Hopitutskwa: An Historical and Cultural Interpretation of the Hopi Traditional Land Claim.

Peter M. Whiteley, Ph.D.
Sarah Lawrence College

October 1988
(amended July 1989)

HP7489

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Historicity of the Claim	7
III.	Reasonableness of the Tutskwa Claim	40
IV.	Cultural Meaning of the Tutskwa	50
V.	Religious Meaning of the Tutskwa	58
VI.	"Religious" and "Economic" Use of the Tutskwa	75
VII.	Conclusion	84
VIII.	Bibliography	86

HP7490

Table of Maps
(located in map binder)

1. Map depicting boundary shrines, from Jake and Susanne Page, "Inside the Sacred Hopi Homeland," National Geographic, Vol. 162, No. 5, p. 611 (November 1982).

2. Map prepared by Dr. Whiteley depicting the tutskwa boundary and places discussed in his reports.

3. Map accompanying the April 8, 1930 petition signed by individuals from Shungopavi, Mishongnovi, and Shipaulovi (Komalentewa et al.) to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

4. Map signed by William R. Mateer, dated 1880, depicting the "Boundary of Moquis Claim."

5. Map signed by Matthew M. Murphy, circa 1908 to 1910, depicting Hopi clan migration routes.

6. "A map of northern Arizona showing principal Hopi trails," from Harold S. Colton, "Principal Hopi Trails," Plateau, Vol. 36, No. 3, p. 93 (1964).

HP7491

Hopitutskwa[1]

I. Introduction.

When pressed to specify the nature and extent of their land claim, Hopis have continually referred to traditional concepts of rightful use and occupancy, no matter what legal context they have been asked to respond to. The continuity of these concepts, despite more than one hundred years of acculturative pressure from the dominant society, is a powerful testament to their fundamental entrenchment in Hopi interpretations of their relationship to and emplacement within the land. In their reports, Drs. Eggan and Adams (Eggan 1986:22-23; Adams 1987: 2-4) both cite a 1951 Hopi petition which it is useful to reiterate more fully here:

> Thus, realizing that inasmuch as you [Commissioner of Indian Affairs] have not given us legal entrance to the problem we must humbly and with deepest thought and sincerity present our claim to the Hopi land (Tusqua) as it is fixed by our traditional life, and which we must use in our traditional way in carrying out our traditional practices and regulations.
>
> * * *
>
> THE LAND AND ITS PURPOSE
>
> The Hopi Tusqua (land) is our Love and will always be, and it is the land upon which our leader fixes and tells the dates of our religious life. Our land, our religion, and our life are one, and

[1] Hopitutskwa means "Hopi land." It is spelled elsewhere as Hopi "tusqua." Spelling of Hopi words herein follows currently prevailing orthographic conventions for the writing of Hopi established by Ekkehart Malotki (e.g., 1978:201-202), except for quotations from texts, where I have adhered to original spellings.

HP7492

our leader, with humbleness, understanding and determination, performs his duty to us by keeping them as one and thus insuring prosperity and security for the people.

1. It is from the land that each true Hopi gathers the rocks, the plants, the different woods, roots, and his life, and each in the authority of his rightful obligation brings to our ceremonies proof of our ties to this land. Our footprints mark well the trails to these sacred places where each year we go in performance of our duties.

2. It is upon this land that we have hunted and were assured of rights to game such as deer, elk, antelope, buffalo, rabbit, turkey. It is here that we captured the eagle, the hawk, and such birds whose feathers belong to our ceremonies.

3. It is upon this land that we made trails to our salt supply.

4. It is over this land that many people have come seeking places for settlement, and finding Shungopovi established, asked our leader for permission to settle in this area. All the clan groups named their contributions to our welfare and upon acceptance by our leader were given designated lands for their livelihood and for their eagle hunting, according to the directions from which they came.

5. It is from this land that we obtained the timbers and stone for our houses and kivas.

6. It is here on this land that we are bringing up our younger generation and through preserving the ceremonies are teaching them proper human behavior and strength of character to make them true citizens among all people.

7. It is upon this land that we wish to live in peace and harmony with our friends and with our neighbors.

* * *

Although we are small in numbers, scarce in money and without wide knowledge of your ways and your laws, with humble hearts but strong determination we state the traditional claims of the Hopi people, who are joined as one on this question of land . . . .

HP7493

* * *

> At the present time and for some years we have been forced from these boundaries inward and it has been only with difficult effort and strong faith in our way of life that we have managed to survive. Our petition to you is for full restoration of the land to us and the freedom to govern its use. We cannot, by our tradition, accept coins or money for this land, but must persist in our prayers and words for repossession of the land itself, to preserve the Hopi life.
>
> Our claim . . . is for our rights to the full use of our resources, our ceremonial shrines and hunting areas (James 1974:102-104).

A series of shrines marks the borders of Hopitutskwa. Through the historical record, the places named do not always coincide exactly, but there is a very high degree of coincidence over their general areas. The lack of absolute coincidence is of little significance here. Different clans have different shrines which they would emphasize differently from other clans. As many writers have pointed out, the notion of the "Hopi tribe" as a unitary polity is recent and imposed from outside (cf. B. Adams 1939:10, Hopi Exhibit 399; Colton 1939:11, Hopi Exhibit 459:11). Villages have rights over different areas, as do clans. The overall tutskwa is then a composite of the interests of different socio-political units. Byron Adams (1939:10), from First Mesa, compares the Hopi to a group of Rio Grande Pueblos speaking the same language: each individual pueblo has its own land area; the close proximity of modern Hopi residence sites owes to defensive needs historically and does not reflect extent of usage.

Further, the synecdochic usage of some place names to refer both to a specific place and a general area (just like

HP7494

English place-name usage) also results in some minor differences. For example, Tokoonavi is both a general term for the Navajo Mountain area and a specific term for an old village close to the confluence of the Colorado and San Juan rivers. Also, exact locations have often proven difficult to identify, because many outlying markers are shrines; while critically interested in preserving their use and occupancy rights, Hopis have always been very reluctant to reveal precise shrine locations. H.S. Colton, in suggesting that Hopi shrines be protected, nonetheless noted: "The location of most of the shrines is secret and I doubt very much if they would care to have them recorded" (Colton 5-16-1932, Hopi Exhibit 364). Fundamental precepts of secrecy in Hopi religious practice prescribe severe social and supernatural sanctions for any breaches (see Whiteley 1987b for more on this, and see also below at 58).

Page and Page (1982a:204-39; 1982b:610-611) have documented the tutskwa boundaries perhaps most clearly in recent times, so I will use these sources primarily for the description that follows. See Map 1. Linking trajectories between points very probably follow natural topographic boundaries, like rivers and cliff rims; in some cases these are known, like the Colorado River, in other cases fairly easily inferable from the topography. My interpretation is that, in Hopi thinking, connections between marked places would follow natural features associated with religio-ecological resources, rather than straight lines. See Map 2.

Beginning with Tokoonavi ("black mountain" or "Navajo Mountain" in English) in the north, the boundary follows the

HP7495

Colorado River (or Pisisvayu, possibly "river between canyon walls," in Hopi) to its confluence with the Little Colorado,[2] thence to Kooninhahawpi ("Havasupai descent trail"),[3] thence up Cataract Creek to Tusaqtsomo ("grass hill" or "Bill Williams Mountain"), thence south to Hoonawpa ("Bear Springs"), thence southeast roughly following the Mogollon Rim to Yotsi'hahawpi ("Apache descent trail" at the head of Chevelon Creek, or Sakwavayu, "blue river," in Hopi), thence northeast to Tsimontukwi ("jimsonweed bluff" or "Woodruff Butte"), thence northeast following the Puerco River to Namituyqa ("bluffs facing each other," near Lupton), thence northwest to Nuyavawalsa ("adobe gap" or "Lolomai Point"[4]), thence northwest to Kawestima

---

[2] This is the site of Sipaapuni, the emergence place, one of the most important Hopi shrines (a photograph appears in James 1974:7).

[3] The shrine Potavetaqa, "migration-spiral symbol place," is nearby.

[4] This point and the next (Kawestima) may reflect decreased access to a northeastern area overtaken in the nineteenth century by Navajos. In recent years, Hopis have expressed different positions as to whether Kawestima is a boundary shrine, or an important clan ruin within the boundaries of Hopitutskwa. The map accompanying the 1930 petition from Second Mesa (see Map 3) places Kawestima within Hopitutskwa. The likely trajectory for a more inclusive boundary would cross north from Namituyqa to Black Creek and follow the Black Creek Valley north along the modern Arizona-New Mexico border towards the Canyon de Chelly, pass west through the Canyon de Chelly, and then follow the Chinle Wash, becoming the Chinle Creek, up to its confluence with the San Juan River. See Map 2, suggested earlier boundary line. The Canyon de Chelly has been occupied by Hopis in historic times (see Adams 1987 and, e.g., Fewkes 1906). The Canyon de Chelly, the Chinle Wash and the Colorado-San Juan confluence figure prominently in First Mesa migration traditions of the Snake and Horn-Flute clans (see, e.g., Fewkes 1900a). Note also Matthew Murphy's 1910 account of the Hopi traditional claim in the text below at 16.

HP7496

(Tsegi Canyon area including both Betatakin and Keet Seel cliff dwelling ruins according to my informants), thence north back to Tokoonavi.

Dr. Adams has amply documented the continuity of Hopi use and occupancy of this area from archaeological evidence. My aim here is to show that this boundary claim is neither a recent intentional product responsive to land claims litigation, nor that it reflects the outer limits of actual Hopi usage historically, but that it is a reasonable claim to thoroughly utilized territory.

HP7497

II. Historicity of the Claim

Historical demonstrations of the traditional land claim are revealed in two kinds of sources: those documenting Hopi expressions of interest in having their occupancy and use rights protected by the United States government (and previously by the Spanish and Mexican governments -- obligations which the United States inherited with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo), and those referring either specifically or generally to the land area itself. In the historical record, both kinds of sources are hampered by communication problems between Hopis and various interlocutors; precision and cultural accuracy become much sharper over time as mutual understanding increases.

At earlier periods, Hopi instigation of relations with governmental agencies suggests, ipso facto, an interest in the preservation of their life-chances. So, an 1819 visit to Santa Fe to request military aid against Navajo depredations (see, e.g., Whiteley 1988:29), makes no land claim per se, but the implication of Hopi desire for control over traditional resources is obvious. Similarly, a Hopi-instigated communiqué to President Fillmore in 1852 (several years before any official government visit to Hopi -- see Whiteley 1988:31) suggests clear interest in the maintenance of traditional rights.

I will not discuss the Spanish and Mexican periods here (some views are presented in Whiteley 1988:13-30), but will only document some historical expressions of Hopi interest in and

HP7498

indications of the tutskwa since 1848 in order to demonstrate the long continuity of that claim.

In 1850, a delegation of Hopis initiated a meeting with the new Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Territory of New Mexico, James S. Calhoun:

> Their object, as announced, was to ascertain the purposes and views of the government of the United States toward them. They complained bitterly of the depredations of the Navajos (Donaldson 1893:25).

In 1858, during the first Mormon expedition to Hopi, the Hopi informed Jacob Hamblin of a tradition prohibiting them from crossing the Colorado River (Little 1881:63). When in 1862-3, three Hopis were persuaded to accompany Mormons to Salt Lake City, they evinced much anxiety at the crossing, again in reference to this tradition (Little 1881:79). In 1870, when Hamblin persuaded Tuuvi (for whom Tuba City is named) and his wife to visit St. George, at the river Tuuvi reiterated this tradition and performed a particular ritual in deference to the tutskwa boundary (Little 1881:105). Charles Peterson (1971:183) refers to an ancient treaty between the Hopis and the Paiutes in which the two peoples agreed that the Colorado River would be the boundary between them. According to statements recorded by the Mormons in the 1850's, the Hopis were "scornful" of the Paiutes who had broken this treaty by moving across the Colorado into the traditionally Hopi area.

At an 1863 meeting between three Hopi delegates and Brigham Young, Mormon settlement near the Hopi villages was discussed favorably, since the Hopis thought Mormon presence would

HP7499

protect them against Navajo incursions; the Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the new Territory of Arizona, Charles Posten, reported:

> [Three] Moqui chiefs from my superintendency had recently visited his excellency [Brigham Young] to ask for protection against the Navajos, who were continually committing depredations on their stock, which induced them to seek a closer alliance with the Americans (Donaldson 1893:33).

Also in 1863, Kit Carson enlisted Hopi military aid during the Navajo round-up (Twitchell 1917:350-51). According to anthropologist Oliver La Farge:

> Kit Carson gave the Hopis to understand that if they cooperated with him in his campaign they would be rid of the Navajos for ever, but later on the government put the Navajos back and for some insane reason gave them joint ownership in the Hopi reservation (La Farge 1937:29, Hopi Exhibit 386:29).

Hopi sources suggest involvement in the round-up as designed to guarantee land rights (e.g., Naquayouma et al. 1929). Moreover, following the round-up, Hopis told Jacob Hamblin that they "hunted out the worst of the thieves among them [i.e., those Navajos who escaped the round-up], and killed them off. . . . The Navajoes have evidently been the plunderers of the Moquis for generations, and the latter have retaliated whenever they have had an opportunity" (Little 1881:103-04).

In 1865, Hopis journeyed to Santa Fe to discuss their interests with Pueblo Agent John Ward (Donaldson 1893:34), who informed them of their transfer to the newly created Arizona Superintendency. So in 1866, Hopis took the initiative again, visiting the new seat of territorial government in Prescott (Arizona Miner 4-25-1866).

HP7500

In 1874, Moqui Pueblo Agent W.S. Defrees proposed a Hopi reservation, extending far to the west of Moencopi, thence to the "east to the present Moqui Villages" and including "the Colorado Chiquito, a desirable place and, I think, sufficiently large to accomodate [sic] the . . . Indians" (Defrees 4-8-1874). Defrees was concerned about Mormon expansionism, but his designation of this area as Hopi territory is apparent nonetheless.

In 1877 and 1878, Hopis farmed an area on the Little Colorado River near Sunset (Godfrey 1988b:138), demonstrating use and occupancy of the tutskwa. In 1878 or 1879, Agent William R. Mateer cited Tuuvi's complaint of Mormon usurpation of Hopi lands at Moencopi and Moenave:

> He states that his father planted there when he was a boy, as well as many other Oraibis, and that it is their ground.
>
> * * *
>
> I would respectfully inquire whether there is not some law by which the Indians can be protected in their rights to lands which they have cultivated for a century or more? (Mateer 5-1-1879:5-6; Godfrey 1988b:29).

In 1879, Mateer (1880) proposed boundaries for a Hopi reservation, which reflected the same general area indicated by Defrees, except for the western boundary, which Mateer would restrict to the Moencopi wash. See Map 4. Although Correll (1972) uses Mateer's map as indicative of some Navajo presence, in fact Mateer's proposed reservation "boundary of Moquis claim" (he makes no mention of a Navajo claim) shows official awareness of part of the tutskwa: down the Moencopi Wash to its junction with the Little Colorado, and thence following the Little Colorado

HP7501

upstream to its junction with the Puerco. Mateer's eastern and northern boundaries, as straight lines, are culturally the least plausible (i.e., less likely to have been derived from consultations with Hopis).

