodwin 1942; Schroeder 1952, 1953, 1959; Schwartz 1956). In the 19th century, historic accounts included references to the Navajo people (Bailey and Bailey 1986; Brugge 1965).

These diverse cultures and populations define the Flagstaff area as central to a shared-use area with travel corridors from the west, north, and east, a finding also of the traditional use study (Toupal et al. 2004). While some of these cultures had more sedentary lifestyles in the vicinity, many of the groups were mobile and had seasonal camps at various locations throughout the north half of Arizona. Based on the archaeological record, the historic emphasis on Hopi and Navajo relationships with the Flagstaff area, and the two previous monument studies (Toupal and Stoffle 2001; Toupal et al. 2004), the cultural focus of this report is on the remaining groups of this shared use area: the Pai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuni people.

**Project Scope and Methodology**

This study focuses on particular data gaps previously identified for the Pai tribes, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuñi people (Table 1). The cultural affiliation data from the previous investigations span the ten types of evidence in varying degrees and time periods (Table 2-4).

In the previous studies, the Pai group, which included the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai people, was addressed as a singular group. In this work, however, the three tribes are addressed individually under the Pai heading. This structure provides for consistency with the previous studies while recognizing that the term Pai is inadequate for discussing the relationships each of the three tribes had with the Flagstaff area.

The primary methodology for this study was literature-based research. The documents and literature reviewed for this report included those identified in the initial review (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) as well as others identified for this report that address the specific tribes and the Flagstaff area. The tribes were contacted as well to identify specific documents that each felt were important to the report. In response, the Hualapai Tribe and Yavapai-Prescott Tribe provided materials, which have been included.
Research Team

The researchers involved in the literature review and synthesis have several years of experience in ethnographic investigations of tribal relationships with place. Dr. Toupal oversaw the contributions by Ms. Fauland and Mr. Chmara-Huff.

Dr. Rebecca S. Toupal is an assistant research scientist with over seven years of research experience with the Bureau of Applied Research (BARA) including work with Scandinavian fishermen, and 18 American Indian tribes in the southwest and Midwest. She has a B.S. in Forestry/Range Management from the University of Montana, a Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) from the University of Arizona (UA), and a Ph.D. in Renewable Natural Resource Studies from UA. Her publications include an article on successful conservation partnerships in the western U.S. in *High Plains Applied Anthropologist*, and an article on multiple cultural landscapes of a wilderness area in southern Arizona in *Conservation Ecology*.

Heather Fauland is a graduating senior majoring in Anthropology and Near East Studies at the University of Arizona. She has worked at BARA for three years on projects concerned with a variety of topics including African cultural astronomy, traditional ecological knowledge in the Bahamas, and Native American natural and cultural resource management. Her Honors Thesis is on the impacts of trails on traditional communities in the southwest.

Fletcher Chmara-Huff, a graduate student in the Department of Geography at the University of Arizona, recently completed his Masters thesis on the cultural landscapes of the Pahrump Band of Southern Paiutes. Mr. Chmara-Huff’s BA in Anthropology is also from the University of Arizona. His work at BARA includes investigations of Bahamian attachments to place, and cultural concerns of Southern Paiute people across the southern Nevada landscape.

Rachel Diaz de Valdes is a Ph. D. student majoring in Archaeology at the University of Arizona. She has a Master of Arts in Archaeology in which she examined faunal remains at Chevelon in northeastern Arizona. She has worked for three years on the Homol’ovi Research Project as an excavator, faunal analyst and edited volume contributor. She is currently part of the BARA team working on cultural affiliations with the Tonto National Monument.
Table 1. Cultural affiliation data needs identified by earlier studies (Toupal and Stoffle 2001; Toupal et al. 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pai</th>
<th>SUCR, WACA, WUPA</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify Pai-Sinagua connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify other activities, including burials that could occur with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yavapai people’s plant and animal use of the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Havasupai tribal elders to document stories (geographic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Direct documentation of the traditions and stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More complete account of Hualapai oral history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pai tribal elders for complimentary stories, and review of the stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to clarify the Pai-Zuni relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pai</th>
<th>SUCR, WACA, WUPA</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarify Hopi-Paiute connections and Paiutes as part of multi-ethnic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>groups that represent the Sinagua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More complete account of the oral history and possible foundation for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCP nominations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of Southern Paiute and Hopi histories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationship between the Kaibab Paiute and the Hopi tribe regarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatment of Anasazi remains suggests an inter-tribal recognition of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paiute affiliation with the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zuni</th>
<th>SUCR, WACA, WUPA</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In some cultural affiliation studies, association of Kayenta and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sinagua ceramics with Zuni needs investigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guided by Western Apache traditionalists through coordinated Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apache cultural resource compliance programs, identify items collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from WACA as well as “intellectual property” (cultural patrimony) in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collections or interpretive materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assemble descriptions of archaeological sites conventionally identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as early Western Apache. Such descriptions may be rare (Basso 1983:463)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider what possible early ancestral Apache/Navajo sites might look</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>like, including undated or precolumbian small or anomalous sites,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>features on larger precolumbian sites, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guided by Western Apache traditionalists, reassess WACA archaeological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventory (Doc. 16).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consult Western Apache traditionalists and CRM programs about items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in NPS Flagstaff “archeology collection.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Compile oral tradition from the available literature and from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultations with Western Apache CRM programs and traditionalists,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>most likely through a study of place names in and around WACA (and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WUPA/SUCR) (see Oral Tradition below).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Oral tradition contributes folkloric evidence as defined here when</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elements of oral tradition are analyzed for clues to the past and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>connections with groups who might have used the Monuments and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding area. Documents in this collection accomplish neither of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>these goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consult today’s Western Apache CRM programs and traditionalists by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extending place name study to area around WACA (also SUCR/WUPA?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultations with Western Apache traditionalist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache</th>
<th>WACA</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension of Western Apache place name study to region around</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WACA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data gap remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Cultural affiliation evidence and time frames for Sunset Crater Volcano NM (Toupal et al 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Shaded indicates adequate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traditional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Ar B F G H K L Or Ot</td>
<td>(time immemorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apache</strong></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An – Anthropological Ar – Archaeological B – Biological F – Folkloric G – Geographical
H - Historical K - Kinship L - Linguistic Or - Oral tradition Ot - Other

Table 3. Cultural affiliation evidence and time frames for Walnut Canyon NM (Toupal et al 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Shaded indicates adequate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traditional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Ar B F G H K L Or Ot</td>
<td>(time immemorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apache</strong></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An – Anthropological Ar – Archaeological B – Biological F – Folkloric G – Geographical
H - Historical K - Kinship L - Linguistic Or - Oral tradition Ot - Other

Table 4. Cultural affiliation evidence and time frames for Wupatki NM (Toupal et al 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Shaded indicates adequate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Traditional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Ar B F G H K L Or Ot</td>
<td>(time immemorial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apache</strong></td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An – Anthropological Ar – Archaeological B – Biological F – Folkloric G – Geographical
H - Historical K - Kinship L - Linguistic Or - Oral tradition Ot - Other
Chapter Two: Prehistoric and Historic Overview

In this chapter, a prehistoric and historic sketch is presented to provide a temporal and geographic context for the cultures associated with Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon, Wupatki, and the Flagstaff area in general. Regional migration and settlement patterns that indicate population fluctuations provide theoretical bases for connections between the people associated with archaeological cultures and contemporary tribes. The introduction of non-Indian cultures to the area provided additional influences to population changes that resulted ultimately in the contemporary reservations.

Sunset Crater

In the history of the Flagstaff area, an event of particular interest and relevance to the question of cultural affiliation with the three National Monuments is the eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano. Early dating techniques yielded estimates in the late 9th century, however, later techniques resulted in an adjustment to the 11th and possibly 12th centuries (Table 4). While the dating is not conclusive (Boston 1995), the overall length of the eruption may be as much as 100 to 200 years (Champion 1980; Pilles 1979; Shoemaker and Champion 1977). Definitive archaeological evidence for cinder deposits suggests 1050-1150 A.D. (Elson et al. 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>886 A.D. *</td>
<td>Colton (1943)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046-1071 A.D.</td>
<td>Colton (1945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064-1065 A.D. (winter of)</td>
<td>Smiley (1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066-1067 A.D.</td>
<td>Stanislawski (1963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066 A.D. *</td>
<td>Breternitz (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067 A.D.</td>
<td>Ellis (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064 and 1066 to 1067 A.D.</td>
<td>Pilles (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046 A.D.</td>
<td>Masse and Soklow (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064, 1066, 1067, and (possibly) 1068 to 1250 A.D.</td>
<td>Kamp (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Sept. 1064 &amp; June 1065, lasted until about 1220</td>
<td>Linford (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050-1150 A.D.</td>
<td>Elson et al. (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental conditions surrounding the eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano have been theorized based on evidence from modern cinder cone volcanoes. The ash plume may have been seen from high points as far away as Palm Springs (California), Las Vegas (Nevada), Durango (Colorado), west-central New Mexico, and along the Arizona-Mexico border. At night the fire fountain would have been visible from as far away as southern Utah, east, west, and central Arizona. Earthquakes may have occurred for weeks or months prior to the eruption with increasing frequency and magnitude. Weather created by the ash and steam would have included thunder and lightning, and forest fires would have been started by the ash fall. Air quality would have declined and been particularly detrimental for the very young.
and elderly. The fires would have spread beyond the extent of the lava flows and at least temporarily displaced human and wildlife communities (Elson et al. 2002).

In the 1930s, Dr. Harold Colton found that many of the pithouse dwellings within the vicinity of the park that dated between 650-1065 A.D. were burned and full of cinders from the primary eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano. No human remains were found suggesting the Sinagua farmers who lived in the area apparently had adequate warning of the eruption and moved to safe locations. Archaeological research and tree-ring analysis indicate that the people who built the pithouses not only survived but witnessed the birth and eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano between 1040 and 1100 A.D. Colton’s interpretation of events was that the farmers found the deep cinder and ash closer to Sunset Crater made farming impossible, but further north where the ash was less, the cinders functioned as a moisture-retaining mulch that made the new lands arable (NPS-SUCR 2001). Tree ring analysis indicates that decades of wet weather follow the eruption and likely had some influence on migration into the area (Elson 2004, 2006).

Tree-ring and ceramic data indicate that the greatest population increase was about 1130-1160 A.D., several generations after the presumed initial eruption of and period of cinder deposition from Sunset Crater. This lag in occupation may reflect a period of regeneration of the local flora and fauna, and of farming experimentation with Sunset Crater ash by the people living in the area (Sullivan and Downum 1991). At least eight eruptive periods of unknown length, however, have been documented for Sunset Crater (Amos 1986), so it is possible that the Wupatki area did not see significant cinder and ash deposition until the twelfth century (Hooten, Elson, and Ort 2001).

There is little question that the eruption of Sunset Crater greatly impacted the prehistoric inhabitants of the Flagstaff area, and possibly those in the greater northern Southwest. The event was the first of its kind in the Southwest United States for which there is no question that surrounding prehistoric populations witnessed it (Colton 1932, 1937), although, two other eruptions in the Southwest have been documented recently as occurring since human occupation of the region.

The McCartys flow near Grants, New Mexico has been dated to around 3160-3200 B.P. (Laughlin et al. 1993; Mabery et al. 1999), and the Little Springs flow near the north rim of the Grand Canyon (Fenton et al. 2001). For the latter event there is little question that it too was witnessed by prehistoric populations. Now estimated as occurring between 200 and 1200 A.D. (Gidwitz 2004), the Little Springs event may have a geophysical connection to the Sunset Crater eruption. It also has a ceremonial connection in that lava rocks with embedded sherds have been found within ruin walls found a mile from the volcano. The sherds are Hurricane Black-on-Gray, a type datable to 1050-1250 A.D. (Gidwitz 2004), further supporting a possible ceremonial connection to Sunset Crater and its corn rocks.

**Walnut Canyon**

Walnut Canyon went through the same population shifts as the rest of the Flagstaff area. The site went through several different periods of habitation between 600 and 1450
A.D., although, split-twig figurines found east of the park unit suggest occupation during the Archaic period (Euler and Olson 1965; Olson 1966). The people of Walnut Canyon were identified by Colton as the Sinagua, referring to the early Spanish of “Sierra Sinagua” or mountain range without water (Houk 1992). The name is a misnomer according to contemporary accounts by Havasupai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, Yavapai, and Zuñi consultants. They referred to the San Francisco Peaks as a source of water that traditionally could be tapped into throughout the surrounding landscape in the form of springs, ice caves, run-off, and streams. The water from these mountains was and is an important resource that has medicinal and spiritual qualities that contribute to its cultural significance (Toupal et al. 2004).

Colton considered them to be a branch of the Mogollon culture, and related to the Hohokam and Anasazi through trade and other connections (Reid and Whittlesey 1997). The Sinagua “made only light use of the Walnut Canyon area before their descendants returned in strength about 1125 A.D.” (Thybony 1996). They remained in the canyon for about one hundred years before leaving the area. By 1250, they had relocated southeast to the Clear Creek and Chavez Pass areas (Reid and Whittlesey 1997; Thybony 1996) to pueblos identified as ancestral locations of the Hopi (Moseley 2003). Ancestors of the Yavapai and Havasupai visited the area for several hundred years. The Apache and Navajo people also began seasonal gathering and hunting in the area sometime in the 19th century (Brandt 1997; NPS-WACA 2001).

**Wupatki**

Wupatki has been characterized as a multi-cultural frontier where many prehistoric cultures interacted. This is not surprising when one considers the strategic location of Wupatki on or near several natural travel corridors such as the Little Colorado River, Deadman Wash, and several mountain passes to the south and east. The archaeological landscape of the monument includes residential sites, ceremonial ballcourts, lithic quarries, agricultural fields, shrines, rock art, and other features (Toupal et al. 2004).

While some sites in Wupatki predate the eruption of Sunset Crater, most sites date from 1100 to 1275 A.D. The wide variety of site types indicates a diverse area of residential, agricultural, and ceremonial uses. Separate from the sites, isolated artifacts date human use of the area as early as 9500-9000 B.C. Evidence of Puebloan occupation sometime after 1000 A.D. has been documented but is limited to a couple of small sites. As with Walnut Canyon, the period of intense building and occupation in the Wupatki area lasted for about 120 to 150 years with the population beginning to decline after 1220 A.D.

Sullivan and Downum (1991) contend that the archaeological survey data for Wupatki suggests a settlement pattern of numerous, briefly-occupied sites and a few perennial population centers. Their interpretation of the data supports Pilles (1979, 1987) criticism of Colton’s (1932, 1936, 1945, 1946, 1949, 1960, 1965) land-rush version of Wupatki settlement. Their analysis also indicates that land-use in the Wupatki landscape was exceedingly light for about two generations after the Sunset Crater eruption. They found a
A drastic increase in archaeological evidence that suggested a rapidly growing population beginning around 1130 A.D., and ending around 1220 A.D.

Although the area was seemingly abandoned by the mid-13th century, it continued to be used periodically by Hopi travelers, ancestral Havasupai hunters, and others. Sometime in the 1800s, Navajo people began to graze their herds in the area using the Wupatki Basin as a seasonal residence (Colton 1946; NPS-WUPA 2001).

**Regional Migration and Settlement: Pre-Contact to 1800s**

Archaeological remains in the Flagstaff area often have been identified as Sinagua, although, the myriad items share many characteristics with the Western Anasazi, reflecting extensive trade and sharing of techniques. Ethnographic evidence “indicates reciprocal daily exchanges of foodstuffs between friends and kinsmen, periodic large-scale exchanges in association with seasonal ceremonies, and often exchanges between communities that specialize in the utilization of particular local plant and animal resources” (Plog 1979:127). Material evidence of the Western Anasazi is most abundant in the drainages of the Little Colorado River, the San Juan River, and their immediate tributaries (Plog 1979).

Archaeologists, anthropologists, and others continue to debate the prehistory of the Southwest while recognizing a core group of archaeologically-defined cultural groups. Since the mid-1930s, the prehistoric Southwest has been defined by four main cultural divisions: Hohokam, Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hakataya/Patayan (Figure 2) (Woodbury 1979). The Hakataya or Patayan subculture encompasses several groups, including the Yuman, Caddoan, Sinagua, and Cohonina. While these people were different linguistically, they had common ancestors and occupied common areas in the Southwest.

The cultural divisions of this subculture are not defined as well as those of the other subcultures. Archaeological evidence of the Hakataya subculture is fragmentary, and what has been found suggests a tendency of the dispersed Hakatayan peoples to reflect cultural influences from the peoples they lived near and with whom they traded (Woodbury 1979). According to Schroeder (1960), the cultural progression for the San Francisco Mountain area shifted around 700 A.D. from Hakataya to Sinagua, and later to Havasupai and Yavapai in the 19th century (Figure 3).

As part of the Hakataya/Patayan debate, Linford (1979:37) noted “that by 900 A.D. there were a number of populations within the culture area with material cultures sufficiently different to warrant their division into three groups: the Cerbat to the west, the Prescott to the southeast, and the Cohonina to the northeast.” He added that the material cultures of these groups [also] exhibited enough similarity to warrant their inclusion within the designation Patayan.

Schroeder (1960) hypothesized that the Prescott Branch became the Yavapai or were assimilated by the Cohonina. Linford (1979) described the Prescott people as practicing agriculture but migrating seasonally for wild foods. The Cohonina occupied the area bounded by Highway 89 (north of Flagstaff) on the east, the Grand Wash Cliffs on the west, the
Colorado River on the north, and the Mogollon Rim on the south (Euler 1963). They were the producers of San Francisco Mountain gray ware, which has been dated to 700-1150 A.D. (Linford 1979)

The Mogollon and Anasazi are ancestral Puebloan (Cordell 1994; Reed 1948, 1950; Weixelman 2004). Reed also felt the Anasazi should be restricted to the distinctive culture of the San Juan region from 300 to 1300 A.D. and described this Anasazi complex as extending “from the upper Rio Grande across the plateau to the Virgin River in southwestern Utah and southern Nevada, and from the Dolores River in southwestern Colorado south into the Little Colorado drainage” (Reed 1950:126). The Flagstaff area and the middle Verde are the locale of the Sinagua complex, and the area south and east of the San Francisco Peaks, i.e. Flagstaff to Wupatki, Winslow, and Chavez Pass, was as heavily populated as the San Juan region from about 300 to 1400 A.D. (Reed 1950). Houk (1995) notes, however, that ancestral puebloan (Anasazi) settlements had expanded westward and clustered around the San Francisco Peaks before the 1064 A.D. eruption of Sunset Crater.

In and south of the Little Colorado Valley, from the Verde Valley and Flagstaff to the White Mountains and the upper Gila, Anasazi traits from the San Juan region are largely absent. A few circular kivas have been found not far south of the Little Colorado River in the Wupatki area where the southern Anasazi boundary crosses the valley, and in the Forestdale Valley where Anasazi influence is found in an early horizon (Reed 1948). Mogollon influence also is seen in the early horizons of the Flagstaff area (Reed 1950). Various Anasazi traits, as well as Hohokam and other elements, are present in the Wupatki-Flagstaff district but Reed (1948) considers these to be comparatively minor influences or diffusions.

The Western Pueblo complex extends back into earlier horizons as indicated by the association of polished brownware and rectangular pithouses in the Flagstaff area dating to 750-900 A.D. Reed (1950:129) does not believe evidence exists that shows the Anasazi culture overwhelming and submerging the Mogollon culture around 1000 A.D. or at any other time. In the 13th century, the Western Pueblo complex expanded, replacing Anasazi traits along the northern Little Colorado, at Hopi and at Zuñi.

According to Gumerman and Skinner (1968:197), the middle Little Colorado River Valley “manifested an Anasazi-Mogollon amalgam, which, by adaptation to its environment, produced a distinct subculture area.” Evidence of a Sinagua presence was limited to “a handful of sherds, …[a] rectangular kiva, and extended burial pattern” [yet] extensive contact must have been maintained” given the large amount of Little Colorado White ware found in the Flagstaff area (Colton 1946).

Colton (1939) developed an archaeological classification consisting of four roots, each with one to three branches, and two to eight foci per branch. Using this system, he named the Kayenta branch of the Anasazi as the basic culture in northern Arizona (north of Holbrook and Flagstaff) from 500 and 1300 A.D. He identified the Tusayan branch as a local specialization of Kayenta in Hopi country from 900 A.D. to the present. The cultural manifestations in the vicinity of Flagstaff that Colton could not assign to the Anasazi root,
were assigned tentatively to Hohokam, Mogollon and Patayan roots. Reed (1940) found Mogollon influence to be evident in the Flagstaff and Verde areas.

While many made use of his system, it was not without problems, one of the most noted being that his classification did not allow for cultural blends (Steward 1941). This criticism is made evident by his “definitions” of Cohonina and Sinagua. Cohonina consisted of 47% of the features shared by Patayan, 42% by Hohokam, 33% by Anasazi, and 31% by Mogollon. Sinagua consisted of 50% Mogollon and 47% Anasazi.

Schroeder (1960) mapped a chronology of major events that he viewed as affecting the processes of cultural change in Arizona (Figures 4-5). He began with the four basic cultural roots - Hakataya, Puebloid, Anasazi, and Mogollon - followed by the introduction and expansion of the Hohokam, and the introduction of the Sonoran. The next change occurred as Hohokam influence moved north while Anasazi came in from the east and Mogollon from the southeast, which resulted in the Sinagua; this step in the progression coincided with the eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano. An expansion of the Sinagua and the introduction of Shoshonean root from the northwest followed. As the Sinagua moved south, they blended with the Hohokam to give rise to the Ootam (O’odham). The Anasazi withdrew eastward from the Flagstaff area, and in the south, the pre-Pima pattern arose from the Sinagua-Hohokam blending. The Mogollon withdrew to the southeast from Flagstaff, and late prehistoric cultural branches appeared in the archaeological record. The last map in the series shows a shift from archaeological labels for people to tribal names for the cultural groups, which developed as first contact was made with European explorers.

Although McGregor (1951) postulated a connection between the Sinagua and Mogollon peoples, Schroeder (1960) found little to no cultural affiliation between the two groups before 1070 A.D. Schroeder interpreted the pre-1070 Sinagua to be a northern branch of the Pioneer Period culture, well-removed from influences coming out of Mexico (such as rancheria farming settlements and ballcourts). Around 1070, however, a group of Hohokam people moved north out of the Verde Valley and joined the Sinagua near Winona introducing some of the southern traits. At the same time, the Sinagua were influenced by Anasazi and Mogollon groups who came to the area (Table 5).

While regional chronological schemes aid organization of the vast amount of archaeological data, often these are limited to providing a culture history and a background for culture change and processes of change. The scale of the population movements of the late prehistoric period is important to understanding such regional cultural phenomena including the connections between historic and contemporary tribes and their ancestors (Lyons 2003). The continuity of cultural groups in the Southwest may not be as direct and close as previously thought, however, contemporary groups are connected to those responsible for archaeological remains in the Southwest (Woodbury 1979).
Figure 2. Chronological subdivisions of the four major cultures of the Southwest (Woodbury 1979:29).

Figure 3. Historical development of the Hakataya (Schroeder 1960).
Figure 4. Cultural change in Arizona pre-700 A.D. to 1150 A.D. (Schroeder 1960).
Figure 5. Cultural change in Arizona 1275 A.D. to the contact era (Schroeder 1960).
Table 6. Archaeological traits introduced to the Flagstaff Sinagua 1070-1120 A.D. (Schroeder 1960)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hohokam</th>
<th>Anasazi and/or Mogollon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architecture</strong></td>
<td>a rectangular jacal with wall posts and a gabled roof supported by 2 posts, and ball courts, firepit near entry</td>
<td>pithouse with alcove, hatch entry, deflector and ventilator; small surface masonry pueblo with contiguous rooms, side entry, T-doors, lack of roof supports in the floor, posts embedded in roof supports, and use of cavates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposal of dead</strong></td>
<td>pit and urn cremation in trash</td>
<td>flexed burials (intrusive) and subfloor burial in pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shell</strong></td>
<td>variety of bead types including disc beads, incising, painting, and overlaying shell, plain and effigy shell pendants, shell ring, carved shell,</td>
<td>tinkler, inlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stone</strong></td>
<td>plain or carved basalt cylinder, carved stone, two-legged stone with knob, palette, stone bowl, stone effigy vessel</td>
<td>full groove axe, polishing pebble, lignite, arrow smoother, basalt cylinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clay</strong></td>
<td>shouldered jar, recurved bowls, heavy-walled pottery vessel and applique decoration</td>
<td>polished and slipped pottery, redware, smudging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metal</strong></td>
<td>copper bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wood</strong></td>
<td>cradle board (perhaps pre-1070 A.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>trash mound, weft-warp open weave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schroeder (1960) and Colton (1932, 1936, 1945, 1946, 1949, 1960, 1965), among others, attributed the influx of people to the “newly created farmlands” created by the 1040-1100 eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano. Pilley (1979, 1993), however, questioned the land rush theory given recent geophysical evidence for a 200-year eruption period. He attributed migration into the area to changes in climatic conditions. Gumerman and Skinner (1968) also credited regional drought as well as cultural pressures as instigating the migration.

Other research has suggested that the volcanic attraction included a spiritual component, that the eruption reflected the world being out of balance and in need of rebalancing through ceremonial activities (Creel and McKusick 1994; Elson et al. 2002; Hargrave 1970; Toupal et al. 2004). Physical evidence suggesting ceremonialism includes large numbers of scarlet macaws found at Pueblo Bonito, Wupatki, and other similar sites that date 1000-1200 A.D. (Hargrave 1970), macaws in Sinagua sites (Creel and McKusick 1994), and corn rocks, lava rocks with impressions of corn cobs, found in and around structural remains at Sunset Crater (Elson et al. 2002).

Bettison (1998) also found settlement to be driven by more than environmental features. In her analysis of traditional settlement pattern studies, she found that some studies assumed that prehistoric settlement locations reflect past environmental conditions, optimal arable lands, local technology, and social and political organization. Other studies took an ecological approach and assumed fixed resources, such as arable lands, dictated settlement locations. She concluded that combinations of social, political, and environmental factors can override the preference to locate settlements near fixed resources and entice people to relocate.
from arable lands to larger population centers with less desirable fields. Her results also challenge the popular notion that the best fields are proximate to archaeological sites.

Schroeder (1960) attributes the Sinagua’s gradual move south to overcrowded conditions around Flagstaff. The Anasazi also left the Flagstaff area but later in the early 1200s moved back across the Little Colorado River. Reed (1950) attributes the population shifts out of the Flagstaff area, as well as the Mimbres and the San Juan areas, to drought and/or enemy pressure. While the archaeological record allows for a variety of interpretations (Figures 6-9), it also maintains a consistent core of Flagstaff cultures: Anasazi, Mogollon, and Sinagua. As Zedeno and Stoffle (1996) pointed out, the movements and locations of cultural groups in Arizona must be considered in the context of everything that was occurring in and around Arizona.

Figure 6. Early 12th century cultures (Colton 1943)

Figure 7. Archaeological branches and historic pueblos (Reed 1950)
Figure 8. The Ancient Southwest (Bell and Lavender 1999)

Figure 9. Archaeological regions of the Southwest during the Great Drought, 1276-1299 (Jones et al. 1999)
The Aboriginal Period: 1850-1950

In the mid-19th century, settlers began to move into the area in greater numbers following the shift of control of the Arizona territory to the United States. The U.S. managed tribal-settler conflicts with a series of treaties and executive orders (Table 7), gradually reducing tribal lands from the entire territory to approximately one-quarter of it by the 1890s (Figures 10 and 11). In 1978, the United States Geological Survey prepared the “Indian Land Areas Judicially Established 1978” map, which illustrates the results of the claims cases heard by the Indian Claims Commission including those in Arizona (Figure 12).

As a source of geographic evidence of cultural affiliation, the Land Claims map is useful but limited. It does not consider shared use areas such as those around Flagstaff and the three national monuments, nor does it reflect temporal variations. The Navajo area, for example, reflects Brugge’s (1983) documentation for the 1800s after the Navajo people had expanded their territory west of the Little Colorado River. With the exception of the Navajo Nation, tribal lands in Arizona today occupy greatly reduced acreages from pre-contact times, although, many of the reservations include traditional homelands (Figure 13).

Contributing to the shift from archaeologically-defined cultural groups to identifiable tribes (1200-1400 A.D.) were the eruptions of Sunset Crater in the 11th and 12th centuries, which brought an influx of people to the region. Environmental conditions in the region may have contributed to the influx as well. From 500 to 1150 A.D., the region east of Flagstaff was favorable for agriculture with high water tables and plenty of rainfall. From 1150 to 1200 A.D., however, conditions were dry and water tables dropped. Adequate moisture characterized the area once again from 1200 to 1275 A.D. but dry conditions returned and predominated for the next 225 years (Dean 1995; Dean et al. 1985; Hall 1985). Relative to cultural affiliation, mobile lifestyles, multiple migrations, and environmental impacts compounded each other to produce the likelihood of culturally diverse human remains and associated funerary objects throughout the Flagstaff area.

Anasazi, Mogollon, Sinagua, and Cohonina are normative cultural concepts based on material culture and, as such, are of little help in cultural affiliation determinations. Originally, these designations were believed to correspond to prehistoric social units, however, as our understanding of group dynamics, clan histories, and community diversity has expanded in recent years, the correlations are subject to criticism (Bohnert 2000). When considered with other types of evidence, however, these archaeologically-defined cultural groups can be connected somewhat to contemporary tribes.

Genetically, the ancient Anasazi are more closely related to modern Pueblo groups than to Athapaskan-speaking groups (Navajo, Apache) and modern Numic-speaking groups in the region (Carlyle 2003). Remembering that genetic data is problematic (Dongoske et al. 1997; Gaff 2005; Shelton et al. 2000), in this case the data are consistent with previous interpretations of archaeological and ethnographic records, which indicate that the Anasazi are more closely related to Acoma, Jemez, Hopi, and Zuñi, than to Navajo and Apache (Carlyle 2003). Carlyle also found no strong indications of eastern and western Anasazi groups but theorized the possibility of north-south divisions.
Table 7. Selected Land Cession Treaties and Executive Orders by Date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Where Signed</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Map Name</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/1/1869</td>
<td>Fort Sumner, NM</td>
<td>Stat. L, XV, 667</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>UT 1, AZ 1, NM 1</td>
<td>Navaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/1870</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>War Department</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>AZ 1</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/1871</td>
<td>Camp Verde, AZ</td>
<td>Indian Commissioner</td>
<td>w/in 689</td>
<td>AZ 1</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/1872</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/1873</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/1874</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>558</td>
<td>UT 1, AZ 1, NV, CA 2</td>
<td>Paiute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/1874</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/23/1875</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>582</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27/1876</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>592</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/1876</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/1877</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/1877</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>602</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/1877</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>603</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/1878</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Navaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/1880</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
<td>AZ 2, NM 2</td>
<td>Navaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/1880</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td>w/in 482</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>AZ 1</td>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/1880</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/1882</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Moki (Hopi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4/1883</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>641</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Walapai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/1884</td>
<td>Executive order</td>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>AZ 2, UT 2</td>
<td>Navaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/1886</td>
<td>Act of Congress</td>
<td>Stat. L, XI, 374</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>AZ 1</td>
<td>Moki (Hopi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/1886</td>
<td>Act of Congress</td>
<td>Stat. L, XI, 374</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>AZ 1, NM 1</td>
<td>Apache (western bands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/1893</td>
<td>Act of Congress</td>
<td>Stat. L, XXVII, 469</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>AZ 2</td>
<td>Apache, White Mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Western bands of the Apache comprise all those bands whose ancestral territory lay to the west of the Rio Grande, the most important of these bands being the Tonto, Mimbres, Mogollon, Coyote, Pinal, and a few of the Mescalero and Jicarilla. No treaty of purchase was made with them. The U. S. took possession of their country, assigning them from time to time sundry reservations, the boundaries of which are shown on Arizona and New Mexico maps No. 2. Their original domain in Arizona is shown on Arizona map #1-689.
Figure 10. Lands claimed by the tribes at the beginning of their relationships with the U.S. government (Royce 1899).
Figure 11. Tribal lands in Arizona after 1890 (Royce 1899).
Figure 12. Indian land areas in Arizona established judicially by 1978 (Indian Claims Commission and USGS 1993).
Figure 13. Tribal Reservations in Arizona (EPA 1999).
Of the tribes with whom this report is concerned, those claiming affiliation with the Anasazi, however, include the Western Apache and the Southern Paiutes of the Four Corners area (Bohnert 2000). The perspective of the Western Apache people reflects some of the issues raised by Dongoske et al. (1997), Gaff (2005), and Shelton et al. (2000). Cultural rules about marriage, traditions of intermarriage, and adoptions create culturally affiliated people who have no biological evidence of affiliation. Simply put, “ancestry does not equal identity” (Todd 2005:48).

The Yavapai claim affiliation with the Sinagua including those in Walnut Canyon (Satala 1990). The Havasupai can be connected to the Cohonina (Euler 1958; Schwartz 1955), and the Hualapai to the Cerbat (Dobyns 1956; Euler 1958).
Chapter Three: Cultural Affiliation of the Pai Tribes

Newly compiled evidence of cultural affiliation of the Zuñi Tribe with Sunset Crater Volcano, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki national monuments builds on the two previous studies of cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and traditional association (Toupal et al. 2004). Summaries of those studies are presented as background to the data obtained for this chapter.

Tier 1: 2001 Cultural Affiliation Summary

In the original document review for cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001), the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai people were found to be affiliated with Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki more than what has been understood previously. Their affiliation with Sunset Crater was supported by anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, oral tradition, and other expert evidence (Table 8). Their affiliation was based in part on evidence of wide-spread interactions among descendants of the Sinagua and Anasazi that addressed all time frames (Table 9).