Hopi claim to the tutskwa is intimately associated with religious mythology. The Hopi acquired their rights in the area from Maasaw, an important deity they met upon emergence from below into the present world. Maasaw is, among other things, ruler of the land (see, e.g., Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:67-86), and so the area is also known as Mastutskwa, Maasaw's land. References to this begin at least in 1883. Anthropologist A.M. Stephen constructed an account, shortly after beginning his studies of Hopi, as a summary of "conversations held in various kivas." Elsie Parsons, the story's editor, regards this early account as less factually reliable than his later work (Stephen 1929:2). Stephen traces Maasaw's land as follows:

> Masau first travelled south, then circuitously to the eastward until he reached his starting point. He called this area his land. The exact limits are unknown, but it is surmised he started from a point about where Fort Mojave now is situated, thence south as far as the Isthmus of Panama, skirted eastward along the Gulf of Mexico and northward by the line of the Rio Grande up into Colorado, thence westerly along the thirty six parallel or thereabouts to the Rio Colorado, meandering along its tributaries and so on southward to his starting point at Fort Mojave. This was Masau's land originally, the land of the Hopitu (Stephen 1929:55-56).

Stephen's interpretation is clearly exaggerated, but if it was aided by Hopi informants, at the very least it shows Hopi knowledge of a much larger area than their subsequent claim. Ten

HP7502

years later, Stephen recorded another version, where both boundaries and story are more precise. The storyteller is recounting a migration legend:

> After my people left Wu-ko-ki [a ruin at Wupatki National Monument], they halted near a little spring on the middle mesa [Second Mesa], and looking across to where we now live, they could see there were no people in the land. But at night they saw a fire moving back and forth along the base of this mesa [First Mesa], from the gap to the point, and they marveled greatly for a while, and then they sent Dove forth to discover, and he found that it was Ma-sau-wuh. Dove saw the tracks of his large, bare feet and he followed them around a great circle, encompassing Nu-vat'-ikyau-obi (place of snow peaks, San Francisco Mountains) on the west; Pa-la-bai-ya (Red River, Colorado Chiquito) on the south; Wu-ko-bai-ya (Great river, Rio Grande) on the east, and Hop-ko-yi-la-bai-ya (from ho-po-ko, the northeast, the San Juan River) on the north (Fewkes 1894:118).

After meeting with the leaders Maasaw tells them:

> "[A]ll this land is mine, and all that lies within the limits of my footprints is yours, for you have won it because you met me and were not afraid" (ibid.:118-119).

The easterly emphasis in this version of the tutskwa, i.e., the extension to the Rio Grande and the relative lack of attention to the western area, likely reflects a First Mesa perspective, which may include a claim to the Rio Grande as ancestral territory of the Tewas at First Mesa. The northern and southern extensions to the San Juan and Little Colorado Rivers and the western inclusion of the San Francisco Mountains (with a likely inferential inclusion of the Colorado River from its junction with the San Juan to a point north of the San Francisco Peaks) are, however, particularly noteworthy.

HP7503

Following a visit to First and Second Mesas in 1883, Dutch anthropologist Herman F.C. Ten Kate noted: "De Moquis noemen hun land Maastoetsjkwe, 'het land van Masawe' (de aardgod)" (Ten Kate 1885:260), i.e., "the Hopis call their land Mastutskwa, 'the land of Maasaw' (the earth deity)."

References to inscribed stone tablets, which were used in the 1930's as traditionary evidence of land claims (see, e.g., Colton 5-16-1932, Hopi Exhibit 364), begin with the first Mormon visits of the late 1850's, early 1860's (Peterson 1971:185). Frank Cushing mentions them after his visit to Oraibi in 1882 (Cushing 1922:266). In 1891, an arresting army officer was presented with a flat stone by "Hostile"[5] leaders at Oraibi (Fewkes 1922:277). In 1910, Yukioma, chief of Hotevilla, in refusing to accept allotments, "produced two slabs of stone which he claimed were evidence that the land belonged to him. He said these stones had been in his house at Oraibi always" (Miller 10-27-1910:2). In 1911, Yukioma showed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs these two flat stones during his visit to Washington, D.C. (U.S. Government 3-28-1911). It is very likely that a stone tablet presented to Commissioner Collier by two Hotevilla leaders, Dan Katchongva (sometimes spelled Kotchongva) and James Pongyayaoma, Yukioma's son and nephew respectively, in 1938, was

[5] "Hostiles" was a term applied by government representatives and others in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to those who most actively rejected the imposition of government policies, especially of enforced education and land allotment. Conversely, those who were more amenable, the government dubbed "friendlies." At Oraibi, the division into factions bearing these appellations resulted in the tumultuous split of the village in 1906.

HP7504

one of the same stones. On that occasion, Pongyayaoma (misspelled Polingyowma in the transcription) stated:

> With the presenting of this sacred map it is in the hope that we will receive recognition -- that what we have been instructed in as pertains to the Hopi land will be recognized. . . . This little instrument, handed down from generations back, is sacred to us and is given up to you with the full thought and humble request that our request concerning the reservation will be taken in the sense that it is given and considered in the light of our sole right to this Hopi reservation (Collier 7-14-1938:24-25, Hopi Exhibit 306:32-33).

According to mythology, these owatutuveni, or stone tablets, were fashioned by Maasaw from hardened cornmeal (Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:58). They are held in great reverence:

> Two were made of the same thing and each brother received one of them to carry in this life, and they were instructed to never let go of it because it will be upon these stone tablets that this Hopi life will be based. In this way they were instructed to live this life and to work and help the people in taking care of this land. Maasaw said they must never forsake, never doubt his teachings and instructions, for if they ever doubted it and forsaked this stone tablet and all its teachings, they will cause a destruction of all life in this land . . . (Hopi Hearings 1955:81, quoted in Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:58).

Another such tablet, in the possession of Oraibi Kikmongwi (Village Chief), Tawakwaptiwa, was shown to anthropologist Mischa Titiev in 1933/34 and was specifically identified as proof of Oraibi's land claim (Titiev 1944:60-61); Titiev reproduces a copy (1944:60). A copy of other tablets is reproduced by Waters (1963:30, 32-33).

The first allotment program of 1891-94, the intention of which was to reorganize traditional landholding, failed on

HP7505

account of extensive Hopi opposition. Active resistance, including the opening of a formal declaration of war against U.S. troops at Oraibi, led to the imprisonment for eighteen months of several Hostile leaders. One hundred twenty-three other Hopi men from every village, several prominent anthropologists, trader Thomas Keam, and General A.D. McCook, signed a petition which halted the allotment program (see, e.g., Whiteley 1988:77-81). In 1894-95, nineteen leaders of the Hostile faction at Oraibi spent one year on Alcatraz Island for an incident at Moencopi. They had attempted to re-assert traditionary use rights in the area by planting wheatfields (Whiteley 1988:86-88).

In 1909, during the second allotment program, Hopis again demonstrated their opposition, especially to the inclusion of Navajos within traditionally Hopi areas. Though opposed in general to allotment, several Hopis, including the Chiefs of Oraibi and Bacavi, and several leaders from First Mesa, petitioned for the replacement of Allotting Agent Matthew Murphy by Ralph Collins, a former superintendent of the Keam's Canyon School. Evidently, they trusted Collins to secure their rights more adequately than Murphy, who had a clear pro-Navajo bias. Collins supported their petition, stating that the government (his employer) had "utterly failed" to honor a land agreement with Hopis initiated in the 1890's (Collins 6-24-1909). Collins included a letter from George Cochise of First Mesa detailing Hopi dissatisfaction:

> With begining [sic] he [Murphy] tell the people that the Gov. going to give the Hopies back their land and going to dirve [sic] the Navajo out off the

HP7506

> Hopies land, but he never do what he said (Cochise 5-8-1909:3).

At First Mesa, $375.80 (a very significant sum for Hopis at this stage) was raised to send two men to Washington to express their concern, but Murphy dissuaded them.

Hopis continued to protest Murphy's allotment efforts throughout 1910, again rejecting Navajo allotment among them (e.g., Gunderson 3-24-1910, 4-5-1910; Murphy 7-9-1910, 1-19-1911).

Murphy recorded another specific reference to the tutskwa. He submitted a map (n.d.) showing clan migration routes (see Map 5):

> The arrows show the routes followed by the clans that inhabit the Moqui villages at the present time. Each clan claims all the land on both sides of route. As the routes converge the claims overlap each other; some of the First Mesa people came from Taos N. Mx.; some from Clear Creek Canon below Winslow; some from Grand Canon; some from ruins to the north; some from Chinlee. The other villages are peopled in much the same way. Each clan claims to have been first on the scene and so claims prior rights to the country.
>
> * * *
>
> Territory claimed by the older Moquis: Mouth of Little Colorado to Holbrook; Holbrook to Chinlee; Chinlee to San Juan River; San Juan River to Colorado River; Colorado R to mouth of Little Colorado (Murphy n.d.).

Clan migration traditions, stating territorial claims are recorded in a number of ethnological texts (e.g., Fewkes 1894, 1900a; Voth 1905; Nequatewa 1936). According to these, Hopis migrated from all directions in to Tuuwanasavi ("earth center"), where the present villages are located. For example, H.R. Voth

HP7507

details the travels of several clans of the Bear-Spider phratry in the Moencopi area:

> While these parties lived at Muenkapi for some time another party had gone along the Little Colorado river, passed by the place that is now called the Great Lakes, and arrived at Shongopavi, where they started a village at the place where now the ruins of old Shongopavi are, east of the present village. . . . The clan that had stopped northeast of Muenkapi soon moved to the place where Muenkapi now is, but did not remain there long. The Bear clan, the Hide Strap clan, and the Blue-bird clan soon moved on towards Oraibi. When the Spider clan arrived at Muenkapi they made marks or wrote on a certain bluff east of Muenkapi, saying that this place should always belong to the Hopi, that no one should take it away from them, because there was so much water there.[6] Here the Hopi should always plant (Voth 1905:22-23).

Voth records other clan movements to Moencopi en route to Tuuwanasavi, confirming archaeological evidence of Moencopi's long-term occupancy by Hopis (see also Adams 1987:27).

In 1918, Hopi Superintendent Leo Crane detailed the history of Hopi-Navajo conflict (see also Euler 1988:13-14), recommending expansion of contemporary Hopi use-rights. Crane recognized the persistence of Hopi expressions of their land claim:

> If these things are done, the Hopi range troubles will disappear. If they are not done, time will not accomplish the reform automatically, and the griefs and impotent petitions of the Hopi will continue, as they have since 1850 (Crane 3-12-1918:13, Hopi Exhibit 55:13).

In 1924, the Hopis filed a petition against the reopening for Navajo students of the Keam's Canyon School. The preamble includes the following statements:

---

[6] The Spider clan was instrumental in the 1894 attempt to reassert traditional claims, in text above at 15.

HP7508

> From time immemorial the Hopi as a tribe has always lived in the villages which they now occupy; in earlier years living in the regions which now are ruins and settling in their present villages to which they were driven by warring Navajos and other Indians. Their ancient history handed from mouth to mouth from generation to generation, is complete; and the Hopi country as they know it by boundaries were marked out in the first days of the tribe . . . (Byron Adams et al. 6-1-1924).

This Hopi petition marks the beginning of a series, with increasingly specific references to the traditional land claim and perceived obligations of the government to uphold it. In 1926, a petition (particularly referring to hunting rights) to President Coolidge and Members of Congress, bearing signatures from each Mesa, emphasized Hopi desire for access to the 1882 Reservation (and to extensions thereof east and south of the 1882 boundaries):

> We ask our land boundaries be extended north to the store known to us as Sue-Chee-pu, to the east meeting the boundary line of the village of Ganado. To the south to the boundary line of the village of Holbrook, to the west to the boundary line of the village of Luepp [sic] (Saloftoche et al. 5-15-1926).

Two years later, Interior Dept. Inspector H.H. Fiske investigated problems at Moencopi. The record contains several references to traditional claims:

> [Interpreter]: This one man says that over at Oraibi the Chief [Tawakwaptiwa] told them that he has an old map from many years ago and it shows that this part of the reservation was made for the Hopis. The Little Colorado River and the San Juan River were the lines. He said he could show this to anyone [Fiske arranges to see it.]
>
> * * *
>
> [John Gashyesva through interpreter]: . . . [O]ur borders were first the San Juan River and the Little Colorado (tracing it on the map drawn). The Apaches lived on the other side of us.
>
> * * *

HP7509

F[iske]: You don't know when your people came here first?
In[terpreter]: No, the old ruins have been renewed and renewed and we don't know how old they are.

* * *

F[iske]: Why did your people leave Oraibi and come here?
In[terpreter]: They really started here first. Then they came back from Oraibi [cf. quote from Voth 1905, above at 17] (Meeting at Moencopi 11-5-1928:4,7,8-9).

April 1929 saw another petition signed by leaders from Second and Third Mesas (to Vice-President Curtis) protesting government failure to prevent Navajo encroachment:

> Take Navajo peoples out of our country. We were there first. Your government put them with us. Your government let them take our lands we were working away from us; let them take our homes, cattles, sheeps, mules, and anything they want of us they take. Your Government men let these things happen. They see it. We ask for this not to be done, but they drive us from them like chase burro (Naquayouma et al. April 1929).

The earliest detailed Hopi statement about their traditional land claim appears in a petition (with an accompanying hand-drawn map of the tutskwa) (see Map 3) signed by many individuals, including traditional leaders, from all three Second Mesa villages, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1930:

> After an extended discussion and consideration on the matter we feel That our old tribal land claim concerning about our old boundary lines and the area of land within the said boundaries should and ought by right in the light of justice, liberty and the Supreme Being, be taken into consideration for us at Washington that we desire and want our land return to us, because we love our home-land and never want to be moved out of this place. For centuries the Hopi shrines at the distance points . . . which boardered [sic] the Hopi people from every direction, marked and designated the Hopis' tribal land boundary lines. Before the other peoples came the

HP7510

> Hopis' essential needs at away places were all obtainable. For examples: Wild game and fowls was plentiful, timber for building purposes could be gotten from either Sun Set Mts. in the west and up from north of here, salt and etc.
>
> But, intrusion of the Navajos, then, coupled with the lack of justice and better understanding on the part of our white-brothers; not the spirit of friendship and brotherhood which we and our grandfathers have always felt toward our white-brothers account for the fact that our boundary lines has never been acknowledged or recognized by the United States Government.
>
> As a result our land had been greatly diminished or reduced in size to what is now called our reservation. Much to our deep regret and the frightful loss of our land we love, that confiscated area of land had officially been set aside as a Navajo reservation and a public land.
>
> * * *
>
> Wherefore; we the people, the majority of the Hopiland signing the said petition are earnestly and sincerely ask that our land we love so well be returned to us for the benefit of our future generations (Komalentewa et al. 4-8-1930; see accompanying map).

Later in 1930, a number of both traditional and younger leaders from all three mesas again asserted the traditional claim to United States government representatives. At a conference in Flagstaff, Arizona on a Navajo-Hopi boundary, Peter Nuvamsa presented Special Commissioner H.J. Hagerman with a sketch "showing an area bounded on the northwest by the Colorado River, on the west by Flagstaff, on the south by a line some 25 miles south of Winslow and Holbrook, on the east by St. Michaels, Fort Defiance and Chinle" (Meeting at Flagstaff 11-6-1930:15). Another petition requesting territorial restoration was submitted to the

HP7511

Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on May 18, 1931 (Sakhongva et al. 5-18-1931).

The idea that boundary shrines should be considered seriously by the government was recommended by anthropologist Harold Colton (e.g., Colton 5-16-1932, Hopi Exhibit 364) and taken up by government representatives (e.g., Hagerman 6-2-1932, Hopi Exhibit 366). While noting the great difficulties of locating these shrines owing to institutionalized Hopi secrecy, Colton nevertheless produced a preliminary listing of Kachina and Eagle shrines, most of which fall in the 1934 area and confirm Eagle shrine maps in Dr. Ainsworth's report (Maps 20a, 20b, 20c) (Colton 6-10-1932, Hopi Exhibit 133). Notably, Colton (ibid.) indicates: "[W]e judge there is considerable friction at times when the Navajos prevent the Hopis from visiting these [Eagle] sites to procure their eagle feathers which play such an important part in their religion."

Numerous references to the tutskwa claim appear in the record of a Senate Hearing on a Hopi-Navajo boundary before the Committee on Indian Affairs (Hopi Exhibit 143), held in Washington in December 1932. Attached to the record are "minutes of meetings conducted by representatives of the Indian Bureau with the Hopi Indians at the various Hopi villages" in November 1932. The Hopis consistently rejected government proposals for a smaller area than the tutskwa:

> Secakamama: We won't try to settle on this present boundary. What we want is our own domain -- the outside line the old reservation [sic] from San Francisco Peaks and around.

HP7512

* * *

> Veits: Being the descendants of the Chimopovi people here and being considering the tribal land claims I will point it out through from here north to the Colorado River and down along the river through that Marble Canyon and down away distant from that bridge at Lee's Ferry, down along a line and at a certain place coming up from the Canyon and on southwest from there along the San Francisco Peaks, recognized as being an old shrine of the Hopis in considering that as a boundary, the original line, but a little farther down, and along from there south through them blue ridges up to the last point and southwest from Winslow and then from there eastward along the highest point, along there and up to this Woodruff Butte along there a little ways ahead up there at a certain point turning north and a little above Ganado along the pine ridges coming down along there and intersecting with the . . . Canyon de Chelly, and along there coming up pointing north straight up to the Navajo Mountain and down into that river. That is the tribal land claim of the first people here.

* * *

> This is all that I have to say. The people here are only interested in that. But the belief of the first people here, as he [probably meaning Maasaw] marked out the original line, and inside of that we are told that he [meaning the Hopi] was to depend on you [i.e., the white man] to protect this land for him -- that inside of this land that whoever does those things wrong and mean should be moved out of that place. . . . We believe that by not allowing the Navajos into the reservation here or into this land here (Boundary Hearings, Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservation, 1932:41,49, Hopi Exhibit 143:43,51).

Again in 1933, Hopis from Second Mesa pressed their case. A petition from Shongopavi (with support from Mishongnovi (Coochwytewa et al. 3-2-1933, Hopi Exhibit 445)), which as the "mother village" has a distinctive role in the maintenance of and public statement of claims to the tutskwa, cited the following boundaries:

HP7513

> Starting from north called Do-go-na-vie [Tokoonavi] by the Hopis in the cliff of Colorado River follow the river down to Salt Canyon [the Grand Canyon], from there along west side of Flagstaff through Blue Ridge to mt. called Pe-heg-ha from thereto [sic] Woodruff Butt [sic] there turning east ward covering Petrified Forest to Mission spring there back to Do-go-na-vei. This is the original boundary line for the Hopi Indians which has been told from generation to generation . . . (Lomahaftewa et al. 2-27-1933, Hopi Exhibit 444).

In March 1934, the same request was reiterated with many signatures from Shongopavi and Mishongnovi (Lomahaftewa et al. 3-8-1934, Hopi Exhibit 376). At the same time, villagers from Kykotsmovi, Moencopi and Shongopavi petitioned Commissioner John Collier to abolish the 1882 Reservation and restore prior legal rights:

> By the stroke of a pen the land that belonged to us under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848, was given and made a dumping ground for all roving bands of Indians that the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to dump there, and who have done us great damage.
>
> * * *
>
> We submit that there never was the slightest legal authority for the issuing of the executive order of 1882, as this land was, and is, our community property under and by virtue of the treaty of 1848, that we were at that time, and for hundreds of years prior, a separate and distinct nation (Fredericks et al. 3-7-1934:2, Hopi Exhibit 447:2).

HP7514

The invocation of Guadalupe Hidalgo is still current in Hopi discourse.[7] Fredericks et al. (above) cite Thomas Donaldson's detailed opinion (1893:39-40,43) that the 1882 Executive Order was illegal:

> The Moquis of Arizona, even if they had no military, pueblo or community grants, would be entitled to hold the lands they now occupy under possessory title and the law of occupancy. By the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo they were to have the same rights, protection, and guarantees under the laws of the United States as they claimed or had under the laws of Spain or Mexico. The rights of the Pueblos of New Mexico have been respected. Why not respect the rights of the Pueblos of Arizona, once a part of New Mexico? (Donaldson 1893:40).

In 1937, anthropologist Oliver La Farge, in authoring the Hopi Tribal Constitution, stressed:

> [Hopi tradition] is absolutely controlling for seventy-five per cent of the Hopi tribe, for which they would be willing to lay down their lives, and for the remainder, Christians and all, it is emotionally dominant. Save by entirely destroying the integrity of a very remarkable group of people, nothing can be done with the Hopis without treating the tradition and the path with the utmost seriousness and respect.
>
> * * *
>
> According to most, the territory rightfully belonging to the Hopis will be cleared of all intruders and turned over to them. From the White Brother the Hopis will receive a much more abundant life in all matters of material as well as spiritual welfare.
>
> * * *

---

[7] The war between Mexico and the United States ended with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, in which Mexico agreed to cede land to the United States. The United States in turn agreed to protect all Mexican citizens residing in the ceded territory, including the pueblo Indians, in the "free enjoyment of their liberty and property" (9 Stat. 922).

HP7515

> The claim to . . . about half the state of Arizona [an exaggeration], is not understood as meaning exclusive habitation. It relates to the fact that Hopi ceremonies are held not only for the Hopis but to maintain the welfare of the whole world, and also to the location of shrines of importance and the eagle hunting territories at places far removed from the villages. It is essentially a spiritual overlordship, plus a demand for access to and protection of the shrines and a restoration of ancient hunting privileges. This issue is confused by growing competition for actual use of land between Navajo and Hopi stockmen and actual encroachment of the Navajos upon the Hopis in a few sections (La Farge 1937:26-28, Hopi Exhibit 386:26-28).

La Farge's observations on the seriousness with which the claim to the tutskwa should be treated hold equally well in 1988 as 1937.

There are numerous reiterations of the traditional claim from the 1930's to the present; Hopis of diverse political allegiances have consistently voiced similar views. Moreover, official government responses repeatedly acknowledge and promise protection and legally guaranteed access to shrine areas, especially. Let me cite a few more documents to support these statements.

First, on the tutskwa claim itself. In a 1938 meeting with John Collier, Tribal Chairman Peter Nuvamsa presented again the 1930 petition from Shongopavi and Mishongnovi (above, at 19). Other important leaders also commented:

> [Byron Adams (First Mesa):] Of all the things presented this morning the most important one is the matter of the Hopi reservation boundary.
>
> * * *
>
> [Kewanimptewa, chief of Bacavi:] "The belief of the Hopi people was that this boundary situation should

HP7516

be discussed by the recognized chiefs of the different villages.

* * *

Mr. Collier, I want to make this statement to you. You have had your say that the tribe and the Navajos and the Government should negotiate. That fact was put into the [Tribal] constitution. This is not the heart of these people [the Hopis]. They think that the gods that they hold in their arms are sacred, and are the means of their life and they think they have the say of where the boundary line should be. We have men here who can think and who were the first settlers on the reservation.

* * *

[Dan Katchongva, spokesman for chief Pongyayaoma, Hotevilla:] Now this land, this whole area we recognize as ours and which we have always claimed to be ours was ours when you came out here and found us. Way back from the beginning of Hopi life we had our instructions in the unwritten language from old men, men of standing and intelligence, as to how to conduct ourselves in the future. This instruction is followed and prized in the life of the Hopi. [The stone tablet was then presented to Collier.]

[Byron Adams:] In many instances . . . [government representatives] have taken advantage of our ignorance and have continually trapped us into their wishes and methods and beliefs. When it comes to the matter of the reservation boundary we don't want anyone to come to us in that way. Don't take undue advantage of us. We want justice this one time (Collier 7-14-1938, Hopi Exhibit 306:20,27,29,31,35).

A few days after Collier's visit, several traditional politico-religious leaders issued their own statement, through spokesman Dan Katchongva:

We cannot recognize any division of the lands we claim not traditionally. We must have all our land according to tradition and to the stone maps. It must follow our traditional boundary and divide none of the land inside it. . . . It was arranged by Masawa, that the Hopi should lay claim to their land by this stone, maintain their land and benefit by it in future years.

HP7517

* * *

> It is the tradition of the Hopi that with the presentation of this stone to claim the Hopi land, and the return of the Hopi's rightful country, that no future harm or detriment should come to them or to their land (Kotchungva et al. n.d.).

This document was publicly signed (i.e., thumbprinted) by traditional Kikmongwis of Hotevilla (Pongyayaoma), Shipaulovi (Humihongva), Shongopavi (Sikyayamtiwa), and other village leaders, including from Moencopi. This conjoint account by the most important traditional leaders of Second and Third Mesa is especially indicative of the level of concern: publicly signed statements of Kikmongwis (normally extremely reticent in such matters) from autonomous villages were, at this juncture, extremely unusual.

Shortly after these meetings, investigating Government anthropologist Gordon MacGregor summarized his views on Hopi traditional claims to Commissioner Collier. MacGregor's account is worth quoting at length, despite his skepticism and my disagreement with several of his interpretations:

> In 1930 and again in 1933, the Second Mesa villages have presented maps outlining their conception of the Hopi country and asking for recognition of it. . . . It includes the distant mountain peaks they can see from their villages and the farthest shrines, except those in Grand Canyon to the west. The line also includes all but one or two ruins in central Arizona [an exaggeration] from which the Hopi clans believe they have migrated. This claim is the true Hopi country, and one which Second Mesa would like to have the Government formally recognize as the Hopi, rather than Navajo country.
>
> * * *
>
> Sipaulovi village has given the section of the geographic Hopi area which they consider theirs. On

HP7518

the west the area commences with a shrine on Sunset Mountain, Navaqueawataka [Chavez Pass ruin] -- a butte just southeast of Sunset Mountain, along the upper side of Clear Creek, where the Sipaulovi eagle cliffs are located to Woodruff Butte, Chimontequi. There is no exact line, but these points mark the southern extremity of the area which this village considers its own territory.

Mishongnovi village claimed no shrine except at Salt Lake, south of Zuni Reservation in New Mexico [certainly the result of incomplete research or Hopi reticence]. . . . A definite western line of the village territory was said to run from the village southwest to Montezuma's chair, a butte within the reservation, to the ruins near Winslow [Homolovi], thence to Sunset Mountain area. On the east, the line ran to White Cone Peak, in the southeastern corner of the Hopi Reservation to Greasewood Springs and then southeast to Salt Lake in New Mexico. Their eagle territory is the same as that of the Sipaulovi, along the upper edge of Clear Creek [also the result of inadequate research].

* * *

The First Mesa claim begins with White Cone Peak in the southeastern corner of their present reservation, runs northeast through Steamboat Canyon to the east edge of Salakai [i.e., Balakai] Mesa, thence north along the eastern and northern edge of Black Mesa passing through a shrine at Chilchinbito Spring and Point, along the mesa edge forming Marsh Pass eastern escarpment, thence to Wildcat Peak just south of the northwest corner of the present reservation, thence southwest to Tuba Butte, thus incorporating Moencopi village, thence southeast along the Moencopi Plateau to Montezuma's chair, a peak just south of the central point of the south line of the present reservation, and thence east to White Cone peak.

* * *

The First Mesa or Walpi people made an agreement with the Navajo some time about 1850 establishing a boundary line. The Navajo were to cross it only on condition of good behavior. As a sign of good faith the Navajo are said to have presented a feather shrine or symbol, which First Mesa still preserves. A pile of rock some distance west of Ganado and on the old road once marked this line.

HP7519

First Mesa, of course, would like to see this line form the eastern limit of the reservation.

Moencopi Claims:

This village was settled permanently about seventy years ago, but for several centuries has been Hopi ground and is the site of earlier Hopi pueblos and the cotton fields of Oraibi. The first whites into the country found Hopi cotton fields here, and an Oraibi man invited the Mormons to settle there about 1875 to protect the Hopi from the Paiutes then in the country. The Moencopi people have given a full account of their history and claim which will be submitted to the Tribal Council [Hopi Exhibit 205:3-5].

Undoubtedly the Hopi cattle and sheep once ranged through the area between Oraibi and Moencopi, and Hopi lived in this intervening area. As they have pointed out in their claim, the Navajo kept them from settling in the area in small groups (McGregor 8-6-1938:1-3, Hopi Exhibit 205:1-3).

In April 1939, Tribal Council delegates met again with Commissioner Collier in Washington. Again they presented the traditional claim and their resolve was entirely undiminished:

[Peter Nuvamsa (Tribal Chairman):] [T]his area shown on the map is the original area that the Hopis in the past have revived year after year in exercising their ceremonies which involve their traditions.

* * *

Every year we hold an annual ceremonial which takes in our claim which is outlined by the outside circle.

Mr. Collier: You mean the area bounded by Rainbow Bridge and Colorado River on the south and east [sic], below Winslow and almost to Gallup on the west and north [sic].

Mr. Nuvamsa: That is the sacred area. We have taken into consideration how we might live after the settlement of this area, how we may obtain our timber, salt, and game in this area. Inside this area is a shrine to be of main purpose to the Hopi people.

HP7520

* * *

> If the Government would recognize this area for the Hopi people and set up regulations as to how it should be governed, then it would be up to the Government to protect us.

* * *

> [Byron Adams (First Mesa):] This large area which the Hopis are claiming, if it is not recognized by the Government, it will be destroying the Hopi's religion because the most sacred and serious ceremony of the Hopis is the rehearsal of the settlement and of their claim in connection with the reservation [see below at 63-64]. If it is true that this outlying boundary is not Hopi, what are these religious ceremonies going to mean? (Conference on Hopi Extension Area 4-24-1939:1-2,8, Hopi Exhibit 397:2,10).

Later in 1939, during an investigation into reservation boundaries by C.E. Rachford, several leading elders spoke, including Kwotka, the Walpi Kikmongwi, principal authority at First Mesa. He describes an historical encounter with a government representative:

> Then the Hopi replied and pointed out the boundary of his reservation, beginning near Ganado and along the line that Maho described [previous pages]; thence on the eastern side along Black Mountain by Lujani [Lohali] up to a place called Navajo Mountain; thence into the Grand Canyon; thence out of the Grand Canyon towards Flagstaff, and from there as far as his eyes could see coming up to Holbrook from the south.

* * *

> It seems very unfortunate that no records have been kept or been found regarding our claims. We have nothing that we can point to in the way of documents. Because of these many promises we look to you now representing great authority from Washington, to consider our claims and take action which would come near to what we had claims before the aggressors [i.e., Navajos] appeared on the scene (Meeting at Polacca 12-4-1939:10-11, part of Hopi Exhibit 399).