Table 8. Pai cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Time frame of Pai cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anthropological evidence was based on Sinagua occupation of the Flagstaff area prior to the Sunset Crater eruptions in the 11th century and included traditional uses of plants and animals in and around Sunset Crater as well as temporary residences. Plant uses included food and medicine. The archaeological evidence was limited to the presence of Sinagua pottery with which the Havasupai and Hualapai people had an indirect association, and the Yavapai people had a direct association. The folkloric evidence includes origin stories that involve the area surrounding Sunset Crater. Havasupai folklore involves the San

---

2 Document 8 – Anthropological Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography for Sunset Crater Volcano and Wupatki National Monuments
3 Document 2 – NPS-Tribes Meeting, 12/12/97
Francisco Peaks and Sunset Crater. Smithson and Euler (1971) established a very significant primordial connection between Havasupai and Sunset Crater.²

Geographic and historical evidence overlap and cover much of the Coconino Plateau and Flagstaff area. Sunset Crater is within the traditional territories of the Havasupai, the Hualapai, and the Yavapai. Sunset Crater Volcano was identified as the House of the Sun in a Havasupai story (Smithson and Euler 1971). This area has cultural significance for the Havasupai. The San Francisco Peaks have cosmological significance for the Havasupai and are on the southeastern edge of their aboriginal territory. The Havasupai lived on Gray Mountain and the surrounding plateau in the late 1800s.²

The Hualapai, some Yavapai, and the Havasupai had adjacent territories in north central Arizona. Overlapping claims include land from the big bend of the Colorado River to the south near Bill Williams Mountain, the Santa Maria River, and to the east to Moenkopi. Ancient trails connected the Grand Canyon and San Francisco Peaks with Pai country. Sunset Crater was part of a long-time trading area of the Hualapai. The landscape bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is a sacred geography anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices of the Pai.²

Stewart (1942) and Driver (1953) showed Havasupai territory as encompassing all three Flagstaff area national monuments. Their maps also showed Walapai territory to the west of Havasupai.⁴ Havasupai territory extended south of the Little Colorado and south of Moenkopi Wash (Map O). Yavapai territory ran along Cottonwood Wash (Moqui Buttes area) prior to 1853 (Map N). The Havasupai traditionally met the Navajo people in the San Francisco Mountains.⁵

Kinship evidence derived from patterns of marrying outside small communities that were accelerated by the great population losses following contact. The Havasupai, the Hualapai, and the Yavapai followed this pattern and also took in migrants. Oral traditions of the Hualapai involve Sunset Crater and the surrounding area.² Other expert evidence is concerned with Zuñi traditional history, which includes stories about the Havasupai people. Zuñi claims cultural affiliation with the Hohokam, Sinagua, and Fremont groups. Their statements implied Pai affiliation with the Sunset Crater area.⁶

Pai cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon was supported by anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, kinship, and other expert evidence (Table 10). The evidence addressed all time frames (Table 11) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

---

⁴ Document 59 – US Govt. Memorandum to Williams from Wenger 1/17/68 with maps and 19th century military correspondence
⁵ Document 60 – NPS Memorandum to Superintendent, Canyon de Chelly from Acting Regional Archeologist 6/25/64 with bibliography and map
⁶ Document 22 – Results of the Conference “Traditional Histories of the Pre-Columbian Past” 6/95
Table 10. Pai cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Time frame of Pai cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological evidence stated that the pre-Columbian dwellers of Walnut Canyon were active participants socially and economically throughout the southwest, and may have contributed to the rise of non-Puebloan tribes like the Havasupai.\(^7\) The Sinagua culture developed in the Walnut Canyon area,\(^8\) and people of the Sinagua culture, with whom the Pai are associated, resided in Walnut Canyon 1125-1200 A.D.\(^1\) Whipple’s 1853 expedition called the “tribe that roams over this region” the Cosnino, a Zuñi term for the “piñon nut people.”\(^9\) The Yavapai collected plants for food and medicine, especially piñon nuts. The Pai groups are well-versed in the biodiversity and use of plants and animals of the San Francisco Peaks.\(^2\)

Archaeological evidence includes the presence of Sinagua pottery.\(^3\) The major period of occupation in Walnut Canyon was 700-1250 A.D. and a predominance of Alameda brown ware points to Northern Sinagua cultural affiliation. Architectural variability and widely scattered sites suggest cultural diversity and organization. In addition to the Northern Sinagua, the area shows influences of Cohonina, Southern Sinagua, and Prescott groups.\(^9\) Alameda brown ware (Sinagua) comprises 92.7% of the undecorated sherds at Walnut Canyon while San Francisco gray ware (Cohonina) comprises 1.6%.\(^1, 10\) Other work found 86% Alameda brown ware (Northern Sinagua) and 1.4% of San Francisco gray ware (Cohonino), as well as a variety of Northern Sinagua point types.\(^9\) NAGPRA remains and artifacts have been attributed to the Northern Sinagua and dated to 700-900 years ago.\(^11\)

Folkloric evidence was found in Pai origin stories that involve the area surrounding Walnut Canyon.\(^2\) Geographic and historical evidence overlap and cover much of the Coconino Plateau and Flagstaff area. The Yavapai consider Walnut Canyon as part of their aboriginal territory. The Havasupai lived on Gray Mountain and the surrounding plateau in the late 1800s. The Hualapai, some Yavapai, and the Havasupai had adjacent territories in north central Arizona. Overlapping claims include land from the big bend of the Colorado

\(^7\) Document 6 – Nihi Kéh nahazá: Our Place in this Land
\(^8\) Document 15 – Walnut Canyon National Monument: An Administrative History
\(^11\) Document 23 – Preliminary NAGPRA Inventory-related Information
River south near Bill Williams Mountain, the Santa Maria River, and east to Moenkopi. Ancient trails connected the Grand Canyon and San Francisco Peaks with Pai country. The landscape bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is a sacred geography for the Pai that is anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices.²

Stewart (1942) and Driver (1953) showed Havasupai territory as encompassing all three Flagstaff area national monuments. Their maps also showed Walapai territory to the west of Havasupai.⁴ Havasupai territory extended south of the Little Colorado and south of Moenkopi Wash (Map O). Yavapai territory ran along Cottonwood Wash (Moqui Buttes area) prior to 1853 (Map N). The Havasupai traditionally met the Navajo people in the San Francisco Mountains.⁵

Kinship evidence derived from patterns of marrying outside small communities that were accelerated by the great population losses following contact. The Havasupai, the Hualapai, and the Yavapai followed this pattern and also took in migrants. Oral traditions of the Hualapai involve Walnut Canyon and the surrounding area.² Oral traditions involve places in the Flagstaff area, suggesting the possibilities of TCPs. Other expert evidence is concerned with Zuñi traditional history, which includes stories about the Havasupai people. Zuñi claims cultural affiliation with the Hohokam, Sinagua, and Fremont groups. Their statements implied Pai affiliation with the Walnut Canyon area.¹²

Pai cultural affiliation with Wupatki was supported by anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, kinship, oral tradition, and other expert evidence (Table 12). The evidence addressed all time frames (Table 13) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

Table 12. Pai cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Time frame of Pai cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review.

| Traditional (≈ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s) | Aboriginal (mid-1800s) | Historic (mid-1800s) | Today | X | X | X | X |

Anthropological evidence included a chronology that had the Sinagua and Cohonina arriving in 1066 A.D. The Cohonina followed Sinagua, and in turn were followed by the

¹² Document 22 – Results of the Conference “Traditional Histories of the Pre-Columbian Past” 6/95
Kayenta Anasazi. The Pai groups are well-versed in the biodiversity and use of plants and animals of the San Francisco Peaks. Plant uses include food and medicine. The Yavapai utilized, but did not occupy this area. 

Archaeological evidence included a NAGPRA inventory that resolved the Havasupai-Sinagua connection, and confirmed the “likely” Havasupai and Hualapai affiliations. Park-wide, Alameda brown ware (Sinagua) was found to comprise 37.4% of undecorated sherds at Wupatki while San Francisco gray ware (Cohonina) comprised 11.7% and Prescott gray ware comprised 1.6%. Alameda brown ware comprised 71% of the undecorated sherds at Wupatki Pueblo. Based on plain ware, Sinagua sites were determined to be concentrated in south-central and southeast Wupatki, while Cohonina and Prescott sites were concentrated in the far western portion of Wupatki. Rock art styles include Kayenta Anasazi, Little Colorado Anasazi, and Sinagua. Alameda brown ware is associated with the Sinagua. The Sinagua burial type of extended position was found at Nalakihu pueblo. Other NAGPRA remains and objects were attributed to the Northern Sinagua and dated to 700-900 years ago.

Folkloric evidence included origin stories that involve the area surrounding Wupatki. Havasupai folklore involves the San Francisco Peaks. Geographic and historical evidence overlap and cover much of the Coconino Plateau and Flagstaff area. Wupatki is in the traditional territories of the Havasupai, the Hualapai, and the Yavapai. Cultural resources in Wupatki have been connected to the Hopi Rattlesnake Clan, which may reflect a Pai/Paiute connection. The Hualapai had a period of residence in Wupatki Basin, and the Havasupai utilized the Coconino Plateau. Both the Havasupai and Hualapai people gave the Navajo refuge from the U.S. army in the 1860s. The San Francisco Peaks have cosmological significance for the Havasupai and are on the southeastern edge of their aboriginal territory. The Havasupai lived on Gray Mountain and the surrounding plateau in the late 1800s.

The Hualapai, some Yavapai, and the Havasupai had adjacent territories in north central Arizona. Overlapping claims include land from the big bend of the Colorado River to the south near Bill Williams Mountain, the Santa Maria River, and to the east to Moenkopi. Ancient trails connected Wupatki, the Grand Canyon, and San Francisco Peaks with Pai country. Sunset Crater was part of a long-time trading area of the Hualapai. The landscape bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is a sacred geography anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices of the Pai.

Stewart (1942) and Driver (1953) showed Havasupai territory as encompassing all three Flagstaff area national monuments. Their maps also showed Walapai territory to the west of Havasupai. Havasupai territory extended south of the Little Colorado and south of Moenkopi Wash (Map O). Yavapai territory ran along Cottonwood Wash (Moqui Buttes area) prior to 1853 (Map N). The Havasupai traditionally met the Navajo people in the San Francisco Mountains.

Kinship evidence derived from patterns of marrying outside small communities that were accelerated by the great population losses following contact. The Havasupai, the
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Hualapai, and the Yavapai followed this pattern and also took in migrants. Oral traditions of the Hualapai involve Wupatki and the surrounding area. Other expert evidence is concerned with Zuñi traditional history, which includes stories about the Havasupai people. Zuñi claims cultural affiliation with the Hohokam, Sinagua, and Fremont groups. Their statements implied Pai affiliation with the Wupatki area.

**Tier 2: 2004 Traditional Association Summary**

The Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai people are traditionally associated with the three national monuments. The summaries that follow reflect traditional association for the Pai with some tribal-specific comments. The summaries are taken directly from Toupal et al. (2004) and presented for each park unit as well as the overall landscape.

**Sunset Crater**

The area surrounding the Lava Flow Trail has traditionally been referred to as Ba'wanwa and Wi'hagnbaiga meaning “Snow Mountains” and used by the Pai people for a variety of purposes. Due to the sanctity of the site, permanent settlements would not have been established. Instead, the place was used for such religious activities as vision quests or preparations for ceremonies and hunting. In former times, prayer, songs and sacrificial activities were performed before and after the volcanic eruption. Lava rocks would have been gathered for use in sweat lodges. Firewood, piñons, pitch, and berries were also collected from the region. The Pai believe that astronomical knowledge could have been obtained at Sunset Crater as well.

Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument does not exist in isolation from other places. To the Pai, Walnut Canyon holds the strongest connection to Sunset Crater. The trade routes between the Hualapai, Yavapai and the Hopi people also connect this place to others in the region. These connections were established through origin stories including one story involving a fly that informed the people of the coming volcanic eruption. The circular lava structure that resembles a Yavapai wikkiup is evidence of the long-term interaction with Sunset Crater by Indian people. This natural form of housing would have been used during the summer months while on trading, hunting, plant gathering or power seeking expeditions.

Specific features within the monument that are held with cultural significance include the water and snow that accumulate in and around the crater as well as the streams that flow beneath the earth. Used on a daily or seasonal basis, water and snow were collected for food, drink, medicine and ceremony. Water was used also for tanning hides and making baskets. It was noted that it was also carried from Sunset Crater to Wupatki to be used conservatively. Traditionally, warriors would utilize snow. For example, they would walk barefoot through it to learn to endure pain. Snow was also employed to purify a newly wed couple by washing themselves while naked.

The plants and animals found in the monument are considered to be more powerful than those in adjacent areas because of the sacredness of the site. As a result, all of the plants have importance including the saltbush, cliffrose, piñons, sage, century plants and cedar.
These were made use of either on a daily or seasonal basis for food, medicine, ceremony, or for making useful implements. If a botanical resource became limited, the Pai people would travel elsewhere to ensure its preservation. The deer, coyotes, eagles, hawks, raccoons, foxes and bears were seasonally relied on for food, medicine, ceremony, clothing and tools. Each animal had specific ceremonies and prayers to obtain what was needed. For instance, a deer dance has to be performed before collecting hide and antlers. Similarly, there are certain times when people avoid hunting such as when animals are mating or when certain ceremonies are occurring.

To the Pai, the mountains, the crater, the ice cave, the lava rocks, and the cinders are regarded as “elders” with powerful abilities. These geological features were not only territorial makers but were sought throughout the year to seek knowledge and power, for ceremonies, to teach new generations valuable cultural traditions or to communicate with spiritual beings through prayer. In particular, the lava rocks were heated and used in sweatlodges, to warm houses or to heat the bed of someone experiencing aches and pains. Participating in a sweat lodge was described as going to church or returning to the “mother’s womb.” The Pai consultants also believe that the ice cave could have been used to store food during hot summer months.

Walnut Canyon

Walnut Canyon is known to the Pai representatives as being a place of the juka, or ancient people. One elder said that the Island Trail area is similar to sites near Supai. The representatives explained that the juka were not a single group of people because four to six different styles of pottery were found there that had gray, brown, yellow, red and white colors. They explained that the canyon has cultural connections to many places in Northern Arizona including Verde Valley, San Francisco Peaks, Supai, and Hopi because it was on part of a trade trail.

The juka used Walnut Canyon to prepare for ceremonies. The Pai elders also speculated that Walnut Canyon was established so people from all areas could come see the volcano. This area was used as well for burials, trade, initiations, and ceremonial preparations and interactions. One elder felt the canyon could have been a place of meditation prior to going to Sunset Crater or Wupatki, and that the water would have been used for medicine, bathing, and for sweats.

They probably went to the Crater or to the circle at Wupatki for the actual ceremony. Singers, flute players, hunters, shaman, and children would be given the gift here. The Zuñi, Hopi, Cohonina, and Yavapai interacted here. People came here for ceremony, especially during the eruption. The shaman would go watch the eruption.

If children were here, they would have been involved in initiation. We have places in the canyon where people prepare themselves for vision quests; they are all isolated [like this]. When the Hopi Snow Clan sends people to Supai,
they always prepare. They live in isolation before coming, and do not return overnight.

The Pai people used many of the plants for a variety of purposes. Yucca was considered a staple plant and was used for food, shoes, clothes, padding, rope, pouches, and belts. Pai people constructed rope bridges out of yucca so they could cross the canyon. They gathered Mormon tea and cedar for medicines and cleansing. Grasses were used for bedding and century plants were cooked with grass for travel food. Medicine men using the plants for religious purposes would put paintings on the plants, especially at the springs.

Elk, deer, rabbits, and bears continue to be used by the Pai people. Animals were used for food, ceremony, and medicine. According to one elder, food was shared with everyone, and bear blood was used for medicine and ceremonies. A rock cairn with a long stick sticking out of its top was, according to one representative, a hunter’s mark or shrine. It meant that the location was a prime hunting spot. The representatives noted that the Hopi people make similar shrines but put feathers around the rocks.

The Pai representatives identified the dwellings, religious signs and shrines, pottery, and burials as evidence of extensive previous use. One elder discussed the presence of a Kokopelli symbol in the canyon:

There is a mark down by the spring of a figure like Kokopelli playing the flute. Kamee was the flute player, he was different than Kokopelli; he has power. His music entices women, because music has lots of power. A power flute of Kamee was found in this area also [near San Francisco Peaks]. Kamee was the one that raised animals around Red Butte. The paintings and peckings were put there by medicine men. Shaman splatter paint or dye at plants to consecrate them. If they practiced black magic, all of their possessions would be destroyed. These structures are juka, kagina.

One elder explained the significance of the geology saying, “This is a place to come and teach people, where the shamans or powerful people taught others. The canyon can take in songs, and return them later to someone. It can give the song to someone when they need it.”

Wupatki

A Pai elder referred to Doney Mountain as jukanwa, meaning ancient dwellings. The Pai people believe that their ancestors used this area as a result of evidence in the form of Pai pottery. The Pai representatives believe that people lived at Wupatki and not Wukoki because, “At Wupatki, there was living, competing in games, and council meetings. At Wukoki, there is no evidence of cooking. It must have been a stopping place. This place was a part of trade trails.” Another Pai elder believes that this was the site of a ceremony.

The Circle Dance was ‘matyjuudua,’ and it could have been held here. There is a central staff with the enemy’s head in the center of the ring. There could be
such a dance here … People would come here for competition, to trade, to hold ceremonies. People came for blessings from the wind home [blowhole] … The people here could collect bird feathers.

Wupatki and Wukoki are connected to many places in northern Arizona. The elders identified connections to Yavapai and Hopi territories, and to the San Francisco Peaks. One elder explained, “This land is Yavapai traditional all the way to the Colorado River. Long ago, the Hopis lived with the Yavapais. The San Francisco Peaks are sacred to the Yavapai, it is in our origin story.”

The Pai representatives identified plants including Mormon tea, cedar, and cliffrose. Some of the plants are used as medicine and food, in blessings and prayers, and for burials. Detailed plant information can be found in Appendix C.

The Pai participants identified deer, elk, and bear as important animals in the area. According to one elder, “Bear was our grandfather, so we didn’t hunt bear.” Another representative stated, “The animals here are the same as elsewhere in terms of power. They are not here because of all the automobiles and National Park Service buildings. This is changing the balance of the spirituality of this place.” The representatives identified use of animals after prayers, for clothing made from buckskins, and other purposes. The materials included dresses, shoes, and burden baskets.

The elders included the ball court and ruins at Wupatki and Wukoki in their discussions of evidence of traditional use. The ball court or Gh-tsu-o was identified as a place of games, trading, and meetings. The ruins, particularly at Wukoki, were identified as places of power.

We used to play games that were like hockey with a ball. At the ball court, there was also a meeting area. Wupatki was probably a trading place; it is in a central location. This place is between the Verde Valley and Hopi. Coconino is a Hopi word to describe Pai people.

At Wukoki, you could feel the power. Something came out and touched me. There is more power there than at the main ruins. It was built strong.

Geologic features of cultural importance include the blowhole, and the round boulders with holes drilled through them at Wukoki. One representative explained connections between the two as deriving power from Wukoki for use at Wupatki.

It is a power point … an area to gather medicine or power for their spirituality. Sma’buuga is a place to gather power, and Geegaga is a place to gather strength. Young shaman would come here and get power. Older shaman would come from their homes using their mental ability to pray.

The wind can give you a song just like water can. The wind has a story spirit. Wind in the hole is strong and pure … a powerful place.
One elder believed that geologic features were used for health, refreshment, cooling and heating. Speaking about the blowhole, one elder stated, “Runners from Hopi and the Verde Valley refreshed themselves while en route. This would be a good place to do it.” Another elder also said, “The round boulders with the rounded holes in them would be good places to make game sticks that were used for the ball court games. The sticks brought the power from Wukoki to help in the games.”

Pai Cultural Landscape

The mapped details of the Pai cultural landscape reflect the documented territories of the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai (Figure 14). The extreme southern details reflect Yavapai use areas for which previous documentation has not been found.

The Pai cultural landscape expands to many locations outside of the traditional territories of central and western Arizona. Their landscape reaches far across the Southwest by extending into New Mexico, Nevada, California, Southern Arizona and northern Mexico. Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai consultants maintain that Wupatki, Sunset Crater and Walnut Canyon are part of a cultural landscape comprised of prehistoric, historic, and contemporary patterns of trade, resource procurement, and ceremonialism. These patterns reflect the resiliency of interaction and interconnectedness among cultural traditions in northern Arizona. Concurring with archaeological research, Pai consultants identified connections between the three monuments and Sinagua, Coconino and Hohokam village sites. Pai consultants asserted that connections between Hopi, Pai, Southern Paiute, Zuñi, and Mojave villages are continuations of the prehistoric connections of trade, ceremonialism, and resource procurement.

According to the Pai consultants, the Flagstaff area was a central location for intertribal trade that reached from Mexico to the Four Corners region and to Zuñi. All of the people in the region recognized it as having a spiritual and geologic significance that necessitated a multi-cultural use area that precluded a single territorial claim. Frequent trading seems to have been a way of managing multi-cultural use that could have otherwise produced conflict. The Pai consultants said most Havasupai trading activities involved members of Hopi and Zuñi villages. Yavapai people also traded with the Hopi, traveling through the Flagstaff area to reach the Hopi mesas. Through these activities, Pai and Pueblo groups exchanged minerals such as salt, paints, and turquoise, and natural resources of native and cultivated foods, firewood, and crafted items. The trading parties would create temporary shelters or borrow available structures during these events.
Figure 14. Cultural landscape field data from the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai tribes.

The various trails through the Pai landscape connected the Pai people to the Hopi and Southern Paiute. Trails ran from Sedona to Laughlin Mountain, from Supai, Peach Springs, and Prescott to the San Francisco Peaks, along the rims and plateaus of the Grand Canyon, and into the Grand Canyon itself. Trails also ran from Seligman and Williams to south of the San Francisco Peaks before swinging northeast to Sunset Crater, Wupatki, and to the Hopi mesas. The Pai consultants also identified trails used by the Southern Paiute to travel...
from Kaibab over the narrowest part of the canyon and into Pai territory, and used by the Hopi to travel to Yavapai through Oak Creek Canyon and Verde Valley.

 Trails from the south lead up toward the sacred mountain area. The Montezuma’s well, Camp Verde area along the Verde River is a place where the Yavapai would allocate salt. This route on up to Walnut Canyon area and over the Little Colorado area was on the trail to Hopi. Another trail in the other direction went past the Prescott area then following a southwest direction down to the Yuma area and then on to the ocean. Also along the Colorado River near Yuma there are big boulders in the design of a snake in the dirt as well a human runner. The Yavapai used to be runners and run all the way down to Yuma area. It would take them 5 days.

 The Pai people used the trails for many purposes. Some trails were trade routes, others were used to go to the San Francisco Peaks for firewood, vision quests, sweat lodges, prayers, mineral collecting, and for hunting. Other trails were for pilgrimages, or to gather resources from the ocean, or seek places where one could acquire knowledge and power. One Pai elder told of traveling to Meteor Crater to obtain power and to collect pieces of the meteor. All such journeys, however, required a traveling prayer before departure.

 The songs and prayers associated with the trails are sacred because the trails are connected to creations and other stories. One elder explained part of the creation story in which Grandma, “Old Lady Keeper of the Pearls,” walked from the San Francisco Peaks to Sedona. Another elder told of the story trail of Yahoya that passes through Sunset Crater as one travels between the Hopi mesas and Supai. A third elder said that Hopi runners would travel the trails to inform the Yavapai that they were coming to Yavapai territory for salt; the people would stop at Sunset Crater during these journeys. The Mojave would come to Supai and share Bird songs that were sung in conjunction with Southern Paiute Salt songs during the Cry Ceremony.

 Songs have both ceremonial and non-ceremonial roles in the Pai cultural landscape. The Pai have songs about an area near Laughlin, Nevada along the Colorado River. One elder explained that, “There are songs near Laughlin on the Colorado River … songs for traveling on pilgrimages. They would sing on the trails. There are prayer songs for hunting, planting, everything that was a direct interaction with some resource or the land itself. Only certain people, like medicine men, knew certain songs.” The people had songs for traveling to view the sacred mountain, and songs for when the men held sweats. Another elder said they have songs the volcano and ceremonies held at Wupatki:

 There were songs about the volcano. The lava rocks are called wiidonwa, the lava cinders (black and red) are called wiigthwiila. The Supai elders are the medicine rocks. The sweat dance leaders can sing at any hunt. All Supai people can know round dance songs. At the circle in Wupatki they would have group ceremonies, circle dance, harvest songs, game songs.
The area encompassing the three monuments is one rich in ceremonial activities and characteristics. These activities connect the associated cultural groups with the landscape, and to prehistoric peoples and events. The eruption of Sunset Crater is probably the most significant cultural event in the prehistoric Southwest as it resonates in longheld beliefs and ceremonies. The effects of the eruption included attracting people from great distances including the Southern Paiute, Pai, Zuñi, Western Apache, Navajo, and Hopi people. The Pai consultants believe that during the period of eruptions, the Wupatki and Walnut Canyon structures were used to accommodate various groups of pilgrims and ceremonial practitioners. Pai consultants felt that these ceremonial interactions upheld various intertribal relationships, physically grounding them in a shared ceremonial landscape.

Although Sunset Crater is now dormant, the cinder cone retains a ceremonial significance that centers intertribal activities in a vast ceremonial landscape. One consultant explained that the Hopi Snow Clan, which is responsible for creating precipitation, interacts with the Havasupai as part of its ceremonial obligation. A Pai elder added, “The eruption of the crater is in our stories. Many of the stories have died with the people, but the Supais and Yavapais still have them.”

Several historic events have shape the Pai cultural landscape; the Pai consultants discussed three of these events. In the first account, the region of the Hualapai reservation has many ruins and was the site of many villages. The second event involves the Yavapai creation story of when the Yavapai emerged from Montezuma’s Well. The third event was when the Yavapai and the Hualapai separated. One elder explained that, “North of Prescott and Granite Mountain, but south of Seligman on an old dirt road, is the site of more ruins. In one place near the ruins, the Pai children got in a fight and the Yavapai and Hualapai separated.”

In addition to the San Francisco Peaks, Sunset Crater, and Granite Mountain, other mountains including Red Butte (Wiigdwiisa), the Hopi Mesas, and Sugarloaf Mountain contribute to our understanding of the Pai cultural landscape. Mountains are places of power and knowledge, places for ceremonial practices, landmarks, and important features that bring traditional stories and songs to life. The Pai elders discussed the connections among all the mountains as special, sacred, spiritual, and physical, the latter including underground water, tunnels, and line-of-site in which they “…stand on tip-toe to see and talk to each other.” Sugarloaf Mountain was part of a trail the Supai would travel on their way to the Pacific Ocean, and Red Butte was a territorial marker:

*The Supai would maybe pass by it on a pilgrimage...maybe on the way to the ocean...not the whole tribe, but individuals. The Supai would go to the ocean (hanthiilta) to make floods and bring them to Supai.*

*Chief Manakaja marked the territory of the Supai. He had foot races around the buttes, and soon he became like a whirlwind. This was before the big flood. In Canyon Mine north of Red Butte, the creators did a round dance.*
The Colorado River and Little Colorado River are defining components of the Pai landscape. The underground aquifers of the Little Colorado River, for example, connect it to all places found in the Pai cultural landscape. The Little Colorado River was recognized as a boundary between Pai and Hopi territories, however, both the Colorado and Little Colorado were known also as “healing rivers” upon which the shamans relied. Northern and southern routes provided access to the rivers and the Grand Canyon for trade, ceremonies, and collecting plants and minerals.

When incorporated with the 2001 cultural affiliation data, the 2004 traditional association study provided anthropological and oral tradition evidence adequate for cultural affiliation with all three national monuments (Table 14). The 2004 study also contributed much new data to the pre-aboriginal time frame for Pai affiliation with Sunset Crater. It also contributed new data to Pai affiliation with the three national monuments for all of the time frames (Table 15).

Table 14. Pai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x, X 2001 Evidence, & 2001 Evidence is Adequate
2004 Evidence is Adequate

Table 15. Time frames of Pai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x 2001 Evidence
X 2004 Evidence

Tier 3: Additional Cultural Affiliation Data

To this point, the question of cultural affiliation of the Pai people with the three Flagstaff area monuments has been addressed with anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historic, kinship, oral tradition, and other expert evidence. The anthropological, geographical, kinship, and oral tradition types of evidence are adequate to establish cultural
affiliation with the three monuments. The evidence as a whole is adequate for affiliation with the three monuments during aboriginal, historic, and contemporary time periods, and at the traditional time period for Walnut Canyon and Wupatki. In this section, additional information is presented that provides anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area in general, and in some cases, with specific park units.

In this section, a different approach is taken with the Pai as a group than in the two previous studies. Some of the evidence pertains to the Pai group while other evidence is specific to one or more of the three tribes (Table 16). The types of evidence are presented with subdivisions as appropriate for the Pai, Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai.

Table 16. Types of additional cultural affiliation evidence by tribe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral Tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualapai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological Evidence

The anthropological evidence reflects regional relationships of the three Pai tribes with other tribes in northern Arizona and includes the Flagstaff area. The evidence addresses traditional, aboriginal, and historic time frames.

The Pai

Parezo (1996) describes the three Pai groups as Upland Yumans and notes that long before European contact, the three groups considered themselves to be one people. At some point the Yavapai became known as traditional enemies of the Hualapai and Havasupai. At that time, the Hualapai were comprised of three subgroups: Witoov Mi’uka Pa’a (Middle Mountain People), Yavapai fighters, and Ko’audva Kopaya (Plateau People) who included the Havasupai. The Yavapai were comprised of the Yavepe (central Yavapai), Tolkapaya (western Yavapai), Wipukpaya (northeastern Yavapai), and Kewevkapaya (southeastern Yavapai).

Historically, the three groups practiced an area-based subsistence pattern in a wide ranging territory that reached to and a little beyond the San Francisco Peaks. Such a pattern resulted in mobile material culture consequently, making archaeological interpretation difficult. All three groups traded extensively with neighboring groups including the Hopi,
Zuñi, Mohave, Navajo, and Southern Paiute people. Sometimes they traveled to the other tribes, and at other times, they hosted visits from those tribes. The historical trade routes had prehistoric counterparts, indicating centuries-old relationships (Parezo 1996). In the early 1900s, the Hualapai and Havasupai made no pottery, but traded for it with the Mojave and Moquis (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960). Extensive trade between the Havasupai and the Hopi resulted in much Hopi material culture being used by the Havasupai people (Sheridan 1996).

Gladwin and Gladwin (1930:167) noted that in 1870, settlers began to encroach upon the Verde Valley. At that time, “the Indian population was chiefly Apache with a few scattered Yavapai and Walapai.”

Archaeological Evidence

Some of the archaeological evidence is specific to Walnut Canyon and Wupatki. Much of it deals with a regional context that includes the Flagstaff area. Evidence is presented for the Pai as well as for each of the Pai groups. The evidence predominantly addresses the traditional time frame.

The Pai

Gladwin and Gladwin (1930:194-195) stated that “...four distinct and unrelated peoples can be said to have entered the [Verde] Valley at various times and by different routes. Taking these in order of their frequency, the most important are the Tusayan people who were responsible for the Proto-Kayenta culture; they built pueblos and cliff-dwellings in Oak Creek and in Beaver Creek, which, as regards pottery and architecture, seem to be identical with those from the Flagstaff pueblos at Elden, Turkey Hill, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki.”

In 1956, archaeologists at the Pecos Conference reached a consensus on the term Hakataya. Hakataya, a Hualapai and Havasupai term for the Colorado River, was defined by the boundaries of the Pacific Coast ranges (W), the Mogollon Rim (E), the Gila River and lower California (S), and the Grand Canyon (N) (Schroeder 1957). Patayan was limited to the area occupied by prehistoric Cerbat. At the 1957 Pecos Conference, however, Patayan was reinstated to mean the culture area as a whole. Schroeder (1960) nevertheless used Hakataya for a group of traits “that appear to be so basic to all cultures of the Yuman root on the lower Colorado River and in western and central Arizona in ceramic times only, as well as in the California desert and northern portions of lower California.” Euler (1963) felt this meant Hakataya included Amacava, Cohonina, Cerbat, Prescott, pre-1070 A.D. Sinagua, and the Pioneer Period Hohokam. Jennings (1971) described the consensus at the time as favoring Patayan to refer to an area bounded by the Grand Canyon (N), the Little Colorado River (E), the Bradshaw Mountains (S), and the Colorado River below its big bend (W). Linford (1979:37) felt it was “sufficient to note that by 900 A.D. there were a number of populations within the culture area with material cultures sufficiently different to warrant their division into three groups: the Cerbat to the west, the Prescott to the southeast, and the Cohonina to the northeast.” Linford’s surmise places the Flagstaff area on the eastern edge of the Prescott and
Cohonina areas. He further concluded that the material cultures of these groups exhibited enough similarity to warrant their inclusion within the designation Patayan.

Gladwin (1957) contended that the people of the Prescott Branch, which centered on what is now the town of Prescott, were the result of a merge of people from the south and southeast with eastern Yuman foragers, and a few Basketmakers. Schroeder (1960) hypothesized that the Prescott Branch became the Yavapai or were assimilated by the Cohonina. The Prescott Branch is dated largely on intrusive pottery and two phases are recognized: the Prescott Phase (900-1100 A.D., Black Mesa black-on-white pottery) and the Chino Phase (1025-1200 A.D., Flagstaff black-on-white pottery) (Euler and Dobyns 1962).

The Cohonina occupied the area bounded by Highway 89 (E), the Grand Wash Cliffs (W), the Colorado River (N), and the Mogollon Rim (S) consequently encompassing the Flagstaff area (Euler 1963). They produced San Francisco Mountain gray ware, which dates 700-1150 A.D. The Hualapai and Havasupai have occupied portions of west-central Arizona region since at least 1600 A.D. Early Spanish explorers, however, referred to the people they encountered as Cosnina or Co’nina. The connection between Pai people and Cosnina/Co’nina is based on historians’ interpretations of the various accounts. Archaeologically, they have not been connected conclusively with the Cerbat but such a connection is plausible (Linford 1979).

In the middle Verde Valley, the basic cultural pattern was affected by the Hohokam from about 700 to 1150 A.D., by a Sinagua movement into the valley from the Flagstaff area about 1125 to 1400 A.D., and reflected historic utilization principally by Yavapai and Apache (Euler 1961; Schroeder 1960). By 1120 A.D., shortly after the Sinagua had adopted sedentary Hohokam traits from a colony settling just east of Flagstaff, Anasazi and Mogollon traits changed this basic pattern.

Schroeder detailed traits for Hakataya, Hohokam, and Sinagua as well as for the historic desert tribes. He suggested prehistoric Yuman-speaking antecedents for many of these including Mohave, Yavapai, Walapai, and Havasupai (disagreeing in the second and last instance with Dobyns and Euler (1960) and Euler (1958).

The Havasupai

Schwartz (1955) described previously unknown materials found among the Havasupai of Cataract Canyon that provided a link between the Havasupai and the Cohonina of the plateau region above the canyon. The Cohonina had been thought to have lived there from 600 to 1200 A.D., however, Schwartz’s findings filled the gap between the two cultures as he documented a 1300-year history for the Havasupai.

Schwartz (1955) puts the beginning of a Havasupai presence in the plateau region at 600 A.D. He described the region as having a low population and, based on ceramic materials, the Havasupai as having a trade relationship with the Kayenta people east of the plateau. From 700 to 800 A.D., the Cohonina population of the plateau tripled, then doubled by 900 A.D. They had settlements throughout the plateau all the way to the northern part of the San Francisco Peaks. Sinagua influences from southeast of the Peaks resulted in some cultural
differences among the latter settlements but not enough to keep them from being characterized with the Cohonina at this time.

During this time of growth, the Cohonina experimented with stone masonry and farming techniques (presumably flood-plain farming). “Ceramic influence from the Kayenta country became increasingly significant. Not only were Kayenta pots obtained in trade, but their designs were copied on Cohonina products” (Schwartz 1959:79).

From 900 to 1100 A.D. was a period of cultural and population climax for the Cohonina. The entire plateau was occupied and growth spilled into the canyons of the Colorado River system. The families who established themselves and farmed in the canyons, Cataract Canyon in particular (Figure 15), provided the basis for cultural survival after 1100 A.D. when a period of drought was experienced throughout the northern Southwest. The canyons presented a challenge to winter living, however, due to higher humidity than the plateau, and a lack of fuel and wild foods. Summers in the canyons and winters on the plateau where more wild foods and fuel could be found became the pattern of Cohonina life during the drought. Cultural diffusion, population growth, contact differences, different ecological opportunities, and presumably climate change contributed to regional divisions of Cohonina culture (Schwartz 1955).

Figure 15. Cataract Canyon northwest of the San Francisco Peaks (Riecker 1879).
The Cohonina people were not the only residents of Cataract Canyon between 1100 and 1300 A.D. Beginning around 1100 A.D. and continuing for about 100 years, Kayenta people came from the east and Prescott groups came from the south (Schwartz 1955). While Schwartz attributed the migrations to pressure from raiding parties, who he theorized were motivated by drought conditions, the Sunset Crater Volcano eruptions during this same period may have played a significant role. The eruptions brought people to the area, which already had a large population.

The Cohonina people of the plateau-canyon region experienced a relatively stable period from 1300 to 1600 A.D. The population decreased as the non-Cohonina populations, all but a small population of Cerbat people, left the area at the end of the 13th century. The remaining outside influence came from trade with the Kayenta people to the east but based on the archaeological record, they did not affect a cultural change in the Cohonina (Schwartz 1955).

Later, Schwartz (1959) concluded that the Cohonina, who occupied the Havasupai homelands archaeologically from 700 to 1100 A.D. are the same as modern-day Havasupai. His historical evidence suggests they have lived in the “plateau country just south of the Grand Canyon” since 1500 A.D. He believed the Cohonina came to this part of northern Arizona from the west around 600 A.D., presumably pushed westward by “population pressure” along the lower Colorado River. Based on ceramics of the age, the Cohonina in this early period likely had strong trading ties with the Kayenta. Their small population lived in family bands at a time when most of the plateau area was unpopulated.

Euler (1958) had a somewhat different view. He found that the range of historic Havasupai people corresponded largely with the range of prehistoric Cohonina but he did not see the Havasupai and Cohonina as related. The Havasupai were in their historic range when Garcés traveled through the country in 1776 and probably at least a century earlier since Spanish documents of 1665 mention them (Schroeder 1953). Euler pointed out that the last known date of Cohonina occupation was about 500 years earlier, and his data suggested that the Cerbat peoples were moving eastward during this time.