HP7521

For want of space, let me mention only two sets of accounts subsequent to the 1930's. The Hopi Hearings of 1955, where a Senate Subcommittee held meetings at all the Hopi villages, contain numerous references to the traditional land claim (e.g., Hopi Hearings 1955:147-50) and still more to requests for its return to Hopi jurisdiction. In 1974, a statement from the leaders of the Hopi Traditionalist movement reiterated the claim, rejecting partitionment of the 1882 Executive Order Reservation and requesting that the entire 1882 area be returned to Hopi jurisdiction. This petition demonstrates the current continuity of the tutskwa claim and its significance within contemporary Hopi life. It is, therefore, worth quoting at some length:

> We will not accept these solutions to the Hopi land problem. . . . We have never entered into a treaty with the United States Government and thus we have full rights to our whole Traditional land area.
>
> * * *
>
> The Navajo Indian Tribe did enter into a treaty with the United States Government on 1 June 1868. Yet, the Government permitted them to move into our Traditional land area and then into an area set aside by President Arthur in 1882 for us. It is absolutely clear from many historical documents and from our traditions that we, the Hopi people, were at war with the Navajo people prior to 1882 and it would make absolutely no sense for the President of the United States to place two enemies within one land area. Therefore, a great injustice will be made again by the United States Government if Congress should let the Navajo people get away with this simply because the Bureau of Indian Affairs was afraid in 1882 and after, to keep the Navajo people out of the 1882 Hopi Indian land area. Instead, we petition the Congress to correct this grave injustice by giving to the Hopi people, all the land area within the 1882 Executive Order Hopi reservation.
>
> * * *

HP7522

We shall continue to press for recognition of our Hopi Traditional land area which is beyond the 1882 Executive Order Hopi reservation. We propose that Congress grant us a simple form of recognition. We will not disturb the tranquility of those people who now live there, nor create any disturbance. In fact, it is our desire that they live there in peace and harmony with all people and with our mother earth. We only ask that this land area be recognized as being the Traditional Land Area of the Hopi People. Such a simple Act of Congress will enable us to freely visit our sacred religious shrines within the Hopi Traditional land area. We will be able to freely visit our Eagle Hunting Grounds and pray in the sacred mountains of Flagstaff, Arizona. We will be able to freely visit the salt mines within the area.

We will not accept the solution proposed in these bills which will carve out a small area for the Moencopi Hopi people from the 1934 Act of the United States Congress. If we accept this proposal in these bills, it will terminate any Hopi claim for any additional land outside of this proposed area as described in these two bills. Our traditions state that the Moencopi Hopi people live well within our Hopi Traditional Land Area. In any event, the Moencopi Hopi people have a basic right to more, much more land, than what is proposed in these bills [H.R. 10337 and S.2424].

* * *

In conclusion, it is our unanimous opinion, made in council, that we, the Hopi Traditional Chiefs and religious leaders, will be making a very bad mistake if we accept these two bills now proposed in Congress.

Instead, we propose that Congress reject these two bills and then grant the Hopi people all of the land within the 1882 Executive Hopi reservation. We propose that Congress grant a simple recognition of the Hopi Traditional Land Area and grant a much greater land area to the Moencopi Hopi people in agreement with us, the leaders of the Hopi people. These proposals seem reasonable to us, a people who have lived within this Country for generations and generations and possibly before the time of Christ (Johnson 1-19-1974).

HP7523

In the 1930's and 1940's several government statements guaranteed Hopi rights within the traditional claim. Prior to Colton's brief survey in 1932, Commissioner Rhoads promised:

> Should the location of the shrines be ascertained we believe that under the general supervisory authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior such shrines even though on Navajo reservation lands, can be definitely set aside for the exclusive use of the Hopis without the necessity of legislation. . . . It is suggested that you [Special Commissioner Hagerman] communicate with him [Hopi Agent Miller] with a view of enlisting Dr. Colton's aid in an advisory capacity so that early field action can be taken by Superintendent Miller in regard to locating and designating the shrines (Rhoads 5-21-1932, Hopi Exhibit 130:1-2).

During the Washington meeting with Hopi Tribal Council delegates in April 1939, Commissioner Collier expressed doubt that restoration to Hopi jurisdiction of the entire tutskwa, involving relocation of all non-Hopis in the area, would be feasible. But:

> we can do whatever may be necessary to protect the shrines. I think we can do whatever is necessary to give access to the forests and the salt and anything else of that kind.
>
> * * *
>
> It may be that you will get some territory outside the boundaries [of the 1882 reservation] (Conference on Hopi Extension Area 4-24-1939:4,12, part of Hopi Exhibit 397:5,14).

The following day, Collier stated, "I want him [the Secretary of the Interior] to confirm the fact that [by accepting an interim policy] you are not surrendering your claims to the larger area." (Conference on Hopi Extension Area 4-25-1939:4, part of Hopi Exhibit 397:6). He also advised against pressing for an interim exclusive Hopi area at Moencopi, "because you

HP7524

might find establishment even of a tentative area would have the effect of jeopardizing your case later on. It would be wiser to wait until we settled this boundary matter" (Conference on Hopi Extension Area 4-25-1939:5, part of Hopi Exhibit 397:7).

In December 1939, Walter Woehlke, Assistant to the Commissioner, reported to Collier an agreement between C.E. Rachford, Hopi Superintendent Seth Wilson, and Navajo Superintendent E.R. Fryer that ceremonial use of shrine areas would be assured the Hopi (Woehlke 12-15-1939, Hopi Exhibit 461).

In October 1940, Commissioner Collier informed the Secretary of the Interior of a specific policy whereby "[t]he Hopi are not to be disturbed in their continued use of certain areas within the Navajo jurisdiction for ceremonial purposes" (Collier 10-9-1940:2, Hopi Exhibit 320:2).

Anthropologist Richard Clemmer (e.g., 1978) has suggested that the early Hopi Tribal Council, organized in 1936, was only supported by a handful of individuals -- an idea that has been picked up and reiterated by many others. Apart from the 1974 Traditionalist petition presented above, a reading of the 1930's documents indicates that Hopis generally were interested in the Council as a means to pursue the land claim. Only with the Council's failure to prevent Hopi restriction to District Six and the stock reduction program, in the late 1930's and early 1940's, did it cease to be viable (prior to its reactivation in the 1950's).

HP7525

The meeting with John Collier at Oraibi in 1938, a particularly important one, involved joint participation by the Council and traditional leaders. Council Chairman Nuvamsa began the meeting by quoting the traditional claim from 1930. Dan Katchongva and James Pongyayaoma of Hotevilla (the former, especially, a major figurehead in the later Traditionalist faction) were prominent speakers. There appears to be no internal conflict whatsoever (quite a rarity in Hopi society) concerning the presentation of the tutskwa claim.

The choice of Peter Nuvamsa as early Chairman is also indicative, owing to his hereditary rights to chieftainship at Shongopavi, the oldest village. At this same meeting, Chief Kewanimptewa of Bacavi publicly recognized Nuvamsa's traditional authority to state the claim, even accusing him of excessive reticence owing to his new capacity as Chairman.

Petitions cited above since the 1920's include names of many individuals identified later as in opposed political camps ("Progressives" and "Traditionalists"), for example, a signature on a 1934 petition, whose other signatories include subsequent Council members, by Thomas Jenkins (a.k.a. Banyacya), prominent Traditionalist spokesman since the 1940's. In 1955, David Monongye, a major Traditionalist leader until his death earlier this year (1988), stated:

> [T]here is a dispute between the Hopi and the Navajos. Both tribes are pulling on the land which we know belongs to the Hopi in the beginning. We all know . . . that not very long ago there were no Navajos anywhere in this section of the country. It was only later that they traveled into our land, but

HP7526

> today the Navajos [are] claiming all the ruins scattered around which the Hopi knows belongs to him. They even claim Tuba [Tuuvi, for whom Tuba City was named] is a Navajo language which we know Tuba is a Hopi name and he is a Hopi. They are trying every way to claim the land which actually belongs to the Hopi people . . ., but we must insist upon the respect for those places that actually belong to the Hopi people (Hopi Hearings 1955:21-22).

Hopi acceptance of the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act ("I.R.A.") (which established the Tribal Council) appears to have hinged on the understanding that this entailed specific rights to pursue the land claim. Peter Nuvamsa clearly states the Hopi view of the I.R.A.:

> We had been led to believe that by acceptance of the Reorganization Act that we could be heard and our claims considered. Now we honestly and sincerely believe that our claims are just but if we cannot get any protection under the Reorganization Act, it seems that the Hopi Tribe will be better off by doing away with it and coming back to his former life (Conference on Hopi Extension Area 4-24-1939:11, part of Hopi Exhibit 397:13).

Similarly, in his 1937 notes to the Tribal Constitution, Oliver La Farge emphasized that Hopis should not be:

> asked to accept wording [regarding a boundary] which would appear to abandon the ceremonial claim. As previously stated, this matter [Hopi acceptance of the Tribal Constitution] will be greatly facilitated if ceremonial requirements are met by action to establish Hopi rights in their outlying shrines.
>
> * * *
>
> The older villages also have wider claims extending far beyond the clan holdings. After a good deal of discussion the Hopis were finally led to agree that these claims . . . should be adjudicated by the tribal council under its power to supervise the use of unoccupied land beyond the clan and village holdings (La Farge 1937:33,35, Hopi Exhibit 386:33,35).

As anthropologist Edward Kennard noted in 1939:

HP7527™

> The expression, "beyond the clan and village holdings," meant to the majority of the Hopi, lands beyond the San Francisco Peaks to the west, Navajo Mountain to the North, the Buttes South of Holbrook, and an indefinite point to the east somewhere east of Ganado (Kennard 1939:1).

One of the first actions by the Tribal Council, less than one month after its formation on January 18, 1937, was a letter to La Farge, clearly reflecting concern over land:

> Under what conditions or under what instrument were the Hopis brought under the U.S. Government, (treaties, or simply agreement either written or oral) and through whose instrumentality and when?
>
> Were the Hopis ever given land grant by the Spanish government, and if so were these ever annulled? (Lomavitu 2-13-1937).

The widespread interpretation by Hopis that the government deceitfully used the I.R.A. to establish Grazing District Six and the stock reduction program proved the downfall of the original Council, implying reversal of the acceptance of the I.R.A. In reply to a Hopi letter of protest, Commissioner Collier noted:

> [Regarding] the reduction in area of the Hopi Reservation [i.e., to District Six], there is no connection whatever, as you seem to imply, between the organization of the Hopi Tribe and the creation of the Hopi grazing district.
>
> * * *
>
> What the Hopi Constitution authorized was that the Hopi Tribal Council might work with the United States Government and the Navajo Tribe in agreeing upon some mutually satisfactory division of land. You say that the Hopi Reservation was reduced by the "Indian Department" without consulting the Hopis or without their knowledge or consent (Collier 3-25-1944).

Extreme opposition to stock reduction among villages which had previously been active supporters of the Council (Bacavi,

HP7528

Upper Moencopi and Kykotsmovi) led to the jailing of Kykotsmovi Governor Roger Quochytewa (Walther 10-15-1945). Bureau of Indian Affairs anthropologist D'Arcy McNickle nicely summarizes the reasons for the Council's demise:

> Unfortunately, the question of setting up a land-management district and of reducing livestock to the carrying capacity of the land confronted the Hopi people with desperate political questions before the Tribal Council had fully established itself in the confidence of the people. It was assumed by many that the written constitution and the Council created under the constitution were somewhat responsible for bringing about an apparent reduction of Hopi territory and of livestock. The Council foundered on that problem and no Hopi leader in the traditional line has been willing to support the [reconstituted] Council (McNickle 2-21-1952:2).[8]

In sum, the claim to the tutskwa is revealed in documentary records long before the present case, or previous legal claims. It is repeatedly reported by Hopis with general consistency and profound commitment. This is still the land area that, in spite of more than one hundred years of Government legislation, the Hopis regard as theirs by inalienable historic, mythological, religious, economic, and political right. They have not accepted the de facto usurpation of large areas by Navajos and EuroAmericans as in any way modifying that right. Because of

---

[8] McNickle is referring to the recently reconstituted Tribal Council in the early 1950's, when it did indeed receive virtually no support from traditional leaders. Previously active supporters, including Peter Nuvamsa, were now also vehemently opposed to the circumstances of the Council's reconstitution. The Council's subsequent history has been fraught with problems of representativeness, and there has been some continuous opposition from a group denominating itself "Traditionalists." But internal Hopi politics is complicated: nowadays, as I have argued at some length elsewhere (Whiteley 1988:223-227), the Council has become the legitimately recognized political forum for the majority of Hopi people.

HP7529

its deep-seated entrenchment in Hopi religious attitudes to the land (see below at 58-74), it is simply not a right that can be bought out or shrugged off.

Hopis consider the government to have failed to honor agreements to protect Hopi rights, guaranteed by interpretations both of Hopi tradition and by specific legal enactments, notably the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Government representatives at the highest level, both before and after 1934, repeatedly acknowledged the traditional claim and promised exclusive Hopi control over certain areas, especially those pertaining to religious activity, and hunting, wood-gathering, and salt-gathering.

Finally, the documentary record demonstrates unequivocally that Hopi interest in regaining control of their traditional area is tribal-wide; it is not limited to any one political "faction" in Hopi society.

HP7530

III. Reasonableness of the Tutskwa Claim

It has been suggested by some that Hopis habitually stayed close to the mesa-top villages, so their claim to the tutskwa is exaggerated. For example, government anthropologist Gordon MacGregor opined: "This boundary running along actual geographic points is not traditional, but I think, is the known geography of the Hopi" (MacGregor 8-6-1938, Hopi Exhibit 205:1). That this view is eminently false can best be demonstrated by showing habitual Hopi usage outside the tutskwa. A number of different usages are recorded at various time periods.

As Dr. Eggan's report (1986:18) notes, many of the outside shrines "mark the last staging areas in the final migrations to the Hopi homeland." Anthropologist Jesse W. Fewkes states: "The Hopi villages were thus peopled by descendants of clans which once lived as far north as the territory of Utah, as far south as the Gila Valley, and as far east as the upper Rio Grande" (Fewkes 1900a:577). Cosmos Mindeleff summarizes this process, using a combination of archaeological evidence and Hopi tradition:

> The migratory movements of a band of village builders often consumed many years or many decades. During this time subordinate settlements were put out all along the line as occasion or necessity demanded, and were eventually abandoned as the majority of the people moved onward. Hopi traditions tell of such movements and rests, when the people remained for many plantings in one place and then continued on. . . . It was a little trickling stream of humanity, or rather many such streams, like little rivulets after a rain storm, moving here and there as the occurrence of areas of cultivable land dictated, sometimes combining, then separating, but finally collecting to form the pueblo groups as we now know them.

HP7531

* * *

> [T]here were also more important movements, when whole villages changed their location at one time. Such changes are mentioned in the traditions and evidenced in the ruins (Mindeleff 1900:645).

Dr. Adams' report confirms this summary view from archaeological evidence. Some movements have taken place in historic times, for example by Tewas to First Mesa in the late seventeenth century.

Clearly, from the migration traditions, Hopis have knowledge of a much larger area than the tutskwa. Identification of many ruins as Hopi is confirmed by other Southwestern Indians: "The old men of the Gila Indians told Garces in 1775 that the 'Moqui nation' formerly extended to the Gila, and that its people built the pueblos then in ruins in their country" (Fewkes 1900a:599).

Prehistoric and protohistoric trade routes from Hopi throughout the Greater Southwest and into Mexico are well-established (see, e.g., Riley 1987:190-98). Hopi participation in these was prominent:

> [T]he Hopi were . . . major suppliers both of raw cotton and manufactured cotton goods, to the New Mexican portions of the Southwest.

* * *

> The Tusayan [Hopi] towns dominated the trade route from the upper Southwest to the Verde area and to the lower Colorado River. Tusayan supplied Cibola, and through Cibola the rest of the upper Southwest and the Gila-Salt and Sonoran regions, with Verde Valley area pigments and, at least the upper Southwest, with Gulf of California and California Pacific Coast shell.

* * *

HP7532

> Tusayan-Hopi, in return for blankets and other cotton goods and transshipped shell and pigments, received turquoise, worked bison hides, fibrolite (probably in the form of finished axes) and perhaps salt.
>
> * * *
>
> Tusayan . . . was an exporter of pottery, especially the beautiful yellow pottery (Riley 1987:193-96).

Historic Hopi trails and trading routes are documented by Colton (1964), who states:

> All these old trails were much traveled because the Hopi have always been traders and these trails, besides, have formed the routes followed by many of the present auto roads in northern Arizona (Colton 1964:91).

In 1884, soldier-ethnologist John G. Bourke emphasized Hopi trading interests, providing a useful insight into contemporary tribal distribution:

> Intimate commercial relations are maintained with the Cohoninos or Ava-Supais on the west, <u>the Navajoes on the N.E. and S.E.</u>, the Apaches and Zunis to the south, the Pi-Utes to the north, and the Pueblos along the Rio Grande, Puerco, and Jemez rivers (Bourke 1884:254-255, my emphasis).

Likewise, in 1776, Garces noted that the Hopis were key traders in an indigenous network for such introduced commodities as awls, dibbles, knives and hoes (Coues 1900:464, Hopi Exhibit 6:4).

Colton (1964) focuses on several major Hopi trails (see Map 6). "Two principal trails" led to the Havasupai in Cataract Canyon, one being one hundred fifty miles in length, the other, one hundred forty miles; one of the <u>tutskwa</u> boundary markers, Kooninhahawpi (Havasupai descent trail), lies on the former. Another trail to the Verde Valley and on towards modern Jerome was noted by several Spanish explorers. A trail to the

HP7533

White Mountain Apaches, followed by Ives in 1858 from near the Little Colorado to Hopi (Colton 1964:92), went southeast to Silver Creek, and then south on to White River. The trail to Zuni, Colton notes, "was well traveled by early Europeans from 1540 on. It crossed the Jeddito Wash near Awatovi, crossed over Jeddito Mesa past White Cone, crossing the Little Colorado near Navajo, passed Navajo Springs and Deep Lake to Zuni" (ibid.). A trail to the Navajos ran from First Mesa to Fort Defiance, passing through Steamboat Canyon. A trail to the Utes "led northeast from the Hopi Mesas, following the Polacca Wash, through a pass into the Chinle Valley, thence to the Four Corners area." (ibid.:93). Colton also includes a well-traveled trail to the San Francisco Peaks, inside the tutskwa.

Historically, some of these trails are known from the earliest Spanish records on, such as the Hopi-Zuni trail, utilized in 1540 by the Coronado expedition and countless times thereafter. In 1583, the Espejo expedition learned of some mineral mines Hopis used far to the south. With Hopi guides, Espejo went, very probably by the Verde Valley trail, to the mines near modern Jerome (Riley 1987:191-192). Again in 1598, under the Oñate expedition, Farfan and Quesada visited these mines with Hopi guides (Hammond and Rey 1953:408-15), and evidently the Hopi were trading minerals to the Zuni also (Riley 1987:192). It is highly likely that the same trail was used by Hopis en route to Prescott in 1866 (see above at 9).

One of the Havasupai trails was followed by Father Garces in 1776 (Coues 1900:361-391, Hopi Exhibit 6), and the other by anthropologist

HP7534

Frank Cushing, with Hopi-Tewa guide Tom Polaccaca, in 1880 (Colton 1964:92; Cushing 1965).

Florence Ellis mentions still another trail, which may be a southern extension of the Apache trail: "A trade route running from the Hopi to the occupied desert areas of southern Arizona crossed this district [San Carlos area]" (Ellis 1974:142, Hopi Exhibit 2:155).

After establishment of New Mexico in 1598 and the building of missions at Hopi from 1629, regular intercourse -- commercial, civil, and ecclesiastical -- with the Spanish, took Hopi parties to Santa Fe and other points along the Rio Grande. Documented Hopi visits to Santa Fe occur in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries (e.g., Montgomery, Smith, and Brew 1949:passim).

One of the most traveled trails was to Zuni; extensive trading and mutual visiting between First Mesa Hopis, especially, and Zuni was commonplace. During exceptionally difficult drought periods, Hopis often sojourned at Zuni. Pilgrimages to Zuni Salt Lake, located about forty-five miles south of Zuni pueblo, from First and Second Mesas are well established. Similarly, very strong relations have existed since prehistoric times with the Keresan pueblos (Parsons 1936), in recent times especially with Laguna and Acoma.[9] Borrowings of Keresan religious elements --

[9] The New Mexico pueblos are divided linguistically into Zuni, the Keresan pueblos and the Tanoan pueblos (which are further divided into Tiwa, Tewa, and Towa linguistic subgroups). The modern Keresan pueblos include Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Cochiti, Zia, Santa Ana, Laguna, and Acoma.

HP7535

songs, Kachinas, myths etc. -- are pervasive in Hopi culture (and vice versa).

In the west and southwest, strong relations with the Havasupai, Walapai, and Yavapai are equally well known. Again, in times of drought, Oraibi Hopis occasionally stayed with the Havasupai (Dockstader 1985:75). Specific references to Hopi presence include Garces' journal of 1776. He notes that the Walapai "go dressed in antelope skins and some shirts of Moqui; they have belts of Castille, awls, and other implements that they obtain from Moqui" (Coues 1900, Hopi Exhibit 6:1). While at a Havasupai or Walapai "rancheria," Garces noted the arrival of "an Indian man and woman who said they were from Moqui. They were well-dressed, and so genteel . . . that they appeared rational [i.e., gente de razon]" (ibid.:2). Garces also remarked on the presence of awls, dibbles and hoes among the Havasupai -- again, all obtained from the Hopi -- and, while at a Yavapai rancheria, again noted the arrival of two Hopis to trade (ibid.).

Hopi trade, then, involved extensive travel outside the tutskwa.

In 1775, Escalante recorded information from Havasupais six days west of Oraibi:

> [N]ine days journey west of this Cosnina [Havasupai], there is a nation which speaks the same language and is called Jomascabas. Fourteen days from these are others whom they call Chirumas. . . . This is what the Cosnina told me, agreeing with the information the Moquinos had given me earlier (Adams and Chavez 1956:303, Hopi Exhibit 4:13, my emphasis).

In other words, the Hopi could speak with authority about people 29-days journey west of Oraibi.

HP7536

Some references suggest Hopi travel to the Pacific Ocean. The large amounts of shells used ceremonially by the Hopi and the Rio Grande Pueblos came from the Pacific and the Gulf of California via trade routes. How much of this commerce involved Hopi long-distance travel west, as opposed to trading with more proximate intermediaries like the Havasupai, is open to speculation. That some of it did involve extensive travel is, however, evident. Antonio Armijo's diary of a journey from Santa Fe to California in 1830, records a trail west of the Colorado River between modern Needles and Las Vegas: "At the arroyo of Hayatas, at the end of which comes in the trail from Moqui, traveled by the Moquis with the object of trading shells with the said Hayatas" (Hafen and Hafen 1954:164). The likely location for "the end" of this trail is ca. twenty to forty miles east of modern Barstow, California (see map in ibid.)

John G. Bourke, inquiring of a Snake priest in 1881 the origin of some olivette shells, was told they had come from the west:

> "muy lejos, muncha [sic] agua" (very far, heap water), an explanation which I took to signify these shells had been brought from a great distance, from the sea.
>
> * * *
>
> I cannot dispel from my mind a conviction that the Moquis betray, in the shells, salt water, sand, abalones, and other features of this [Snake] dance, a derivation from a people who once knew, and perhaps worshipped, the ocean (Bourke 1884:143).

HP7537

Bourke's conviction was later confirmed: "The sea-shells you saw in the Estufa [kiva] were brought by our forefathers to the country of Moqui. They are very old. They were not obtained in trade with other tribes" (ibid.:193).

Ten Kate (1885:301) also recorded Hopi and Zuni pilgrimages to the Pacific for shells, noting in the same passage that Zuni (and perhaps by implication, Hopi) geographical knowledge went from the Gulf of California to the Missouri River. During my own research at Hopi in 1980-81, I was told of explicit ritual references to the Pacific Ocean during the Hopi Saalako ceremony (last performed in 1981).

Journeys outside the tutskwa for other traditional materials include for plant dyes and mineral pigments. In the 1890's, Walter Hough inquired about moccasin dye:

> "You know Flagstaff? Well, way farther across the mountains, at 'Apache House,' get bark from tree; use 'em to make tochi [moccasin] red." This means a journey of four hundred miles to get the bark of a birch tree . . . (Hough 1898:138).

Hough (1900:469-70) also records two pigments regularly obtained from Cataract Canyon, and Florence Ellis, citing Alexander Stephen, records other pigments collected from this area (Ellis 1974:142, Exhibit 2:155). Moreover, specular iron, a face-painting pigment, was obtained "somewhere north of and not far from San Carlos" (east of Phoenix) (Stephen 1936:1195, cited in Ellis 1974:142, Hopi Exhibit 2:155).

Following Anglo-American penetration of the Southwest, Hopis made numerous journeys to settlements or forts. Some of these, such as 1850 and 1865 journeys to Santa Fe, and 1860's

HP7538

journeys to Prescott and Salt Lake City have been mentioned above, at 8-9. There were serious plans to take a Hopi representative to Washington as early as 1870 (Whiteley 1988:41), and although these plans failed, Hopi leaders did journey to Washington for the first time in 1890. Relations with Mormons led to trading trips to southern Utah for horses, among other things; Bourke notes such a trip to St. George in 1881 (Bourke 1884:317). Tuuvi, head of Moencopi, and his wife Katsinmana stayed in St. George for a year in 1870 (Flake 1965:35-36). Hopi travel, voluntary and involuntary,[10] after 1890 to areas far beyond the tutskwa boundaries, has been extensive. Introduction of motorized vehicles in the 1920's and 1930's made this even more commonplace, although it is worth emphasizing that documented Hopi long-distance running is legendary. For example, Nabokov (1981:21-23) includes references to a 65-mile run accomplished in eight hours (partially at night), a 72-mile run in thirty-six hours, and most remarkable of all, a 156-mile run accomplished in approximately twenty-four hours.

In summary, any notion that the tutskwa includes the widest extent of habitual Hopi usage of the environment, let alone Hopi knowledge of geographic limits, either prehistorically, historically, or at present, is simply not credible. Hopi knowledge of and usage of a much larger environmental expanse is amply documented in many sources. Walter Hough notes that Hopi

---

[10] Involuntary travel includes to Alcatraz Island in 1894-5, and to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, Fort Huachuca, southern Arizona, and Riverside, California in 1906 and following years.

HP7539

knowledge of environmental resources is exceptional among American Indians in its extensiveness:

> The Hopi are assiduous collectors. A catalogue of the substances brought to their pueblos from long distances would awaken surprise . . . . Every house is a museum of the environment, with specimens from the mineral, animal, and vegetal kingdoms, and every Hopi is a repository of knowledge as to the places where materials may be secured. Time and distance are little thought of when it comes to procuring the materials desired (Hough 1900:465).

Writing of the 400-mile trip for moccasin dye, Hough observes:

> These journeys are common, for the Moki [Hopi] is no stay-at-home, but roams far beyond the widest view from the high vantage ground of his village, visiting the former seats of his people of by-gone centuries. Thus he knows the flora and fauna over a wide region, and is as much at home in the White Mountains as on the Great Colorado. In former times he may have journeyed to the Gulf of California for precious sea-shells, to be used as ornaments and for ceremonial trappings, or made long quests for the much prized turquois [possibly to the Kingman vicinity], just as he now goes to the Coconino canyon [Cataract Canyon] for baskets or deerskins. His face is familiar at Zuni, where he fares often on a neighborly visit (Hough 1898:138).

HP7540

IV. Cultural Meaning of the Tutskwa

Tutskwa i'gatsi -- "land and life" -- go together in Hopi thought. The mythological granting of permission for Hopis to use the tutskwa by the deity Maasaw combined the land with its life resources, from which the Hopis would gain their sustenance, and towards which they assumed responsibility to reciprocally sustain:

> [Maasaw] took this altar or tiiponi and placed it in the hands of the younger brother and told him, "I give you this symbol which represents land and life and I appoint you as the leader to take care of this land. Your name shall be Hopi and you must lead your people in this life along the good life which I have given you. Take care of your children. Take care of this land and life so that all people will be well and shall live long lives, that there shall be plenty of food for all people." (Hopi Hearings 1955:80, quoted in Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:59).

In some versions (see Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:passim), Maasaw does not actually give the Hopi his land, but merely grants them permission to use it; they are only tenants while living upon this earth, while Maasaw remains the "landlord." Again, this is associated with the entrustment of responsibility over the earth and its products (cf. Eggan 1986:6). From this viewpoint, Hopis cannot allow the land to be alienated because of an eternally binding, sacred obligation to take care of it for the supernatural owner.

Thus, Hopi conceptions of the tutskwa are fundamentally religious in orientation; they are not reducible to "real estate." Obligations to the land itself are culturally inexorable:

HP7541

> [T]ies of sentiment and association springing from residence and localization, ancestral connections, legend, myth, and religious belief, form the basis for the development of a strong bond of union between the Hopi and the land . . . (Beaglehole 1937:14).

Interdependencies between humans and other species pervade Hopi thought and practice. The fundamental form of social organization is matrilineal clans (see also Eggan 1986). The vast majority of these clans are named for a natural species or element, e.g., Bear, Badger, Deer, Rabbit, Coyote, Butterfly, Spider, Ant, Wild Millet, Tansy Mustard, Corn, Greasewood, Reed, Eagle, Sparrowhawk, Bluebird, Parrot, Sun, Star, Cloud, Snow, Fog. This is in contrast to the majority of Navajo clans, which are named after specific places (e.g., "the rock-extends-into water people"), mythico-historical events (e.g., "the monster people"), or historically observed characteristics (e.g., "the sticking-up-ears people,") (Navajo examples taken from clan list in Young and Morgan 1987:351-52).