Euler’s (1958) had several hypotheses for the Havasupai. First, the Havasupai were descended from the Cohonina, so they were producers of San Francisco Mountain Gray Ware, which meant, in the guise of Cohoninas, they were living in the area as early as 700 A.D. If true, this hypothesis would mean that the lack of San Francisco Mountain Gray Ware around 1100 to 1150 A.D. was a finding that resulted from faulty tree-ring dating or failure by archaeologists to find post-1150 A.D. sites. It also would mean that the Havasupai were the only Yuman-speaking group to fire their ceramics in a reducing rather than oxidizing atmosphere. Second, the Havasupai represent the easternmost advance of Yuman migration from California. As such, they are not related to the Cohonina and entered their historic range after the Cohonina left. They fired their ceramics in an oxidizing atmosphere as other Yuman-speaking groups did, and the San Francisco Gray Ware was simply no longer made after 1150 A.D. Euler’s final hypothesis was that Havasupai and Hualapai ancestry was Cerbat, that they did not enter their historic ranges until 1150 to 1300 A.D., and may have displaced the Cohonina. They considered themselves one people, the Pai, distinct from other
Yumans, including Yavapai, but the U.S. Government distinguished between them as Havasupai and Hualapai.

_The Hualapai_  

Dobyns (1974) attempted to fix the location of the Hualapai through ceramic assemblages, notably Tizon brown ware. He was careful to note that the archaeologically-defined range of certain cultural traits does not coincide with other cultural traits, and therefore are not a proper indicator of tribal territory. The manufacture techniques and decoration of Hualapai pottery as described by Dobyns are similar to those for the Yavapai described by Corbusier (Dobyns 1974).

Dobyns’ (1974) consideration of the archaeological evidence led to the conclusion that the Hualapai exclusively occupied the land from a point midstream of the Colorado River to the plateau ridge between Prospect Valley and Mohawk Canyon; along the crest of the ridge to the Aubry Cliff escarpment; east to Mount Floyd’s northernmost peak and along the plateau north of Ash Fork; southwest to Black Mesa; southeast across Chino Valley to where it meets Walnut Creek; south to Kirkland Creek and the north fork of the Santa Maria River; the Santa Maria to where it meets the Big Sandy River; Big Sandy to Signal, Arizona; north of Bill Williams Fork to the Needles; northeast to the Black Mountains, following the range and then back to the Colorado River.15

According to Ortiz (1979), the Yavapai and Hualapai were known as the Upland Yumans to distinguish them from the Riverine Yumans, Apache, and Navajo people. Four distinctive prehistoric civilizations - Anasazi, Mogollon, Hohokam, and Hakataya - were in the process of formation by 1 A.D. The presence of Mesoamerican influence in belief systems and tangible domains gives the Southwest cultures an underlying continuity in their diversities and distinguishes them from surrounding cultural groups.

Euler (1958) used ceramics diagnostically to link the Hualapai to the Cerbat. Hualapai ceramics include Aquarius Brown, a type of Tizon Brown Ware. Euler (1958) concluded that other types of Tizon Brown Ware from post-contact times, such as Cerbat Brown and Sandy Brown, are also Hualapai. Although Colton (1939) described Tizon Brown Ware as not being made after 1100 A.D., Euler believes this was in error by approximately 800 years based on his findings and historical documentation of Hualapai use of native pottery as late as 1867 (U.S. Senate 1936).

Another Hualapai diagnostic artifact is the milling stone, which was slab-shaped sandstone upon which food was pounded with a mano, or shaped pounding stone, rather than ground, or crushed by rocking the mano back and forth (Euler 1958). These are distinguishable from Havasupai pounding stones, which were rectangular with a shallow oval to rectangular depression (Spier 1928), and Yavapai grinding stones, which included stones similar to the Hualapai and Havasupai as well as deeper troughed metates (Gifford 1936).

---

15 This area is a large part of the traditional territory of the Hualapai discussed under Geographical Evidence. Euler (1958) described Mohawk Canyon as part of a joint-use area shared by the Hualapai and Havasupai.
Euler (1958) did not identify pounding stones as part of the prehistoric Cohonino people material culture.

Euler (1958) attributed the replacement of Hualapai ceramic manufacture with Mohave pottery to a shift in trade relations. Traditionally, the Hualapai traded extensively with the Hopi but shifted to trade with the Mohave in the late 19th century.

*The Yavapai*

Euler (1958) found that the range of historic Yavapai corresponded in large part to the range of prehistoric Prescott but felt that the Yavapai moved eastward from the Colorado River into Prescott territory. He reviewed ceramic data for correlations between the Yavapai and several ceramic styles. He could not, however, determine conclusively whether the Yavapai made Tizen Brown Ware or Dome Rock Gray, a hybridization of Tizen Brown Ware and Lower Colorado Buff Ware. He viewed Tizen Wiped, Dome Rock Gray, Cerbat Brown, and Aquarius Brown as possible Yavapai ceramics, but also theorized the possibility that the Yavapai traded for rather than made ceramics, or made a ceramic not yet identified. He rejected hypotheses that Wingfield Plain and Prescott Gray Ware were indicative of the Yavapai.

*Folkloric Evidence*

The folkloric evidence reflects written versions of oral histories. Two Pai stories are reflected in the Hualapai stories that follow, one of which is related directly to Sunset Crater. This evidence addresses the traditional time frame.

*The Pai*

The theme of the Pai origin story appears in the traditional stories of several southwestern tribes for whom the San Francisco Peaks is sacred. The account obtained by Ewing in the early 1900s includes a specific reference to the San Francisco Peaks (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1961:37-38).

...the frog-woman made the spring rise up through a hole to the first coil of the vine, then to the second, and on up to the top until it was covering the earth. The people put a small girl in a log with the ends blocked with pitch. She had with her food, water, birds, and animals. Two men told her she would be going up and down in the water and that they would all be drowned. She should remember the San Francisco Peaks so she could find it if she came back to earth in another place. She was to get water from a spring on top of the peaks.

The story of the Sun and his daughters relates to Sunset Crater, which is located on the southeastern edge of the former “aboriginal” range of the Havasupai. The narrative is suggestive of life in the area during prehistoric eruptions and may have helped the Pai people to deal with the Sunset Crater eruptions of the 11th century.
The sun used to live at Sunset Crater, its home. Tribes used to gather around Sun’s home and play games. Tribes played with Sun; Sun was the hero and always won. They played the sixteen-stick game. The tribes kept betting a little bit of hair on their bodies at a time until they lost all their bodies. Sun used them for meat. He made prickly pear cactus red fruit from the blood of animals. He used tears for drinking water. He took the liquid from inside the eyeball and made corn from it. He made beans from the kidney. He used this method to get food to feed men when the tribes gathered to play games. He gets the guts and makes dried pumpkin. He took meat from people and made deer meat from it. He fed them this food, called different tribes to games, and beat them until he killed all the tribes but one from the north rim [of Grand Canyon], the lion. The ground was higher on the north rim, and he looked toward Flagstaff. The lion could see smoke from a fire built by Coyote, who built a fire in the brush they lived under. Then Coyote could get them and eat them (muskrats, ground squirrels, small ground animals about the size of a mouse). The lion kept watching, and went across the canyon to see what Coyote was eating. He crossed on this side of Red Lake. [Near the present Williams, Arizona-Grand Canyon highway.] A large village was there. He went to house after house but all were empty. He found no human being, just one old coyote. The lion approached him by sneaking up to see what Coyote was doing. The lion watched from outside. Coyote lay inside a house like he was starving, snapping at the flies that came around on his face. The lion asked where everyone was. Coyote said, “There is no one here but me. I built all this village myself and am alone here.” Lion said, “This can’t be true because I have seen (feces) from babies wrapped up in the trees.” Coyote said, “No, this is all from me, all my (feces).” Lion knew Coyote was lying and asked Coyote to tell him the truth, but Coyote kept insisting he was the only one around and no other people lived there. The lion said, “Well, if you said you are by yourself, give me some food to eat.” Coyote said, “I am hungry. I’ve got nothing to eat. I’m starving.” The lion said, “You’ve been making fun of me. I want you to go fetch the meat I dropped just before I reached the [p.63] village.” The coyote said he was glad to go get it. He went but couldn’t lift the meat; it was too heavy. It was wrapped up in a deer hide. So the lion went back and brought it to the house and they cooked it. After eating they bedded down. Before daybreak Lion said, “I want to ask you again. You have been kidding me. I want to know where the people went.”

The coyote didn’t speak for awhile, then said, “I’ll tell you the right story. There used to be many people here. Then the sun killed them one after another when they gambled with him and lost, until they were all dead. I am the only one left.” After Coyote told the truth, the lion said, “That is what I wanted you to tell me so I would know what to do.” The lion told Coyote to make all different sizes of flint arrowheads, a whole pile of them, bundle them in deer hide and put them to the east; then before dawn, take the whole skin of flints and throw it toward the sun. “Be sure not to leave any little pieces lying
around but have every one inside the deer hide and throw them all.” Coyote did it and returned. The lion said, “This wasn’t done in vain. This isn’t the end. The things you threw out will come to life and return to the village. I am telling you ahead of time. You must go into your house and not peep out or do anything foolish no matter if you hear people chopping wood or whatever you hear. Stay inside until evening.” Lion told Coyote these things. Then the sun rose and they soon heard people’s voices in the village, but Lion heard only old people, no small children, and he knew Coyote hadn’t obeyed. The coyote pretended he knew nothing that Lion had told him and said, “Uncle, I hear people’s voices and I want to peep outside.” Coyote tried to beat the lion outside but the lion grabbed him and said, “My head itches. It must be some kind of bug in my hair. I want you to see what it is.” He held Coyote there. Finally evening came. Both went out and peeped into house after house but saw only old people. The lion said, “You didn’t obey me. What did you do with the small chips?” Coyote said, “I threw the big ones toward the sun and the small ones just behind me.” Lion said, “That is all right as long as we got everyone back but we don’t have any little children. Tonight we’ll have a meeting because if we keep looking at him [the sun] he will keep on killing men until there won’t be a living creature around here.” After this talk they decided to meet after sunup. The lion said, “I’m not the smart one, but I know one who is: the squirrel. He is the smart fellow. He lives at Rain Tank south of Tusayan [near Grand Canyon village on the south rim]. The lion said, “He thinks real good. He’ll know what to do and we can ask him.” After they held the meeting, and everyone agreed to a plan, the lion sent Coyote after Squirrel. The lion told Coyote to tell the whole story with eloquence and tell him the sun would kill everyone if they didn’t get help. So Coyote started off. There were two brothers living at Rain Tank. The oldest one lay on top of pine trees and watched, and the younger one was inside a tree. The older one saw smoke signals of Coyote approaching and said, “Someone is coming, Younger Brother. I want you to put some meat on the fire to feed whoever is coming. It looks like it is coming toward our place.” The younger one said, “Coyote always makes smoke when he burns out small animals around those peaks where he lives. I don’t think he is coming here.” “Yes, he is getting near and is really coming to our camp.” The younger brother said, “It must be someone to tell us bad news; there must be trouble somewhere.” The older one said, “They must have been attacked by another tribe somewhere. They have come for help. I can see the man now. It looks like Coyote.”

When Coyote reached the house he didn’t speak. The brothers were smart and didn’t want to ask; they wanted him to tell of his own accord. They gave him food. He ate and pretended he was on his own business. They slept and Coyote didn’t say anything. Older Brother got after Coyote and said, “All you want to do is eat. When I saw smoke signals approaching I knew it was to tell of trouble and ask for help. They call out before they reach the house and tell
their trouble that someone attacked them or otherwise. But you didn’t say even a word. You just eat.”

Coyote said, “Yes, I was on a mission to tell of trouble.” Then Coyote recounted the entire story that had gone before: “The lion told me to come here and ask your help but I didn’t say it out.” After Coyote told the story they said, “OK, we’ll help but won’t start today. We’ll start tomorrow.” He told Younger Brother to tie hides in the trees and to bury some of their things to prepare to leave their camp.

Next day they started back to the village and reached it. The lion told them the whole story. The two brothers said, “Yes, it is a sad story. The sun is a real smart man and no one can ever beat him. He will keep on until he kills everyone. It is good that you [p.65] told us your story. Now we’ll try to do something about it. We’ll ask the badger to help. If we went on top of the ground the sun would see us and kill us. The badger says he is a good digger so we’ll ask him to dig a tunnel to the sun’s house and under the house where the sun has hides of men on the floor, and all people would go into the tunnel and into the house.” After Badger did it, the older brother inspected and found it went zig-zag and never reached the sun’s house. So he called Prairie Dog to try and dig a straight tunnel to the sun’s house. “You say you are a good digger. Now let’s see if you can do it!” The prairie dog said, “OK,” and started from where he was sitting; but before he went far he came up to the top. The two brothers inspected and found it wasn’t good; it kept coming to the top of the ground, instead of staying underground. They called the ground squirrel, who said, “OK, I’m a good digger.” He did better than the others but went straight, then down, then zig-zag, then up. The brothers inspected and said, “No, it isn’t right.”

Then they called for the pocket gopher, the kind Coyote used to eat. He was the best digger and went straight to Sun’s house. They told him to feel the man’s hide on Sun’s floor and leave it there. They inspected and said it was right. Then they went back and told people it was what they wanted. They came out of the tunnel and told the people it was time to start. They said, “We’ll go through the tunnel; Sun will hear us but we’ll keep going until we come into the sun’s house. We’ll line up along the wall. We’ll be the leaders with Lion next to us and will stand along the wall and wait to see what Sun will do.” They followed the plan and Sun heard a rumble as people walked through the tunnel. He was on top of his house. He looked around but could see no one. So he went into his house. The two brothers were in the middle and the others were along the walls. Sun shone full on them trying to blind them but they didn’t blink. Finally, Sun got tired and said, “I thought you were children but you are not.” So Sun gave up. Sun got an elk antler and threw it in front of them. He told them to split it in two (like a sling shot). This was a game he had always used to beat men. The brothers said, “We never heard of this. Visitors should always be given food and drink and not asked to play
games so the host can beat them. You want us to break this and it isn't even hard." Older Brother picked up the antler and easily broke it apart and into small pieces and threw it on the floor before Sun. After this, Sun called his daughters. He asked them to bring water for the visitors. The girls brought a pottery jar of water and set it in the room and watched. Coyote got excited and spoke up, “I’m thirsty and want to drink.” But the brothers told him to sit down. “How do you know it is water? If it is real water it should have green willows in the mouth of the jar.” This was in a bowl instead of a proper pottery jar with a small mouth closed by a lid of willows from the spring to keep water from slopping out. Older Brother told Coyote that it wasn’t water. He told Coyote to throw it out. He said, “I thought it was real water and I used to drink it. Maybe I have a bad odor so he doesn’t want to kill me.”

The sun asked his daughters to grind cornmeal and make mush for the people. When the corn mush was cooked and set before the people, no one wanted it except the Coyote as before. Older Brother said, “It isn’t corn. We saw no cornfields and no cornhusks lying around. They made the corn out of the fluid of the eyes of humans.” He told Coyote to throw the corn mush out, so he did.

Next the sun called his daughters to cook meat and soup for the people. They did. When served to the people Coyote was the only one who said he was hungry. He said he was going to drink the soup. Older Brother said, “If this was real meat it would have some hair on it like deer meat. This meat came from your body so if you eat it the sun will win again. I want you to throw it out.” So Coyote did as he was told.

Next Sun told his daughters to cook beans for the people and they were served to people on the floor. Coyote started toward it. But Older Brother said, “This isn’t real beans. You should have seen farms. I saw no leaves around here. Throw it out or he’ll beat you on this.” So Coyote did.

Sun called his daughters to cook prickly pear fruit to drink. They fixed it in pottery jars. Coyote jumped up and said, “I used to wish for this kind.” Older Brother said, “This is made of your blood.” So Coyote threw it out.

All these things were made from the bodies of victims. Sun called for his daughters to cook pumpkin. Coyote repeated his wishes but Older Brother said, “If this was real pumpkin you would see fields and leaves; it is made of your guts. They will beat you.” Coyote said, “Why is the sun trying to trick us on this? I thought it was real.” He threw it out.

The sun told his daughters to bathe and wash themselves with sand and to sharpen the teeth inside their vaginas and to lie down in a row without clothes on. The visitors came and circled around where they were lying. Coyote spoke first and said he wanted to have intercourse first. “This is just what I’ve been
wanting to do.” Squirrel said, “No, don’t. I’ll be the first. I’m the oldest. See what happens first. They have teeth in their vaginas and this is what has killed the other men.” He had a neck bone of the mountain sheep with skin sewed over it. He had it in his pocket. He had an erection and put it in with his hand until the teeth of vaginas were worn off. He did this to the first girl. He had a spirit power inside him so it made the other girls OK. He had intercourse then and it was OK so called the others. Coyote rushed in to be the next one and the others all came and did it too with all of the other girls.

After they had done this, the sun said, “I have a pet, a female antelope; I want to race it with yours.” The brothers had a doe, middle-sized. They were going to race it to Moon Rock [on the Walapai Reservation] and around the rock four times and back to the house. Sun’s antelope started out first. The doe didn’t start until the other had a good start. The doe started bounding along but didn’t run. Sun said that his pet was a good runner, and if it went around four times and back he would beat. Older Brother said, “My pet isn’t running yet. Wait until mine gets started running. She’ll go around four times and from there she will come back alone. Wait till she starts running.” Sun said, “Mine is about to go around the rock and yours is only halfway. Why doesn’t yours come back so I can kill you?” The brother said, “Mine hasn’t started yet. Mine will jump over two or three washes at a time and will beat yours yet.” Sun shouted out, “My antelope is three times around the rock and yours is only going around the first time.” The brother said, “My doe hasn’t started yet; wait ‘til her fourth time around and she will start running and will jump two or three washes and will beat yours.” Sun said, “My antelope is four times around and yours is only three times. Mine will be back by the time yours will go the fourth time. Then I’ll kill you.” Sun shouted out, “Mine is nearly halfway home and yours has just gone around four times.” Older Brother said, “Mine is going to start running now. Yours will stay about halfway and mine will come like the wind.” Then the deer really started coming. Antelope was winded and tired and wasn’t making much progress. The Brother said, “Yours is tired and mine is really running and will beat yours.” Sun said, “You really mean it. Your doe is nearly past mine. I see it with my own eyes. That’s the end of it.” The deer got back to the house first but the antelope wasn’t nearly home yet.

The sun said, “You beat me on that, but I can think of something else. We’ll try the same course and race.” He called his fastest runners. After he set the plan they agreed. So the sun’s runners started out and built a fire a short distance away and the brothers started out slow. They passed the place where [they saw the] ashes of the fire of the other runners. The sun called out, “They’ll lose the race. Why didn’t they give up and let me kill them to use their blood to stripe myself.” Before the brothers started they whispered to Coyote and told him they would go easy until they went around the rock four times, and said when they were starting home Coyote should pull the sun down from his roof, kill him and cut his heart out, and when he saw them
coming, start running with them. Sun’s runners went around the rock four times. When the brothers had gone around two or three times they met the others and talked. Older Brother said, “We’ll let them run hard at first and we’ll take it easy so they’ll be tired out before we are.” When they met the other team it was tired and they were looking for shade, tongues hanging out. A coyote was with them. They said, “We aren’t going to stop at Sun’s house but just pass by.” They said to Coyote, “You look tired out,” and teased him. The coyote got mad and threw a rock and hit Older Brother on the back of the head. Blood came out and is a darker color on “squaw’s” head from that today. But they kept on running and passed all the fast runners. When they got near, Coyote pulled the sun down and killed it, but instead of cutting through the belly and getting the heart, he cut the shoulder and got the arm instead. Older Brother got after Coyote and said, “You did the wrong thing. You won’t even survive.” After he said that the sun’s house was in flames. The sun was still alive. Coyote had taken the right arm and left the left arm. Sun leaned against the post of the house. He took a stone knife and rubbed against his cheek and set his house on fire. The fire spread out after the [p.69] people. It nearly caught up with them so they were afraid. They asked the pines, pinyons, and other green trees if one would do them a favor and not burn so they would be saved. The trees said, “Even if we are green we still burn.” They asked a rock if it would not burn so they could get inside and be saved. The rock said if it was in the fire it would get hot and split into chips. They reached some water and asked if it could protect the people. It said, “If I get in the fire I’ll get hot and cook the meat.” After they passed the water they asked a small bush for shelter and it said, “I won’t burn, except maybe the top part.” They didn’t believe him. They went on and asked an ant where his house was, and if he would burn easy. The ant said it wouldn’t burn because he lived down in the ground far below. The people said, “That is what we want to hear.” The people went inside but the last one in was a rabbit. As the fire swept by it singed his back and made a brown spot along his back. The people were saved from the fire in the ant’s house.

The people stayed there for a long time. Older Brother said, “I don’t know how it is on top. I want the fly to see how it is, if the ashes are cooled.” The fly went out and found it was cold. He reported back, but Older Brother didn’t believe it. He sent the bee out, and he found the same thing. He went back and told them nothing was left. They said, “OK, we’ll go out. Before we go out I want everyone to stay together until I say so. No one should say I came from that way or that way until I say it is OK.”

There were many different animals. They came out one at a time and all waited for the others until all had left the ant’s house. Older Brother said, “Now it is time to separate. Everyone can go the direction they came from. My brother and I will stay around here and not return where we came from and will turn into the squirrels.” After everyone had departed for their homes, they stayed and turned into the squirrels and are still around yet.
The Hualapai

Several Hualapai stories relate to the Flagstaff area and specifically to the San Francisco Peaks and Sunset Crater. The story about *Nya*, the Sun, parallels the previous Pai account. The following synopses are based on oral traditions shared by Hualapai elders as they heard them from their grandparents.

*Wika Hme'* tells of the recreation and repopulation of the land and resources after the great flood. Judabah gave the different peoples their instructions on where and how to live. The Hualapai were the last to receive their instructions. Their land was designated as all of that surrounded by the Colorado River (Talieje 1981). This area presumably was centered on the Hualapai Mountains and potentially places the San Francisco Peaks on the extreme eastern boundary.

*Madwida*\(^{16}\) occurs after *Wika Hme'* and tells of how the people initially lived together and spoke one language. A lying child caused a war among the people and their chief, *Waqiyasma*, said that they would no longer speak the same language and would leave Madwida to go their separate ways. As the people migrated and found new places, they became the contemporary tribes of north and central Arizona, including the Hualapai, Havasupai, and Yavapai. The people who went past Flagstaff and beyond became the Hopi, Navajo, and Pueblo peoples (Mapatis 1981a).

*Qimwid’m Ginyweva* is the story about an old lady, *Qimwidma*, who lived at *Wihakinbacha*, the San Francisco Peaks. She landed there in a canoe that her people had placed her in when the great floods came. This woman was alone and wanted children so she sat by a dripping spring and her son was created. A while later, she decided to go back to the spring and had a second son. When they were older, her sons traveled to the boundaries of Hualapai land before returning to *Wihakinbacha*. During their journey, they discovered other people. Two girls came to visit them at *Wihakinbacha*. During their journey, they discovered other people. Two girls came to visit them at *Wihakinbacha* and later, one of them had a son. After many years and many tragedies, the boy went to live with his grandmother, *Qimwidma*, at *Wihakinbacha*. After many years, they realized that they could not die but they could not continue living at *Wihakinbacha*. The grandson directed his grandmother to go live in the west where she would be known as *Qimwid’m Ginyiweva*, and he would go to the east to live and be known as *Hmany Qech Ginyiweva* (Mapatis 1981b).

*Nya* is the Hualapai version of the story about the Sun, when long ago it was human. The Sun played games and gambled with the people, always winning, until all the people died. Kathad and his cousin *Hadgwila*\(^ {17}\) planned to fight *Nya* and bring the people back to life with the help of their cousins *Qwithdahwakva*\(^ {18}\) (Squirrel) and his brother *Tokwe* (Squirrel) who lived at *Wihakinbacha*. Hadgwila and Qwithdahwakva eventually beat Nya, then they decapitated him. His head hit a big, shiny white rock next to his house and burst into flames (Mapatis 1981c).

\(^{16}\) Hualapai spelling is Madwida
\(^{17}\) Hualapai spelling is Hadgwila
\(^{18}\) Hualapai spelling is Qwithdahwakva
When the people saw that this was going to happen, the people escaped. The people were told to get into the tunnel. Nya’s head bounced off and hit the white rock and exploded into flames. Nya’s house burned to the ground. The people ran away. Qwithdahwakva and Hadgwila had warned them what was going to happen. “When his head is decapitated, run, don’t hesitate. Everything is going to burn up. Keep going, don’t slow down, keep going.” (ibid. 1981c:264).

Geographical Evidence

The geographical evidence shows the Pai people and their relationships with each other and the Flagstaff area in a regional context. The evidence addresses traditional, aboriginal, and historic time frames.

The Pai

The Cohonina occupied the area bounded by Highway 89 (E), the Grand Wash Cliffs (W), the Colorado River (N), and the Mogollon Rim (S) consequently encompassing the Flagstaff area (Euler 1963). The Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai occupied almost a third of northern and central Arizona for centuries before European contact. This area was defined as being from the Colorado River to the San Francisco Peaks, and from Chino Creek near the Prescott area to the Pinal Mountains south of Globe (Parezo 1996). While Parezo does not give a western boundary to this area, she notes that is the area with which they identify and maintain a deep cultural attachment.

An early encounter with the Spanish came in 1582 when Antonio Espejo was searching for minerals and found some Yavapai people near Jerome. Most of the documentation by early Spanish explorers, including Farfan and Onate, provide little information about the people in the Pai territories. The Spanish, in fact, explored very little of Pai territory until the late 1700s. Spanish records do show that the Hopi people referred to the tribes west of them as the “Cohonina” without differentiating between the Hualapai and the Havasupai, a trend that was carried into the nineteenth century by later explorers. Europeans confused the three groups repeatedly but after the 1690s, the Yavapai were referred to often as Yavapai-Apache or Mohave-Apache. In 1776, the three groups were distinguished by Francisco Garcés when encountered 34 families in Havasupai Canyon; he identified the three groups as Walapais, Yabipais, and Coninas (Parezo 1996).

Spanish records indicated that the Hualapai and the Havasupai people have occupied their traditional territories since at least the late 1600s. In 1752, the Coconinas were recorded as living “30 leagues west of the Hopi in 11 rancherias” (Schroeder 1953:47). This number was later reported as 42 and 37 leagues by two different trails. In 1776, Father Garcés recorded a number of Hualapai bands living in locations that were claimed as traditional territory at the time of the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) hearings. These locations extended as far east as Pine Springs (between Ash Fork and Williams) and as far south as Truxton Canyon in the mountains east of Hualapai Valley (Dobyns 1974).
Though the Spanish held expeditions into the area as early as 1540, Anglo influence upon the Havasupai began when Franciscan missions were founded in the 1600s in Hopi territory. By the time Francisco Garcés visited the canyon in 1776, “the Havasupai had already acquired horses, cattle, and European trade cloth” as well as “Old World plants such as apricots, figs, peaches, and alfalfa. ...the main factors which caused changes in this period were the gradual increase in trade goods from the Americans and the shifts in Havasupai culture to accommodate them” (Schwartz 1959:82-83).

In the late 1890’s, a school was established on the reservation that slowly ended the winter migration to the plateaus by forcing children to remain behind for school during the winter. Cattlemen on the plateaus also reduced available resources used by the Indian people (Schwartz 1959).

The Havasupai

The traditional territory of the Havasupai occupied the Coconino Plateau (Schwartz 1983). Approximately 90 miles wide and 75 miles long (Spier 1928), the area included Cataract Creek Canyon, a locale strongly associated with the Havasu aperture even today. The area was bounded by the Grand Canyon, Aubrey Cliffs, Bill Williams Mountain, the San Francisco Peaks and the Little Colorado River (Figure 16) (Schwartz 1983).

The Havasupai held the best territory, according to Ewing in the early 1900s, and successfully defended it with a “handfull (sic) of warriors.” Their chief, Old Navajo, gave Ewing the precise boundaries of their land, which he said were given to him by the Great Spirit, who charged him to defend the land. On the north, there was the natural boundary of the Grand Canyon, on the east a line from the Grand Canyon to the San Francisco Peaks, called Weka Hanapache or “Snow Mountain;” on the south a line from the San Francisco Peaks and the Bill Williams Mountain, called We-ka-u-la or “Riding Rock,” to a mountain near Seligman known as Thav-a-ka-yal-yal-a; and west to the Grand Canyon through Pine Springs. Ewing noted that they often defended their hunting grounds from Apache and Navajo parties hunting deer and antelope (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960).

Havasupai lands were defined legislatively in the early 1880s (Table 17) (Figure 17). A relatively small area was initially defined as approximately 2.5 miles by 12 miles and centering on Cataract Creek. No map unit designation was made, however, until 1882.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1880</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Superceded by EO of November 23, 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23, 1880</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Superceded by EO of March 31, 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 1882</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Havasupai territory in the 1800s (Schwartz 1983:13).
Figure 17. Federal adjustments to Havasupai lands in Arizona (Royce 1899).
The Hualapai

The Hualapai roamed the Grand Canyon region from the Grand Canyon on the north to the Santa Maria and Bill Williams River on the south, Pine Springs and Seligman on the east to the summit of the Colorado River Mountains on the west. To the north were the Shivwit Paiute, and to the west were the Mojave and Chemehuevi (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960). This area may have been where they made their seasonal rounds but they were known also to travel to Hopi for trade purposes, which took them through the Flagstaff area (Parezo 1996). They would have used the resources along the way and possibly observed ritual or ceremonial practices, particularly in relation to the volcanic features of the area (Toupal et al. 2004).

Expansion of Hualapai territory and cultural stability characterized the period from 1300 to 1850 A.D. Euler (1958) noted that early explorers made little mention of the Hualapai whose territory became inferred by descriptions of their neighbors. The route followed by Antonio de Espejo in the 1580s was documented as an Indian trail that connected the Verde Valley and Hopi villages (Bartlett 1942; Schroeder 1952). After Oñate’s 1604 travels in Arizona, Europeans did not visit the west-central part of the state again until the late 1700s. In spite of this lack of exploration, the Spaniards in New Mexico knew of the Hualapai and Havasupai by 1665 but they knew them collectively as the Coninas (Hackett 1937; Schroeder 1953). They also knew that the Coninas ranged west of the Hopi (Schroeder 1953). Examining New Mexico archives in the late 1700s, Father Silvestre Velez de Escalante described the area west of New Mexico as being mostly occupied by the Apache with the only ‘neighbors’ being the Hopi and the Cosninos nation west of them (Twitchell 1914). Notices in 1686 placed the geographic position of the Coconinos as being north of Apache; Schroeder considered these people to be Yavapai (Schroeder 1953). Euler (1958) concluded that the Hualapai and Havasupai occupied their pre-American territories west of Hopi and north of Apache since at least the late 1600s.

In 1744, some Hopi people told Fr. Carlos Delgado that the nation inhabiting the “Sierra Azul” was the Conina Apaches, however they used the term ‘Apache’ to mean hostile people, not Athabaskans. The missionary at Sandia Pueblo in 1752 reported that the Coninas lived about 90 miles west of the Hopi in 11 rancherias. Euler (1958) interpreted these accounts as referring to the Hualapai and Havasupai since 11 rancherias comprised more than what the Havasupai could occupy. He also took into consideration the distances between Cataract Canyon and Oraibi along the Havasupai “Moqui Trail,” which was estimated at 126 miles; between the Havasupai rancheria on the plateau east of Cataract Canyon and Oraibi, which was estimated at 111 miles; and between the easternmost Hualapai settlements and Oraibi along the Hualapai-Oraibi trade route, which was only slightly greater than the Havasupai distances.

Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez began exploration for a route from Santa Fe to Monterey, California in the summer of 1776. Three months later in Utah, north of the present day Hualapai Reservation, the party encountered deep snows and decided to turn back but did so by heading south. They encountered Southern Pauites (Payuchis) and were told of people wearing blue clothes, who the Spaniards understood to be the Cosninas who bought
blue woolen cloth in Moqui. Near Cataract Creek north of Mount Trumbull, another Southern Paiute told the expedition that the Ancamuchis were just across the river and grew much corn. The Spaniards interpreted the Ancamuchis to be Cosninas, who Euler interpreted to be Havasupai, or possibly Hualapai who had fields in Diamond Creek Canyon. A few days later, another Paiute told the Spaniards about the Cosninas and Moquinos (Bolton 1950). The Spaniards found on the mesa above Navajo Creek, just south of the Colorado River, “ranchos of Yutas Payuchias, neighbors and friends of the Cosninas” (Bolton 1950:120, 228). The Paiutes indicated that the Cosninas lived nearby. Euler (1958) considered these Cosninas to be Havasuapi because they were so far to the east.

Father Francisco Garcés began an exploration in 1776 of unknown Indian tribes in the southwest. Some of his terminology has been misinterpreted, however, Euler (1958) believes Garcés’ term *Yabipai* corresponded to the Yuman term *Nyav kopai*, which meant “people to the east,” who Euler interpreted as Hualapai. The Mohave people told Garcés of the *Yabipai Cuercomaches* who Euler believed to be the *Ko’audva kopai* band of the *Nyav kopai* among the Hualapai, that is, the “people to the east on the plateau.” The Mohave also spoke of the *Jaguallapais* who were the *Whala pa’a* band ranging in the Hualapai Mountains. These people were known to the easterly Hualapai as *Sutool kopai*, or “people to the west.” This was the first recording of the band designation *Whala pa’a* by a European; it was also applied the first time to the entire tribe (Euler 1958).

Garcés encountered the Hualapai near present-day Kingman: “I traveled four leagues east, and arrived at the *Jaguallapai* [Hualapai], who had provided much game for our refreshment...They go dressed in antelope skins and some shirts of Moqui; they have belts of Castille, awls and other implements that they obtain for Moqui. I saw no crops, and so I believe that they subsist on mescal and game” (Manners 1974:85). In Truxton Wash in Hualapai Valley, Garcés met with a group of 60 Indians whose presence suggested joint occupancy by the Yavapai and Hualapai, or at least evidence that neither had exclusive claim to the land. Garcés believed that the “Indians call by different names one and the same nation” (Manners 1974:89).

The *Jaguallapai* gave Garcés a full account of all the land between the Mohave villages, Oraibi, and Santa Fe. Garcés headed to Oraibi in the summer of 1776 and stopped briefly at the *Jaguallapai* rancheria, which Euler (1958) places at *Tak tadapa* on Walnut Creek, which is on the western side of the Hualapai Mountains. Garcés also stayed with some *Yabipais* on Truxton Creek who, he said, differed from the *Jaguallapai* only in name. Euler (1958) believed these *Yabipais* were eastern Hualapai. Garcés’ route skirted the heads of the south rim side canyons. The last Hualapi settlement he stayed at was five to seven miles east of Pine Springs. From here he headed east to Oraibi but was received coolly by the Hopi so he returned to Cataract Canyon, continued on to Pine Springs, and west to other Hualapai settlements. He stayed with the *Yabipais Cuercomaches* who Euler believed were the *Ko’audva kopai* band of Hualapai.

Garcés found during his travels in 1776 that the Hualapai were distributed throughout the territory they claimed in the 1950s as traditional. Hualapai rancherias were never more than a day’s travel apart, but usually much closer. He found Hualapai settlements from
Walnut Creek and Truxton Canyon northward to the south rim side canyons of the Grand Canyon. One hundred years later, Anglo-American accounts of some of these settlements were detailed enough to fix their positions. Euler surmised that the consistency of Hualapai locales reflected a high degree of stability in Hualapai land use and settlement patterns, which in turn indicated long-term occupation of the area prior to 1776 (Euler 1958).

Lieutenant Whipple, in early 1854, was crossing the Aquarius Range at Cactus Pass (today Tuckayou Wash) when he encountered two Indians. From this location in Hualapai territory, these Indians, who called themselves Yabapais, which Whipple called Yampais, placed the Havasupai to the northeast, and the Paiutes to the northwest on the other side of the Colorado River (Manners 1974).

Lt. Joseph C. Ives traveled from the Colorado River to the east in 1858. He found Hualapai people living on the west side of the Cerbat Mountains, at Peach Springs Canyon. Ives called the Hualapai “Haulpais” and the Havasupai “Yampai.” The following years saw more U.S. military presence and the end of the Hualapai aboriginal period. Ives’ explored northern Arizona again in 1861. Two men were pointed out by Ives’ Mojave guide and introduced as Hualapai, and later traveling north to the Grand Canyon, they passed a Hualapai encampment of 200 people near Diamond River (Manners 1974).

Kniffen (1935:27) described the Hualapai country (Figures 18, 19) as lying “in northwestern Arizona, bounded roughly to the north and west by the great bend of the Colorado. It extends nearly to the Bill Williams fork on the south; to the east it reaches a line passing from the western end of Grand canyon (sic) to the divide between the eastern afluents of the Big Sandy and the tributaries of the Santa Maria.” In mapping village sites (Figure 20), Kniffen (1935:44) surmized that given the scarcity of water, villages “must have been maintained in the same places for generations.” From the Hualapai perspective, mountains are sources of power, where people go to get power for healing. The San Francisco Peaks on the Hualapai eastern boundary reflect this perspective and tribal members are known to still go to the Peaks for healing purposes (Toupal 2005).

McGuire (1983) described a broader area as Hualapai territory (Figure 21) including subunit areas (Table 18). His eastern boundary extends to the Little Colorado River, overlapping with Havasupai land. The fluid nature of Hualapai resource use and difficulty Europeans had in distinguishing the Hualapai from their neighbors limited an accurate reconstruction of their land base.
Figure 18. Walapai territory in Arizona (Kniffen 1935:26a)
Figure 19. Walapai territory in Arizona (Kniffen 1935:28a)
Figure 20. Walapai villages (Kniffen 1935:245a)
Initially, Hualapai lands in Arizona were defined legislatively in the mid-1880s (Table 19) (Figure 22). The Hualapai later were granted land by the Indian Claims
Commission from the southern shore of the Colorado River to the northern tip of the plateau ridge between Prospect Canyon and Mohawk Valley; from the rim of Mohawk Canyon to the edge of the Aubry Cliff escarpment; from the escarpment southeast to Picacho Peak; south to Indian Peak; southwest to Camp Wood Mountain and Signal, Arizona; northwest to Crossman Peak and north to the Buck Mountains; northwest to the southern tip of the Black Mountains, following the range to Mount Wilson and then northeast back to the southern shore of the Colorado River (Figure 23) (90 Ind. Cl. Comm. 447).

Table 19. Federal adjustments to Hualapai lands in Arizona (Royce 1899).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 1883</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1886</td>
<td>Stat. L., XI, 374</td>
<td>Map unit 683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 22. Federal adjustments to Hualapai lands in Arizona (Royce 1899).
The Yavapai

In October 1851, Lt. Sitgreaves was traveling from the Little Colorado River to the north side of the San Francisco Peaks when his party came “upon a large encampment of Yampai or Tonto Indians on the edge of a deep ravine” (Sitgreaves 1853). This was a piñon camp of men, women, and children. Antoine Leroux, Sitgreaves’ guide, found more lodges of unidentified Indians on the south side of the San Francisco Peaks, however, these people fled at the site of him (Sitgreaves 1853). As Sitgreaves made his way west to the Colorado River, he encountered more Yampais and Cojnninos.
MacGregor (1935a:25) recorded Yavapai territory as “the land from Williams to Walnut Creek, Widj'g'hwa’l', to Winukwa’ (a big mountain, not far from Signal), to Sanyagahate’va (eagle’s nest in the benches, near Hillside mine), to Phoenix, to Prescott, to Ash Fork.” Ewing (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960) obtained different landmarks noting that the Yavapai people occupied the current Yavapai County area, Date Creek on the south to Prescott on the north, the Mogollon Mountains and Verde River on the east to the Santa Maria on the west. The boundaries with the Hualapai were lax with both groups frequently using the same hunting grounds, although, Ewing believed this to be a cause of tension.

Gifford (1936) placed the northeast boundary of Yavapai just south of Flagstaff, while Goodwin (1942) placed the northwest boundary of the Northern and Southern Tonto bands of Western Apaches in this area (Figure 24). Goodwin (1942) described these bands as being either purely Athabaskan, or part Apache and part Yavapai. The intermingling of the Apache and Yavapai led Schroeder (1963), Harrington (1908), and Gatschett (1879) to conclude that the entire Northern and Southern Tonto bands were Yavapai. Corbusier (1886), however, identified them as mixed and descended from Yuman and Athabaskan Indians.

Figure 24. Overlapping territory of the Yavapai (Gifford 1936) and Tonto (Goodwin 1942) peoples (Brugge 1965: 356)
Brugge (1965) noted that Yavapai people were living in the Verde Valley when the Western Apache people began to expand westward. The two groups developed a close alliance while retaining their languages and knowledge of separate origins. Brugge describes this alliance as paralleling that between the San Juan Paiutes and the Navajo.

Yavapai territory extended from northeast of Yuma to the San Francisco Peaks, the Verde Valley, and Globe (Figure 25). The Yavapai had four subtribes: the Tolkapaya in the southwestern part of Yavapai territory, the Yavepe in the northwestern part, the Wipukpaya in the northeastern part, and the Kewevkapaya in the southeastern part (Khera and Mariella 1983). The route followed by Antonio de Espejo in the 1580s was documented as an Indian trail that connected the Verde Valley and Hopi villages (Bartlett 1942; Schroeder 1952). Running through the valley, it would have crossed the southeastern and eastern foothill region of the San Francisco Peaks.

The Yavapai made extensive use of the area between the San Francisco Peaks and Oak Creek Canyon, traveling as much as 30 miles a day. Rather than occupying a fixed area, they made a wide seasonal round, occupying the spaces between their camps. Historically, the Yavapai were encountered as far east as Mormon Lake. The northern boundary of the Yavapai included areas near the San Francisco Mountains including a rancheria there (Schroeder 1974a).

On the north, the Yavapai were bordered by the Walapai and Havasupai. Both these tribes had a language and had a culture very similar to the Yavapai. The Walapai, in particular, were a mountain people with a culture almost the same as the Yavapai. However, from early historic times, the Yavapai and Walapai were reported to be more or less hostile to one another. Since 1869, when bands of Walapai Indians joined United States troops in a campaign against the Yavapai, the hostility between the Yavapai and Walapai has been frequently cited and has been a cause for placing the two on different reservations. Similarly, since early historic times hostilities have occurred from time to time between the Yavapai and Havasupai. For a long time prior to 1860, the Yavapai were distinct and separate from both the Walapai and Havasupai (Schroeder 1974a:403).

Yavapai lands in Arizona were defined legislatively in the mid-1870s (Table 20) (Figure 26). They were not identified in the first map showing tribal aboriginal claims but were granted the Camp Verde reserve in 1871. Less than four years later, the reserve was returned to the public domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 1871</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1875</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26. Federal adjustments to Yavapai lands in Arizona (Royce 1899).
The ICC findings regarding Yavapai territory includes several maps that show exploration routes, estimated boundaries, and use areas (Figures 27-34) (Schroeder 1974a). Some of Schroeder’s maps are based on Gifford (1932, 1936) who also identified the traditional origin places of the Yavapai clans Amahiyukpa and Atachiopa as being in northeastern Yavapai territory.

Thomas (1974) also provided mapped information more directly involving the Flagstaff area. He identified an area of hunting, gathering, and special uses that centered on the San Francisco Peaks, and two rancherias on the north side of the Peaks. He also located a battle with U.S. troops within the use area of the Peaks (Figure 35). In a second map, he detailed Yavapai and neighboring tribal lands of approximately the aboriginal period (Figure 36). Thomas also detailed Yavapai territory for the period 1583-1848 showing exploration routes, missions, rancherias, and use areas of south and central Arizona (Figure 37).
Figure 27. Explorations of Arizona from 1539 to 1700 (Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 28. Explorations of Arizona in the 1700s and 1800s (Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 29. Traditional Yavapai bands and territory (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 30. Traditional Yavapai locales 1540-1600 (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 31. Traditional Yavapai locales 1600-1700 (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 32. Traditional Yavapai locales 1700-1800 (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 33. Traditional Yavapai locales mid-1800s (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a).
Figure 34. Yavapai use areas (Gifford 1932, 1936 in Schroeder 1974a)
Figure 35. Yavapai rancherias, use areas, battles with U.S. troops, bands/clans, and unoccupied areas (Thomas 1974:358)
Figure 36. Thomas’s (1974) interpretation of normal land use and danger (hatched) areas of the Yavapai and Northern Tonto people.
Figure 37. Yavapai territory 1583-1848 documents explorations, missions, rancherias, and use areas of south and central Arizona (Thomas 1974)

**Historical Evidence**

Much of the geographical evidence can be considered historical evidence. The historical evidence for the Pai and Hualapai, however, is essentially geographically-oriented so only the Havasupai and Yavapai are addressed in this section.

*The Havasupai*

Cardenas “discovered” and documented the Grand Canyon in 1540, however, it was Father Francisco Garcés who, in 1776, became the first European to document the existence
of the Havasupai people when Hualapai guides took him to a village within the Grand Canyon. The Havasupai people continued to live free of European influences until 1825 when trappers and prospectors moved into the area. In the 1850s, military and scientific expeditions brought the next wave of non-Indian people to the plateau region but in the 1880s, the railroad and cattle ranches brought the greatest change to the area. The Havasupai people were given a reservation in 1880 that encompassed a five-mile by twelve-mile portion of Cataract Canyon; the reservation was reduced to the bottom of the canyon two years later. Changes to the Havasupai people’s way of life, however, came with the establishment of a government school in the canyon in 1895. They lost access to their plateau residences and made the canyon their year-round home (Schwartz 1955; Smithson and Euler 1994).

When the first European, Father Francisco Garcés, visited them in their canyon homeland in 1776, the Havasupai still carried on most of their aboriginal life. From their Hopi friends to the east they had obtained a few European goods, but aside from occasional raids by the Yavapai from the south near present-day Prescott, and to a lesser extent from Paiutes who lived across the Grand Canyon to the north, there were few interruptions to the native life of the Havasupai. In addition to their Hopi trading partners, the Havasupai had friendly relations with the Hualapai, Mojave, and the Halchidoma, all speakers of Yuman dialects. Navajos were not then in direct contact with the Havasupai (Smithson and Euler 1994: viii).

Prior to 1850, the Havasupai occupied, with little competition, an area the size of Delaware from the eastern part of the current-day Hualapai reservation to the Little Colorado River. In 1776, the Havasupai had settlements as far as Moenkopi in current Hopi territory19, and they ranged as far south as Flagstaff, or perhaps even further in Tonto Apache central Arizona, and west to Askfork. Family bands wandered across the lands north of Flagstaff on hunting expeditions (Whiting 1985).

In the mid-1800s, Francois X. Aubry crossed Pai territory from west to east in a running fight with 50-60 Pai until they passed out of Pai territory near the San Francisco Peaks. This account indicated large numbers of Havasupai people hunting and gathering along the slopes of Mount Floyd (northeast of Seligman) and Bill Williams Mountain (Martin 1985).

Whiting (1985) suggests that when the U.S. Government designated the Havasupai as a separate group from the Hualapai in 1882, they were mistaken. Intermarriage among the two was common, and the Havasupai often spoke of themselves as a “band of that larger tribe” (ibid. 1985:4). This relationship suggests that cultural affiliation evidence for either the Havasupai and for the Hualapai with the Flagstaff area can be extended to both.

Smithson and Euler (1994) notes that the Havasupai believed that the world was flat and that the sky was a dome that came to meet the earth all around the edges. The earth, high in the middle and sloping away to the edges, was small, but the sky was large and very high. The middle of the world was at the San Francisco Peaks, the highest peaks in Arizona, north of Flagstaff, and visible from all parts of Havasupai territory except in the deep tributary gorges of Grand Canyon. This visibility accounts for the belief that the San Francisco Peaks

---

19 Although these may have been only occasionally occupied (Coues 1900).
are central in Havasupai world concepts even though, geographically, they are near the southeastern corner of their former range.

The San Francisco Peaks were thought to contain spirits which, if appealed to, could produce rain, although, people were afraid to go too close to the sites, which were considered dangerous. It was possible that visitors to the sites might cause too much rain or strong winds that could blow people off the canyon walls (Smithson and Euler 1994). Stories from Smithson’s and Euler’s informants illustrate the spiritual nature and importance of the San Francisco Peaks to the Havasupai:

On one dream journey the spirit on horseback took our informant to one of the highest of the San Francisco Peaks. It was very steep and the spirit told him to walk around it, stepping carefully in footholes. Under the ground he could hear a strong wind humming as though it were far away. He put out his hand and patted down the top of the peak, saying, “I’m not here looking for trouble. I came here for a good reason. I came here for a lot of drinking water.” The wind decreased and our informant awakened, not knowing why he had uttered these words except that it was upon instruction from the spirit (Smithson and Euler 1994:7-8).

A shaman in the 1930s spoke of dreams he had that led to him becoming a shaman. In one, he “was transported through the air northeasterly toward Cameron. Near there he saw many people coming from underground, and also talking an unintelligible language. This time there were more people than he had seen in the north. The shaman waited until they were all on the surface. They spoke (but the informant couldn’t explain his sudden understanding) and told him, “Over by the San Francisco Peaks there is something to fight sickness, to drive it away and conquer it.” This proved to be small red rocks, about a foot long, and cylindrical “like a baby bottle.” The shaman gathered these and tied them in cloth. Then the people advised him to take one more, a smooth opaque white one that could be rubbed on patients’ chests to eliminate sickness. The shaman returned with his rocks to Rain Tank and told “sickness that he didn’t want it to be going around.” The ground around turned white as though it were snow covered. The shaman awakened but later reported that he had felt the dream had not been complete” (Smithson and Euler 1994:10).

The Yavapai

According to Gifford (1932:243), “the southeastern Yavapai have no stories about displacing previous inhabitants, in spite of the ruins in their country.” He also noted that their origin story included the San Francisco Peaks as a prominent stopping place after the great flood. From there, Widapokwi traveled to the red rock country east of the Verde River.

The Yavapai arrived in their traditional territory possibly as late as 1400 A.D. (Dobyns 1956; Linford 1979; Schroeder 1952). Their relationship to the preceding Prescott Branch is unclear although they may represent a mix of Yavapai and Prescott ancestry.
Linford noted three distinct Yavapai groups: the Southeastern, the Northeastern, and the Western (Gifford 1936). The Southeastern and Northeastern groups were close friends and allies in warfare. The northeastern group was divided into the Oak Creek Canyon Band, the upper Verde Valley people, the Prescott region people, the Jerome tableland people, the Black Mountain people (Crown King region) and people of the southern part of the Jerome mountain ridge. The Western Yavapai territory ran “from the western slopes of the Bradshaw Mountains to Castle Dome and the Colorado River near La Paz and comprised an eastern band (Wiltonkapaya) and western band (Hakehelapa)” (Gifford 1932).

Schwartz (1955) noted that Francisco Garcés, during his explorations in 1775-1776, located a group of Yavapais far within the present day borders of the Hualapai reservation, leading to a question of inter-tribal relations if no joint occupancy. According to Schwartz, additional support for this finding comes in frequent cross-referencing and comparison between meetings with the individual groups.

The Espejo expedition20 traveled from Moqui to near the present day site of Flagstaff, at which point they headed for the western shore of Mormon Lake. On this segment of the journey, Luxan recorded their first encounter with a “mountainous people” who were the Yavapai (Thomas 1974).

An examination of early Yavapai life and relations with other Indians and with Spanish explorers reveals a variety of practices, motivations, and strategies which informed the way Yavapais dealt with whites in the nineteenth century. Yavapais struggled constantly to survive in their harsh desert environment, and thus their efforts to maintain economic and territorial integrity in the face of disruption and dislocation are historically central (Braatz 1997).

The general similarities of material culture and subsistence adaptations led to the Yavapai being referred to often as “Apache” by Euro-American observers. “Tonto Apache” is a term used by Euro-Americans to describe all the groups which lived in the Tonto Basin, whether they were Apache or Yavapai (National Museum of Natural History 1994).

Khera and Mariella (1983) note that the more common names used by the Spaniards for the Yavapai include Cruzados (1598), Cruciferos (1716), Tacabuy (1605), Tas(s)abuess (1775), Nijor (1699), Nijoras, Nijores, Niforas, Nifores, Nixoras, Nichoras, Nixotas, and Nijotes (nd), Tejuas (1776), and Tehuas and Teguas (nd). Through the 17th century, the Yavapai were often called Apaches in Spanish and English (Schroeder 1974a). The Northeastern Yavapai were called Apache-Mojaves (English, Spanish), Yavapais (Yuman), and Kohenims (Athapaskan) (Corbusier 1886). The Western Yavapai, or Tolkapaya, were called Apache-Yumas in the latter half of the 1800s. The Southeastern Yavapai, or Kewevekapaya, were called Apache-Tontos, Tonto Apaches, or Tontos. This group intermarried extensively with the Apache.

20 Antonio Espejo and Father Bernaldino Beltran led the expedition recorded in the diary of Diego Perez da Luxan in 1582.
Gifford (1932) also found that the Tonto Apache frequently intermarried with the Yavapai and possibly with the Cibeque Apache, and the Yavapai sometimes stole Apache wives. The Yavapai built huts similar to those used by the San Carlos Apache. Given the numerous and inconsistent indentifications, and inter-tribal relations, similar affiliation with the Flagstaff area likely exists for both the Yavapai and Tonto Apache people.

**Linguistic Evidence**

Native place names are considered important because such words often signify much more than the location to which they pertain (Schneider 1965; Lyons 1969; Fox 1971). Place names can denote discreet categories in nature, and even global perceptions (Berlin et al. 1971; Bulmer 1970), which may account for the application of words (Rosaldo 1972). “Naming is seen as a process which confers contextual significance on objective continuities and discontinuities in nature” (Rosaldo 1972:83-99).

**The Pai**

The Flagstaff area is a culturally significant area on the southeastern, eastern and northeastern extents of the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai peoples respectively. The San Francisco Peaks is a sacred landmark that encompasses specific places in the surrounding landscape that includes the three Flagstaff monuments. Similarities of tribe-specific Pai place names relative to the Flagstaff area are apparent and include discrete features (Table 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21. Pai place names associated with the Flagstaff area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunset Crater</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amat pi la</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“earth-burn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walnut Canyon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Waltauwa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“walnut grove”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Widjgʷhwa’l</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wupatki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wiithluuwa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Citadel sink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wiivasuwa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco Peaks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ba’wanwa, Wi’hagnbajga</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“snowy mountains”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Weka Hanapache</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Snow Mountain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wihakinbacha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also refers to Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualapai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapatis 1981b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wee muunee goh-wah’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“very cold mountain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>21</sup> Applies to the Yavapai-Prescott, Ft. McDowell, and Yavapai-Apache tribes.
Oral Tradition Evidence

The previously presented folkloric evidence included stories that are still passed on to the coming generations. Where several accounts of a given story were merged to reflect a common version, the Pai label could be assigned. Oral traditions, however, are conveyed verbally by tribal members, leaving no room for a Pai, or generalized, version.

The Havasupai

The Havasupai say that their ancestors inhabited the ruined dwellings in the San Francisco Mountain area (Schroeder 1953). McGregor (1951) also implied such a relationship, and interpreted this as potential evidence of a relationship between the Cohonina and Havasupai.

Hopi oral history states that the southern portions of Paiute territory, such as Tuba City and Moenkopi, were occupied by the Havasupai. By 1830, the San Juan Southern Paiutes were expanding into the area and the Havasupai slowly retreated (Bunte and Franklin 1987). If the Hopi account records the eastern boundary or use area of Havasupai territory, then the other types of evidence regarding Havasupai relations with the Flagstaff area may indicate their southern boundary or use area and, consequently, a much larger traditional territory than previously recorded.

Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing (1961) address Pai (Hualapai and Havasupai) traditions and culture is a reprint the second part of Ewing’s 1903 manuscript, which included legends and traditions. The account of the Pai creation story says that humans were created at the request of the Great Spirit by Ka-that’ Ka-na’-ve, “Told the Coyote,” a man with supernatural abilities. He created man from a bed of cane growing along the Colorado River. The tall, strong canes were men, the tall and slender canes were women, and the small canes were children. After he created them, he stayed with them for several generations and taught them how to use the land, and how to live with the land. Kathat Kanave also named “every water, mountain, valley and important locality…every plant, tree and shrub.” The Pai were told never to rename or change the name of a place; this way, every place carried only one name, and there was no confusion (ibid. 1961:13). The Havasupai names for Wupatki and the San Francisco Peaks given under Linguistic Evidence are two places named by Kathat Kanave.

The Hualapai

Hualapai stories relating to the Flagstaff area and specifically to the San Francisco Peaks and Sunset Crater have been presented under Folkloric Evidence. These stories are also part of Hualapai oral traditions told to Hualapai elders by their grandparents.

The Wika Hme’ creation story places the Hualapai on their lands surrounded by the Colorado River, apparently centered on the Hualapai Mountains (Talieje 1981). The San Francisco Peaks are on their extreme eastern boundary. Madwida\(^{22}\) provides an account of

\(^{22}\) Hualapai spelling is Maďwiđa
the breakup of the people and the places to which they migrated including those who went past Flagstaff and beyond (Mapatis 1981a). This account suggests that the San Francisco Peaks have been a landmark since the beginning of time. Qimwid’m Ginyweva places the San Francisco Peaks centrally in the Hualapai world. The Peaks are the place from where the guardians of the east, Hmany Qech Ginyiweva, and west, Qimwid’m Ginyiweva, come (Mapatis 1981b). The story of Nya, the Sun, is an account of when the people sought the help of relatives who lived on San Francisco Peaks so that they could defeat Nya. The story ends with Sun being decapitated, and his head hitting a white rock and bursting into flames. The people run away and everything is burned. The story is suggestive of how the people dealt or could deal with the Sunset Crater eruption (Mapatis 1981c).

The Yavapai

Lucy Satala (1990), a Yavapai elder along with others, related a story that her grandparents told her about her ancestors who lived in Walnut Canyon before a great drought caused them to move closer to the Verde River. She explained that the Yavapai used to live there and stored food in the small houses in the canyon walls. Today, legends say that "little people" still live in these places, waiting for the Yavapai to return. These little people were the guardians and protectors of the Yavapai. Yavapai elder Ted Vaughn said that more people should know about these legends so that the Yavapai have their rightful place in the history of this area. The Yavapai story about “The World Fire” parallels the Pai and Hualapai stories about the Sun and again suggests the Sunset Crater eruptions:

_A long time ago the sun was a living being and walked the earth with Coyote. Squirrel, Rabbit and Hummingbird, who liked to gamble, won many things from the Sun. The Sun lost all his belongings, even his home. Mr. Squirrel hit Mr. Sun on his forehead with a stone axe and the Sun died._

_Mr. Squirrel said that Mr. Sun was not going to be in this world anymore. Mr. Squirrel threw Sun’s arm into the sky and it has been there ever since. Mr. Squirrel said "Don’t drop the body of the sun on the ground. Be careful with it."_

_All the people got a piece of Sun’s body. Coyote got a piece of Sun’s stomach. He put it on a rock pile. The World Fire started from that piece. It spread and became larger. The fire burned everything. The people cried, "How are we going to save our lives?"

_They were in a broad valley. The world was on fire and the ground was burning. It was burning the world. It killed all kinds of people and animals. Coyote had done very wrong._

Corbusier (1968), the son of an army surgeon from 1869-1886, contextualized and finalized a manuscript of his father’s memories, large portions of which were drafted before Dr. Corbusier’s death in 1930. In the late 1880s, Corbusier found little Yavapai oral history due to a taboo against speaking of the dead, but he considers them to be recent arrivals to the
Verde Valley as the Hopi claim to have left the valley in the last 350-400 years (approximately 1336-1386).

In a manuscript of Mike Burns’ (also known as Hoomothya) autobiography, Dr. Corbusier made an editorial note questioning why a Yavapai would give a Walapai story in documenting tribal history. His observation suggests that the split among the Pai groups was recent enough that folklore was still shared in Corbusier’s time. The more recent the split, the more applicable all affiliation evidence is to all three Pai groups.

In the manuscript, Burns describes the early migrations of the Yuman peoples, with the Maricopa relocating and allying with the Pima, the Cocopas at the mouth of the Colorado River. He stated that for a time the rest of the Yuman people lived together in harmony until some children fought and caused a larger dispute. Following this incident, the people divided with the Kachan (Yavapai) people moving west to the Colorado, some staying at the river to the north (Mojave), some going to the pine country (Hualapai) with their relatives (Havasupai), and a group moved to near Wickenburg (Western Yavapai) between the Yavapai and the others. The territory of the Yavapai went from the Mazatzal Mountains, all along the Verde River, and notably included the San Francisco Peaks (Burns 2002).

**Ethnographic Summary**

In terms of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments, the Pai people’s traditional use of and relationship with the Flagstaff area are recorded in anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, and geographical evidence. Additionally, affiliation of the Havasupai is recorded in archaeological, geographical, historical, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence. Affiliation of the Hualapai is recorded in archaeological, folkloric, geographical, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence. Affiliation of the Yavapai is recorded in archaeological, geographical, historical, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence. Cultural affiliation evidence is stronger for the Pai people as an ethnic group than as individual tribes due to limited early explorations and documentation followed by confused historic recording of tribes and locations.

The materials reviewed for this report bolster anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historic, and oral tradition evidence from the 2001 review (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and the 2004 study (Toupal et al. 2004) for the Flagstaff area as well as the three park units. The materials also added linguistic evidence for the three groups. In addition to affiliation with the Flagstaff area, some archaeological and linguistic evidence is specific to Walnut Canyon and Wupatki, some folkloric, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence is specific to Sunset Crater, and some oral tradition evidence is specific to Walnut Canyon. The cumulative evidence now addresses nine of the ten types of evidence that contribute to Pai cultural affiliation, five of them adequately for Sunset Crater and Walnut Canyon, and seven of them for Wupatki (Table 22). The cumulative evidence addresses five types of evidence specific to the Havasupai (Table 23), six types of evidence specific to the Hualapai (Table 24), and five types of evidence specific to the Yavapai (Table 25). Two types of evidence are adequate for each tribe.
The body of evidence for the Pai addresses all four time frames. Evidence is adequate for the traditional, aboriginal, and historic time frames (Table 26). Evidence specific to the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai addresses all four time frames with it being adequate for the traditional and aboriginal time frames (Tables 27-29).

Table 22. Cumulative evidence of Pai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaelogical</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate

Table 23. Cumulative evidence of Havasupai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaelogical</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate

Table 24. Cumulative evidence of Hualapai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaelogical</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Table 25. Cumulative evidence of Yavapai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate

Table 26. Time frame of Pai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate

Table 27. Time frame of Havasupai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate

Table 28. Time frame of Hualapai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Table 29. Time frame of Yavapai cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Chapter Four: Cultural Affiliation of the Southern Paiute

Newly compiled evidence of cultural affiliation of the Southern Paiute with Sunset Crater Volcano, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki national monuments builds on the two previous studies of cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and traditional association (Toupal et al. 2004). Summaries of those studies are presented as background to the data obtained for this chapter.

Tier 1: 2001 Cultural Affiliation Summary

In the original document review for cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001), the Kaibab and San Juan Southern Paiute people were found to be affiliated with Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki more than what has been understood previously. Their affiliation with Sunset Crater was supported by anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, oral tradition, and other expert evidence (Table 30). Their affiliation was based in part on evidence of wide-spread interactions among descendants of the Sinagua and Anasazi that addressed traditional and historic time frames (Table 31).

Table 30. Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Time frame of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (≈ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anthropological evidence was concerned with traditional uses of plants and animals in and around Sunset Crater including medicine plants and hunting.\(^1\) The archaeological evidence was limited to the presence of Sinagua pottery with which the Southern Paiute people had an indirect association.\(^2\) Folkloric evidence was based on Yuman origin stories that identify Southern Paiute people as coming from the Grand Canyon.\(^1\)

The geographical evidence noted that Southern Paiute people occupied areas from the Grand Canyon to the San Francisco Peaks, and that these two places were connected as well.

---

\(^1\) Document 8 – Anthropological Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography for Sunset Crater Volcano and Wupatki National Monuments

\(^2\) Document 2 – NPS-Tribes Meeting, 12/12/97
by a hunters’ trail; a Southern Paiute hunting area was known to be near the Sacred Mountain Trading Post, just outside Flagstaff. The area bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is known to the Southern Paiute people as a sacred geography that is anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices.

The historic evidence complements the geographic evidence with the identification of Sunset Crater as being within traditional Southern Paiute territories. Historic evidence overlaps with oral tradition evidence, particularly that of the San Juan Southern Paiute people, which speaks of historic events that occurred in Sunset Crater and nearby areas. Places noted in the oral traditions suggest the possibility of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) in this area.

Other expert evidence noted that the Southern Paiute are part of the Fremont Anasazi culture, which has been documented in proximity to Sunset Crater. Southern Paiute ancestral lands cover parts of Utah, Nevada, California, and Arizona, the latter being home to the Kaibab and San Juan Southern Paiute people. Southern Paiute tenure in Arizona is reflected in Hopi clan histories that connect two peoples.

Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon was supported by anthropological, archaeological, geographical, and oral tradition evidence (Table 32). The evidence addressed traditional and historic time frames (Table 33) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

Table 32. Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Time frame of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anthropological evidence was concerned with traditional uses of plants and animals in and around Walnut Canyon including medicine plants and hunting. The archaeological evidence was limited to the presence of Sinagua pottery with which the Southern Paiute people had an indirect association.

The geographical evidence noted that Southern Paiute people occupied areas from the Grand Canyon to the San Francisco Peaks, and that these two places were connected as well.

3 Document 22 – Results of the Conference “Traditional Histories of the Pre-Columbian Past” 6/95
by a hunters’ trail; a Southern Paiute hunting area was known to be near the Sacred Mountain Trading Post, just outside Flagstaff. The area bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is known to the Southern Paiute people as a sacred geography that is anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices. Places noted in the oral traditions suggest the possibility of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) in this area.

Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Wupatki was supported by anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historic, oral tradition, and other expert evidence (Table 34). The evidence addressed traditional and historic time frames (Table 35) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

Table 34. Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review (shaded reflects adequate evidence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35. Time frame of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anthropological evidence was concerned with traditional uses of plants and animals in and around Wupatki including medicine plants and hunting. The archaeological evidence included the presence of Sinagua pottery with which the Southern Paiute people had an indirect association. Human burials within Wupatki boundaries have been connected to the Southern Paiute people. Mountain sheep found in Kayenta Anasazi rock art within the park reflect a possible connection to the Southern Paiute people. Mountain sheep are of great importance in Southern Paiute culture and their presence in the rock art may be associated directly with San Juan Southern Paiute.

Folkloric evidence was based on Yuman origin stories that identify Southern Paiute people as coming from the Grand Canyon. San Juan Southern Paiute legends tell of enemies living in the Wupatki area. The geographical evidence noted that Southern Paiute people occupied areas from the Grand Canyon to the San Francisco Peaks, and that these two places were connected as well by a hunters’ trail; a Southern Paiute hunting area was known to be near the Sacred Mountain Trading Post, just outside Flagstaff. The area bound by the Grand Canyon, the San Francisco Peaks, and the Little Colorado River is known to the Southern Paiute people as a sacred geography that is anchored through oral tradition and cultural practices.

---

The historic evidence complements the geographic evidence with the identification of Wupatki as being within traditional Southern Paiute territories. The general area of Wupatki is mentioned in San Juan Southern Paiute oral tradition. Places noted in the oral traditions suggest the possibility of Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) in this area.

Other expert evidence noted that the Southern Paiute are part of the Fremont Anasazi culture, which has been documented in proximity to Wupatki. Southern Paiute ancestral lands cover parts of Utah, Nevada, California, and Arizona, the latter being home to the Kaibab and San Juan Southern Paiute people. Southern Paiute tenure in Arizona is reflected in Hopi clan histories that connect two peoples.

**Tier 2: 2004 Traditional Association Summary**

The Southern Paiute people are traditionally associated with the three national monuments. The summaries that follow are taken directly from Toupal et al. (2004) and presented for each park unit as well as the overall landscape.

**Sunset Crater**

The Southern Paiute name for Sunset Crater is *Kaiv Pa’kectis* meaning “Mountain with hole or water bowl on top.” This area has been used traditionally to collect basket making materials, medicinal herbs, and food plants. The Paiute also hunted and fished in this area and recognize a strong connection between Sunset Crater and Wupatki. Evidence of previous Indian use of the area included Paiute baskets and bodies such as that of a farmer found in one of the caves. Snow melt from the mountains and ice from the caves was used for subsistence and domestic purposes, but also had medicinal and spiritual uses. Significant geological features include the volcano and the ice cave. The consultants speculated that the Indian people who witnessed the volcanic eruption were frightened but returned to the area once the land had cooled. Both prehistorically and today, these features are visited seasonally for seeking knowledge and power, to communicate with spiritual beings, and to receive songs from the caves.

The elders agreed that Southern Paiute people would come to Sunset Crater for camping, hunting, plant gathering, seeking power and knowledge, and performing ceremonies. One elder felt that it was difficult to say conclusively whether these activities occurred before the eruption because the landscape was so changed afterward. As an example, he explained that, “songs need a cave and it’s hard to tell if there were any before the lava flow.”

Plants are of great cultural importance to Southern Paiute people. Southern Paiutes used a variety of plants found in the park including pines, three leaf sumac berries, and yucca. Different plants were harvested at certain times of the year. Yucca and sumac, which were used for baskets and cradles, were harvested in March and October. Plants that could be dried after harvest would be used during the winter for food. One elder said, “This place is close to plants; there are a lot of plants to eat. [Sumac] was for cold drinks. Older people would make this. There are plants here, but not as many as yesterday.” Plants also are used
for medicine and in ceremony and as one elder explained, “Healing people come here for plants.” Also, the type of plant to be used would be determined by the dream the person had. If, for example, a person had a bad dream, he or she would burn and pray with the plants.

Animals are also culturally significant to Southern Paiute people. The elders who visited the park identified rabbits, deer, antelope, elk, squirrels, and quail. Their uses of these and other animals, which pre-date European contact, included food, medicine, ceremony, clothing and tools. The Paiute elders explained how many objects were made from animal hide, horns, teeth, and bone, including clothing such as robes, and various tools. Medicine was made from animal parts to cure such ailments as headaches or sickness believed to be related to a specific animal. The elders added that deer were not used during mating season, that they waited until afterward during October and November to hunt them. They dried much of the deer meat for later use.

Critical to all forms of life, water from a Southern Paiute perspective is essential to the distribution of power throughout the landscape. The Paiute people believe that the mountains call down the water in various forms and as it makes its way downslope either underground or as surface runoff, it transfers some of its power to resources along the way. Where the water resurfaces in springs and ice caves, more of its power is concentrated making use of these places spiritually dangerous for anyone other than specialists who know how to use those places properly. One elder added that just as water was a conduit for power across the landscape, the waterways were paths for spiritual people to follow to the source of the power.

The geologic features of Sunset Crater were used daily, seasonally, prehistorically, historically, and today in various ways. Because features such as the Crater, the ice cave, the lava flows, and cinders are products of powerful earth forces that acted to put the world back in balance, uses tend to be ceremonial. Other uses include seeking knowledge and power, teaching new generations, and communicating with spiritual beings. One elder suggested that the ice cave may have been used for storage, and the lava rocks may have been used as grinding stones or in the construction of buildings and sweat lodges. As one elder explained, “the lava rocks were for sweats, and were sacred for purification. People wouldn't come here while the volcano was erupting, but would come afterward.” The volcanic mountains are sources of great power and knowledge and, consequently, a primary choice among Southern Paiutes who need to seek visions, knowledge, or power. In some cases, specialists would build fires on the mountain tops to teach others about the volcano.

Walnut Canyon

The Southern Paiute representatives identified Walnut Canyon as a place to collect plants, to farm, and to hunt. They suggested that some places in the park might have been excellent places for star gazing. They also believe that the canyon was a place for ceremony, although one person felt it was not a place of power. One consultant said that the people who lived in Walnut Canyon in the past were “another kind of people, they lived under the rocks. They were called Winno Kwiiuits [the ancient ones].”
The places the Southern Paiute elders identified as connected to Walnut Canyon include Wupatki, Sunset Crater, the Grand Canyon, and the Verde Valley. One elder explained that the places in the canyon seem more modern than those at Wupatki, and that similar constructions can be found in the region high up in the hillsides such as the “granaries in the north wall of the Grand Canyon.” Another elder stated that Walnut Canyon is connected with the eruption at Sunset Crater although he did not know the reason for the connection. They agreed that the canyon is connected to Yavapai and Hualapai as well.