For Hopi, there is a fundamental connection between the organization of nature in the landscape and the organization of society: the conceptual arrangement of the cosmos is reflected in the conceptual arrangement of society. Speaking of phratries (groups of related clans), R. Maitland Bradfield states:

> [T]he clan names linked together by native theorizers represent fundamental associations of ideas . . .; . . . these associations of ideas are how the Hopi classify nature and their own place in nature; . . . this classification lies at the root of the ceremonial system, the one being the outward form and affirmation of the other; and . . . the links established between certain bodies of related persons (i.e. the clans) and certain associated elements of nature (i.e. the elements represented by

HP7542

> the clan names) furnish the means by which, in their ceremonial, the Hopi community brings the communal will to bear on the environment at the point where physical action, e.g. digging the fields, cleaning the springs, setting traps for game, ends (Bradfield 1973:199).

This "totemic" identification of a social group with a species or element is more than symbolic. It affects the way that people of certain categories behave towards corresponding categories in the environment. Clans have proprietary interests in classes of environmental phenomena.

Attitudes towards a clan's wu'uya, totemic name, emblem and "spiritual ancestor," are powerful determinants of behavior:

> Between the clan group and the wuya a definite relationship exists -- the wuya is personified in part and kinship terms extended to it. The wuya protects a Hopi; he will pray to it for strength and good crops. Some informants evince a belief in descent of the clan from its wuya, but the mythological explanations generally refer to the securing of wuya and clan names as a result of events occurring after the emergence of the clans from the underworld (Eggan 1950:81).

Acquisition of the wu'uya occurred during migration. Migration legends thus refer to aspects of both natural and human presence in the landscape:

> "We were living at Kiisiwu . . . . The people had heard of Oraibi and they decided to try to move there. So we picked up and migrated over here. Our leader went to see the Oraibi Kikmongwi to ask for permission to live in the village. He refused. So we set up camp in a valley below Oraibi . . . . That first night, the leaders wanted to pray. So they set up a pongya [sand altar], right there on the ground. They started to pray. Right in the middle of their pongya a Badger emerged from the ground. That's when we became Badgers" (Whiteley 1988:51, quoting a Hopi consultant).

HP7543

Since the badger is associated in Hopi thought with medicinal roots, butterflies, porcupines, and their observed properties, Badger clan people have proprietary interests in these phenomena also (and in some additional phenomena). The association is actualized in numerous practices besides those Eggan mentions, from formal representation in ritual drama (here, especially the Powamuy ceremony, which the Badger clan owns), and extensive iteration in clan oral traditions (for example, here pertaining to a specific Kachina spirit, Tsowilaw, which accompanied the Badger clan's migrations), to the naming of children after clan prerogatives, e.g., the name "Honanheptewa" means "looking for a badger." Let me quote from a summary passage in my own work:

> Mythological history and its reenactment in ritual or its reiteration in tradition constitute crucial features of clan identity in Hopi thought. Clan traditions are matters of continuous intraclan discourse that repeatedly reaffirms marks of distinction. Such marks occupy manifold frames of reference: mythico-historical, theological, ritual, geographical, archaeological, botanical, zoological, meteorological, and so forth. In short, clans in Hopi thought are cosmological, not simply sociological, entities (Whiteley 1988:53).

Hopis, then, perceive no radical break between "nature" and "society." Interdependence and consubstantiality of humans and other species and elements are axiomatic in Hopi thought, and this has clear effects on relations with the environment (see below at 54-55).

In societies organized along totemic lines, as the great French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss (e.g., 1966) has observed, natural species, as well as being good to eat, are "good to think." The arrangement of nature into distinct classes, or

HP7544

taxa, provides a conceptual model that can be metaphorically extended into the classification of society. In the Hopi case, the species are more than "good to think" but "good to act," as becomes most evident in ceremony (the Snake Dance, which involves ritualized interaction with and manipulation of live snakes, is an apposite example). Humans then conceive of themselves as in specific environmental relationships. There is a mystical co-participation with species with whom you share the same name; hence the clan-members' intrinsic interest in propitiating their natural consociates.

A fundamental principle of Hopi metaphysics is that human thoughts and intentions produce direct effects in the environment. The environment is charged with other intentional beings, natural and supernatural, susceptible to communication and petition if properly addressed. Humans beings, then, take responsibility for ecological events. When a Hopi says that a ritual is "for rain" this is meant literally. If it does rain within four days of the performance, the ritual is considered successful. If it does not rain, or if there are adverse weather conditions, interpersonal recriminations ensue; the sponsor or his family may be accused of violating ritual prohibitions, or of not having a "pure heart" or "pure thought" deemed essential for ritual success (cf. Parsons 1925:73-74).

Similarly, famines, plagues of crop pests, disease outbreaks, and other calamities, are often interpreted as intentionally planned by society's leaders, or as direct cosmic retribution, for general failure to live up to the ethical and moral

HP7545

precepts of the Hopi way (see Whiteley 1987b). These concepts are perhaps best seen in "maqastutavo" (literally "fear teaching"), a pervasive moral doctrine that people should adhere to Hopi norms for fear of provoking inevitable supernatural repercussions against themselves or members of their families (ibid.). More dire consequences will arise if Hopis ever let go of Maasaw's teachings inscribed into the stone tablets (see above at 13-14): "'for if they ever doubted it and forsaked this stone tablet and all its teachings, they will cause a destruction of all life in this land'" (Hopi Hearings 1955:81, quoted in Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:58). Earthquake, flood, and total world destruction, caused by the Snake deity Paaloloqang, are envisaged as the apocalyptic outcome.

In short, since human thought and action directly affect the environment, Hopi moral principles are addressed not just to interpersonal relations but also to interspecific relations. The result is a moral ecology and an ecological morality. Again, this is underscored in the idea that the land is not just Hopitutskwa but Mastutskwa, Maasaw's land, and his teachings are mandatory for the proper conduct of human life in this ecosystem.[11]

Hopis consider themselves centered in this particular landscape. The particularity of the tutskwa landscape as the Hopi destiny appears repeatedly in clan migration legends, ritual

[11] One consequence of this is that Hopi statements about their use of the landscape, such as in the records of Dr. Ainsworth's interviews, tend to be especially reliable, since it is absolutely axiomatic in Hopi thinking that willful mendacity about such matters will have inevitably injurious personal and environmental effects.

HP7546

practices, and tribal traditions. Being Hopi in a cultural sense veritably demands emplacement within this landscape. In the absence of writing, the landscape itself serves as the repository of many traditional associations. For example, Kaktsintuyqa ("many Kachinas point," or "Monument Point" in English) refers to the Spanish mission period when Hopis were prevented from conducting their religion. They took Kachina performances to this place away from the fathers' attention, hence the name. Connotations of named ruins associated with clan migrations are much more elaborate. And the power of Hopi memorate tradition has been remarked on by many anthropologists: "Mythological events, the Spanish invasion and the words of Kit Carson remain equally fresh and clear in the Hopi mind" (La Farge 1937:29, Hopi Exhibit 386:29). Because of the sheer length of Hopi occupancy, then, many names in the landscape call forth deep historical associations, implanting Hopi traditional knowledge itself within a topographic matrix.

Hopi orientation in their landscape is basically centripetal. That is, they consider themselves as living at the center of the earth, Tuuwanasavi (earth center), into which they migrated according to ordained mythological destiny, and into which they solicit power from specific places and directions. As Armin Geertz (1984:230) puts it, "the Hopi consider their particular Mesa village as being the Center of the World, especially in relationship to the many ancestors who live on as invisible guardians of the boundaries of Hopiland." The clan migrations

HP7547

all followed environmental signs, often a large star, moving in gradually towards this center:

> Eventually, as you travel along, you'll see a huge star. Where you sight this star, you'll settle permanently at that spot. There you'll found a village and dwell forever. The land where that happens will be yours (Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a:63-64).

The Hopi view that their migrations led them to Tuuwanasavi, the earth's center, where they now dwell, results in a pronounced attachment to the particular landscape. This view differs qualitatively from those societies, like the Navajo for example, which do not stress geographically crucial journeys towards a center in their mythologies, histories or ritual practices. The entire Hopi ritual structure is dependent on emplacement within the particular landscape, ecology, and meteorology with its seasonal variations -- as are the ritual systems of other Pueblo societies. Hopi rituals would be meaningless outside this <u>particular</u> environment (cf. Byron Adams remarks above at 30).

HP7548

V. Religious Meaning of the Tutskwa.

It is difficult to discuss religious aspects of Hopi relationships to their environment because of institutionalized secrecy in such matters. Again, this contrasts with the relative openness of Navajo religious ideas (see Reichard 1945:199). Despite more than one hundred years of ethnological research, there are still great gaps in our understanding of Hopi religious ideas and practices. In particular, traditions associated with tuutuskya, shrines, including those marking the tutskwa boundaries, are inadequately known, because songs and sacred narrative which record specific associations occur in private rituals. On the rare occasions when outsiders have not been excluded, e.g., nineteenth century ethnologists Stephen and Voth, the sheer complexity of Hopi ritualism, lengths and numbers of songs and narratives etc., has often proved baffling (e.g., Stephen 1936:passim). On the critical need for secrecy (see also Whiteley 1987b), one of Bourke's informants stated:

> A secret order is for the benefit of the whole world, . . . and not for the exclusive benefit of the few men who belong to it. But its privileges are the property of its members, and should be preserved with jealous vigilance; since, if they become known to the whole world, they would cease to be secrets, and the order would be destroyed, and its benefit to the world would pass away (Bourke 1884:183-84).

The Hopi ritual system consists of a number of initiated religious societies (cf. Eggan 1950; Frigout 1979; Whiteley 1987a):

> A ranking of the societies into three orders of ascending importance may be constructed as follows

HP7549

> (translations are given where Hopi names are translatable): Kachina and Powamuy are third-order societies; Blue Flute, Gray Flute, Snake, Antelope, Lakon, and Owaqol are second-order societies; and Wuwtsim, One-Horn, Two-Horn, Singers, Soyalangw, and Maraw are first-order societies.
>
> Each of these societies focuses upon a different set of supernatural beings and a different set of specific concerns. The ranking into three orders parallels the age requirements for initiation into particular societies. All children aged six to ten . . . are initiated into either . . . the Kachina or the Powamuy society. After this initiation, they are eligible to join second-order societies . . . . At about age sixteen, all males (traditionally) are initiated into one of the four manhood societies (Wuwtsim, One-Horn, Two-Horn, Singers) and females into the Maraw (womanhood) society. Initiation into one of the manhood societies, together with birthright, is prerequisite to participation in the Soyalangw society . . . .
>
> The public dimension of each society's activities is concentrated at particular points in an annual liturgy (Whiteley 1987a:519).

(For the calendrical cycle of ceremonies, see Eggan 1950; Bradfield 1973; Frigout 1979; and Whiteley 1987a, among others.)

Responsibilities toward society and the environment conferred by initiation are grave; revelation of ritually secret matters is punishable by death, though this is mainly enacted supernaturally. The deep-seated sense of ritual responsibility is created by what are regarded as psychologically harrowing initiation rites.

The arrangement of rituals conforms to the cycle of the seasons. This is the case with other Pueblo religions also (see, e.g., Ortiz 1969, Parsons 1939, Bunzel 1932), and again it contrasts with the Navajo system. Anthropologists recognize two general types of religious orientation among "primitive"

HP7550

societies: those geared to communal rites performed in relation to natural cycles ("calendric rituals"), and those focused on curing sickness or misfortune in the lives of individuals ("rituals of affliction"). Affliction-centered systems tend to have far less strong connections to particular environments than do calendric systems. The Hopi system is utterly rooted in local ecology, meteorology, and seasonality. By contrast, the Navajo religious system, while clearly attentive to local landscapes, is more concerned with individual contingencies than ongoing environmental relations (cf. Reichard 1945).

Hopi rituals reflect, parallel, encourage, and sustain the natural cycle. Again, this is exactly similar to other Pueblo peoples; Alfonso Ortiz (1969) has explained this well for the Tewa, showing how the ritual cycle intersects with the seasonal requirements of nature and society. At Hopi, the Soyalanqw ceremony, for example, occurring at the Winter Solstice, ritually ensures the reversal of the sun's southward movement and serves to regenerate human, floral (both wild and cultivated), and faunal (wild and domestic) life. The Powamuy ceremony (or "Bean Dance" as it is called in English) in February ritually purifies the earth, preparing it for the growing of crops, and magically prefigures the planting season. Beans are germinated in soil boxes in the kivas by the artificial warmth of constant fires. The sprouted beans are then presented by Kachina impersonators to all the households in the village, serving as a replication in miniature of the agricultural cycle to come and a prayer for its success.

HP7551

Kachina dances in the plazas follow the early stages of growth and maturation of the crops. The Kachinas sing to the crops and bring rain to nurture them. Niman (the Home Dance) in July signals the departure of the Kachinas from their temporary residence in and around the villages for their sacred homes, some of which are in the tutskwa boundary shrines; this marks the point when the crops have attained sufficient maturity that they no longer require such acute care. The Snake-Antelope and Flute ceremonies provide one critical last bout of rain for the full maturation and healthy progeny of the plants. Ritual concern with the health and growth of game animals occurs again during the period that Hopis do most hunting, late fall and winter (Beaglehole 1936).

As Bradfield stresses, Hopi ritualism is centrally concerned with ecological conservation and the balance of human population and environmental resources:

> [B]eside its integrative function, the ceremonial cycle serves to maintain the limit which the Hopi have voluntarily set to their own use of the resources available to them. We can now see how that limit is maintained. Every relation, or at least every critical relation, between community and environment is watched over by one of the phratries; each of these, in turn, "owns" -- or is closely associated with -- one or more of the major ceremonies, the purpose of which is to promote the harmony of the relation in its care. This watchful care alone may have sufficed to keep the balance between people's needs and the capacity of the land to satisfy them; but behind it, in case it were not enough, lay the "whip" [a specific mortal disease capable of being caused by society powers] . . . which inheres in each ceremony, ready to be exercised on the communal behalf by the fraternity responsible for carrying out its rites (Bradfield 1973:295).

HP7552

At the same time as focusing upon environmental concerns, Hopi rituals also enact sociological concerns. Powamuy, for example, marks the migration to Hopi of the proprietary clan, Badger. Before admission to a Hopi village, a clan had to prove ritual capability to influence the environment beneficially. So the clan performed its ceremony, which with Badger was Powamuy. Hence the enactment of Powamuy also commemorates migration and original performance prior to acceptance into the village. The ritual is thus a "social charter" of clan rights within Hopi society.

At Powamuy, a dawn procession from outside the village reproduces the Badger clan's migration route, naming the places where they stopped, and gradually processing into the village. Prior to the public ceremony the participants undertake a pilgrimage to Kiisiwu, by a special route with prescribed stops along the way there and back (this is recorded in other sources, but my account is taken from a participant in 1987). At Kiisiwu, they conduct a number of rites and bring back spruce boughs which form part of the Kachina costumes. Such trips are sacred, conforming to religious pilgrimage patterns elsewhere (cf. Turner and Turner 1978). Discussion is kept to a minimum, and upon return, each participant must recount in detail his experiences and observations of the country passed through. The diary of Crow-Wing, a First Mesa man, recounts these practices:

> They camped on their way, in the afternoon they came back. The chief gives them a smoke and then he asks them about their journey. They tell about their journey to Black Mountain . . . [o]ne of the abodes of the kachina. Messengers are supposed to relate

HP7553

> all the details of their trip; whom they met, how these are dressed, what they say, where they were going, what they carried; where the messengers have camped, where they found snow, where the trail was muddy, where they deposited their prayer-offerings, where they got their twigs (Parsons 1925:37).

I have been given a very similar account of a pilgrimage to the Aalosaka shrine on the San Francisco Peaks. No detail of thoughts or sense impressions is too minute to be of significance. It is as if the experiences, the thoughts and impressions themselves, provide "electrical" conduits to the shrine, retrieving its associated power and connecting it into the village centers.

Thus, the bringing in of power from the outlying shrine is both symbolic and actual. The clan migration route is both acted out in symbolic drama in the village and in the actual revisiting of points along the route. Clan ruins and other outlying shrines are both commemorated and drawn upon for their resources, natural (i.e., gathered products) and supernatural. Ancestral spirits at the shrines are renewed and propitiated in their local capacity as guardians of the tutskwa boundaries. Page and Page (1982a:217-39) have documented a 1981 Hopi pilgrimage to the outlying tutskwa shrines. As Armin Geertz puts it:

> Pilgrimages are made to the various ruins which Hopi Clan Migration Mythology lays claim to, and which are guarded by the . . . clan ancestors. . . . [C]lans made journies[sic] to the former homes of their ancestors in order to keep an eye on the ruins, to keep the spirits alive as boundary guardians and to notify them whenever major ceremonials were to be performed at home (A. Geertz 1984:230).

HP7554

Fewkes (1900a:591-92) records this procedure for the Flute and other ceremonies. He especially notes the visitation of clan ruins during the ceremonies:

> This symbolic reception of the Flute priests [into Walpi by the Bear and Snake chiefs] not only dramatizes a historic event in the growth of Walpi, but also displays a tendency to visit old sites of worship during ceremonies, and to regard water from ancient springs as efficacious in modern religious performances. It is a common feature of great ceremonies to procure water from old springs for altar rites, and these springs are generally situated near ancestral habitations now in ruins.
>
> This tendency is illustrated in the Sio-calako or Zuni Calako ceremony celebrated at Sichumovi in July, when the chiefs procure sacred water from a spring near St Johns, Arizona, called Wenima, the ancient home of the Hopi and Zuni Calako. The Kwakwantu chief obtains water for some of his ceremonies from a spring called Sipabi [on the Little Colorado], where the Patki clans, who introduced the Kwakwantu, once lived. The Piba chief of the Tataukyamu procures water from Clear creek, near the ruin of Cakwabaiyaki, the former home of the Piba clans (Fewkes 1900a:592).

Typical Hopi ritual practice involves a nine-day or sixteen-day ceremony, with private rituals in kivas culminating in a public sacred drama. Private rituals are multifarious, but generally include much prayer, singing of traditional songs, and recounting of ritual narratives, focused around a naanan'i'vopongya, or "all-directions altar" (A. Geertz 1984:231). The protagonists must obey numerous ritual prohibitions, their central effort being to concentrate their thoughts harmoniously towards the success of their ceremony. The power of thought has been noted above; "pure thoughts" or "pure hearts" are essential to ritual success (Whorf 1956:61-62 expands upon these ideas in the context of Hopi linguistic concepts).

HP7555

Altars show particularly well the centripetal emphasis in Hopi ritual practice. The base of the altar is a sandpainting aligned according to Hopi directions:

> The Hopi six-directional system consists of a pole (atkyamiq "below," and oomiq "above") and a system of four solstitial directions (kwiniwiq "northwest," teevenqe "southwest," taatoq "southeast," and hoopoq "northeast").
>
> * * *
>
> The use of this astrospherical system is best illustrated in ritual contexts, specifically the six-directional altar. Here we find that the bearing principle is that of the center. This altar has a bowl filled with sacred water. Radiating from its center are six lines of meal. At the ends of these lines are placed corn-cobs, bird skins, animal skins, stones and other utensils -- all with the corresponding directional color. These objects point towards the center, and all ritual involvement in connection with this altar is towards the center. In other words, the ritual movement is . . . "centripetal" . . . (A. Geertz and Lomatuway'ma 1987:100-101 n.11).

In a sense, the altar is an icon of the Hopi cosmos, reproducing it in miniature, and bringing in to the village blessings, especially in the form of clouds and rain, from the outer boundaries. This centripetal pattern is also parallel with other Pueblo ritual practices, and again contrasts with Navajo:

> The elaboration of the notion of the center has the further implication that the dominant spatial orientation, as well as that of motion, is centripetal or inward. That is to say, all things are defined and represented by reference to a center. The contrast has often been noted between the Pueblos and the Navajo, who have a dominant centrifugal orientation. Thus a Pueblo priest, when setting out a dry painting, will first carefully set out the boundaries and then work his way inward toward the center. The Navajo singer, on the other hand, will work outward from the middle. Dry painting, one of the most sacred acts performed in either culture and in both cases intended to represent some aspect of

HP7556

> the cosmos, has implications for understanding well-known differences in other art forms, in dance, in subsistence and in settlement patterns (Ortiz 1972:142-43).

Again, it should be stressed that in Hopi ritual, these patterns are followed not only in symbolic action, but also literally, involving regular journeys to outlying parts of the tutskwa to bring in necessary ritual materials -- spring-water, pine, spruce, cottonwood, turtles, eagles, pigments, etc. Crow-Wing's diary (Parsons 1925:passim), for example, is replete with references to such trips. Nowadays, with motorized vehicles, such journeys are easier to accomplish and may in some instances be more frequent than in the past.

Some Hopi religious practices have ceased during the twentieth century, but since some have been subsequently revitalized, it is not possible to determine whether in particular cases a demise has been final. At Third Mesa especially, the only societies still practicing as extensively as in the past are the third-order societies (I have chronicled these changes elsewhere (Whiteley 1988)). The fullest ritual cycles are maintained at Second Mesa, especially Shongopavi, where all the above-mentioned societies remain fully operative. Shongopavi tradition is that it should actively maintain the ritual cycle in part so that if other villages want to reactivate any ceremonies, the necessary expertise will be available.

HP7557

The diminution of some religious practices does not, however, materially affect the religious relationship to the environment. At every village on all Mesas, the Kachina cult continues to flourish. It is regarded as the basic underlying form of Hopi religion, open to all, in contrast to the higher order societies, which are exclusive and more esoteric. As Edward Kennard notes:

> The Kachina cult, however, is distinguished from the others in that every man, woman, and child is initiated into it and every man takes an active part in its dances throughout his life. Furthermore, fully half the year is devoted to the various ceremonies which are part of the cult and the ideas associated with it are constantly reflected in daily life and folklore (Earle and Kennard 1971:3-4).

The Kachina concept is complex:

> The term Kachina in Hopi applies to a number of distinct things which are all associated in the Hopi mind. It refers to the masked and painted impersonation, to the spiritual being impersonated, to the clouds, and to the dead (ibid.:4).
>
> Kachinas appear in numerous guises and represent many features of the natural and supernatural worlds. They are dramatized in masked impersonation and in stories, where they appear in the forms of animals, plants, birds, the sun, and stars and as spirits such as the War Twins, sky deities, culture heroes and so on. Some kachinas also represent game animals, and kachinas associated with the directions are also linked with hunting. Kachinas dwell in locations on the edges of the bounded world: in mountains, for instance, or in lakes or other sites associated with the powers of moisture. The three concepts of the dead, the clouds, and the kachinas overlap: the dead may become kachinas, and kachinas may manifest themselves as clouds. The interrelation among clouds, the dead, and kachinas points up a significant concern of Pueblo beliefs and ritual practices: the importance of rainfall in this largely arid environment is paramount, and the kachinas, as rain spirits, have the power to bring rain to nourish the crops -- the central link in the Pueblo chain of being (Whiteley 1987a:517).

HP7558

Kachinas are thus multiform characterizations, again linking representations of environment and society, since they embody both natural features and moral qualities associated with the most desired forms of Hopi behavior. With Kachinas as reincarnations of the dead and as clouds of the four directions, the cyclical emphasis in Hopi religion and the reciprocity between humans and the environment become most apparent: the dead form the substance which nourishes all forms of life upon which the living subsist (see also Eggan 1986:3-4,19).

The association of Kachinas with outlying shrines is explicit (cf. Eggan 1986:15). At the "Home Dance" they are sent back to their spiritual homes, a principal one of which is at Nuvatukya'ovi (San Francisco Peaks). Before this dance, as well as before Powamuy and other Kachina dances, participants go to another Kachina shrine at Kiisiwu (see above at 62). Numerous materials collected from outlying areas -- turtles (for rattles) and cottonwood (for drums) from the Little Colorado, spruce and water from Kiisiwu and Nuvatukya'ovi, eagles from throughout the tutskwa, etc. (see Ainsworth 1988, maps 20a, 20b, 20c) -- are for the Kachina performances. From July to December the Kachinas live at the outlying shrines around the tutskwa boundaries. During the Kachina season (December to July), they come to dwell around the villages:

> at shrines and springs bearing names associated with them. The number of these sacred places is legion and they are constantly referred to in song and prayer. They are also the places where offerings of prayer sticks and sacred meal are made for the Kachinas (Earle and Kennard 1971:7).

HP7559

Another, linked, religious use of the tutskwa, often particularly its outer areas, is for gathering eagles (see Ainsworth 1988:76-81,84). Eagle feathers have multiple ceremonial uses, and form a central means of communication with deities, especially through prayer-feathers. Bradfield (1973:5254) has documented the significance of prayer-feathers, suggesting that it is in this practice that Hopi "religious ideas . . . receive their most complete outward expression, are indeed epitomised . . ." (1973:52).

Expressing serious concern over Navajo destruction of nests in his clan gathering area, an Eagle clan elder stated in 1981, "eagles are our life-line." For his meaning, the association between the dead and the living (above) is important as well as the exceptional way in which eagles are conceptualized in Hopi culture. After they are captured, eagles are treated as human beings; young eagles are felt to be Hopi ancestors reincarnated. They are, accordingly, baptised and named, just like human babies; given children's gifts; and finally formally buried in a special eagle cemetery at the outskirts of each village. While many interactions with natural species contain ritual, no other species is treated in this way as human beings. Bradfield summarizes the writings of Voth (1912:105-109), Fewkes (1900b:690-707), Beaglehole (1936:18-22) and Stephen (1936:568-69) on eagle gathering:[12]

---

[12] For recent accounts of eagle-gathering practices, see Page and Page 1982a:192-203; Page and Page 1982b:626-29.

HP7560

The territory around the Hopi villages where eagles are to be found is, and has been for a long time past, divided into portions or allotments, which are controlled by particular clans and lineages. Every spring, in May or early June, hunting expeditions set out to procure young birds at the nest, both of eagles . . . themselves and of the larger kinds of hawk . . . . When captured, the young birds are tied to wooden racks and carried back to the villages;[13] there they are kept on the flat roof tops,[14] tied by one leg to a beam or stone to prevent their escape, and fed daily on rabbits, field rats and other small rodents; by late July, the young birds should be full grown. During the nine days of the Nima'n katcina festival, they are treated with special care and attention, then -- early on the morning of the tenth day -- all the birds in the village are ceremonially killed. The killing of the eagles is done in a special, prescribed manner: while one man holds the thong attached to the bird's leg, another throws a cloth or a blanket over its head, pulls the bird to the ground and kills it by pressure exerted on the heart and throat. No eagle is killed by any other method . . .; and each bird is killed in this way -- 'that its breath may mount to Cloud with the Hopi prayers for rain, that its breath-body may return to its real home' (Stephen 1936, p. 569).

When life is extinct, the large feathers are plucked and carefully sorted; the body is then flayed, and the skin with the remaining feathers carefully dried and preserved. Five prayer feathers . . . are tied to the corpse, one to the beak, one to the tip of each wing, and one to each leg just above the claws: this is done, so that 'the eagles should not be angry but hatch young eagles again next year' (Voth [1912], p. 108). Some

---

[13] Nowadays, pick-up trucks are used instead of hand-carrying on wooden racks.

[14] Bradfield here footnotes:

> Beaglehole states (1936, pp. 20-1) that, as the birds come from clan-owned cliffs and buttes, they are considered to be 'children' of the clan; and that, on the return of the hunting party to the village, the women of the clan should assemble, wash the head of each eagle, and ceremonially name it with an appropriate clan name.

HP7561

> rolls of blue pi'ki, corn meal and a woven tray are prepared, then the carcass, prayer-offerings and a pointed stick are taken to the graveyard especially devoted to eagles; a hole is dug with the pointed stick, and prayers offered that the soul ('breath body') of the eagle may fly back to the buttes, there to be born again; then the body of the bird, with the food, is buried in the eagle grave . . . (Bradfield 1973:239).

As Ellis (1974:152, Hopi Exhibit 2:166) points out, captured eagles are thought to be "'dead Hopi who have returned to the village disguised as eagles.'" This ancestral connection reveals several important features. First, it clarifies the reverence with which eagles are treated.

Second, it explains the proprietary interests which Hopis hold towards eagles; not simply general reincarnations, they are reborn clan ancestors, who dwell, appropriately, near clan ruins. Hence the division of eagle-gathering territories by clan reflects the migrations:

> In their early migrations from distant pueblos to their ultimate homes, each clan halted at intervals, where towns were built but afterward deserted. . . . [T]hus . . . certain tracts of land are regarded as the property of this or that clan. The present ownership of eagle-nests in the vicinity is a survival of a similar claim (Fewkes 1900b, quoted in Ellis 1974:149, Hopi Exhibit 2:163).

Third, this equation of eagles and Hopi ancestors clarifies the role of eagles as guardians of the tutskwa boundaries, in that they dwell near clan ruins, from where they watch over their Hopi descendants -- just as, when captured and tethered on the rooftops, they watch more closely over the villagers and judge whether they are living properly (cf. Page and Page 1982b:628-29).

HP7562

Fourth, the equation explains why Hopis are so adamant about their rights to gather live eagles from their specific clan nests. Despite harassment by Navajos while collecting eagles, at least since the turn of the century (Fewkes 1900b, quoted in Ellis 1974, Hopi Exhibit 2:162), Hopis have indefatigably insisted upon their clan gathering areas, and explicitly associate these with the tutskwa boundaries. It is interesting to note that current conflict over eagle gathering (e.g., Gallup Independent 7-25-1988) replicates exactly issues reported independently by anthropologists in 1900, 1915, and the mid-1930's. The Hopi have consistently stated the same claims:

> It thus appears that the present claims to ownership of eagle-nests are based mainly on the situation near former places of residence. This fact can hardly be regarded as a mere coincidence, nor do the Hopi consider it as such; indeed, they regard their proprietorship as proof that the country in which eagle-nests are situated is theirs, and have repeatedly urged me to so inform those engaged in surveying the boundaries of their reservation (Fewkes 1900b:693-700, quoted in Ellis 1974:151, Hopi Exhibit 2:165).
>
> The curious fact comes out that these eagle preserves are near the place of ancient occupancy of the clans and show in a most interesting way the lines of migration by which the several clans traveled to the villages where they now live. These rights are jealously guarded by the Hopi and are one of the sore spots in their relations with the Navaho; they frequently ask to have the government define their eagle reservations by survey to establish the boundaries free from molestation (Hough 1915:169-170, quoted in Ellis 1974, Hopi Exhibit 2:161).
>
> The buttes on which eagle nests are to be found are owned by the various clans in each village and under no circumstances do members of one clan trespass on the buttes owned by another group. The buttes are situated in the country surrounding the mesas and may be forty miles or more away from the village.