The Southern Paiute elders identified important use plants including yucca, Indian tea, cedar trees, and piñon, which is used for eating, making bows, and for firewood. The Paiute people farmed traditional squash and corn, and gathered wild plants, fruit, walnuts, and berries in the area. Some plants were dried for winter use as food and medicine, and for ceremonies. Cedars were used to make flutes, yucca was used to make clothing and shoes, three leaf sumac was used in basket making, diapers were made from juniper and cliffrose, and red dyes used in basket weaving were extracted from mountain mahogany; the dye was created by boiling the roots in the water.

One elder explained use of specific plants was determined by the amount of power a plant possessed, and not everyone could use those plants. According to this elder, “They used to have to pray for some plants. The medicine men would pray for them. Some plants you can just use, others you can't, others you would have to pay the medicine man for. You'd have to pay for strong medicines. They aren't growing now because there is a lack of rain.”

The animals identified by the Paiute representatives were used for food, ceremonies, and medicines. These included antelope, deer, rabbits, squirrels, chipmunks, elk, bobcats, mountain lions, and hawks, all of which are still used today. One elder said that deer heads and antlers were used in ceremonies, bones were used for ceremonial flutes, and antlers and bones were used to make tools. One elder’s grandmother used to melt deer hooves to put on bows, which she then decorated with horse hairs.

There are good hawks. Their feathers are used for arrows and spears. They are also used for ceremonies. Medicine men used hawk feathers all the time.

The elders believe that in the past people collected rainwater in the indentations present in some of the rocks. Water was obtained as well from the canyon and Walnut Creek. One elder noted trincheras above the site, which meant that people practiced rain-fed terrace farming near the trail some time in the past. Several elders said that spring water would be used in ceremonies, and to mix medicines and herbs.

The representatives believe that Paiute people lived on the cliff walls, although it may have been seasonal camping. Medicine men would have lived here because it is a place with a lot of power and it has many powerful medicines. Some of the place’s power comes from the peaks and volcanoes. Hunting camps would have been along the rim, and hunting ceremonies would have been held there as well.
The elders said that the people who lived here did so to get away from the cold and during times of trade. The geology played an important role in ceremonies and seeking knowledge; it allowed Indian people to communicate with spiritual beings, which would have occurred on the canyon rims. The elders said that the canyon was still a good place to teach their children about the old ways.

**Wupatki**

Southern Paiute people refer to this area as *Nuvaharka*, a term that is applied to the entire San Francisco Peaks region. The elders noted many special characteristics about the Wupatki and Wukoki sites. In addition to living and playing games at Wupatki, the Paiute representatives believe that it was a trading place. The elders explained that the two places are sacred as a result of connections to many other places.

This place is not too far from San Juan. When people crossed Lee’s Ferry [where the water was low], they would go through San Juan to Wupatki. Going to the Grand Canyon, there was another crossing. It was open, a source for red paint. The water was low there, too.

I know from stories that the whole area was connected. This is a sacred area. Not just one spot is sacred; you have to do special ceremonies to move between different spots.

I have heard in stories from my parents. Hopi stories also. The whole area was sacred because of the volcanoes.

The presence of the spring intrigued the elders and they recognized that it would have been a significant feature in the past when the water had better flow. The elders explained that people would have made pilgrimages to visit the spring and make offerings to the water, and that the spring connected Wupatki with the San Francisco Peaks. Paiute people also would have used the water in certain medicines.

The representatives identified a variety of plants used as medicine, food, and making things like baskets. One elder explained that juniper seeds were for diabetes, juniper branches are used to ward off evil, and sage would be used for stomach ailments. Another representative said that the sumac bush has berries from which they make a drink, and its stems are good for basketry. Piñon nuts provided a staple food source, rope was made from yucca, and cliffrose bark was used in making shirts.

Southern Paiute elders identified rabbits, wild turkeys, antelope, and deer as some of the animals that were hunted. These animals provided food and manufacturing materials including hides and bones. Tools were crafted out of bones including needles and punches for sewing buckskin for shoes and other forms of clothing.

The elders believe that the structures and the artifacts at Wupatki and Wukoki provided shelter and lookout vantages. One elder believed that Wupatki was used as a
residential area and other sites such as Wukoki were used for ceremony. Another elder told a story about the people who constructed the ruins at Wupatki.

_The people who made these ruins were dark in color, and wore rings in their noses. They killed some Southern Paiutes along the Little Colorado River. The Paiute people recruited Hualapai and Havasupai to come and attack this village. There was only one dark person left to go tell his people to come fight. He was wounded and probably died somewhere. The Pais and Paiutes went home after that. They probably had a round dance together. We don't know why the dark people attacked the Paiutes. They were passing through along the regular trail past Willow Springs. This is a story that is told a lot by my grandmothers._

The elders found similarities between the blowhole at Wupatki and those found on the Arizona Strip. They called this area hurrikanni, house of the wind. They said that it was a special area where people would come and talk to the wind and the wind would talk to people.

_This is a special area. There is one more hole near the road out of the park. It had a fence around it, which is not good. The NPS is putting a fence around the other, that is not right. The wind comes to people to talk, and this is a place where people would go to talk to the wind. They could learn a song about it, and you could go over there alone. It's probably scary to go there alone. The wind talks to you. Before you go you have to prepare yourself in some secret way. The Park Service would have to close the area off for however long it takes. Both men and women can talk to the wind._

**Southern Paiute Cultural Landscape**

The traditional territory of the Kaibab Southern Paiute Tribe extended from southern Utah to the Grand Canyon and the Kanab Creek, and contained many villages. It extended east across the Colorado River to the San Juan Southern Paiute territory, which was east of the confluence with the Little Colorado River (Figure 38). Opposite the Paiute territory on the Colorado River are the Hualapai and Havasupai. An important aspect of this multi-cultural landscape is the connection between the Colorado River and Little Colorado River, and its role in the Southern Paiute cultural landscape. One of the elders talked about the Granite Park area in the Grand Canyon near modern day Hualapai reservation. He said the Paiutes from Shivwits would cross the river in Granite Park for travel or to trade with Hualapai.
Figure 38. Cultural landscape field data from the Kaibab Paiute and San Juan Southern Paiute tribes.
Northern Arizona, specifically from the Arizona strip through the Grand Canyon to the Flagstaff area is part of a Southern Paiute cultural landscape of traditional villages, trade routes, resource use sites, and sacred places. Elders from Kaibab stated that the San Juan band probably has closer connections to the area of the three Flagstaff monuments and to the region of the Little Colorado River confluence with the Colorado River as it is part of the San Juan Southern Paiutes’ traditional territory. They would have used the Flagstaff area primarily for gathering natural resources and trading with other tribes.

The Paiutes maintain that the Sunset Crater-Wupatki-Walnut Canyon area is one of spiritual, subsistence, and geographic importance not only for Southern Paiutes, but also for Hopi, Zuni, and Pai tribes. Paiutes in prehistoric and historic times have used this area to hunt and gather resources for food and medicine, and to travel for trade purposes. Some of the elders believe that the presence of the ruins in the area indicates it was populated prior to the eruption, that people hunted, gathered plants, and had villages. They also believe that after the eruption, people only traveled through the area. Other elders believe that people did not have permanent settlements at Wupatki. They believe that it was either part of a trading center or a place of ceremony. The elders discussed archaeological evidence that directly links Southern Paiute people to Wupatki including similar pottery and a large, uncovered archaeology site on the Kaibab Reservation that connects the Kaibab Paiutes to Wupatki.

Southern Paiutes living near Paiute Mountain (known today as Navajo Mountain) frequently traveled through this area in the past. One elder said, “A long time ago, the Paiutes traveled along this country. They gathered herbs, went hunting and got medicine. They would come from Navajo Mountain. They used to come from far away. The San Juan would visit this area and stay for extended periods of time for plant gathering and hunting.”

The Southern Paiutes used much of the established trail system used by other tribes in the region. They would travel the Grand Canyon for plant and mineral resources, and go to an area near the confluence of the Little Colorado and Colorado Rivers to gather salt. They also used part of the trail system through Wupatki to visit the Hopi area. As one elder described it, “One trail went from our village through Lee's Ferry to Kaibito Plateau to Moenkopi and Tuba City areas. One went to here [Sunset Crater] and San Francisco Peaks, to Hualapai, to the Colorado River Crossing with a big cave and red paint, and then back to the village.” The red paint was a resource they often shared with the Hualapai.

Songs are vital components of the Southern Paiute cultural landscape. They connect people to places, guide them in their travels, and are sung to call on the rain. When a person traveled alone, he or she would sing to make the journey faster and to ensure a safe arrival to their destination. One elder said, “there are two to three different songs like that. Where, why, and places along the way are all sung.”

The Southern Paiute people have songs about different areas and each one has a different purpose. They have songs about Navajo Mountain when it was called Paiute Mountain, and round dance songs about animals that were sung while hunting. One elder told of songs and ceremonies that came from west of the Colorado River. He said, “There are also songs from the west [Parker]. Most of the songs and ceremonies are from west of the
Colorado. There is a branch of Paiutes from around Palm Springs who lost a song. The Kaibab helped them by singing it back in Palm Springs.”

The Paiute elders acknowledged that there are many places in the area of the three monuments where people would go to learn songs. The San Juan Southern Paiutes would visit the blowhole at Wupatki (hurrikanni, home of the wind) to learn songs that would bring the rain. The volcano and ice caves are also important places where Southern Paiute men can acquire songs. One elder explained that, “They have to have a song for the volcano. This would be a place where young men would come to get songs and dreams. Ice caves would have songs for Indian people, too.”

The elders talked about different types of ceremonies and dances that were conducted in the Flagstaff area. In the spring, around April, people would hold a Bear Dance to honor the bear coming out of hibernation. During the summer months, recreational dances were held. Marriage ceremonies were held at Wupatki and in the past, women were married in the round area of the ruins.

Historic events discussed by the Southern Paiute consultants connect the Flagstaff region and the three parks to Southern Paiute history. According to one elder, “This place is connected to places in traditional lands, where hunting, gathering plants, and trading took place.” Another elder said that in the past there was a war with the Navajos, and war might have occurred in the area near the three monuments. Another elder told how in the early 1900s, ranchers would drive their cattle through this area.

The Southern Paiute elders emphasized that everything is connected. One elder said, “The whole area connects it, people know how to take care of it. Power connects the area. All places are the same in power. The caves are no different that other places.” Another consultant added, “They are connected through water. Water flows in different ways from one place to another.”

When incorporated with the 2001 cultural affiliation data, the 2004 traditional association study provided anthropological and oral tradition evidence adequate for cultural affiliation with all three national monuments as well as additional other expert evidence for affiliation with Walnut Canyon (Table 36). The 2004 study also contributed much new data to the aboriginal and contemporary time frames that is adequate for Southern Paiute affiliation with the three national monuments (Table 37).
Table 36. Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x, X 2001 Evidence, & 2001 Evidence is Adequate
2004 Evidence is Adequate

Table 37. Time frame of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x, X 2001 Evidence, & 2001 Evidence is Adequate
2004 Evidence (Adequate)

Tier 3: Additional Cultural Affiliation Data

The question of cultural affiliation of the Southern Paiute people with the three Flagstaff area monuments has been addressed with anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, oral tradition, and other expert evidence. Some of this evidence is adequate to establish cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments for all time periods. In this section, additional information is presented that provides anthropological, archaeological, geographical, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area in general, and in some cases, with specific park units.

Anthropological Evidence

Southern Paiute, Havasupai, and Hualapai people had frequent intertribal interactions across the Colorado River (Stoffle et al. 1994) that included trade in ceramics and other goods (Dobyns 1974, Smith 1977), trade of red hematite pigment (Dellenbaugh 1933), intermarriage, and joint use of trails in Peach Springs and Diamond Creek Canyons, and at the Toroweap Valley-Prospect Canyon crossing. The trade of the red pigment suggests ceremonial interactions since red hematite pigment, or red ochre or ompi, is sacred to Paiute people and used almost exclusively for ceremonial purposes (Stoffle et al. 1994). The Hualapai and Southern Paiute people also share Grass Springs, the site of the 1889 Ghost Dance, in ongoing ceremonial ways. The site is an important stopping point on the Salt Song trail, which is the Southern Paiute and Hualapai people’s trail to the afterlife. The trail and the song are
important components of Hualapai and Southern Paiute funeral ceremonies, and even today Paiute people retain the services of Hualapai singers for the Cry (Sapir 1912; Stoffle et al. 1994). Sacred sites in the Flagstaff area include the volcanic features of the San Francisco Peaks and Sunset Crater. As these are culturally significant to all three groups, there is a strong likelihood of shared interactions at these places as well.

**Archaeological Evidence**

Ceramics as evidence of a Southern Paiute connection are limited (Euler 1964; Stewart 1942). If Southern Paiute food caches\(^5\) are present, these would indicate traditional use areas (Osborn 1993). Unusual artifacts have been found, however, that indicate ceremonial relationships with Sunset Crater and possibly the Flagstaff area in general. Corn rocks were found at Sunset Crater and sherd rocks were found in Southern Paiute territory at Little Springs on the north rim of the Grand Canyon. The corn rocks are lava rocks with distinct impressions of full corn cobs. The sherd rocks are lava rocks laced with pottery sherds. Both artifact types reflect ceremonial interactions with active volcanic features (Elson et al. 2002). Since the sherd rocks reflect Southern Paiute interactions that occurred around the time of the Sunset Crater eruption, the corn rocks may reflect Southern Paiute presence, interaction, and/or a sharing of ceremonial strategies for dealing with volcanic activity.

**Geographical Evidence**

Some of the earliest documentation about the Southern Paiute comes from the Escalante journals. The Southern Paiute of Arizona traded for shell goods and nets made by the Cocomaricopa on the Gila River, with either the Hopi or Havasupai interacting as middlemen. They also had trade relations with the Hopi. On October 23, 1776, Escalante talked with the Southern Paiutes about their neighbors, the Hopi and Havasupai. Near Paiute Mountain (Navajo Mountain), Escalante encountered other Southern Paiute people (San Juan) whom he referred to as *Yutas Payuches* (Euler 1966).

At the Crossing of the Fathers, on the south side of the river, Escalante encountered a small group of San Juan Southern Paiutes. He wrote that “eight or ten leagues [25-30 miles] to the northeast of the ford there is a high, rounded peak which the *Payuchis*, whose country begins here, call *Tucane* [Paiute Mountain, aka Navajo Mountain]” (Bolton 1950; Shepardson and Hammond 1970). Later in the trip and further southeast, Dominguez and Escalante stopped on the rim of the canyon above Navajo Creek. At a point on the mesa they saw “ranchos of the *Yutas Payuchis*, neighbors and friends of the *Cosninas*” (Bolton 1950; Euler 1966).

As Armijo, with the first recorded pack train over the Old Spanish Trail, crossed the San Juan country in 1829, he saw Navajo people before he saw Paiute people, which places the Navajo far to the east. Coming from Canyon de Chelly, the party met with three Southern Paiute people at what is believed to be Paiute Canyon. Six days later Armijo arrived at the Crossing of the Fathers (now covered by Padre Bay, part of Lake Powell). His travel \(^5\) A three-gallon, plugged basket of whitestem blazingstar seed (*Mentzelia albicaulis*) was found intact on the Nellis Air Force Range in southern Nevada in 2006. The area has been closed since the 1940s.
accounts indicate that the Navajo had not yet intruded on Southern Paiute territory, and that the San Juan Southern Paiute used, if not occupied, lands south of the Colorado River (Euler 1966).

Antonio Armijo . . . left Abiquiu, November 1829, and traveled to Los Angeles, California . . . South of the San Juan River he mentioned seeing Navajo Indians . . . As he went west he passed the vicinity of what is now known as Paiute Canyon, east of Navajo Mountain, [he] mentioned the water hole of the Payuches Indians, where Southern Paiute Indians are still living [Stewart 1966: 180].

In 1852, Dr. P. G. S. Ten Broeck, Assistant Surgeon of the United States Army, documented the San Juan Paiute people as still occupying the area bounded by the San Juan and Little Colorado rivers. In 1859, Thales H. Haskell traveled from Pinto, Utah, north of the Santa Clara River, to the Hopi villages. He encountered four Southern Paiutes within three days of crossing the Colorado River, and others in the following two days. Haskell’s party was somewhere on the Shonto, but he did not indicate whether the Southern Paiutes were living there or on a trade journey to the Hopi villages. Presumably, their purpose was trade because Haskell also wrote later that a number of Southern Paiutes were at Oraibi for trading purposes. Haskell’s party was warned that they were in Navajo country, south of Kletha Valley, a Southern Paiute-Navajo boundary area. The Paiute who moved into Hualapai country were apparently of the Shivwits band; they farmed at both Peach Springs and Diamond Creek (Euler 1966).

How far east the Paiute were found in Arizona at that time appears to be a matter of speculation as far as the U.S. military was concerned. Twelve years after Haskell, Frederick S. Dellenbaugh recorded a Navajo trading party at the Crossing of the Fathers, and John D. Lee recorded some Navajo people trading as far northwest as Beaver the same year; the Navajo apparently used a trail to Kanab for trade. The Cedar Ridge area, between Moencopi and Lee’s Ferry, was reported as a Navajo winter grazing area in 1872, however, E. O. Beaman reported in 1874 that while Navajo people were living in Moencopi Wash, there was “renegade band of Pah-Utes” living in the area between Lee’s Ferry and Moencopi. Both the Navajo and the Southern Paiute used the Hole-in-the-Rock crossing after its opening (1879-1880) for trade purposes (Euler 1966). Powell and Ingalls (1874) found the San Juan Paiute people still occupying the area bounded by the San Juan and Little Colorado rivers in 1873.

An archaeological perspective has the Southern Paiute people beginning their eastward move from California around A.D. 1000 and by A.D. 1300 they had begun to define their space in California, Nevada, Utah, and Arizona (Madsen 1975). The Southern Paiute people, however, say they have inhabited the southern frontier of the Great Basin and western Colorado Plateau since Creation (Stoffle and Zedeño 2001). The Kaibab Paiute and other Southern Paiute bands have controlled the area north of the Grand Canyon from at least A.D. 1150 (Euler 1964; Shutler 1961) until the mid-1800s (Stoffle and Evans 1976). The Kaibab and San Juan Paiutes were known to the Bureau of Indian Affairs as distinct bands in 1906, with the San Juan Paiutes being identified two hundred miles to the east of the Kaibab Paiutes (34 Stat. 325) (Knack 1993).
Some archaeologists, cultural anthropologists, and linguists (Bettinger and Baumhoff 1983) believe that Paiute people came into the region by at least A.D. 1150. Other archaeologists (Torgler 1985; Whitley 1994a, 1994b), cultural anthropologists (Stoffle, Halmo, Evans, and Olmsted 1990), and linguists (Shaul 1986) support the theory that the Southern Paiute people have lived continuously in the Great Basin and western Colorado Plateau for thousands of years. Kaibab Paiute tradition holds that they originated on the Kaibab Plateau, and have resided in their traditional lands, which include the area now known as the Arizona Strip, for many generations. It is their belief that they have lived on this land with the Virgin River Anasazi and that they are this same people. While archaeologists are not in agreement on this issue, the Kaibab Paiutes define their aboriginal and sacred lands as including Virgin Anasazi territory (Kaibab Paiute Tribe 2005). The Southern Paiute perspective is that the Creator placed them in this region, and that they have always been there (Stoffle et al. 2000a).

The Southern Paiute people turn traditionally to religious knowledge to explain traditional ethnic territories and the events by which the people came to inhabit them. According to their traditional beliefs, Paiute people were created in these lands that encompass parts of Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California. Through this event, the Creator gave Paiute people a special supernatural responsibility to protect and manage the land and its resources (Kaibab Paiute Tribe 2005). In Euroamerican terms, this land is their Holy Land (Spicer 1957), and each of the sixteen Southern Paiute groups is responsible for part of it (Figure 39) (Stoffle et al. 2000a). Their attachment is reflected in the meaning of their names, which they often took their names from the earth. The Kaibab Paiute were the Kai’-vav-wits or “mountain lying down” people. Reeve (2002) records the San Juan Paiute as the “tock-river” people, however, Powell and Ingalls (1874) documented them as the Kwai-an’-ti-kwok-ets or ”from across the river” people.

The aboriginal boundary of the Kaibab Paiute traditional lands (Figure 40) included the Colorado River on the south, and extended downstream (south and west) from the Paria River to just west of Kanab Creek. The northern boundary ran along the Pink Cliffs near the Paunsaugunt Plateau at the divide between the northern Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin (Kelly and Fowler 1986; Stoffle et al. 2000a).
The easternmost of the Southern Paiute bands is the San Juan Paiute from the river of that name. Their old habitat now is a part of the Western Navajo agency under whose jurisdiction are the few remaining Paiute. They cling to an inaccessible district near Navajo Mountain and eastward along the canyons leading to the San Juan from the south. Prior to the Navajo incursion, which seems to have started in the eighteen-sixties (Bartlett 1932) these Paiute claimed the region between the Monument Valley district just east of Moonlight Creek, and Black Falls above Cameron on the Little Colorado River. Black Mesa, which they regarded as Navajo, formed the eastern boundary, and the uninhabited Moencopi plateau formed the southern boundary (Kelly 1934).
Geographically, Southern Paiute people view cultural resources as bound together by aspects of functional interdependency and proximity rather than by inherent characteristics. Southern Paiute cultural landscapes include holy lands (Figure 41), storyscapes, regional landscapes (Figure 42), ecoscapes, and landmarks (Stoffle, Halmo, and Austin 1997).

Figure 41. Puaxant Tuvip, Southern Paiute holy lands (Stoffle, Halmo, and Austin 1997:240)
Holy lands describe broad, fundamental connections between Native Americans and the landscape (Spicer 1957) that were created by supernatural beings who established birthright relationships between a group and the land. Such relationships include use rights and obligations to protect the land and resources. Storyscape are parts of a holy land that may extend beyond the holy lands, and are defined by stories or songs that connect places within the storyscape. Regional landscapes usually have distinct or unique natural resources that are bounded by a major geographical feature. Ecoscapes are ecological landscapes within a regional landscape that reflect more specific relationships between Native Americans and ecosystems. These landscapes are defined by unusual or distinct geographic features and the accompanying cultural relationship. Landmarks are discrete physical places in a cultural landscape (Kelley and Francis 1993) that are topographically and culturally unique (Stoffle, Halmo, and Austin 1997).

The Grand Canyon, *Piapuxa 'uipi* (Big River Canyon) was a critical part of Southern Paiute life, and the lands along the Colorado River were especially important components (Stoffle and Evans 1976). The river flows through the traditional territory of three Southern Paiute districts: the Shivwits-Santa Clara, the Kaibab, and the San Juan. Each district included an oasis where crops were grown near permanent communities, and upland areas where Southern Paiute people gathered plants and minerals, and hunted. Other Southern Paiute communities lived in the uplands as well. The San Juan Southern Paiute also farmed
along the San Juan River to the east (Stoffle, Halmo, and Austin 1997). One elder described the ecosystem of the Colorado and San Juan rivers in cultural terms:

The river there is like our veins. Some are like the small streams and tributaries that run into the river there, so the same things; it's like blood - it's the veins of the world ...This story has been carried down from generation to generation. It's been given to them by the old people ...It would be given to the new generation, too (Stoffle et al. 1994:1).

The San Juan Paiute people have resided in their present homelands since prehistoric times and maintained their distinctive ethnicity, their language, and their customs despite the fact that their lands have been incorporated into the Navajo Reservation. The San Juan Paiute occupation of the area southeast of the San Juan-Little Colorado confluence far predates that of the Navajo who migrated to that territory after the 1867 Bosque Redondo incarceration. The antiquity of Paiute occupation was probably as early as A.D. 1300 (Turner and Euler 1983).

Fray Francisco Atanasio Dominguez began exploration for a route from Santa Fe to Monterey, California in the summer of 1776. Three months later in Utah, north of the present day Hualapai Reservation, the party decided to turn back but did so by heading south. They encountered Southern Pauites (Payuchis) and were told of people wearing blue clothes, who the Spaniards understood to be the Cosninás who bought blue woolen cloth in Moqui. Near Cataract Creek north of Mount Trumbull. Another Southern Paiute told the expedition that the Ancamuchis were just across the river and “planted much maize” (Bolton 1950). The Spaniards interpreted the Ancamuchis to be Cosninás, who Euler (1958) interpreted to be Havasupai, or possibly Hualapai who had fields in Diamond Creek Canyon. A few days later, another Paiute told the Spaniards about the “Cosninás and Moquinos” (Bolton 1950). The Spaniards found on the mesa above Navajo Creek, just south of the Colorado River, “ranchos of Yutas Payuchias (San Juan Southern Paiutes), neighbors and friends of the Cosninás” (Bolton 1950). The Paiutes indicated that the Cosninás (Havasuapi) lived nearby but to the east (Euler 1958).

Dominguez and Escalante mapped tribal locations when they explored Arizona (Figure 43). They recorded a San Juan Southern Paiute village (Payuchis on the map) south of the Rio de Nabajoo, now known as the San Juan River (Bolton 1950). This place name raises a question about the area labeled Provincia de Nabajoo. Is this the land of the Southern Paiute or the Navajo? The placement of Moqui in the center of San Juan territory suggests that the area was a shared-use area in the late 1700s.
Dominguez and Escalante also identified the southern portions of Paiute territory around Tuba City and Moenkopi as being occupied by the Havasupai. Hopi oral history states that by 1830 the San Juan were expanding into the area and the Havasupai slowly retreated (Bunte and Franklin 1987).

Bunte and Franklin (1987) found that the encroachment experienced by the San Juan Southern Paiute people was due largely to Navajo expansion. They noted Kelly's (1964) description of San Juan territory included hunting expeditions to the San Francisco Peaks area, which they believe to have been used by multiple groups for resource collection. The Southern Paiute people used brush corrals to trap game. Similar corrals were found near “the Hopi Buttes, Kinnikinnick Ruin, and on Anderson Mesa southeast of Flagstaff, and on Gray Mountain west of Cameron” (Wetherill 1954). Kelly also reported that the San Juan hunted antelope southeast of Cameron and on the Kaibabito Plateau, and collected pine nuts on the Kaibabito, Shonto, and Rainbow Plateaus, as well as on the South Rim of the Grand Canyon. Their access to high forest zones included Paiute Mountain (now Navajo Mountain), the San Francisco Peaks and the Paria Plateau.

The Navajo-Hopi land dispute affects San Juan Southern Paiute lands in the Little Colorado River watershed (Fowler and Fowler 1971). The Southern Paiute reaffirmed their claims to this area in the 1930s (Kelly 1934, 1964) and further documented their claims to researchers (Bunte and Franklin 1987; Euler 1966; Stoffie and Evans 1976; Turner and Euler 1983). The San Juan Southern Paiutes legal standing in the land dispute is based on data supporting their federal acknowledgment (Federal Register Vol. 54, No. 240, December 15, 1989). They gained additional leverage when a U.S. district judge declared that they could
intervene in the land dispute (Sidney v. MacDonald, U.S. District Court, Arizona) (Stoffle 1990). Additional Southern Paiute connections to this part of the Little Colorado River watershed came from the Kaibab Paiute Tribe whose members expressed concern for their cultural resources, especially burials, that could be affected by Navajo relocations to House Rock Valley and the Paria Plateau (Bureau of Indian Affairs 1978:1:210).

Southern Paiute lands in Arizona were defined legislatively in the mid-1870s (Table 38) (Figure 44). Southern Paiute people in map unit #576 included the Moapa band of Nevada. Southern Paiute people in map unit #558 were identified as having occupied southwest Utah, northwest Arizona, southeast Nevada, and part of southern California. Within twenty years, the two Arizona map units were lost.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 1874</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 576, 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1875</td>
<td>Stat. L., XVIII, 445</td>
<td>Map unit 576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contemporary definitions of ethnic groups and explanations of how they are culturally bounded provide inadequate portrayals of past cultural characteristics (Stoffle and Zedeño 2001). Ethnic groups may or may not have boundaries, or may co-reside sharing territory, resources, and communities (Barth 1969). Shared areas are not limited to territorial boundaries and can extend deep within other groups’ territories. Use rights and control over land and resource use were exercised generally over specific localities and unequally distributed resources rather than over a continuously bounded space (Zedeño 1997). Though not usually acknowledged, co-residential patterns were quite common in aboriginal North America among both mobile and sedentary groups (Sutton 1985). Archaeologists, ethnohistorians, and historical linguists are recognizing co-residency among American Indian ethnic groups (Cameron 1995; Reid and Whittlesey 1997; Shaul and Hill 1998). The Flagstaff area is an example of a shared-use landscape. The Southern Paiute people are connected to it through the river systems and inter-tribal relationships that included ceremonies and trade (Toupal et al. 2004).

The Kaibab Paiute people continue to maintain a strong attachment to the sacred lands of their ethnic group as well as to their own local territory. They continue to reaffirm their ties to their traditional lands by affiliating themselves with these places as symbols of their common ethnic identity, and by performing traditional ceremonies along with rites-of-passage rituals (Kaibab Paiute Tribe 2005). The locations of these ceremonies and rituals are transformed from secular to sacred places through these activities, which also provide the Kaibab Paiute people with a way to carry out their sacred responsibilities given to them by the Creator (Stoffle et al. 2000a). It is through this relationship with place that the Kaibab Paiute people and their cultural system persist (Bunte and Franklin 1987; Stoffle and Dobyns 1983; Stoffle and Evans 1976; Stoffle et al. 1996; Turner 1985; Turner and Euler 1983).

---

6 These are not recorded in Royce (1899).
Figure 44. Federal adjustments to Southern Paiute lands in Arizona (Royce 1899).
Historical Evidence

The “Notice of Final Determination That the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe Exists as an Indian Tribe” was published in the Federal Register on December 15, 1989, 54 FR 51502. As part of the background in a reconsideration of a federal recognition determination for the San Juan Southern Paiute people of Arizona, Anita Vogt, Administrative Judge, (1990) wrote:

Members of [the San Juan Southern Paiute] live on lands in north central Arizona which were traditionally and aboriginally Southern Paiute. Today's [tribal] members are predominantly lineal descendants of the Southern Paiute Indians whose ancestors have inhabited this area since [it] first sustained contact with Euro-Americans around 1850. Both historically and up through the present day, the [San Juan Southern Paiute people have] been repeatedly identified by scholars, local non-Indians, federal officials, other Southern Paiute bands, and members of the Navajo [Nation] both as Southern Paiute and as a distinct body of people. This has occurred even in contexts where close interaction with the Navajos and some acculturation to Navajo culture has been evident.

Garces had been told by the Havasupai that they had friends (Chemeguaba [Paiute]) north of the river with whom they traded (Coues 1900; Schwartz 1966). At other times in the 18th century, the Southern Paiutes would cross the river to raid the Havasupai villages (Smithson and Euler 1994).

Garces also recorded that the Yavapai traded with the Southern Paiute north of the Colorado River (Schroeder 1959; Sheridan 1996). Sometimes the Southern Paiute traveled to other tribes’ villages to trade, and at other times, those tribes would come to the Southern Paiute villages. These historical trade routes have prehistoric counterparts, indicating long relationships (Sheridan 1996).

The westernmost Pueblo ancestors and the Paiute-Shoshone ancestors interacted with each other (Lyneis 1996; Winslow 1996). These ancestral groups were relatively mobile, and shared territory and resources in the Grand Canyon and other places (Stoffle et al. 1994). Interactions were particularly intense among Southern Paiutes living side-by-side with other ethnic groups such as the Hopi and the Hualapai. Their proximity and traditional attachment to the Colorado River and its upper canyons put them in contact with people from as far away as New Mexico and California who made pilgrimages to the river shrines and collected resources along its banks (Stoffle and Zedeño 2001).

Less is known about Hualapai-Paiute connections than about Hopi-Paiute connections. The two groups do not speak mutually intelligible languages (Yuman and Numic respectively), their territories are separated by a major river, and they have not always been at peace with one another. Yet they are connected in unique ways including the trail to the afterlife or Salt Song Trail, which is associated with a set of songs called the Salt Songs (Stoffle and Zedeño 2001). These songs are related to specific places along the trail, which passes across both sides of the Colorado River and covers most of Southern Paiute and Hualapai traditional territory (Kelly n.d.; Laird 1976).
[This] traditional interaction included “the sharing of bird, salt, deer, and water songs; dances; ceremonial and social gathering places; paint, salt, and plant collection areas along the Colorado river; and fishing areas” (Stoffle et al. 1998:57). Hunting along the territorial boundaries often took people into each other’s territory, and large hunting parties often included Southern Paiute and Hualapai hunters. Both groups also shared important Southern Paiute ceremonial sites and important Hualapai sites known to be sources of medicine stones and crystals in Arizona (Stoffle et al. 1998).

**Linguistic Evidence**

The Southern Paiute people are Numic speakers. Southern Paiute and Hopi ancestral languages are part of the Uto-Aztecan Shoshoshonean families, which allowed for the development of mutually intelligible languages (Sapir 1930).

The Southern Paiute people have names for places and features in the Flagstaff area (Table 39). The San Juan and Kaibab names for the San Francisco Peaks reflect dialect differences while their names for Sunset Crater reflect differences in their relationships with the place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sunset Crater</strong></th>
<th><strong>Kaiv Pa’kectis</strong></th>
<th>“Mountain with hole or water bowl on top”</th>
<th><strong>San Juan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Toupal et al. 2004</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuva Hara</strong></td>
<td>Kaibab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ya-na-ka-ru-chets</strong></td>
<td>Refers to basaltic cones around Mount Trumbull (John W. Powell Manuscript 1795, no. 11) but apparently used by Powell to refer generically to volcanic cones (Dutton 1882) and relevant to the Flagstaff volcanic field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Walnut Canyon</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wupatki</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>San Francisco Peaks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nuvalaharka</strong></th>
<th>the San Francisco Peaks area</th>
<th><strong>San Juan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Toupal et al. 2004</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nu-wa ’ka-ret</strong></td>
<td>“snow sitting down”</td>
<td>Kaibab &amp; UT bands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oral tradition Evidence**

Oral histories may be tied to a landscape and reflect a chronological cultural history (Basso 1996), or behavioral performance tied to place (Stoffle and Zedeño 2001). Southern Paiute elders working with applied ethnographers to identify and protect their cultural resources have described a time almost 900 years ago when Paiutes had relationships with or were the people archaeologists call the Virgin Anasazi and the Fremont people. Linguistic and archaeological research (Fairley 1989; Fowler, Madsen, and Hattori 1973; Gunnerson 1962,
1969; Swarthout 1981; Wikle 1979) has provided support for these accounts (Stoffle et al. 2000b:14).

Oral traditions tell of the first Hopi clans to arrive at the Hopi Mesas in Arizona, the Snake Clan and Horn Clan, who came from the north and west, probably from the upper Colorado River area (Courlander 1987; Fewkes 1897; James 1994). The Southern Paiute and Hopi people share almost identical clan origin stories, particularly snake creation stories.

**Ethnographic Summary**

In terms of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments, the Southern Paiute people’s traditional use of northern Arizona connects them to the area encompassing the three park units. The volcanic connection between Little Springs on the north rim of the Grand Canyon and Sunset Crater is related to world balancing ceremonies and of particular significance. It is a connection that needs further study.

The materials reviewed for this report contributed much new data relative to Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments. It bolstered anthropological, archaeological, geographical, historic, and oral tradition evidence from the 2001 review (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and the 2004 study (Toupal et al. 2004). New evidence was added to the previous works in the linguistic category (Table 40). The cumulative evidence now addresses eight of the ten types of evidence that contribute to cultural affiliation, six of them adequately for Sunset Crater, five of them adequately for Wupatki, and two of them adequately for Walnut Canyon. This body of evidence also adequately addresses the four time frames for Sunset Crater and Wupatki, and three of the time frames for Walnut Canyon (Table 41).

Table 40. Cumulative evidence of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SU CR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Table 41. Time frame of Southern Paiute cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

X Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Chapter Five: Cultural Affiliation of the Western Apache

Newly compiled evidence of cultural affiliation of the Western Apache with Sunset Crater Volcano, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki national monuments builds upon the two previous studies of cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and traditional association (Toupal et al. 2004). Summaries of those studies are presented as background to the data obtained for this chapter.

Tier 1: 2001 Cultural Affiliation Summary

In the original document review for cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001), the Western Apache people were found to be affiliated with Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki national monuments. Their affiliation was supported directly with Walnut Canyon, and indirectly with Sunset Crater and Wupatki. Their affiliation also was supported directly by archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historical, and kinship evidence, and indirectly by anthropological, linguistic, oral tradition, and other expert evidence associated with other Athabaskan people (Table 42). Their affiliation was based in part on evidence of wide-spread interactions among descendants of the Sinagua and Anasazi that addressed traditional and historic time frames (Table 43).

Table 42. Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x 2001 Evidence (indirect)
X 2001 Evidence (direct)

Table 43. Time frame of Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeological evidence did not provide a realistic picture of Western Apache affiliation because the Western Apache people left few archaeological traces. A highly criticized document stated that ancestral Apache people were not in the southwest before the

1 Document 3 – Flagstaff GMP Meeting, 10/30/97
Ancestral Apache material culture before A.D. 1400-1500 did not necessarily resemble more recent forms, so archaeologists may not recognize sites.  

An analysis of oral tradition suggests a pre-Columbian ancestral Apache presence. Some oral traditions tell of Holy Beings’ travel routes that connect the three national monuments to San Francisco Peaks and the Grand Canyon. Geographic evidence included the belief that there were Western Apache place names throughout the Flagstaff area as well as traditional plant gathering and other resource uses, particularly in Walnut Canyon. White Mountain Apaches gather ceremonial minerals at large 13th-14th century architectural sites. Such places have names and therefore probably oral history attached.

Historic evidence places Apaches and/or Yavapais in the region in the late 1600s-1800s. The Yavapai and Tonto Apache people intermarried. Early Spanish documentation (1500s-1600s) places ancestral Apaches in the Southwest including northern Arizona. They traded with, provided refuge for, and intermarried with Puebloan groups.

The White Mountain Apache and other Apache tribes do not claim cultural affiliation under NAGPRA with sedentary pre-Columbians. The two groups, however, have some sort of genealogical connection, and certain Western Apache clans descend from Navajo and Apache clans who may have pre-Columbian ancestry.

Tier 2: 2004 Traditional Association Summary

The Western Apache people are traditionally associated with the three national monuments. The summaries that follow are taken directly from Toupal et al. (2004) and presented for Sunset Crater, to which site visits were restricted, and the overall landscape.

Sunset Crater

The Western Apache have interacted with Ko’ha godi’i hi’i’ ka’aa’, ‘the burnt place,’ for centuries. As one elder described it, Sunset Crater serves to remind the people of how the forces of good can prevail over evil. The crater and lava flows are all that remain of a battle that saved the Apache people long ago:

The fire, the burnt area and the fire is a reminder of ... the salvation of our people. And what it pertains to, and I won’t go into all the details, but it needs to be known that Good and Evil, so to say, had a battle here. And Good won, because what had happened was that Evil had ... taken control of us men and so Good came in, and in the battle he won us back to what we are today. So

---

2 Document 12 – USFS Cultural Affiliation Assessment for Sinagua
3 Documents 24 – Report of the Navajo Nation/Navajo Lands Area Superintendents Summit Meeting 4/16-17/97; 25 – Affiliation Conference on Ancestral Peoples of the Four Corners Region 3/99, Vol 1
4 Document 8 – Anthropological Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography for Sunset Crater Volcano and Wupatki National Monuments
5 Document 27 – Affiliation Conference on Ancestral Peoples of the Four Corners Region 3/99, Vol 3
Evil then burnt himself up and that's why it's a reminder of that. This place [made us] who we are today because Good won. This is a holy place; the peaks are a holy place too (Apache consultant 2003).

Although Evil lingers in the area, when the forces of Good triumphed, they left behind positive things that the Apaches continue to come here to use. After this event, Dzil’cho, the San Francisco Peaks, and the surrounding landscape including Sunset Crater, Mormon Lake, and Prescott were inhabited by Apaches. As one elder explained it, this notion as well as other traditional understandings of Apache use of the area, often will conflict with scientific conceptions:

This is where ... scientific mind versus my cultural mind, sometimes they conflict but it’s the ... what makes a difference is the faith in what is being told. I think my great uncle ... expressed it probably the best way that I can use ... and he said, “I remember, I asked my grandpa... And I started schools and these other things and I heard about us coming from Siberia and Alaska and all these things ... I asked my grandpa ... are these things, these stories you tell me, are they really yes? Or are they just stories to tell?” And he said in a tone, “They’re Yes. They’re real. That’s who we are and that makes us with all the connections to not only the earth but the person that made us.” And so it’s a real faith that is like, it makes it whether it’s Yes or not. ... So you know, I know having had geology classes, I know that gas bubbles erupt and are circular in these fields over here, and I remember back when I was a little boy when I first, as far as I can remember, when I first came up here with my dad, and I remember we walked ... science says that it’s the gas bubbles that formed and they’re always round craters there, but what my dad told me was, “You see, this is where those people that Evil had taken control of, this is where they used to live. And Evil used to live within that camp. And when he burnt himself up, these are those remains of the wickups over there.” So in my own life I have to lay the facts together you know, I’m like my grandfather and my dad; sometimes science and culture don’t match (Apache consultant 2003).

These sacred areas have been used for a variety of purposes including hunting, gathering food, camping, praying, and performing ceremonies. The Apache people have stories that tell of them making pilgrimages to Sunset Crater to gather medicinal and food plants such as Apache plume and rabbitbrush. One elder told of how the Apache people would hunt to the north of the monument on the large ridge coming off the San Francisco Peaks. In recent times, Native American rodeos and dances were held in the town’s park on the west end of Flagstaff up the hill from the observatory.

Sunset Crater is culturally interconnected to other places in the region. The elders expressed that these connections can vary among tribal groups and each should be individually considered. For one Apache representative, the San Francisco Peaks, Camp Verde, and Winslow are culturally connected with Sunset Crater. Another elder stated that all the Apache traditional use areas bounded by Snowflake, Ash Fork, and the Pinal Mountains
are related to the park as well. These connections have developed over many generations. During the battle of Good and Evil, a crater with cultural relevance similar to that of Sunset Crater was created near Winslow as a result of the “sky falling.” The battle between Good and Evil also connects Sunset Crater to the formation of the Grand Canyon:

In the sense of holy places, yes, because the race that, or the thing that happened between Good and Evil centered all the way around the [San Francisco] peaks. It’s connected to this [Sunset Crater] and what happened at the Grand Canyon is connected to this too. [Good and Evil] did battle but it involved the Grand Canyon; it was one of the results during the battle and the geographic center of the race ... would be the peaks (Apache consultant 2003).

Water contained in the ice cave or running in springs from the surrounding mountain tops continues to be used periodically for food, drink, medicine, and ceremony. Kachina Springs, just south of Flagstaff was traditionally an Apache camping ground for some of these activities. Apache people traveled to this area to gather special medicine plants that were nourished from these mountain springs. At the same time, they would drink the water that the plants have used because it contained unique properties. Today, Apache people continue to use the water in the area especially those that attend school in Flagstaff.

The centrality of plants in the lives of the Apache people extends back in time before European occupation and has persisted into the modern era. Seasonally, annually, calendrically, or periodically, plants have been gathered for food and drink items, medicine, ceremonies, and to make useful implements or structures. Herbs, acorns, piñon nuts, Mormon tea, banana yucca, wild spinach, walnuts, and various pine trees like sugar pines are just a few of the culturally significant plants used by the Apache people. Medicine plants such as cedar were boiled and strained for colds. In the winter months, acorns and piñon nuts were collected in forests four to five miles from Sunset Crater. The Apache people would spend two to three days at these camps gathering and preparing the harvested plants. The acorns were dried, ground, and separated to make acorn soup. Tree sap and other food items would be gathered. In July and August, they focused their efforts on harvesting Banana yucca fruit. Orange-colored ‘sour berries’ were picked, cleaned, ground, stained, mixed with water and sugar to make a wild fruit juice. Other use plants include the osha root, piñon nuts, dropseed seeds, walnuts, Douglas fir, willows, and alders. Traditional plant gathering guidelines continue to be observed:

[Her grandmother] use to say that you couldn’t go pick them unless you purified yourself and prayed, and then you could find [what you needed]. In doing herbs studies with our old people, real potent medicine sometimes comes in pairs and they both resemble each other but one of them’s poisonous. That’s why only the people that really knew about the medicine, prayed about it and sometimes the holy people, when they treated somebody that was sick they would be revealed unto them through revelation what kind of medicine was supposed to be used and that’s what they would prescribe and they got it themselves, the patient didn’t. They knew ... they were led to which one it is. They come in pairs, or sometimes they come in fours (Apache consultant 2003).
The animals that make their home in the vicinity of Sunset Crater are significant in Apache culture. Since prehistoric times through the historic period and into today, animals have been used daily or seasonally depending on the food, ceremonial or clothing requirement. The area around Sunset Crater is considered to be an excellent hunting ground because the pine forest provides food and shelter for wildlife. Rabbits, quails, and packrats were sought in the past. They continue to hunt deer and use the hide ceremonially in the Sunrise Dance, which is a three-day ceremony that honors young women when they come of age.

Since prehistory, specific geological features within the monument including the ice cave and crater have been visited by the Apache people. These landforms were places to conduct ceremonies and to pray to spiritual beings. Other activities included communicating with Indian people and teaching younger generations about the cultural significance of the place. These features also stand as territorial markers between tribes.

**Western Apache Cultural Landscape**

The Western Apache cultural landscape encompasses areas that reach well beyond the present day reservation borders, expanding across the Four Corners region and southward into the lower Sonoran desert (Figure 45). The Western Apache people traveled great distances for ceremonies, trading, hunting, and plant gathering, which resulted in significant interactions with and impacts on neighboring tribes.

Relationships with other villages, physical and mythical trails, stories, songs, ceremonies, pilgrimages, legends, mountains, and rivers contribute to the fabric of the Apache cultural landscape. The volcanic area encompassing the three national monuments holds critical significance for the Western Apache people as this is where the battle between Good and Evil occurred. The world was shifting out of balance prior to the eruptions of Sunset Crater, and it was during that geologically unstable period that Good and Evil battled for the people. The hornitos represent the houses or wikiups of Evil and are reminders to the Apaches of the struggle that Good won so that the Apache people could become who they are today. Pilgrimages to Sunset Crater and ice caves in the region help them in their own struggle to stay in balance for themselves, their families, and communities.

Apache elders identified many Indian villages having connections to Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon and Wupatki. The three monuments had ties with villages in San Carlos, Tonto Apache, and Camp Verde areas as well as with Jerome, Holbrook, Window Rock, the Hopi Mesas, and northern New Mexico. One elder explained that eighty years ago there were Apache villages located at Sunset Crater and that, consequently, all Apaches are connected to this area. One elder stated that the villages of her mother’s clan, the yú anéé, were connected to the villages found near and around Sunset Crater. Apache people were connected to this area through family. The elders believe that the Navajo, Hopi, and Yavapai Apache people had villages near Sunset Crater because it was such a sacred place.
Figure 45. Cultural landscape field data from the Western Apache tribes.
The trails used by the Western Apache spread from present-day reservation areas northwest, north, then northeast. Springs and mountains provided landmarks, healing places, and places to seek knowledge and power from the spirits. Areas with turquoise, acorns, tobacco, and piñons were prized, however, plants and animals were used throughout the Apache landscape. Many gathering areas were within the volcanic fields of Sunset Crater and the San Francisco Peaks. Predominant trails in this area include a trail to the top of Sunset Crater, trails around the east side of Mount Elden that pass through the Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon and Wupatki areas, and a trail through Schultz Pass to the backside of the San Francisco Peaks. Trails connecting the Flagstaff area to other places in Arizona include those to tobacco fields, Bill Williams Mountain, Fossil Creek, Clear Creek, Apache Maid, Stoneman Lake, and Forest Lakes. Other trails connected Pumpkin Center (White Sands) with Oak Canyon and Oak Creek. Regarding the importance of the interconnectedness of the area, another elder stated that,

It’s all part of the whole complex in this area, there’s no real separation in the sense that distance ... so in a way what happened here ... the battle between Good and Evil is part of the creation story because that’s why we are who we are today. ...one of the reasons this is very sacred to us is not only do the spirits live here, but it’s the only mountain that didn’t wash away in the flood. And to me, it represents stability.

The Apache are known as people of the mountains and mountains are central to their religion and way of life. The elders identified five essential mountains in their cultural landscape: the San Francisco Peaks, Mormon Mountain, Bill Williams Mountain, Salt Mountain, and Porcupine Mountain. The Grand Canyon is connected with these places because each one has spirits that live there and interact with each other. The Grand Canyon is another reminder of the battle between Good and Evil because Good made it after he defeated Evil. It is a source of white ceremonial clay and red hematite. The Colorado River or túlché’e meaning Red River, and the Little Colorado River were part of this geologic network as important corridors for trade and ceremonial purposes.

Songs are associated with many different aspects of Apache culture and life. The Apache have songs for everything found in nature including the mountains, pine trees, different types of water, clouds, sky, trails, and plants. One elder explained that, “If you are there and you hear the songs, you can be taught sometimes by the sacred plants. That’s the only way. We can’t do with out. That’s that only way you can find it.”

One elder said that even today there are places for ceremonies and places to gather resources needed for ceremonies that will be held somewhere else. He explained, “For instance, you get different plants, greens, which like Douglas fir is at particular places. The time, and year, and resources needed dictate the place for a specific ceremony. There still are specific places where there’s things that are done for healing, things that are done for thanksgiving but I won’t [pinpoint them].”

When incorporated with the 2001 cultural affiliation data, the 2004 traditional association study provided anthropological and oral tradition evidence adequate for cultural affiliation with
all three national monuments (Table 44). The 2004 study also contributed much new data to the aboriginal time frame for Walnut Canyon, and to the historic and contemporary time frames for Sunset Crater and Wupatki that is adequate for Western Apache affiliation (Table 45).

Table 44. Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45. Time frame of Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier 3: Additional Cultural Affiliation Data

To this point, the question of cultural affiliation of the Western Apache people with the three Flagstaff area monuments has been addressed with anthropological, archaeological, folkloric, geographical, historic, kinship, linguistic, oral tradition, and other expert evidence. The anthropological evidence is adequate to establish cultural affiliation with the three monuments. Oral tradition evidence is adequate to establish cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater. The evidence as a whole is adequate for affiliation with the three monuments during historic and contemporary time periods, and at the aboriginal time period for Walnut Canyon. In this section, additional information is presented that provides anthropological, archaeological, geographical, historic, kinship, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area in general, and in some cases, with specific park units.

Anthropological Evidence

Some anthropological evidence reflects regional relationships of the Western Apache with other tribes in northern Arizona that potentially extend to the Flagstaff area. Other anthropological evidence addresses the cultural significance of geologic features and objects that are relevant to the Flagstaff area, particularly Sunset Crater.
The Western Apache people have several clans related to the Navajo clan *Tsi’naajinii* and to the Hopi clan of the same name (Forbes 1966; Goodwin 1942); it is not known whether the names have the same meaning or pronunciation. The Western Apache clans originated at a place where the Navajo, Hopi, and Western Apache clans all lived together at one time, probably *Tááláhooghan* (Awatobi) (Goodwin 1942). According to Matthews (1897), the clan *Tsi’naajinii* migrated to Dinétah in the upper San Juan watershed before the *Tábąąhá* clan [before the 1700s]. They settled along the river where they kept gardens near their houses and in some cases, also farmed on the north side of the valley (Anschuetz 2002a).

The Western Apache were known to travel widely for resources. Ewing, a former agent on the Hualapai Reservation, noted that the Havasupai people had to defend their hunting grounds routinely from Western Apache and Navajo hunting parties who sought deer and antelope in Havasupai country. Dobyns and Euler could find no evidence of such intrusion (Euler, Dobyns, and Ewing 1960), however, and thought the discrepancy could be an oversight by Ewing when formally documenting the information.

The Western Apache people say that the *gan* live inside mountains, which they access through caves (Anschuetz 2002a). Buskirk (1986) reports that the Western Apache people know the *gan* as the “Cave People” and hold some of the most sacred of ceremonies at caves. Western Apache stories tell how the Hero Twins discovered the *gan* dancing in the mountain caves, and about the origin of the *gan* and their responsibility to assist people by giving them the power and knowledge to live appropriately (Mails 1974). The *gan* were sent by the…

…Giver of Life to teach the Apache how to live a better way. Now they learned in plain terms how to live decently and honorably, how to cure the sick, how to govern fairly, how to hunt effectively and responsibly, how to plant and harvest, and how to discipline those who failed to live as the Giver of Life wished them to (Mails 1974:129).

The Western Apache people also recognize the power contained in volcanic rocks and materials. Among the Cibecue Apache, “a large lightweight red pumice stone was kept at one camp to ward off lightning” (Buskirk 1986:106). Volcanic rocks can act as protection from harm. The White Mountain Apache people place obsidian “at the four corners of a field to keep away lightning and ‘bad things’” (Buskirk 1986:106). Sacred stones have healing properties as well (Bourke 1888). He noted that the medicine-men seemed subject “to a gradual decadence of their abilities, which can only be rejuvenated by rubbing the back against a sacred stone projecting from the ground in the country of the Walapai, not many miles from the town of Kingman, on the Atlantic and Pacific railroad” (Bourke 1888:460).

**Archaeological Evidence**

The basic cultural pattern of the middle Verde Valley was affected by the Hohokam from about A.D. 700 to 1150, and by a Sinagua movement into the valley from the Flagstaff area about A.D. 1125 to 1400. Middle Verde Valley culture reflected historic utilization principally by Yavapai and Apache people (Breternitz 1960; Euler 1961). The Verde Valley
as a major travel corridor between southern and northern Arizona is connected to the Flagstaff area. Groups using this corridor can be expected to have used the Flagstaff area as well.

**Geographical Evidence**

The Western Apache people used a broad resource base through seasonal rounds that covered a large geographic area. The territory of the Cibeque, Southern Tonto, and Northern Tonto included use areas north from the Salt River as far away as the Flagstaff area (Hilpert 1996). Thrapp’s (1967) Apacheria and Tonto Basin country illustrate the vastness of the territories claimed and used by the Apache people (Figures 46, 47). The Apache people not only made use of a vast area, they interacted with the people who lived there (Table 46).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apache Division</th>
<th>Maricopa</th>
<th>Pima</th>
<th>Opata</th>
<th>Papago</th>
<th>Havasupai</th>
<th>Hualapai</th>
<th>Yavapai</th>
<th>Hopi</th>
<th>Chiricahua</th>
<th>Zuni</th>
<th>Navajo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Mtn</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibecue</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Tonto</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Tonto</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>T,R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oñate, who in 1598 was traveling southward from “Hopi towns,” found an Apache camp near Flagstaff. There were mountain people in the Upper Verde Valley as well who were believed to be either Havasupai or Apache (Goodwin 1942).

Goodwin (1935:55) defined the Western Apache people as those groups living in Arizona in historic times except for the “Chiricahua, Warm Springs and allied Apache, and a small band of Apaches known as the Apaches Mansos, who live in the vicinity of Tucson.” Goodwin (1935, 1942) divided the Western Apache people of the mid-1800s into five distinct groups: White Mountain with Eastern and Western bands; Cibecue with Carrizo, Cibecue, and Canyon Creek bands; San Carlos with Pinal, Arivaipa, San Carlos, and Apache Peaks bands; Southern Tonto with the Mazatzal and six unnamed bands; and Northern Tonto with Mormon Lake, Fossil Creek, Bald Mountain, and Oak Creek bands.

The White Mountain and San Carlos groups were located in the southern part of the Western Apache range, and the northern groups, east to west, were the Cibecue, Southern Tonto, and Northern Tonto. Goodwin’s mapping of their historic range included the Flagstaff area and showed Walnut Canyon within the historical territory of the Mormon Lake Band of the Northern Tonto. Within the bands were local groups composed primarily of single clans who had their own territories. The clans were not territorial units since they were not restricted to a single group but had members in multiple local groups (Figure 48).
Figure 46. Apacheria (Thrapp 1967:ix)

Figure 47. Tonto Basin country (Thrapp 1967:219)
Schroeder (1974b), however, believed that the Northern and Southern Tonto bands resulted from their members intermarrying with Yavapai bands. He also believed that the San Carlos had subsumed the Pinaleño and Arivaipa Apaches, and that White Mountain included Sierra Blanca in the north and Coyotero in the south. Hilpert (1996) noted that in the late 1880s, the southern and northern Tonto groups formed one group, and the Cibeque joined the White Mountain Apache.

Brugge (1965) summarized the debate of the ethnicity of the Tonto bands. Gifford (1936) identified the northeast boundary of Yavapai territory as just south of Flagstaff while Goodwin (1942) placed the northwest boundary of the Northern and Southern Tonto bands of Western Apaches in the same area (Figure 49). Goodwin described these bands as being either purely Athabaskan, or part Apache and part Yavapai. While Schroeder (1963), Harrington (1908), and Gatschett (1879) recognized the intermingling of the Apache and Yavapai, they concluded that the entire Northern and Southern Tonto bands were Yavapai. Corbusier’s (1886) identification, however, indicated that they were mixed, having descended from Yuman and Athabaskan Indians, which lends more support to Goodwin’s classification. Brugge’s (1965) linguistic analysis (see Linguistic Evidence below) led him to believe that both Gifford and Goodwin adequately described the demographic patterns of the area with the exception of Gifford’s consideration of the Tonto distribution. Overall, Brugge determined that Goodwin’s demographic and socio-political conclusions were the more accurate.
“In 1851, Sitgreaves, on the word of his guide Leroux, referred to the Yampais or Tontos in the vicinity of the San Francisco Peaks, near Flagstaff, and these were stated to be the same as those found further to the west” (Sitgreaves 1853: 9, 11, 13). Schroeder (1974b) maintained that Leroux’s Tontos were at least two Yavapai groups. He noted that the confusion about the identification of Yavapai people as Apache continued well into the 20th century as evidenced in Indian Claims Commission testimony. Some of the confusion is due to Apache incursions and intermarriage during the 1700s. Statements were recorded by Garces in 1776 that indicate the San Francisco Peaks were not in Havasupai or Athapascan Territory. Schroeder felt this indicated the Peaks were probably occupied by the Yavapai and that the Apaches did not come into the area until the mid-1800s (Schroeder 1974b). He stated as well that although linguistically Yuman, the Tonto identified themselves as Apache, and considered the Northeastern Yavapai to be Mojave-Apache in their testimony. Yet numerous other sources already discussed have established the extensive area that the Western Apache utilized, often seasonally. Such a pattern of use would limit when they could be encountered and consequently documented. The Western Apache pattern of resource use also left little material non-perishable evidence of their presence so archaeologically-speaking little if any material evidence remains to establish their relationship with the Flagstaff area (Coder 2005).

Contemporary discussions with Ft. McDowell members suggest ethnic representations of Yavapai, Apache, and Yavapai-Apache mixed with tribal members tending to identify
themselves as either Yavapai or Apache (Toupal et al. 2004). These distinctions illustrate
cultural identity being based on belief systems more than ethnicity, which supports
discussions in the introduction regarding the limitations of genetic evidence in affiliation
determinations.

Royce (1899) defined the Western Apache all those bands whose ancestral territory
lay to the west of the Rio Grande. He further specified that the most important of these bands
were the Tonto, Mimbre, Mogollon, Coyotero, Pinal, and a few of the Mescalero and
Jicarilla. Their aboriginal territory, which spanned Arizona and New Mexico, was reduced
through several decisions during the late 1800s to a variety of reservations (Table 47)
(Figures 50, 51).

Table 47. Federal adjustments to Western Apache lands (Royce 1899).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 1871</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 541, 573, 582, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>Established White Mountain, Camp Verde, and Camp Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 1872</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 573, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>President enlarged White Mountain reservation by tract known as “San Carlos addition.” Restored to public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map unit 541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 5, 1873</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 546, 573, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21, 1874</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 541, 546, 573, 603</td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23, 1875</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 582</td>
<td>Restored to public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 1876</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 541, 546, 573, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26, 1877</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 541, 546, 573, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 1877</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map units 541, 546, 573, 592, 601, 602, 603</td>
<td>San Carlos addition was partly restored to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1886</td>
<td>Stat. L. XI, 374</td>
<td>Map unit 689</td>
<td>Reiteration of AZ portion of country claimed at the beginning of their relations with the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 1893</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 720</td>
<td>Removed from map unit 603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 50. Western Apache aboriginal lands specified in 1886 (left) and federal adjustments to Western Apache lands from 1871 to 1893 (right) (Royce 1899).

Figure 51. Details of federal adjustments to Western Apache lands from 1871 to 1893 (Royce 1899).
Historical Evidence

Western Apache territory was dotted with Anasazi, Hohokam, and Mogollon prehistoric remains. Not only were the Apache aware of these remains, they often used items such as beads, arrowheads, turquoise, white shell and red stone “for their own adornment”; the other remains they left for fear of the dead (Goodwin 1942:63).

According to Hopi elders, first contact with Apache people occurred in the 13th century presumably near present-day Winslow, Arizona. From that time, the two peoples maintained peaceful economic and personal relations using well-established trails to visit each other. These first Apaches in Arizona were the ancestors of the Tonto Apache people who recognize the Mogollon Rim country between Chevlon Butte and the Little Colorado River as their original ancestral lands (Coder 2005). Goodwin (1942:74) also documented friendly relations between the Western Apache and the Hopi people. As one his Apache informants explained it, “The Hopi are a peaceful people and were friendly to us. They never fought. They went about with the Cibecue people just as if they were good friends. We used to visit them once in a while.”

The Mormon Lake band of Northern Tonto Apaches was in Walnut Canyon and the surrounding region by the 1800s. Other Western Apache bands who intermarried with Yavapais were there as well. Ancestral Apache people were documented in early Spanish documents as being in the area of the Little Colorado River, the Hopi Mesas, and the San Francisco Peaks in 1583, 1630s, 1662, 1686, and 1776. Their presence in the late 1500s the longevity of Western Apache connections with previous users of Walnut Canyon and the surrounding region (Goodwin 1942). Others have identified the first written historical account of Apache presence in Arizona as being made in 1590 by Gaspar Castano de Sosa who came to New Mexico on a scouting expedition and was raided by Apache people (Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946).

Trade relations between the Western Apache and the Zuñi people were frequent and involved a variety of traditional and historic items. The Western Apache bought bow staves, stone arrowpoints, prepared arrow feathers, “basket with handles made especially for Zuni trade,” turkey-feather caps, buckskin leggings, and shirts. The Zuñi traded a variety of items including turquoise, white shell (ground and already drilled), a mineral paint called té-djį’, small saddle blankets (teʾidno-zé or “striped blanket”) and a larger striped blanket (hálya-gonoduzí or “striped downward”) (Goodwin 1942:80-81).

The Western Apache and the Havasupai people had trade relations according to Basso (1983) but Goodwin (1942) only documented hostile relations between the two tribes, and no relations between the two in the 1940s. Gifford (1932:181-182) recorded that the Tonto Apache “frequently intermarried with the Yavapai” and “possibly a similar relationship existed with the Cibecue Apache.” The Yavapai were known as well to steal Apache wives on occasion.
In a summary relevant to Apache cultural affiliation, the Smithsonian Institute’s Repatriation Office (1994) (http://www.nmnh.si.edu/anthro/repatriation/reports/regional/southwest/apache.htm) states:

The Apache people are a diverse group of Na-Déné (Athapaskan) speaking tribes and bands, who appear to have entered the southwest several centuries before the arrival of Europeans. In the 19th century the Apaches inhabited a broad area from central Arizona to southern Texas and northern Mexico. Many Apache groups were nomadic or semi-nomadic, and traveled over large areas, including areas visited or inhabited by other tribes. This makes it impossible to correlate geographic locations with any single specific cultural group, or even with a particular tribe. [Further,] “Tonto Apache” was used by Euro-Americans to describe all the groups which lived in the Tonto Basin, whether they were Apache or Yavapai.

The Mogollon tribes include the Miembres Apaches of the Miembres Mountains, the Coyotero Apaches of the Sierra Blanca of Arizona, the Pinal Apaches of the Pine-leño Cordillera, the Tonto Apaches between the Rio Salinas and Verde, and the Chi-ri-ca-hui Apaches of the Chi-ri-ca-hui Mountains. Their numbers respectively are: 400, 700, 2000, 800, and 500. All of the Mogollon bands remained “at large” in the mountains and tablelands along the Mogollon Rim in the mid-1800s (Bell 1869).

**Kinship Evidence**

The Northern Tonto Apache people are known as the *Dilzhe’e*, which means “going hunting.” (Coder 2005) The *Dilzhe’e* are the Mormon Lake/Walnut Canyon Apaches (Goodwin 1942). They are linked to the Navajo *Tachii’nii* clan (Matthews 1897). Western Apache clans are connected to an emergence place that may be the same as the Hopi emergence place in the Grand Canyon, and some clans lived among Hopis and Navajos at “Dance Camp” (probably Awatobi east of Hopi Mesas, 1200s-1700) (Goodwin 1942).

**Linguistic Evidence**

Information about the Yavapai appears to have been gleaned in the Spanish period from neighbors, and as a result, Indians north of the Pima were generically called “Apache” including the Tonto Apache (Schroeder 1959). The earliest records of the Tonto Apache language consist of vocabularies of Yavapai words (Gatsch et al. 1879; Loew 1873; Schroeder 1959). Goddard (1913) noted that the Apache people who occupied the Tonto Basin were so isolated from other Apache bands that they developed their own dialect, which was likely influenced by the Yuman-speaking Yavapai with whom they were closely associated.

In the 19th century, however, the Northern Tonto Apache Mormon Lake band was “pure Athabaskan linguistically; but some other bands in surrounding region were biligual Yavapai and Apache” (Goodwin 1942:43). In the mid-1800s, some Fort McDowell Indians who were Athabaskan speakers confirmed that they were Tonto Apaches and that they were born and grew up in the area north and east of the fort (Smart 1866, 1868).
Brugge (1965) conducted an analysis of 821 names recorded in pension applications by Indian people living in areas identified by Gifford (1936) and Goodwin (1942) as Apache or Yavapai. He concluded that the people who occupied the area assigned by Goodwin to the mid-19th century Tontos were predominantly Athabaskan speakers but included non-Athabaskan speakers. Brugge also determined ratios of “Apache-ness” and “Yuma-ness” from the names. The Verde River area had a ratio of 11:9, the Northern area was 13:7, the Tonto, Southern, and Flagstaff areas were 7:3. Not surprisingly, the lower ratios occur in areas of boundary overlap or shared use.

The name of the place of Western Apache emergence, Ha-tc’ono-ndai (coming up out of) is somewhere to the north of the historic Western Apache territory (Goodwin 1939), which could be anywhere in the Little Colorado River watershed. Tweedie’s (1968) linguistic analysis showed geographic relationships among Athabaskan speakers in Arizona and New Mexico (Figure 52). Based on the linguistic analysis, he determined the San Carlos to be the first group to separate (Tweedie 1968).

![Figure 52. Theorized original geographic relationship and shift of the Apache people based on glottochronology (left - Hoijer 1956; right - Hymes 1957) (Tweedie 1968).](image)

Place names are complex mnemonic devices. Athabaskan speakers are known to use named landscape features to talk about the passage of time (Cruikshank 1993). Western Apache place names reflect historical significance, conceptions of wisdom, morality, politeness, tact, and interpretation of history. The cultural significance of Western Apache place names and the rules associated with sharing them reflect an enduring relationship with the Apache landscape that permeates all of Apache culture. The Western Apache people have named countless springs, hills, meadows, outcroppings, and other landscape features. Many of the places are linked to stories about the ancestors who conferred the name, and to stories that refer to central elements of Apache culture and morality (Basso 1996).

Confidentiality issues often hinder non-Apache understanding but the Apache people do have place names for the three Flagstaff monuments as well as other sites in the Flagstaff region (Table 48). According to Apache elders Indé il ké da’ biiké yah is the homeland of the old people that lived long ago; they lived at all three Flagstaff national monuments (Toupal et al. 2004).
Table 48. Some Western Apache place names associated with the Flagstaff area (Toupal et al. 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Translation/Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunset Crater</strong></td>
<td>Ko’ ha godi’i’ hi’i’ ka’ a’ “the burnt place”</td>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walnut Canyon</strong></td>
<td>not revealed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wupatki</strong></td>
<td>not revealed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco Peaks</strong></td>
<td>Dzil’cho</td>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Inde il ke da’ biike yah</em> refers to all three places, and surrounding area</td>
<td>Toupal et al. 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oral tradition Evidence**

The Western Apache people embed their oral stories in the landscape (Sheridan 1996). Their oral narratives have the power to establish bonds of an enduring nature between people and the landscape. The stories, consequently, have moral imperatives; the land is said to “stalk people with stories” that teach them how to “live right” (Basso 1984:22). Western Apache oral tradition says that ancestral Apaches were in their historical homeland in late pre-Columbian times. An Apache legend about tribal movement begins with the Zuñi, Hopi, Pima, Papago, and Navajo in the present Navajo country. From there, they migrated southwest looking for good places to live. When they reached the ocean, they retraced their steps. The Pima and Papago stopped in their present lands but the Navajo, Hopi, and Zuñi returned to the north (Goodwin 1942). Goodwin also found that very few mythic events took place in the south, “except in conjuncture with the four directions” (ibid. 1942:66).

Brugge (1965) also documented migration traditions of the Western Apache clans that indicated an expansion from north to south. He noted that Forbes (1960) placed the Apaches in the Little Colorado River valley in the 1500s where the original Western Apache clans are said to have originated. Yavapai people were living in the Verde Valley when the Athabaskan speakers began to expand westward. The two groups developed a close alliance while retaining their languages and knowledge of separate origins (Brugge 1965). Tweedie (1968) added that the migration told of the north to south migration originating at a legendary place called *t aya kq wa* where the Western Apache had lived with the Navaho, Hopi, and other people, and made raids on people to the south. Tweedie noted other traditional stories of the Western Apache that involve the Grand Canyon. One of Reagan’s (1930:288) informants gave this account:

We came from the cold, cold north to this land. When we came here we found people living in cliffs, in caves, and in mud and stone houses and villages. They waged war on our fathers who fought them. After a long time our fathers who were fighters, overcame the cliff-dwellers and dwellers in houses and either killed them all or drove them toward the boiling ocean (south) and if the Indah (white man) had not come we would have gone on south in getting our possessions. What became of those peoples who fled before our fathers we do not know.
Other tribes also place the Apache people in the Flagstaff vicinity. The Hualapai origin story Madwízé identifies neighboring tribes to the east of Hualapai country as Yavapai with Apache beyond them, the Pueblo north of Apache, Hopi north of Pueblo, and Navajo north of Hopi. The Yavapai left Madwízé on the east side of the Colorado River and went to Rose Well. From there, they headed south to Seligman, then southeast where they became Yavapais. Some of them went on to White River and became Apaches (Mapatis 1981a).

**Ethnographic Summary**

In terms of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments, the Western Apache people’s traditional use of and relationship with the Flagstaff area recorded in oral traditions and place names only some of which has been shared to date. Patterns of resource use overlay the Flagstaff area and are reflected in anthropological, geographic and historic accounts.

The materials reviewed for this report contributed additional data relative to Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments. It bolstered anthropological, geographical, historic, kinship, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence from the 2001 review (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and the 2004 study (Toupal et al. 2004) for the Flagstaff area and the three park units. The anthropological and linguistic evidence include specific references to Sunset Crater, while the geographical and kinship evidence include specific references to Walnut Canyon. Linguistic evidence exists for Walnut Canyon and Wupatki but those place names have not been shared at this time. The cumulative evidence now addresses nine of the ten types of evidence that contribute to cultural affiliation, six of them adequately (Table 49). This body of evidence also adequately addresses the four time frames (Table 50).

Table 49. Cumulative evidence of Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral Tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

Table 50. Time frame of Western Apache cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (− 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Chapter Six: Cultural Affiliation of the Zuñi Tribe

Newly compiled evidence of cultural affiliation of the Zuñi Tribe with Sunset Crater Volcano, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki national monuments builds upon the two previous studies of cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and traditional association (Toupal et al. 2004). Summaries of those studies are presented as background to the data obtained for this chapter.

Tier 1: 2001 Cultural Affiliation Summary

In the original document review for cultural affiliation (Toupal and Stoffle 2001), the Zuñi people were found to be affiliated with Sunset Crater, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki. Their affiliation with Sunset Crater was supported by anthropological, archaeological, geographical, and oral tradition (Table 51). Their affiliation was based in part on evidence of wide-spread interactions among descendants of the Sinagua and Anasazi that addressed traditional and aboriginal time frames (Table 52).

Table 51. Zuñi cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52. Time frame of Zuñi cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (≈ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological evidence was given by the Pueblo of Zuñi as part of a National Park Service report. All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. Repeating 1995 and 1997 statements issued by the Pueblo, the Zuñi stated, “The Pueblo of Zuñi claims cultural affiliation to all prehistoric and historic properties throughout much of the Southwest region of the United States.” Specific reference is made to “Hohokam, Mogollon, Mimbres, and Salado.” The Little Colorado River has been identified as a sacred river. Review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicates that “cultural associations with high mountain peaks and natural resources in the San Francisco Peaks region are historically-based. “All prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within the Flagstaff Area National Monuments are
culturally affiliated with the A:Shiwi People as determined by the Zuñi Cultural Resources Advisory Team.”¹

Additional anthropological evidence comes from other documents that place Sunset Crater within the traditional territory of the Zuñi as well as a trail system that connects the Grand Canyon with Zuñi. The San Francisco Peaks also are sacred to Zuñi. Based on the literature, “…it is probable that there may be some sites of significance to Zuñi within the monuments.”²

Archaeological evidence includes sources that document Zuñi cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area monuments,³ and state that the archaeological identification of Wupatki should explain that it was inhabited by “at least three archeologically separate ancestral puebloan cultures.”⁴ The Zuñi Tribe has made claims of cultural affiliation with the human remains and cultural items associated with the three monuments. The Pueblo of Zuñi claim was made in a 1995 public statement from the tribe.

The Pueblo of Zuñi considers archaeological sites and associated cultural resources within the monuments to be Zuñi traditional cultural properties (TCPs), however, “Specific details on the purpose, function, and content of certain TCPs involve esoteric information that must be kept confidential.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. The Zuñi have made specific association references to the “Hohokam, Mogollon, Mimbres, and Salado.” A review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicates “that many of the recorded archaeological sites within the project area are considered ancestral to the Zuñi people. …All prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within the Flagstaff Area National Monuments are culturally affiliated with the A:Shiwi People as determined by the Zuñi Cultural Resources Advisory Team.”¹

Geographic evidence places Sunset Crater within the traditional territory of the Zuñi. A trail system connects the Grand Canyon with Zuñi, and the San Francisco Peaks are sacred to the Zuñi.²

Oral tradition evidence includes a statement by Loren Panteah that “The cultural resources are tied together regardless of political boundaries. All relate to Zuñi migration.”⁵ Claims by Zuñi of cultural affiliation “to all prehistoric and historic cultures and their properties are based on Zuñi oral history of ancestral Zuñis migrating and settling throughout this geographical area in search for Iidiwan’a, the Middle Place of the world, which is now Zuñi Pueblo.”¹ Roger Anyon reported that the Forest Service has determined Zuñi has a “close” cultural affiliation with the Anderson Mesa remains of the Sinagua, and a “likely affiliation with several Sinagua/Cohonina sites. Anyon also reported that the NPS has

² Document 8 – Anthropological Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography for Sunset Crater Volcano and Wupatki National Monuments
³ Document 17 – NAGPRA Review Committee Meeting 5/4/99
⁴ Document 2 – NPS-Tribes Meeting, 12/12/97
⁵ Document 1 – NPS-Tribes Meeting, 8/25/98
Zuñi cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon was supported by anthropological, archaeological, biological, geographical, and oral tradition evidence (Table 53). The evidence addressed traditional and aboriginal time frames (Table 54) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

Table 53. Zuñi cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54. Time frame of Zuñi cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological evidence was given by the Pueblo of Zuñi as part of a National Park Service report. The Pueblo of Zuñi “has traditional associations with natural and cultural resources at Walnut Canyon National Monuments.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. Their claim of cultural affiliation repeats 1995 and 1997 statements issued by the Pueblo that stated that, “The Pueblo of Zuñi claims cultural affiliation to all prehistoric and historic properties throughout much of the Southwest region of the United States.” The Little Colorado River was identified as a sacred river. Review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicated that “cultural associations with high mountain peaks and natural resources in the San Francisco Peaks region” are historically-based.

Archaeological evidence also was given by the Pueblo of Zuñi as part of a National Park Service report. The Pueblo of Zuñi considers archaeological sites and associated cultural resources within the monuments to be Zuñi traditional cultural properties although, “Specific details on the purpose, function, and content of certain TCPs involve esoteric information that must be kept confidential.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. Specific association reference was made to the “Hohokam, Mogollon, Mimbres, and Salado.” A review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicated “that many of the recorded archaeological sites within the project area are considered ancestral to the Zuñi people. …All prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within the Flagstaff Area National Monuments are culturally affiliated with the A:Shiwi People as determined by the Zuñi

---

6 Document 26 – Affiliation Conference on Ancestral Peoples of the Four Comers Region 3/99, Vol. 2
Cultural Resources Advisory Team." Indirect archaeological evidence was inferred from a statement that occupants of Walnut Canyon moved to sites on Anderson Mesa, which other documents have determined to be culturally affiliated with Hopi and Zuñi.  

Biological data suggest an affinity between the Sinagua, Zuñi, and Hopi. Zuñi is included as well in the biological affinities discussed by Joe Powell. Geographic evidence includes Brandt’s conclusion that, “... it is probable that there may be some sites of significance to Zuñi within the monuments.” Pueblos in the Anderson Mesa area [15 miles southeast of Flagstaff] “also have Zuñi affiliation.”

Oral tradition evidence includes a statement by Loren Panteah that “The cultural resources are tied together regardless of political boundaries. All relate to Zuñi migration.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. “Cultural affiliation claims to all prehistoric and historic cultures and their properties are based on Zuñi oral history of ancestral Zuñis migrating and settling throughout this geographical area in search for Idiwan’a, the Middle Place of the world, which is now Zuñi Pueblo.” Roger Anyon reported that the Forest Service has determined Zuñi has a “close” culturally affiliation with the Anderson Mesa remains of the Sinagua, and a “likely affiliation with several Sinagua/Cohonina sites.

Zuñi cultural affiliation with Wupatki was supported by anthropological, archaeological, biological, geographical, oral tradition, and other expert evidence (Table 55). The evidence addressed traditional and aboriginal time frames (Table 56) (Toupal and Stoffle 2001).

Table 55. Zuñi cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 56. Time frame of Zuñi cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument based on 2001 review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional (~15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anthropological evidence includes statements made during NPS-tribal meetings by tribal members: “According to Puebloan oral tradition, Wupatki represents one ancestral

---

8 Document 12 – USFS Cultural Affiliation Assessment for Sinagua  
The Pueblo of Zuñi “has traditional associations with natural and cultural resources at Wupatki, Sunset Crater, and Walnut Canyon National Monuments.” The Pueblo of Zuñi’s claim of cultural affiliation repeats 1995 and 1997 statements issued by the Pueblo that, “The Pueblo of Zuñi claims cultural affiliation to all prehistoric and historic properties throughout much of the Southwest region of the United States.” Review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicates that “cultural associations with high mountain peaks and natural resources in the San Francisco Peaks region” are historically-based. The Wupatki area is considered to be “Zuñi traditional territory.” Zuñi advisors identified three shrines at Crack-in-the-Rock site, and a solstice symbol “important in the Zuñi world-view.” Wupatki is said to be associated with the Hopi Parrot Clan, which has a Zuñi origin. Some accounts associate the Zuñi Parrot Clan with Wupatki. “The Parrot Clan Gash-wungwa at Hopi has Zuñi origins and one of their ancestral sites was in Wupatki.”

Archaeological evidence included the clarification that the archaeological identification of Wupatki should reflect it as being inhabited by “at least three archeologically separate ancestral puebloan cultures.” The Pueblo of Zuñi considers archaeological sites and associated cultural resources within the Monument to be Zuñi traditional cultural properties, however, “Specific details on the purpose, function, and content of certain TCPs involve esoteric information that must be kept confidential.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. Specific association reference has been made to the “Hohokam, Mogollon, Mimbres, and Salado.” A review of published literature by Zuñi cultural advisors indicated “that many of the recorded archaeological sites within the project area are considered ancestral to the Zuñi people.” Zuñi advisors identified three shrines at Crack-in-the-Rock site, and a solstice symbol “important in the Zuñi world-view. ...All prehistoric and historic archaeological sites located within the Flagstaff Area National Monuments are culturally affiliated with the A:Shiwi People as determined by the Zuñi Cultural Resources Advisory Team.”

The Pueblo of Zuñi is listed as being “likely” culturally affiliated with human remains and cultural items from NA358 (Nalakihu), NA618 (Three Courts Pueblo), NA682 (House of Tragedy), NA12512, NA405 (Wupatki Pueblo), NA1755; and NA404. Ancient ovens at Zuñi are similar to ancient ovens at Nalakihu. Pueblos in the Anderson Mesa area “also have Zuñi affiliation.” The Zuñi also have interpreted some of the petroglyphs found in Wupatki as migration symbols. Other petroglyphs also probably have Zuñi cultural referents.

Biological data suggest an affinity between the Sinagua, Zuñi, and Hopi. Zuñi is included as well in the biological affinities discussed by Joe Powell. Geographic evidence includes Brandt’s conclusion that, “... it is probable that there may be some sites of

---
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significance to Zuñi within the monuments.” Wupatki is within the traditional territory of the Zuñi. A trail system connects the Grand Canyon with Zuñi.² Pueblos in the Anderson Mesa area [15 miles southeast of Flagstaff] “also have Zuñi affiliation.”³

Oral tradition evidence includes a statement by Loren Panteah that “The cultural resources are tied together regardless of political boundaries. All relate to Zuñi migration.”⁴ The Pueblo of Zuñi has stated that they have “traditional associations with natural and cultural resources at Wupatki National Monument.” All ancestral sites are considered sacred because they are associated with the emergence and migration of the Zuñi people. “Cultural affiliation claims to all prehistoric and historic cultures and their properties are based on Zuñi oral history of ancestral Zuñis migrating and settling throughout this geographical area in search for Idiwan’a, the Middle Place of the world, which is now Zuñi Pueblo.”⁵ Some tribal accounts associate the Zuñi Parrot Clan with Wupatki. “The Parrot Clan Gash-wungwa at Hopi has Zuñi origins and one of their ancestral sites was in Wupatki.”⁶ Tribal members have stated that “According to Puebloan oral tradition, Wupatki represents one ancestral Puebloan group.”⁷

Roger Anyon reported that the Forest Service has determined Zuñi has a “close” culturally affiliation with the Anderson Mesa remains of the Sinagua, and a “likely affiliation with several Sinagua/Cohonina sites. He reported that the NPS has determined Kayenta Branch remains in the Grand Canyon are affiliated with Zuñi and all other Pueblos. Anyon also reviewed NPS determinations for sites within Wupatki that are considered to be “likely” affiliated with Zuñi.⁸

### Tier 2: 2004 Traditional Association Summary

The Zuñi people are traditionally associated with the three Flagstaff area national monuments. The summaries that follow are taken directly from Toupal et al. (2004) and presented for each park unit as well as the overall landscape.

#### Sunset Crater

Although a specific name for Sunset Crater was not offered, the Zuñi people refer to the San Francisco Peaks and the surrounding area as “Kwa ba chuwa llona.” The Zuñi people also have names for volcanoes and sharp volcanic rocks but, given the sacred and powerful nature of these materials, they did not feel it appropriate to share that information at this time. As in the past, the Zuñi people regularly visit the San Francisco Peaks to obtain spiritual power and to ask for blessings. Sunset Crater is believed to possess a similar capacity as it is positioned near a point of pilgrimage. Resources in the park that the Zuñi identified as significant to the landscape include scenery, valleys, plants, air, and Sunset Crater. Traditionally, people would have settled or camped in the park’s vicinity but not near the crater. They would have come to hunt, gather herbs, and collect soil, minerals, and volcanic rocks. Ceremonies would have occurred in special places such as in the ice cave to which Zuñi people continue to make pilgrimages for offerings and other religious practices. They also engaged in star observation in the park.
Many of the features in Sunset Crater National Monument are culturally interconnected to other places within the region. Mount Taylor in Grants, New Mexico, for example, is similar in size, slope, persistence of snow, and cultural importance. The oxidizing rock at Sunset Crater and the San Francisco Peaks resembles the lava flows and cinder cones at El Malpais, New Mexico. These areas have parallel plant assemblages as well, such as aspen and sumac, which are gathered seasonally for making prayer sticks. The ice cave at Sunset Crater, referred to as “Sun hakal’ekwaula,” is associated with similar caves found in the privately owned Bandera Crater, New Mexico and in the El Malpais area. According to the Zuñi, these caves are not separate entities. Like a plant’s roots, they are connected through an underground series of channels, and are religiously significant to the Zuñi people. The Sunset Crater ice cave is related to the west direction, while Bandera ice cave is related to the east. These ice caves are mentioned in Zuñi songs and are visited twice a year, during the summer and the winter solstice. It is believed that the spiritual beings that brought the Zuñi from the Grand Canyon wanted the people to live in a safe place. Therefore, the spiritual beings guided the people to the Zuñis current home at Middle Place between the Mount Taylor and the San Francisco Peaks volcanoes. As a result, the Zuñi Pueblo is connected to everything within the area including Sunset Crater. Offerings are still left in ice caves so that eruptions will not happen again reflecting their belief that the spirits and powers of cold and heat are one and the same. By leaving offerings and praying to cold forces, they show respect for the powerful forces of the earth and hope their prayers will dissuade future volcanic eruptions.

For the Zuñi, the streams and rivers that run from the Zuñi River to the Little Colorado River to the Colorado River and west to the Pacific Ocean create an “umbilical cord” that leads back to the birthplace of the Zuñi. Beginning in prehistoric times and continuing into the modern era, the Zuñi have relied on above or belowground waterways. This reliance has been on daily, seasonal or calendrical basis. The Zuñi, for example, have visited the ice cave since its formation during the Sunset Crater eruption. The pure water found in the “Kenteleton” or “room of ice” is used for healing and in medicine, for food and drink including during pilgrimages, ceremonies, and when asking for blessings. The cave has been used as well for storage and is associated with planting crops.

Plants have been central in the lives of the Zuñi people since prehistoric times. Tribal elders identified many important plants in the park that are still used today. Plants provide seasonal foods, medicine, ceremonial purposes, and are used to craft a variety of objects including prayer sticks. Some plants like sage are used daily while others are sought on a seasonal, annual, or calendrical basis. When preparing to travel to the ice cave, the Zuñi people would gather certain plants bi-annually taking only what was needed to make prayer sticks and offerings. One tribal representative commented that the Zuñi might not travel this far to gather plants that occur abundantly throughout the southwest unless a special plant was required.

The animals that live in the Sunset Crater area are culturally significant as well. Prehistorically, historically, and even today, these animals are sought daily or seasonally depending on the need. All animals, especially birds, rabbits, squirrels, deer, antelope, and elk are sources of food, clothing, tools, and medicine, as well as being important components
of ceremony and prayer. In particular, various bones are made into tools. Fluids extracted from the leg glands of deer or antelope are believed to increase speed when running. Bluebird feathers, antlers, and fur have medicinal applications. Antlers are shaped into carving and fetishes or are used by ceremonial dancers. At the same time, animal hides, or feathers of sacred birds such as blue jays, are used by kachina impersonators or in initiation ceremonies. Some animals and even insects like flies, can visit people to convey important information.

Contemporary evidence of Native American use of Sunset Crater include Hopi prayer sticks found by the Zuñi in the entrance to the ice cave as well as in the smooth areas within the cavern; they explained that they do not bother what others have left. In terms of older remains of Zuñi occupation, they felt that the area was visited as needed from pre-historic to modern periods to conduct ceremonies and to obtain spiritual strength from powerful features such as the ice cave.

As with plants and animals, the unique geological features of Sunset Crater are essential to Zuñi culture. From prehistoric times, items like pigments, alkaline in the lava, certain minerals or crystals found near volcanic activity have been gathered as necessary: daily, seasonally or annually, in the Sunset Crater area. Lava rocks such as basalt have been used as grinding utensils. Sharp lava stones were used for scraping flesh off and softening animal hides. Yellow, red, and blue sands are employed as paint and in ceremonies. Today, cinders may be used to line driveways or oven floors because of its heat retaining ability or laid in fields to prevent sinking into mud. In religious terms, the ice cave and Sunset Crater are referred to in Zuñi migration songs. As stated above, it is believed that the cave ice is pure and has healing properties. Offerings are left not just for the Zuñi but also for all the people in the area to ask for good health, rain, and productive crops. Other activities that these features are used for include communicating with spiritual beings to seek knowledge or power or to teach younger generations about the cultural significance of the place. This may be accomplished by performing ceremonies in the ice cave or in special geological places within the monument’s boundaries. Finally, the San Francisco Peaks stand as a significant territorial marker between tribes.

**Walnut Canyon**

Walnut Canyon is known to the Zuñi people as “Sunhakwe Kyabachyalane” or “Enodakwa” meaning “the ancient people’s sites.” As one elder described it, this ancient place was first inhabited by Indian people long ago who sought protection in the canyon’s walls.

> The cliff dwellings are a lot different than the sites at Wupatki. They are like some of the sites in Zuñi that were put there for protection from the Navajo, Apaches, and Utes that came into the area. Those tribes were the war-like tribes that came in and started taking over. The people who were at the ancient sites like Walnut Canyon where peaceful.

The canyon was important ceremonially because wherever “the ancient ones stopped, they had ceremonies and people who were healers would seek knowledge.” Other activities
would have included seasonal camping, collecting food and medicine plants, hunting game, and, during migration times, farming. Star observation occurred as a way to mark the changing seasons, and to navigate throughout the region. In addition to the protective qualities of the canyon, the area provided a variety of food resources and places for religious activities: “the ruins are very well blended into the landscape/cliffs. This was good protection, in the cliffs. At that time there would have been a lot of food here [such as] piñon, berries, acorns. I saw a room that was big enough to have been a gathering room, so they would have their ceremonies here too.” Additionally, people traveling on the “Middle Route” would have visited the site.

Walnut Canyon is culturally associated with all the present day Pueblos and Southwestern Native American tribes. To the Zuñi, the canyon is connected to all their traditional use sites from the Grand Canyon to the Zuñi Pueblo. These connections were first established during the migrations from the Grand Canyon.

*We have our Emergence stories. We came up from the Fourth Underworld, we emerged in the Grand Canyon, and then we began our search for the Middle Place. We traveled all through this area. We would settle where there was water. We would stay for four days, maybe that meant 400 years at a time at that time. While living in a place, young spiritual people would leave to look for new places ahead of the group and then when they found a good place, the rest of the group would migrate. They would look for a good place, with water, with good food resources, with game for hunting, maybe a place to raise crops.*

Since migration times, the Zuñi people have used the springs and underground water reserves in Walnut Canyon daily, seasonally, annually, calendrically, or as needed. These resources were vital for ceremonies, medicine, food, and drink. The canyon springs were particularly important to the early inhabitants given the difficulty in transporting water from outside the canyon. Medicinally, canyon spring water is preferred because “the water from springs is used especially when needed for healing. The spring water itself is clear and clean which is clearer than pond (water) and is free from bacteria. So for healing, spring water was used.”

The botanical resources in and around Walnut Canyon are highly valued by Zuñi people. Plants continue to be used at different times in the year including seasonally, annually, biannually, daily, or as needed. According to one elder, Walnut Canyon’s plant composition is more diverse then Sunset Crater and Wupatki. These unique canyon plants provided food and medicine, were employed in ceremony and crafted into useful implements. Food plants included wild berries, roasted acorns, walnuts, banana yucca fruits, piñons, boiled and dried prickly pear pads and edible roots. The traditionally cultivated staples of corn, beans, and squash would have been grown on the cliff tops or in the fertile canyon floor. Plant materials commonly used in medicine and curing included piñon pitch, and juniper leaves and berries. It is believed that in some curing ceremonies, plants act as the medium by which healers can communicate with ancestor spirits whom can aid in the treatment. The smooth branches of shrubs such as sumac or mountain mahogany were used
in basket making. Yucca fibers were woven or sewn into fabrics, sandals, bed mats, baskets and garments. Piñon wood was collected for fuel, and the pitch was used to seal baskets or to repair broken pots. Many plants in the area, including Douglas fir, continue to be used as prayer plumes in religious ceremonies.

All of the animals mentioned on the Walnut Canyon trail markers have cultural significance. Before the arrival of Europeans in the Americas, the fauna that lived on the mesa tops or in the valleys below, were sought on a seasonal, calendrically, or daily basis for food, medicine, ceremony, tools, or clothing. Traditional food items such as deer, turkey, antelope, squirrels, rabbits, elk, pack rats, and porcupines were often skinned and made into jerky. The Zuñi people also have spiritual relationships with many of these animals. Antlers, sinew, deer hooves and skin are still utilized in ceremonies. Antlers are carved into fetishes, and mounted on house walls as hooks. Medicine men would have rubbed the glands from deer legs on children to make them “active and good runners.” Turkey feathers were made into warm blankets worn by persons of high social status. Animal hides were made into blankets, moccasins, hunting pouches, or medicine bags.

The cliff dwellings stand as the strongest evidence for Zuñi use of the area that began in prehistory and has persisted into the modern era. Many architectural features including the stone walls resemble those at the Zuñi Pueblo. Traditionally, these dwellings would have been used as protective residences, for hunting, plant gathering, and to perform power seeking ceremonies. Although no one has lived at the site for some time now, the Zuñi continue to come to make cornmeal offerings to Walnut Canyon’s past residents.

Geological features with cultural importance for the Zuñi people include the natural rock overhangs or alcoves. According to one elder, these landforms not only provided protection from outsiders but also allowed the ancient inhabitants to construct only one wall for living spaces instead of four. One elder speculated that Walnut Canyon’s topography created a “Middle Island” for socially important people to conduct religious activities, saying that it was possible that “important leaders and spiritual leaders were here in the middle. The high Middle Island and high place next to it [allowed the] spirit leaders to have connections to spirit beings.”

The canyon also served as a territorial marker between tribes where people would come to trade and share information about house construction, farming practices, or medicine plants. For the site to be used to teach younger generations about the cultural significance of the place, the elders explained that they would “have to be pure [so] the place has to be taught to [them].” The uninhabited canyons, high peaks, and rock piles are other important features of Walnut Canyon. Certain rock piles in the monument may be shrines that were erected in high places; some may still be used today.

Wupatki

The Zuñi participants viewed Wupatki and Wukoki as one site, and the Citadel and Lomaki as another site. In both cases, one provides support for activities at the other. The following summary deals first with Wupatki and Wukoki, then with the Citadel and Lomaki.
The Zuñi word for Wupatki National Monument translates as “ancient place.” As traditional stories convey, the area is one of many migration sites established by Zuñi ancestors or passed through after their emergence from the Grand Canyon. The Zuñi elders described how crops were nurtured in areas with adequate rainfall, and that medicinal plants and wild foods were gathered. Deer, antelope, and rabbits were hunted, and games were played in open areas. The stars were observed in special places to foretell the changing of seasons, and ceremonies similar to those conducted today were performed that celebrate the summer and winter solstice, or coincide with planting and harvesting. The area is associated as well with pilgrimages to the Little Colorado River to collect pigments.

Wupatki National Monument is culturally connected with all Zuñi ancestral sites in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. Many of these places are united by their common architecture, which includes kivas and plazas, and are mentioned in the Zuñi migration stories including Zuñi Pueblo, Bandelier National Monument, the Grand Canyon, the Little Colorado River, the San Francisco Peaks, various ruins, and rivers. The Zuñi River, for example, is a key element in the Zuñi cultural landscape. The Zuñi elders described their migration story as it has been passed down over the many generations.

We came from the Grand Canyon, looking for the Middle Place. These places were built during that time, so the people would be safe from destruction, tornadoes and such. Zuñi is the Middle Place between El Malpais and Sunset Crater.

The Zuñi River joins with the other river and it connects to Zuñi Heaven. Then it connects west, to the Little Colorado River, it then connects to the Colorado River and the Grand Canyon.

Water has long been valued by the Zuñi people for food, drink, medicine, ceremony, cleaning, irrigating crops, and watering livestock. As one elder explained, “Springs are sacred. They would be used for medicine water [because they flow] from deep within Mother Earth. They are more important than ponds, which can become stagnant.” According to one elder, water was the most important resource because “It connects us back to the pilgrimages to the Grand Canyon. When they were migrating, they needed springs, so they would look for cottonwoods.” Rivers continue to play an important role in pilgrimages, which usually occur every four years. “Water is a connection. Rivers are like umbilical chords. The Zuñi River goes to the Little Colorado, which goes to the Colorado, which goes to the ocean. We follow riverways on our pilgrimages to the Grand Canyon.”

There are plants in Wupatki National Monument that the Zuñi people have gathered as needed for food, drink, ceremony, medicine, or to craft useful implements. The Zuñi people also found the landscape suitable for agriculture as described by one elder, “It looks promising for crops. They had to make food before traveling. So they would grow food there for four years, then travel. Everything in Zuñi is in fours.”

Although certain plants may not have uses today, one elder commented that the ancestors would have known how to utilize them all. Some specific plants of interest...
included saltberries, which were eaten or used to cure stomach aches, “Just like pepto bismol. If a person is not sweating in the heat, crush the berries and rub them on their hands and on their forehead to make them sweat.” Yucca plants, distinguished by having slim or wide leaves, were ceremonially and as a food source. Today, dancers continue to carry yucca bundles, and yucca strings are made into headbands, which are worn only by Medicine Society men. Apache plume is used by religious societies in ceremonies. The War Society, for example, collects this plant for prayer bundles, and leaders of the Medicine Society will carry bundles of it along with other ritual objects in dances. Willow branches were cut for prayer feathers, and the purple flowers of Colorado beeweed were dried, crushed, and stored to season meat or used to make pottery pigments. Other plants are used in healing, and as medicine including Indian tea for stomach aches.

Zuñis have a traditional conservation ethic in regards to killing and using wildlife. “Nothing was wasted - it was worn, eaten, or made into tools.” When needed for food, animals were hunted on a daily or seasonal basis, however, in historical times, this has changed in response to game laws. Nonetheless, fresh meat is still preferred: “Elders always used to say that the best meat is wild meat. It's pure, has no chemicals or residue, because it grazes on grasses.” Traditionally, open pits covered with a layer of sticks were constructed to capture deer, rabbits, antelope, elk, and rams. These animals also played significant roles in healing and ceremony. Antlers continue to be use for religious purposes.

Many features in Wupatki National Monument indicate previous Zuñi use of the area. As they moved across the land, the ancestors would build in promising places; occupying the site for a number of years. Once the first group moved on, often after a four-year period, a successive party would move in to inhabit the site. Both Wukoki and Wupatki were used as protected living quarters, and the plazas would have served as amphitheaters for games, ceremonial dances and entertaining performances. After leaving the site as a residence, people would return on a seasonal basis for hunting, wild plant gathering, farming, and to conduct power-renewing ceremonies. One elder distinguished between the kinds of spiritual activities that would have taken place at Wupatki.

We don't seek power. We ask spirits for help in healing. Those who know the way wouldn't seek power for himself; that would anger the spirits. The healing ceremonies are private. The social ceremonies, such as for farming, planting, and harvesting, are for everybody.

All the geological features in the monument have cultural significance for the Zuñi people who have names for each mountain in the region including Doney Mountain and the San Francisco Peaks. These landforms as well as ice caves in Wupatki, Sunset Crater and Bandelier National Monument are mentioned in Zuñi migration songs. During the migrations, the people traveled back and forth throughout the area and used caves as food caches. The blowhole was an important power seeking spot, and would remain so today if it were not so accessible to the general public. The Zuñi people continue to pray and meditate here, asking spiritual beings for assistance in their daily lives. The knowledge received from spirits is used and shared by individuals for religious education purposes. In places where the spirits are of great help, shrines are constructed as indicators of what had occurred as well as
to thank the spirits for their guidance. According to one elder, the size and shape of a shrine does not matter as each holds the same power. In other high places, once a month or annually, prayer feathers are deposited as offerings to the sacred directions north, west, south, and east. These directions are very important in the ceremonial activities of each religious fraternity.

According to the Zuñi elders, there is a possible relation between the Citadel and Lomaki. In the Zuñi language, the Citadel and the neighboring ruins are referred to as “Inode kwe” meaning the “ancient people.” These first inhabitants were attracted to the site for the view. From such a high point, the people could see for miles in any direction and provide a protective watch over the communities living on the valley floor. Activities associated with the site include hunting deer and antelope, gathering food and medicine plants, and farming corn and other crops while ceremonies were performed at special places. One elder said the vistas allowed people to communicate with spiritual beings, “They would pick spots with a good connection to the spiritual, the supernatural. They would use all these features to teach their children how to take care of the landscape.”

One elder speculated that the Citadel was used for protection, and as a place to give warnings to the people living in the area in case something was about to happen. Another elder noted that Lomaki is not in an open flat area so it must have been “…built for protection; they were hard to get to.” The Zuñi participants noted as well that, “The structures…the masonry work…they needed to have an understanding of the weight needed to support two stories and wall bases.” The elders believe that the Citadel was where people went to perform ceremonies and to watch the stars, that it was not a permanent place to live, and that people camped here for a period of time but later moved on.

*During the migration, people were traveling and looking for Zuñi [the Middle Place]. This was one place with crops. The story says that they were at each place for four days. That could be four years, [or] four hundred years.*

*At other areas, there were kivas. I don't see a place here for medicine men to be together. The Citadel looked like there may have been a kiva…it could have been used for spiritual matters. The leaders with knowledge would use it.*

The ruins of the Citadel are culturally connected to Zuñi ancestral sites in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. After their creation in the Grand Canyon, the Zuñi ancestors moved across the land that now comprises these four states establishing settlements. According to one elder, as the migration progressed, so too did the architecture which soon developed into the enduring structures that remain today.

Although a perennial source of water is no longer present at the Citadel, the Zuñi elders speculated that in prehistoric times there was more water in the region noting many stories about rain from the elders. The Zuñi ancestors would have collected runoff from the mountain peaks and would had used the water for irrigating crops, food, drink, medicine, and ceremony. One of the Zuñi elders said that any spring water is used for purification and teas for medicinal use and that water is used in healing and kachina ceremonies.
As in the past, Zuñi people would seek various plants growing in the vicinity of the Citadel, particularly for food and medicine including Mormon tea to treat constipation. One Zuñi elder discussed the various uses of plants found at the sites.

Some plants were prepared for winter use, gathered in the summer for winter use. Sumac (or mahogany) used for prayer sticks, others were used in religion. Indian ricegrass, after the seeds drop, was used to sweep metates clean. Some grasses were used for weaving. If there was willow in the canyon, in the wet areas, it would have been used for baskets. Yucca was used for weaving sandals and baskets; its root was used for soap. You cut it in half and swirl it in water. Medicine plant knowledge is held only by healing societies so I can’t say anything about it. Flowers and seeds include locoweed, Indian rice, or any little seeds. Locoweed is not for human consumption. The seeds are used in prayer bundles; they stimulate everything that grows. You plant the prayer bundle, and the spirits help things grow.

Animals used by the Zuñi people included deer, elk, and antelope; these provided food, medicine, and clothing. One elder explained, “The hair of the animals is used for smoking. It is burned for medicinal use. When we kill an animal, it is not just for fun. We use everything.” Rabbit skins were used to make blankets, and storage bags like pouches for food and traveling were made from buckskin. Hides were used for ceremonial dress, and prayers were made to certain animals. Many birds including flakers and bluebirds were valued for their feathers, which were used in ceremonies.

The Zuñi elders speculated about the Citadel Sink adjacent to the ruins. They thought this deep basin might have been used as a deer trap, and that there may have been water in the bottom, allowing cultivation of some sort. The adjoining valleys and rock outcroppings provided places for ceremonies to seek spiritual knowledge and power, meetings to converse with other Indians, and culturally significant areas to teach younger generations valuable traditions. Today, the Zuñi people continue to make pilgrimages to the Citadel ruins to offer prayers.

Zuñi Cultural Landscape

The Zuñi cultural landscape stretches well beyond the boundaries of the study area. Their ancestors migrated through the Flagstaff area when they left the Grand Canyon, following nearby canyons and rivers including the Little Colorado River and Zuñi River all of which connect to Zuñi Heaven (Figure 53). The cinder cones remind the Zuñi people of what is below ground including some migration sites that are covered up today. As one elder described, the land now encompassing New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and Colorado is culturally united:
Figure 53. Cultural landscape field data from the Zuñi tribe.
This whole area is aboriginal Zuñi land, connected via the Migration in search of the Middle Place. The Migration went from the Mongolian Rim to Eagle Peak, Socorro, New Mexico, to Mount Taylor to the San Francisco Peaks and the Grand Canyon. All these places are mentioned or used in the prayers that Zuñi has. The Zuñi legend says that they had lived there for four days, which was like 400 years. Then, others would be sent to find a good place until they found the Middle Place. If conditions were good, they would stay in the place for a while, for years, until they moved on. All the settlements in Wupatki are connected to this.

This region has several Zuñi names including Sun hakuse, Kiap’hachuya, and Sunhakwin meaning “where the sun goes down.” As the Zuñi ancestors migrated over these large expanses, they established settlements where they farmed, gathered wild plants, hunted, played games, performed ceremonies, held political meetings with other tribes, and observed the changes in the skyline and stars. According to the Zuñi elders, the villages of Elden Pueblo, Walnut Canyon, and Wupatki are just a few of the numerous interrelated traditional sites in the region. Each of these settlements, were places that the ancestors founded on their journey to the Middle Place, what is today the Zuñi Pueblo. At that time, there were other Indian people living in the area with whom the Zuñi interacted including the ancestors of the Hualapai, Havasupai, Hopi, and New Mexico Pueblos. The Zuñi people consider these groups to be relatives describing a longstanding relationship with the Hopi people and identifying the Hualapai people as a “subdivision” of Zuñi society.

All the places and settlements along the migration trails were connected through an elaborate system of physical and mythical trails, trade, intertribal relations, hunting, gathering, and ceremonies. The trails connected Zuñi with places as far away as Laguna and Acoma Pueblos, and Tuba City. Other trails led to ceremonial places and sacred sites. In the 1920s, the Zuñi were still making pilgrimages to the San Francisco Peaks along these trails, leaving offerings to spiritual beings, and collecting the necessary herbs and minerals that would be needed when they arrived. Pilgrimages to the Grand Canyon also followed the ancestral trails so that the Zuñi people could properly visit their origin place.

Zuñi culture and life is supported by many songs. Some are religious and sung only by the medicine fraternities while others, such as prayer-songs, are associated with special places, or performed in ceremonies like the rain dance. Individuals may arrange a song for a special purpose as in the case of a Zuñi man who recently composed a migration song about the Hualapai before he passed away. Zuñi people also have songs for traveling and for tribal gatherings; there are many songs that are tied to place in the parks and the surrounding area.

Other culturally significant places for the Zuñi include Twin Arrows, Winslow, Holbrook, and Kumanchan, or Walnut Canyon. The former originated during the Zuñi Migration and was occupied for a long period of time before the people separated:

The people, when migrating, would travel in groups. They would stay in places for four days, which may mean 4 years, 400 years, etc. They would leave. The young would travel, but the old and weak would stay in the place.
They made plenty of stops on the way to the Middle Place. In the Arizona area, “Jumanchan” is the place where the people split. They had to choose an egg. Elders tell the story about the parrot and the crow.

After the split, the people who went east went to the Bandelier area. The area is now sacred to all New Mexico Pueblos. This group joined Zuñi and brought the Medicine Society. The people who went south are still down there, in the “Land of Everlasting Sun.” The others went straight to the Middle Place, where they live now.

Physical features of the landscape that have important roles in Zuñi culture include all the mountains, which are physically connected by underground “roots.” The mountains are culturally centralized in prayers and accounts of the Zuñi Migration. Like the San Francisco Peaks, these sacred landforms were used to navigate during the Migration. Waterways are culturally significant as well, particularly the Colorado River, Little Colorado River, and Zuñi River. As one elder explained, “All the waterways are connected to the oceans and the oceans around the world, like an umbilical cord.” As cultural significant phenomena, the Colorado River, Little Colorado River, and Zuñi River carry the Zuñi people to heaven because they flow to the emersion [emergence] place in the Grand Canyon.

The Zuñi River goes to the Little Colorado and the Colorado. Zuñi Heaven is there. It's also (on) the migration route.

The Little Colorado runs to Zuñi heaven. The path to heaven is the same path as the migrations. It goes back to the Grand Canyon.

In recent times, the Zuñi elders taught the children about the importance of their cultural landscape during the annual Indian fairs in Flagstaff. The Zuñi also performed dances to help the elders tell traditional stories to the children. One elder described some of the motivation behind the esteem that the Zuñi people hold for their traditional use sites in the region:

Where people stopped and built homes are all sacred places. No matter if they passed on, the people who couldn’t travel stayed in the homes. Their spirits are there in all the sites. All sites are sacred to us.

When incorporated with the 2001 cultural affiliation data, the 2004 traditional association study provided anthropological and oral tradition evidence adequate for cultural affiliation with all three national monuments (Table 57). The 2004 study also contributed much new data to all time frames resulting in adequate evidence of Zuñi affiliation with the three national monuments (Table 58).
Table 57. Zuñi cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x, X 2001 Evidence, & 2001 Evidence is Adequate
2004 Evidence is Adequate

Table 58. Time frame of Zuñi cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on traditional association study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x, X 2001 Evidence, & 2001 Evidence is Adequate
2004 Evidence (Adequate)

Tier 3: Additional Cultural Affiliation Data

To this point, the question of cultural affiliation of the Zuñi people with the three Flagstaff area monuments has been addressed with anthropological, archaeological, biological, geographical, oral tradition, and other expert evidence. Much of this evidence is adequate to establish cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon and Wupatki for all time periods, and anthropological and oral tradition evidence is adequate to establish cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater. In this section, additional information is presented that provides anthropological, archaeological, geographical, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area in general, and in some cases, with specific park units.

Anthropological Evidence

The Zuñi people maintained sovereignty over their lands throughout the Spanish (1540-1821) and Mexican periods (1821-1846). Trade provided a method of control and monitoring, and was a major component of Zuñi economy even after the Spanish arrived. The Zuñi people maintained an extensive trail system that extended hundreds of miles in all directions. They consequently had trading partners throughout the southwest including the Rio Grande Pueblos, the Grand Canyon tribes, the Hopi Tribe, and tribes as far south as the Gila River and Sonora, and as far west as the Pacific Coast. The arrival of the Spanish brought some disruption to use of the more distant trails but it was not until American encroachments of cattle and settlers in
the latter half of the 1800s that the Zuñi trail system was greatly diminished (Ferguson and Hart 1985). Cushing (1979:153) noted, however, that the Zuñi continued to interact with the Havasupai as late as the 1880s, traveling the 1100 miles to their village on horseback. Their path crossed “the great San Francisco plateau and desert.”

During pre-contact times, the Zuñi traded with the Pimas, Yumas, Mojaves, Yavapais, Hualapais, Cocopas, Havasupai, the Rio Grande Pueblos, the Tipais and Ipais of California, and the Indians of Sonora. Their primary trade items were salt, turquoise, and buffalo robes, which they exchanged for exotic items such as macaw feathers and seashells, but they engaged in an extensive inventory of trade items including gems, paints, and plant and animal parts. The extent of the trade system based from Zuñi is reflected in a 17th century observation by a Spaniard who observed ten languages being spoken along the trail between Zuñi and California. Since this trail ran along the south edge of the San Francisco Peaks, the early observation provides linguistic substantiation of the diverse cultural character of the Flagstaff area during the traditional period (pre-mid-1800s) (Ferguson and Hart 1985).

While the Zuñi closely monitored and controlled their traditional territory, they also welcomed friendly travelers and traders. It was well known that travel in Zuñi country was safe for those without bad intentions. One way in which the Zuñi people managed their territory was through pilgrimages, gathering expeditions, and religious activities. Pilgrimages to sacred places in the Zuñi landscape for religious activities also provided a way to monitor the availability and condition of plant, animal, and mineral resources (Ferguson and Hart 1985).

Archaeological Evidence

Cushing (1896) documented ancient features of Zuñi culture found in the archaeological record. There was a twofold nature to Zuñi burial customs at the time of Spanish contact. Sometimes the dead were cremated with all of their belongings while at other times, they were buried in courts, houses, or near walls of their villages. The concurrent practice of such different burials reflected customs of two or more ancestral Zuñi peoples (possibly Hohokam and Anasazi).

Architecturally, western branch Zuñi ancestors “were almost from the beginning dwellers in square structures” (Cushing 1896:361). Spier (1919) noted strong similarities in Hopi and Zuñi pottery features when the Zuñi originally lived further west of Zuñi Pueblo. Pilles (1993) described the characterization of the archaeology of Walnut Canyon as Sinaguan and useful to supporting indirectly Zuñi cultural affiliation. Each of these descriptions further supports Zuñi oral histories of their relationship with the Flagstaff area.

Bettison’s (1998) study of agriculturalist settlement patterns in the Lower Zuñi River valley of east-central Arizona, A.D. 500-1540, provides some interpretive reconsideration of the Wupatki area. She suggests that responses to drought could include a combination of gathering, hunting, and cultivation, or increased trade with neighboring groups. Her results indicate that settlement locations of prehistoric agriculturalists on the Colorado Plateau were determined to some extent by the location of two fixed resources: potable water sources and agricultural field locations.
She also found that combinations of factors such as environment, socioeconomic organization, and adaptive strategies, could override the desire to be located near fixed resources and, in fact, can entice people to move from favorable farm lands to areas of larger population concentration and less desirable farm lands. Her results indicate that food resource locations such as agricultural fields should not be assumed to be adjacent to archaeological sites, although, potable water sources appear to be closer to archaeological sites.

Bettison noted two occupation hiatuses in her study area: one from A.D. 875-1010 and the other from A.D. 1200-1475, both wet periods. She attributes this oddity to socio-political shifts in the region including the Chacoan system and Cibolan Puebloan aggregation that followed, however, in the latter case, the eruptions of Sunset Crater likely drew them away.

Bettison’s study area is in Arizona approximately halfway between St. John’s and the Zuñi Reservation in New Mexico. While east of the Flagstaff area, her discussion on population settlement and movement may be useful to understanding patterns at Wupatki that have been interpreted in the past as agricultural and more recently as ceremonial (Toupal et al 2004).

NAGPRA-related documents suggest a widespread Zuñi presence in Arizona. A review of published notices of inventory completions involving the Zuñi Tribe and Arizona locations revealed cultural affiliation with one site in Cochise County, eleven sites in Coconino County including Elden Pueblo and Turkey Hills Pueblo, seven sites in Gila County, four sites in Navajo County, and five sites in Yavapai County. Seventy-two additional sites were included but the counties were not specified. These sites include 66 involving Coconino National Forest, one each with Tonto National Forest and Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, and four with museums, colleges, or historical societies (NAGPRA Notices 61 FR 16643-16644; 62 FR 51898-51903; 63 FR 8209-8210; 65 FR 45399-45401; 65 FR 81884; 67 FR 8996-9002; 67 FR 57843-57844; 68 FR 48624-48625; 68 FR 58132-58133; 68 FR 66485-66486; 69 FR 68162-68169; 69 FR 68171-68172; 71 FR 9151-9152) (http://www.cr.nps.gov/nagpra/fed_notices/nagpradir/).

The Zuñi, however, view their past in terms of their ancestors who lived at the sites studied by archaeologists, and their interpretation is much more dynamic than what archaeologists can portray with the various archaeological culture concepts. From the Zuñi perspective, it is likely that the different migratory groups of Zuñi ancestors were affiliated with the Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hohokam (Dongoske et al. 1997). Their perspective is supported in several NAGPRA notices that recognize cultural affiliation of the Zuñi with the Hohokam (67 FR 8996-9002), the Anasazi (69 FR 68171-68172), and the Salado (71 FR 9151-9152).

The archaeological record is challenged further by the Zuñi view that ethnicity is expressed culturally, more in religious beliefs and language than in material objects. “Cultural, ethnic, and tribal affiliation is not necessarily synonymous with archaeological cultures. …[Tribes] can have equally valid cultural affiliation to an entire archaeological culture area, certain portions of that area at different times, specific sites, or even just certain cultural items” Dongoske et al. (1997:605).
Geographical Evidence

The origin and migration of the Zuñi people spans much of north-central and northeastern Arizona, and northwestern New Mexico (Figure 54). The Zuñi people traditionally used much of this area, and had a trade trail to the Pacific coast that ran south of the San Francisco Peaks. The area encompassing the Flagstaff national monuments was a source of food and medicinal plants, soils, and religious activities. The Flagstaff area, including the San Francisco Peaks, Sunset Crater, and Walnut Canyon, was part of the Zuñi people’s sovereign lands in 1846 but lost to American settlement by 1876 (Figure 55) (Ferguson and Hart 1985).

Two culturally significant sites in the Flagstaff area are the San Francisco Peaks, or Sunha: K’yaba:chu Yalanne, and K’yabachu’a/Sunha:kwin or K’yaba:ch Wohnanne, located just south of the Peaks (△ and ◊ in Figure 55 respectively). The San Francisco Peaks are an ancestral site in the Zuñi migration narrative, and a major medicinal herb collection place. They are also a common boundary point of traditional Hopi, Zuñi, and Havasupai lands (Indian Claims Commission Docket 161-79L 1987). These sacred peaks can be seen from the Zuñi River Valley and is associated with the Big Fire Society whose members collect herbs from the Peaks. Willows, aspen, and soils also are collected from the Peaks and religious activities are held there. The second site was a traditional piñon nut gathering area (Ferguson and Hart 1985).

Figure 54. Zuñi migrations from the Grand Canyon to Halona:wa (Zuñi) based on the basic tenets common to the various origin accounts (Ferguson and Hart 1985:20)
Figure 55. Traditional use areas of the Zuñi: plants (a), minerals (b), religious activities (c); and sovereign lands in 1846 (Ferguson and Hart 1985:44, 48, 50, 56).
The Zuñi people know the Grand Canyon as the fourth level of the underworld from which they emerged to begin their journey to Iitiwana or the “middle place.” Zuñi accounts record that during their journey different groups split from and joined them (Bunzel 1932; Ferguson and Hart 1985; Stevenson 1904). One group went to the “land of everlasting sunshine,” in the south and did not return. Later, the main group of Zuñi divided into three groups with one following the Little Colorado River to Zuñi while another traveled north, and a third traveled south.

The Zuñi clans were created when the Zuñi people were traveling through the Little Colorado River valley and just before they reached Iitiwana, the Middle Place. Iitiwana was occupied by other people at the time and a great battle was fought. The Zuñi, with the spiritual assistance of the war gods, won and incorporated some of those who lost into their tribe. The two ancestral groups who had left them earlier returned to join them at Iitiwana (Dongoske et al. 1997). The Spanish found the Zuñi people well established in their Arizona-New Mexico territories in the 17th century (Figure 56) (Kessell 2002:38).

Figure 56. Native groups of 17th century southeastern Colorado Plateau (Kessell 2002:38)
Following the Spanish (1540-1821) and Mexican (1821-1846) periods, American settlement policies and British cattle investments led to the reduction of access to the Zuñi people’s traditional lands. The federal government provided some protection with a small reservation in 1877 but reduced that area even further in 1886. Legislation in 1949 and 1962 added acreage to the Zuñi reservation (Table 59) (Figure 57).

Table 59. Federal adjustments to the Zuñi land base (Royce 1899).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 1877</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1883</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>Map unit 645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1885</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>no map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1, 1886</td>
<td>Stat. L. XI, 374</td>
<td>Map unit 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13, 1949</td>
<td>63 Stat. 604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 1962</td>
<td>76 Stat. 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 57. Federal adjustments to the Zuñi land base in 1877 (left) and 1886 (right) (Royce 1899).

The Indian Claims Commission hearings resulted in judicially established areas for most of the federally recognized tribes. The Zuñi Tribe, however, did not file a land claim under the Indian Claims Commission, and had to secure a congressional act in 1978 to sue the U. S. for lands taken without payment. Three litigations followed from 1981 to 1984 that the Zuñi won. The Zuñi Reservation today comprises approximately 450,000 acres, or about 3% of their aboriginal lands (Pueblo of Zuñi http://www.ashiwi.org/) (Figures 58, 59), however the San Francisco Peaks remain their sacred western boundary. The Peaks and sites within the surrounding area including in the three national monuments retain their cultural roles in the lives of the Zuñi people.
Figure 58. The Zuñi Reservation following litigations in the 1980s (Ferguson and Hart 1985).

Figure 59. Aboriginal lands about 1850 as determined by the Indian Claims Commission and the Zuñi Land Settlement Act (see Schroeder 1974b; Ferguson and Hart 1985) (Welch 1997:79)
Historical Evidence

The "New Lands" refers to the largest off-reservation area purchased for use by relocated Navajo people. The New Lands involved a series of large ranches generally located south of Interstate 40, east of Holbrook and extending from the Petrified Forest National Park and Wilderness Area east to the Arizona-New Mexico-Zuñi Indian Reservation border. The Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission recognized the potential for Zuñi-Navajo conflicts as a result of the choice of the New Lands area so inventories were prepared for each of the ranches. A resource inventory of the Wallace Ranch, a considerable distance from the Zuñi reservation boundary, included a "cultural uses" analysis, which included Pueblo archeological sites and places where contemporary Zuñi people gathered eagles and eagle feathers (CH2M HILL 1985).

The Zuñi people consider the New Lands area to be part of their traditional holy lands (Stoffle 1990). While this area is approximately two-thirds of the way from Flagstaff to Zuñi Pueblo, it lies along the Zuñi migration route from the Flagstaff area and attests to Zuñi connections with the Flagstaff area. The connection to the Flagstaff area is supported further by the Zuñi people’s participation in cultural growth on the Little Colorado with other tribes in the area (Spier 1918).

The Zuñi had relationships and interactions with other tribes that involved extensive trading. According to Goodwin (1942:80-81), items frequently traded between the Zuñi and the Western Apache included “turquoise, white shell (ground and already drilled), a mineral paint called té-djí’, small saddle blankets (te’idno-zé or “striped blanket”) and a larger striped blanket (hiya-gonoduži or “striped downward”). The Apache bought bow staves, stone arrowpoints, prepared arrow feathers, baskets with handles made especially for Zuñi trade, turkey-feather caps, buckskin leggings, and shirts.”

The Zuñi also traded extensively with the Havasupai, Hualapai, and Yavapai peoples. Any of these tribes might travel to the other tribes’ villages, or welcome traders from those tribes into their villages (Parezo 1996).

Linguistic Evidence

Linguistically, the Zuñi people are categorized as a language isolate of the Penutian family. Dutton (1983) considered the Zuñi language to be a distant relative of Tanoan or Tewi languages. Dixon and Kroeber (1913, 1919), and later Sapir (1921), supported the Penutian classification, although, pursuing cognates between the Zuñi language and California languages, they determined that any cognates could be expected to be at least 3000 to 5000 years old. In 1881, Frank Cushing was invited to visit the Havasupai people with a group from Zuñi. He was interested in “investigating linguistic affinities said to exist between the [Havasupai] and the Zuñi, by the latter” (Cushing 1979:146). Linguistically, the Zuñi reflect a language isolate born of diverse southwestern cultures.

Zuñi place names in the Flagstaff area have been recorded by Ferguson and Hart (1985) and Toupal et al. (2004) (Table 60). Zuñi names for places and features within the
Flagstaff national monuments and the Zuñi landscape reflect an intimate and ancient relationship between the places and features and the Zuñi people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 60. Zuñi place names relative to the Flagstaff national monuments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunset Crater</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sun hakal'ekwaula</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walnut Canyon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Enodakwa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sunhakwe Kyabachyalane</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wupatki</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inode kwe</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jukanwa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gh-tsuo-o</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Francisco Peaks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sunha: K'yaba:chu Yalanne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>K'yabachu'a/Sunha:kwin or K'yaba:ch Wohnananne</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kwa ba chuwa llona</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zuñi Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wiktata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sun hakuse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sunhakwin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kiap'hachuya</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oral tradition Evidence**

The Zuñi people descend from two or more groups and are heirs to at least two cultures. These lineages are reflected in their legends of places and the past, and in their creation and migration stories. Three branches exist in the migration story: the western group, the northern group, and the southern group. Of these, the western group had the fewest numbers but remains the most told of in the myths, and contributed the majority of distinguishing traits. The northern group, upon rejoining the western group at the Middle Place, introduced additional cultural traits including some of material culture (Cushing 1896).

Zuñi traditions recount an emergence in the Grand Canyon, followed by a long migration to the “Middle Place” at Zuñi Pueblo, where the Zuñi people have resided for 800 years or more (Cushing 1896; Ferguson and Hart 1985; Parsons 1923; Tedlock 1979). Bunzel (1932) found no single origin myth but a long series of separate though related myths. She also found that each ceremonial group has a myth which contains, in addition to a general synopsis of early history, the mythological sanction for its own organization and rituals.
Dongoske et al. (1997) explain that Zuñi oral traditions about the creation and history of the Zuñi tribe are embedded in the histories of kivas, priesthoods, and medicine societies. While all Zuñi people have a general understanding of tribal history, each religious group has its own detailed account about its origins, which are known only to those in the group. Two basic elements of all Zuñi oral histories are relevant to archaeological research: migrations and the various migration routes, and encounters and conflicts with other people during the migrations.

Goodwin (1942:75) documented Zuñi origins through an Apache legend that also told how the Hopi, Akimel O’odham, Tohono O’odham, and Navajo people came to their lands. “Long ago the Zuñi, Hopi, Pima, Papago, and Navaho were all living to the north in the present Navaho country. Then they started from there, migrating to the southwest in search of good places to live, journeying in search of life. They wandered all the way to the edge of the ocean, and, when they arrived there, they could go no farther. …On their way back the Pima and Papago stopped in their present territory and have lived there ever since. But the Navaho, Hopi, and Zuñi went back to the north where their old homes were.” This account seems to make reference to the Mojave Valley/Grand Canyon origin of the Zuñi people but also suggests that their starting point was where they are today rather than somewhere in California.

Inter-pueblo migrations constituted a significant cultural exchange. Most of the knowledge gained through these interactions was incorporated with that from ancestral sources in the oral traditions. Some of those ancestral sources reflect the Zuñi ethnographic landscape, which includes volcanism and volcanic features (Ferguson 2002). Sunset Crater, consequently, reflects part of that ethnographic or cultural landscape.

Volcanoes are prominent land forms that were used in the past to guide travel across the landscape. These landforms and associated geological objects and products can be found in Zuñi oral traditions. In Western Pueblo culture, volcanoes are powerful places because of their relation to the Warrior Twins, beast gods (fetishes), and other religious beings and events with historical and cultural importance. Part of the cultural importance of the volcanoes is that volcanic rocks are “alive” so that they can take care of the plants. The Zuñi believe that in the ancient past when people came to the volcanoes for medicinal plants, they left offerings for the rocks and volcanoes because of the sacred relationship among the volcanoes, rocks, mountains, and medicinal plants (Evans et al. 1994:18). Cushing (1896:389-390) describes the role volcanoes played in the “Hardening of the World”:

Dread was the din and stir. The heights staggered and the mountains reeled, the plains boomed and cracked under the floods and fires, and the high hollow places, hugged of men and the creatures, were black and awful, so that these grew crazed with panic and strove alike to escape or to hide more deeply. But ere-while they grew deafened and deadened, forgetful and asleep! A tree lighted of lightning burns not long! Presently thick rain fell, quenching the fires; and waters washed the face of the world, cutting deep trails from the heights downward, and scattering abroad the wrecks and corpses of stricken things and beings, or burying them deeply. Lo! they are seen in the mountains
to this day; and in the trails of those fierce waters cool rivers now run, and where
monsters perished lime of their bones (âluwe, calcareous nodules in malpais or volcanic
tuff) we find, and use in food stuff! Gigantic were they, for their forms little and
great were often burned or shriveled and contorted into stone. See are these, also,
along the depths of the world. Where they huddled together and were blasted thus,
their blood gushed forth and flowed deeply, here in rivers, there in floods; but it was
charred and blistered and blackened by the fires, into the black rocks of the lower
mesas (âpkwina, lava or malpais). There were vast plains of dust, ashes and cinders,
reddened as is the mud of a hearth-place. There were great banks of clay and soil
burned to hardness - as clay is when baked in the kiln-mound,-blackened, bleached,
or stained yellow, gray, red, or white, streaked and banded, bended or twisted.
Worn and broken by the heavings of the under-world and by the waters and
breaths of the ages, they are the mountain-terraces of the Earth-mother,
“dividing country from country.” Yet many were the places behind and
between these - dark canyons, deep valleys, sunken plains - unharmed by the
fires, where they swerved or rolled higher - as, close to the trace of a forest-
fire, green grow trees and grasses, and even flowers continue to bloom.
Therein, and in the land sheltered by the shield, tarried the people, awakened,
as from fearful dreams. Dry and more stable was the world now, less fearsome
its long places; since, changed to rock were so many monsters of prey (some
shriveled to the size of insects; made precious as amulets for the hunter and
warrior, as told in other talks of our ancient speech).

Ethnographic Summary

In terms of cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments, the Zuñí
people’s traditional use of their western territory contributed to an intimate
knowledge of the area encompassing the three park units. Religious activities and
medicinal plants associated with the San Francisco Peaks highlight the depth of
knowledge and relationship the Zuñí people retain with the area. Zuñí
place names further reflect this ancient relationship.

The materials reviewed for this report contributed much new data relative to Zuñí
cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff national monuments. It bolstered anthropological,
archeological, geographical, and oral tradition evidence from the 2001
review (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) and the 2004 study (Toupal et al. 2004). New
evidence was added to the previous works in the historic and linguistic categories (Table 61). The cumulative evidence
now addresses eight of the ten types of evidence that contribute to cultural affiliation, seven
of them adequately. This body of evidence also adequately addresses the four time frames
associated with cultural affiliation (Table 62).
Table 61. Cumulative evidence of Zuñi cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthropological</th>
<th>Archaeological</th>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Folkloric</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Oral tradition</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cumulative evidence based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

Table 62. Time frame of Zuñi cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area national monuments based on 2001 review, 2004 study, and this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional (~ 15,000 BC to mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Aboriginal (mid-1800s)</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cumulative evidence is Adequate
Chapter Seven: Summary and Research Needs

At a 2003 workshop concerned with Traditionally Associated Peoples (TAPs) in national park units, the distinction between cultural affiliation and traditional association was explained. Cultural affiliation is generally a subset of traditional association. All culturally affiliated people are traditionally associated but not all traditionally associated people are culturally affiliated.¹

The two designations are defined in NAGPRA and NPS Management Policies. The NAGPRA definition of cultural affiliation specifies “a relationship of shared group identity which can reasonably be traced historically or prehistorically between members of a present-day Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and an identifiable earlier group.” NPS policy defines traditional association by three criteria. Social or cultural entities such as tribes, communities, and kinship units are traditionally associated with a park unit when:

- the entity regards the park’s resources as essential to its development and continued identity as a culturally distinct people; and
- the association has endured for at least two generations (40 years); and
- the association began prior to the establishment of the park.

The relationship of shared group identity is represented by a preponderance of evidence that supports a conclusion of cultural affiliation (43CFR10.2(e)). Such evidence may be categorized as anthropological, archeological, biological, folkloric, geographical, historical, kinship, linguistic, oral tradition, or other expert opinion (43CFR10.14(e)). Since a preponderance of evidence is considered to be that of greater weight or more convincing nature (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition), a finding of cultural affiliation should be based upon the totality of the circumstances and evidence, and not withheld if gaps in the record exist (43CFR10.14(d)).

The types of evidence are not always clear-cut. Folkloric and oral tradition, for example, will overlap. Geographic and historic also can overlap as can biological and kinship. The lack of specific definitions for the types of evidence can contribute to subjective interpretations of evidence classification. The review of the literature for this report led to a reinterpretation of the types of evidence identified in the earlier studies concerned with cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff monuments (Toupal and Stoffle 2001; Toupal et al. 2004). Some evidence that was categorized as biological is now categorized as anthropological because it dealt with traditional plant and animal use rather than genetic evidence to which the literature seems to limit the biological category. Only the data for Zuñi at Walnut Canyon and Wupatki remain in the biological category.

¹ http://www.cr.nps.gov/ethnography/training/TAPS/overview.htm
Summary

The literature reviewed for this report has provided much new data and reinforced previously presented data of cultural affiliation for the Pai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuñi peoples with the three Flagstaff national monuments. The Pai present a particular challenge in that early documentation often did not distinguish between the Pai tribes. Sources including the tribes themselves recognize a recent split between the Havasupai-Hualapai and the Yavapai peoples that occurred sometime since the Hualapai people were given their lands by the Creator, possibly as late as the 19th century (Corbusier 1886). Other sources distinguish between the Havasupai and Hualapai in the 19th century (Sitgreaves 1853) although the two tribes did not do so. Since the Pai as an ethnic group represent three tribes and some affiliation evidence is tribally-specific, the following summary of cultural affiliation includes that evidence with the Pai evidence (Table 63).

Cultural affiliation with Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument has been further established for the Pai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuñi peoples. For the Pai, the evidence now is adequate for the anthropological and folkloric categories. Linguistic evidence was found as well that also is adequate for affiliation purposes. The evidence addresses all four time periods and is adequate for the traditional, aboriginal, and historic periods. Affiliation evidence specific to the Havasupai addresses archaeological, folkloric, geographic, and oral tradition evidence, with geographic being adequate. Evidence specific to the Hualapai addresses archaeological, folkloric, geographic, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence with the latter being adequate. Evidence specific to the Yavapai addresses archaeological, geographic, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition with geographic and linguistic being adequate.

Cultural affiliation of the Southern Paiute people with Sunset Crater is now supported by anthropological and linguistic evidence, which is adequate for affiliation purposes. Evidence in the archaeological, geographical, historic, and oral tradition categories is now adequate as well. Evidence now addresses the aboriginal and contemporary periods and is adequate for affiliation purposes. The traditional and historic periods now have adequate evidence. Affiliation evidence for the Western Apache people with Sunset Crater is now adequate for anthropological, geographical, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories as well as all four time periods. Affiliation evidence for the Zuñi people with Sunset Crater is now adequate for anthropological, geographical, and oral tradition categories. New evidence in the historic and linguistic categories was found that is adequate for affiliation purposes. Evidence for the historic and contemporary periods has been added and all four periods now have adequate evidence.

Cultural affiliation with Walnut Canyon National Monument has been further established for the Pai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuñi peoples. For the Pai, the evidence now is adequate for the anthropological category, and new linguistic and oral tradition evidence is adequate as well. Specific to the Havasupai is evidence in the archaeological, folkloric, geographic, and oral tradition categories. Evidence for the Hualapai was found in the archaeological, folkloric, geographic, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories. Evidence for the Yavapai was found in the archaeological, geographic, historic,
linguistic, and oral tradition categories. The geographic, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence is adequate for affiliation purposes.

Cultural affiliation of the Southern Paiute people with Walnut Canyon is supported adequately with oral tradition evidence. Anthropological evidence has been added and is adequate for affiliation purposes. The evidence now includes the aboriginal and contemporary periods, which along with the historic period, are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes. Affiliation evidence for the Western Apache people with Walnut Canyon now is adequate for the anthropological, geographical, historic, kinship, linguistic, and oral tradition categories. All four time periods are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes. Affiliation of the Zuñi people with Walnut Canyon is supported adequately by archaeological evidence, and new historic and linguistic evidence. The historic and contemporary periods have been added and all four periods are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes.

Cultural affiliation with Wupatki National Monument has been further established for the Pai, Southern Paiute, Western Apache, and Zuñi peoples. For the Pai, the anthropological evidence now is adequate for affiliation purposes as is new linguistic evidence. Specific to the Havasupai, affiliation evidence was found in the archaeological, folkloric, geographic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories with the geographic and linguistic evidence adequate for affiliation purposes. Specific to the Hualapai, affiliation evidence was found in the archaeological, folkloric, geographic, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories. Specific to the Yavapai, affiliation evidence was found in the archaeological, geographic, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories.

Cultural affiliation of the Southern Paiute people with Wupatki is supported adequately with archaeological, geographical, historic, and oral tradition evidence. New anthropological evidence was found to be adequate for affiliation purposes as well. The aboriginal and contemporary periods have been added and all four periods are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes. Affiliation of the Western Apache people with Wupatki is supported by adequate anthropological, geographical, linguistic, and oral tradition evidence. All four time periods are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes. Evidence of affiliation of the Zuñi people with Wupatki is now adequate in the archaeological category. Historic and linguistic evidence has been added and is adequate for affiliation purposes. The historic and contemporary periods have been added, and all four periods are addressed adequately for affiliation purposes.
Table 63. Cumulative cultural affiliation evidence and time frames for Flagstaff national monuments (adequate).

### Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hual.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Walnut Canyon National Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hual.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wupatki National Monument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Evidence of Affiliation</th>
<th>Time Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hual.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yav.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An – Anthropological  Ar – Archaeological  B – Biological  F – Folkloric  G – Geographical  H – Historical  K - Kinship  L - Linguistic  Or - Oral tradition  Ot - Other
Research Needs

The recommended literature sources from the 2001 study (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) were reviewed for this report along with numerous other Pai documents. The Hualapai and Yavapai-Prescott tribes were consulted as well for information pertinent to cultural affiliation with the Flagstaff area monuments. Three of the six research needs relative to the Pai tribes that were identified in Chapter One have been addressed in this report to varying degrees (√). The three remaining needs are similar and have been compiled as a need category (Table 64). The Pai-Sinagua connection appears to be strongest with the Yavapai people, however, the close relationships of the Pai tribes suggests the possibility of a Sinagua connection with the Hualapai and Havasupai.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Need</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify Pai-Sinagua connection</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify other activities, including burials that could occur with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai people’s plant and animal use of the area</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More complete account of Hualapai oral history</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pai tribal elders for complimentary stories, and review of the stories to</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarify the Pai-Zuni relationship, Havasupai tribal elders to document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stories, direct documentation of the traditions and stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended literature sources from the 2001 study (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) were reviewed for this report along with numerous other Southern Paiute documents. Three of the five research needs relative to the Southern Paiute people that were identified in Chapter One have been addressed in this report to varying degrees (√). The remaining needs are concerned with place relationships and/or Hopi-Paiute relationships, which may be addressed through a volcanic landscape study and oral histories with both groups (Table 65).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Need</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review of Southern Paiute and Hopi histories</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More complete account of the oral history and possible foundation for</td>
<td>√, data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP nominations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify Hopi-Paiute connections and Paiutes as part of multi-ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that represent the Sinagua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship between the Kaibab Paiute and the Hopi tribe regarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment of Anasazi remains suggests an inter-tribal recognition of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute affiliation with the area</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended literature sources from the 2001 study (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) were reviewed for this report along with numerous other Western Apache documents. Two of the ten research needs relative to the Western Apache people that were identified in Chapter One have been addressed in this report to varying degrees (√). While several of the specific needs were not addressed as identified, the evidence categories to which they pertained were addressed through the literature review. The remaining needs address anthropological, archaeological, geographical, kinship, and linguistic evidence categories. Consultations with tribal elders and cultural resource programs are necessary for much of these needs, however,
oral histories emphasizing place names and relationships would provide additional data as well as context to data gathered through consultation (Table 66).

Table 66. Western Apache cultural affiliation data needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Need</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Compile oral tradition from the available literature and from consultations with Western Apache CRM programs and traditionalists, most likely through a study of place names in and around WACA (and WUPA/SUCR).</td>
<td>✓, data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult today’s Western Apache CRM programs and traditionalists by extending place name study to area around SUCR, WACA, WUPA.</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided by Western Apache traditionalists through coordinated Western Apache cultural resource compliance programs, reassess WACA archaeological inventory; identify items collected from WACA as well as “intellectual property” (cultural patrimony) in collections or interpretive materials; and consult about items in NPS Flagstaff archeology collection.</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assemble descriptions of archaeological sites conventionally identified as early Western Apache. Such descriptions may be rare (Basso 1983).</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider what possible early ancestral Apache/Navajo sites might look like, including undated or precolumbian small or anomalous sites, features on larger precolumbian sites, etc.</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultations with Western Apache traditionalists regarding kinship.</td>
<td>data gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended literature sources from the 2001 study (Toupal and Stoffle 2001) were reviewed for this report along with numerous other Zuñi documents. The archaeological research need relative to the Zuñi people that was identified in Chapter One has been addressed in this report to some degree (√) (Table 67). The literature also added significantly to the existing evidence of affiliation by addressing anthropological, archaeological, geographical, historic, linguistic, and oral tradition categories. Additional cultural affiliation evidence including further clarification of the association of Kayenta and Sinagua ceramics could be addressed through a volcanic landscape study and oral histories with tribal elders.

Table 67. Zuñi cultural affiliation data needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Need</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In some cultural affiliation studies, association of Kayenta and Sinagua ceramics with Zuñi needs investigation.</td>
<td>√, data gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Flagstaff area has a long and diverse cultural history. While archaeological data indicates occupation and use of the area as early as 600 A.D., many of the tribes in northern Arizona contend a much longer history with the region. Extended dry and wet periods seem to have influenced movement out of and in to the area respectively while volcanic activity appears to have been less discouraging to use of the area. The pithouse dwellings at Sunset Crater that dated between 650-1065 A.D. were burned and full of cinders from the primary eruption of Sunset Crater Volcano but had no human remains. Archaeological research and tree-ring analysis show that the people survived and returned to later witness the mid-11th century eruption.
Walnut Canyon went through the same population shifts as the rest of the Flagstaff area from at least 600 through 1450 A.D. The earliest evidence of human use dates to 6000 B.C. (Stein and 1987) while the earliest Sinagua evidence dates 500 to 700 A.D. for Flagstaff and 800 to 900 A.D. for Walnut Canyon although there was an apparent hiatus from 900 to 1100 A.D. (Stein and 1987).

Some sites in Wupatki predate the mid-11th century eruption of Sunset Crater but most sites date from 1100 to 1275 A.D. supporting the idea that the eruption attracted people to the area. The wide variety of site types at Wupatki indicates a diverse area of residential, agricultural, and ceremonial uses. Separate from the sites are isolated artifacts that date human use of the area as early as 9500 to 9000 B.C. Other sites that were occupied concurrently with Walnut Canyon and Wupatki are Elden Pueblo, Turkey Hills, and Montezuma’s Castle, Tuzigoot, Honanki, and Palatki in the Verde Valley and Red Rock country. As with Walnut Canyon, the period of intense building and occupation in the Wupatki area lasted for about 120 to 150 years with the population beginning to decline after A.D. 1220. Sullivan and Downum (1991) found a drastic increase in archaeological evidence that suggested a rapidly growing population beginning in the first half of the 12th century, approximately 1130, and ending around 1220 A.D.

Although the Flagstaff area was seemingly abandoned by the mid-13th century, it continued to be used periodically by Hopi travelers, ancestral Havasupai hunters, and others. Sometime in the 1800s, Navajo people began to graze their herds in the area using the Wupatki Basin as a seasonal residence (Colton 1946; NPS-WUPA 2001).

An aspect of the diverse cultural relationships with and within the Flagstaff area that deserves further study is volcanism. The Southern Paiute and Zuñi people recognize the power associated with volcanic features and processes, and incorporate this in ritual and ceremonial practices. The Pai and Western Apache tribes have stories that are concerned with volcanic features and processes but these are not as well documented.

Northern Arizona is a volcanic landscape with volcanic features from the Hoover Dam east into New Mexico. The Zuñi people connect volcanic features in New Mexico to volcanic features in the Flagstaff area. The Southern Paiute people recognize a connection between the Little Springs flow near the north rim of the Grand Canyon and Sunset Crater. This connection is supported archaeologically through sherds embedded in lava rocks and corn cob impressions in lava rocks, both of which represent ceremonial interactions (Elson et al 2002; Gidwitz 2004). Volcanic-based ceremonialism reflects the longevity of native people’s cultural relationships with places. The broad geographical extent found in northern Arizona, to which Flagstaff is central, suggests deeper cultural ties to the Flagstaff area than what the literature has conveyed historically. Volcanic landscape studies and oral histories would be useful in exploring these relationships.
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