HP7563

> Clan ownership rights are established by legendary accounts of clan migrations which usually relate, along with other incidents, how the clan in question came to possess particular buttes. Unfortunately, the Navaho are unable to appreciate the Hopi viewpoint on this matter, and their rival claim to control of certain buttes is at present the source of much petty quarreling, and was probably in former times a potent cause for intertribal warfare (Beaglehole 1936:18, quoted in Ellis 1974, Hopi Exhibit 2:160).

Current reports of disputes with Navajos about eagle-collecting rights demonstrate the continuity of beliefs and practices discussed above:

> Each summer, the Hopis rear the young eagles as spiritual children of Hopi clans.
>
> "These eagles are human, just like you and me," says Archie Humeyestewa, a member of the tribe's Two Horn religious society. "They're not here on earth for no reason. They're here for a purpose."
>
> * * *
>
> "I want to continue coming to these buttes, where I've been going for all the time that I can remember, and my forefathers and uncles," [Harlan] Williams says. "I don't go out and bother anything All I'm doing is going to my shrines. And if eagles are there, I receive them."
>
> * * *
>
> From rooftops, Hopis say, the eagles watch over the villages to see whether people are leading proper lives.
>
> * * *
>
> "The whole family structure centers on the eagles when they are brought in. . . . Then the family has to observe a strict code of conduct during the time they are keeping the eagles," said [Vernon] Masayesva. "No arguments, no fighting within the house, because the eagle is right there" (Gallup Independent 7-25-1988).

HP7564

In short, the persistence of eagle gathering attests to the vital role this religious activity plays in Hopi culture. Its explicit association with the tutskwa boundaries, through the equation of eagles and living embodiments of clan ancestors at established clan ruins, makes this practice of particular importance to the present case.

HP7565

VI. "Religious" and "Economic" Use of the Tutskwa

Several writers, including expert witnesses, have pointed out the inseparability of Hopi "religious" and "economic" practices. For example:

> All actions, including the collection of daily subsistence needs, are a part of the religious cycle, and the practice of Hopi religion, conversely, is an aspect of subsistence in the Hopi way of thinking (Ainsworth 1988:5).

> The Hopi have no word for "religion" as such because for them virtually all aspects of their life have a sacred quality. Relatively isolated in their land for centuries, they have integrated their subsistence practices, their land base, their social organization, and their cosmology into one interdependent whole (Eggan 1986:20).

In the sections above on cultural and religious meaning of the tutskwa, it was stressed that Hopi social organization and religious practices have their primary focus upon relations with the environment. The great majority of religious practices are designed to maintain the chain of all being and the flow of all life. The fundamental axiom that human thought affects ecological conditions underlies this concentration upon environmental equilibrium. This is a difficult landscape to wrest a living from, and, as numerous anthropologists have observed (e.g., C. Geertz 1966), a society's religious foci tend to reflect areas of ongoing social concern.

In the present century, economic patterns have followed two paths: the traditional, i.e., subsistence, economy; and participation in the national society's system, i.e., cash economy. The cash economy has had increasing influence in Hopi life (see,

HP7566

e.g., Whiteley 1988:138-161), but the traditional economy has remained vital, not purely for physical survival, but for what Hopis consider important for the perpetuation of their distinctiveness as culturally Hopi. While one can buy lettuce and radishes from the supermarket, one cannot buy nepni (greens), höhöösi (Hopi tea), piiva (Hopi tobacco), or hoohu (juniper), etc., there. Thus Hopi interest in the tutskwa for gathering purposes, for example, finds no acceptable substitute in the cash economy, and, as a traditional practice consciously maintained, continues to constitute a significant aspect of cultural identity, as Ainsworth (1988:5) and Nagata (1970:219) emphasize.

A key element in Hopi thinking about traditional religio-economic activity is the idea of reciprocity; the interdependence of clan groups, of men and women, of old and young, of humans and other species, of the living and the dead, requires ongoing reciprocal exchanges in order to sustain the processes of life. Concerning the relationship between "religion" and "economics" I have elsewhere focused upon the sexual division of labor as embodying their inseparability:

> Male involvement in the subsistence economy was devoted primarily to agriculture, herding, and hunting . . . . All three activities were practiced away from the village, in fields, grazing, or hunting areas. . . . [Men] cultivate (and herd and hunt) away from the village and bring the finished products in to the village to present to its rightful owners, the women.
>
> Women's major economic activities are the processing, preparation, and distribution of the produce provided by men. . . . In the sense that the domestic economy is female-owned, largely female-organized, and female-articulated, the role of males

HP7567

> as providers of the raw materials is conceptually subsidiary.
>
> In ritual and politics . . . the pattern is converse. Men are the major ritual and political protagonists.
>
> * * *
>
> For the most part, women's ritual and political roles are subsidiary (Whiteley 1988:163-64).

The reciprocal arrangement of relations between males and females, as primarily "ritualists" and "economists" respectively, produces overall coherence in the organization of Hopi life:

> For ceremonies, women mostly provide food, which is not symmetrically equivalent to the "raw materials" men provide for the domestic economy. In a sense, however, the circle of reciprocity can be extended, since the intent of much ritual action is to produce beneficial conditions for the crops [and other subsistence produce] -- which eventually become these "raw materials" (Whiteley 1988:324 n.2).

Let me give an abbreviated example of how such cycles of reciprocity work. A Hopi man plants his field with corn; as soon as he has planted the seeds (the reproductive metaphor is explicit), the growing plants become the "property" of his wife, for whom he will take care of them until they are mature (the role of a father in raising children for his wife's clan is similar). As part of this nurturance, he must perform certain religious activities, such as participating in the Niman Kachina ceremony. For this, he will undertake a pilgrimage to Kiisiwu, where he will collect spruce, a powerful source for attracting moisture for the crops, for the Kachina costume. When cutting the spruce, as in virtually all activities in the environment (including antelope hunting, eagle gathering, spring visitation,

HP7568

farming etc.) he presents the tree with a paaho, prayer-feather, a basic sacred device for communicating between humans, natural, and supernatural forces. Crow-Wing describes this as follows:

> When they get to the pine trees, at the first tree they will tie on some prayer-feathers, then they will cut branches from another tree[15] and put them into the sack to take home (Parsons 1925:81).

The man takes the spruce boughs home and presents them to those who will use them in the Kachina costumes. The ceremony is a prayer for rain to Hopi ancestors to manifest themselves as clouds to produce rain for the crops to sustain the living. At the end of the ceremony, men from the audience take the spruce boughs from the Kachinas and plant them in their fields, again wishing to attract moisture. At the conclusion of the growing season -- the successful realization of his sacred and secular attentions -- the man presents his wife with the crop. She prepares it and presents it as cooked food to her family and others who are sustained by it.

The reciprocal links in this example between male and female, between human, natural and supernatural, between farmers and Kachinas, and between living and dead, interweave so completely that to isolate supposedly "religious" from supposedly "economic" threads would simply vitiate the reality. All aspects of subsistence practices are reflected in Hopi ritual activities.

---

[15] Parsons here footnotes:

> Here is what we may call conservation ritual. The tree to which the prayer-feathers are tied is prayed to, for increase and for indulgence towards cutting down one of its kindred.

HP7569

Symbolism dominantly pertains to the maize cycle, but all species and natural elements are represented in one way or another (there are cow and sheep kachinas for grazing, badger kachinas for medicine, numerous hunter kachinas etc.).

The concern with rainfall also highlights an explicit attention to ecological interdependency:

> At the conclusion of . . . [the Kachina] dances we present them with paaho and pray that they take our messages in all directions so that we may be constantly visited by rain. <u>But a Hopi does not pray solely for himself; he prays for everyone who is thirsty, including animals and plants</u>. He prays to the Kachinas for rain for all things (Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987b:293, my emphasis).

The numerous petitions requesting return of the <u>tutskwa</u> to Hopi control cite both ritual usages (eagle gathering, shrine visitation, turtle gathering, pigment gathering, etc.) and straightforward subsistence usages, <u>i.e.</u>, for livestock, hunting, food gathering, fuel gathering, etc. As chiefs Saloftoche and Kolchovtewah told a Congressional Hearing in 1932:

> [Saloftoche:] The Hopi Indian chiefs want their own boundary line, just as we have been talking about on these petitions, and that has been spoken to you or read to you. You understand what it is all about. This reservation here where we Hopis are located now is to us something like a capital. There is no other place for the other things for the Hopis except this. This little village here, as the map shows you, is the ground where the village stands. We cannot raise our cattle and sheep right in our homes and in our fields right surrounding that. That is the reason we have this boundary petition that we want, as the old people want it as theirs and what belonged to the Hopis in the early days.
>
> [Kolchovtewah:] [T]he Navajo Indians live around this [Hopi] country and steal our cattle, our horses, our seed [sheep?], our corn, and our beans. That is why we want you people, our brothers, to fix this land for us and then we will have more room for

HP7570

> the cattle and then we will have something. . . . [W]e want some more and bigger land for our cattle, and feed to make something from our country. That [traditional area] is what the Hopi Indian chieftans [sic] want you to fix as his [their] land (Boundary Hearings, Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservation 1932:19-20,23, Hopi Exhibit 143:21-22,25, partially quoted in Godfrey 1988a:208-209).

Finally, Hopi attitudes towards the environment reveal economic and religious concerns simultaneously. I noted above at 78 Crow-Wing's account of spruce cutting, and Parsons' comment that it embodies a conservation ritual. Conservation motifs pervade Hopi ritual practices. Outsiders' expressions of concern that Hopi eagle gathering is just another form of reckless human endangerment totally misconstrue Hopi intentions and Hopi practices they believe (and several hundred years of experience would support) ensure perpetuation of a species they consider embodies their own ancestors:

> Near the school of Dawapa (Sun Spring) below Walpi, is the eagle egg shrine where "eggs," stone and wood have been placed with prayers for increase of eagles (Fewkes 1900b:171-72, quoted in Ellis 1974:151, Hopi Exhibit 2:165).

Jake and Susanne Page, after documenting an eagle-gathering pilgrimage in 1981, expressed concern for the species to an informed colleague, Edward Ayensu, Director of the Smithsonian Institution's Biological Conservation Office. His reply:

> "The Hopi are among the best eagle managers we have, in the sense of wildlife management. It is not the Hopi who have put eagles on the list of endangered species. It is our civilization. . ." (Page and Page 1982a:195).[16]

---

[16] The golden eagles that the Hopi collect are not an endangered species.

HP7571

Emphasis on conservation is central in Bradfield's account of Hopi relations with the environment (Bradfield 1973, and see above at 61). Dr. Ainsworth has underscored this in his report (e.g., at 3), and commenting upon Beaglehole's account of hunting ritual, notes:

> These elaborate preparations indicate the interest and care the Hopi took in the process of hunting, the place of ritual in hunting, and the reverence in which Hopis held land and animals (Ainsworth 1988:68).

Similarly, Nequatewa has documented specific practices of "respect" for game animals:

> To a Hopi all the game animals are people . . . . The Hopi believe that animals have homes, like kivas, all over the world and when they need rest they go home and convert themselves into human beings and live in these places. To get the confidence of the game animals, big and small, a Hopi has to be an early riser and go out at dawn asking for their mercy, saying that he wishes to eat their flesh for food and would like to be selected as their god-father and be allowed to catch them at the time of the hunt (Nequatewa 1946:61).

In short, there can be no meaningful division of usage of the tutskwa for "religious" as opposed to "economic" practices. Hopi religion is principally addressed to the tutskwa environment, as this provides for the sustenance of life, i.e., the economy. The complete interweaving of practices outsiders would regard as "economic" with those labeled "ritual," "symbolic," or "religious," suggests a non-Hopi cultural origin for such conceptual divisions. Hopi need for the tutskwa is not for some arcane or unfathomable mystical reasons; rather Hopi survival, as a cultural as well as physical process, requires access to the material resources of the tutskwa, whether these are used in an

HP7572

overtly "economic" way or whether their economic utility is mediated through practices an outsider would label "religious."

The usages detailed in the Hopi expert witness reports are mutually confirming as to extent of Hopi utilization of the vast majority of the 1934 area (with the possible exception, owing to lack of concentrated research there, of a portion outside the northeastern tutskwa boundary -- but see my note 4, and also Godfrey 1988a:55). The extent of overlap in areas covered from a) documentary historical sources (Euler 1988; Godfrey 1988a, 1988b; McCawley 1987), b) Hopi interviews and oral traditions (Ainsworth 1988), c) culled ethnographic sources (Ainsworth 1988; Eggan 1986; Euler 1988; Godfrey 1988a, 1988b), and d) agronomically specifiable range use areas (McCawley 1987), is striking. Hopi farming (Ainsworth 1988; Godfrey 1988b), Hopi grazing (Ainsworth 1988; Godfrey 1988a; McCawley 1987), Hopi gathering and hunting (Ainsworth 1988; Godfrey 1988b), and Hopi "religious" usage (especially Ainsworth 1988; Eggan 1986) -- involving gathering and hunting of additional floral and faunal species and collection of minerals -- have all continued to occur throughout the tutskwa (and beyond), including most of the 1934 area, since prehistory (Adams 1987). While some areas are especially reserved for certain practices (farming areas are kept distinct from grazing areas, for example), numerous areas -- especially towards the tutskwa boundaries -- overlap in functions. So, in these areas, gathering of eagles coincides with gathering of other species and minerals, with cattle herding, and with rabbit hunting, for example. Such overlap is a common feature of gathering-hunting

HP7573

practices in many societies worldwide. Further, given areal variation in annual and periodic occurrence of moisture and species distribution, the availability of a significantly larger area than that utilized in any one year is essential for the continuance of the multiple practices sustaining the Hopi way of life.

HP7574

VII. Conclusion

I have emphasized several issues regarding Hopi conceptions of and relations to their environment.

The Hopi claim to the tutskwa must be treated seriously, since Hopis have insistently reiterated this claim for more than a hundred years.

The claim is not an unreasonable demand that reflects the extent of Hopi geographical knowledge, but only the central core of their known usage areas in historic times.

The relationship of Hopis to their environment, as revealed in social organization, traditions of migration, ritual activities, etc., fundamentally situates the Hopi in this particular environment at Tuuwanasavi, earth center. The specific landscape is charged with deep historical meanings and moral obligations, both to ancestors and to other resident species and elements, all of which play definitive roles in the religiously and economically enacted perpetuation of the Hopi chain of being. Between these different kinds of occupants of the tutskwa Hopis perceive a thoroughgoing consubstantiality.

Hopi cosmology is utterly entrenched in the proximate landscape; it is not a cosmology, like that of a world religion such as Christianity or of a nomadic society such as the Navajo, which is easily transportable from one geographic locale to another.

Traditional religious activity pertaining to the tutskwa claim was vital in 1934 and is vital in 1988, as is particularly

HP7575

evidenced in the tribal-wide vigor of the Kachina cult, and the continuation, despite many years of physical harassment by Navajos, of eagle gathering.

Let me conclude with some contemporary Hopi statements, translated into English, regarding their relationship to the tutskwa, via traditional commandments regarded as eternally binding. After emergence at the sipaapuni, the Hopi were given instructions for their migrations by the deity Maasaw:

> "All right, you will now journey forth from here. Mark well how you conduct your life. Be kind to one another and don't live dissolutely. Spread out across the land and be sure to establish settlements. As you trek along, heap such things as ashes and trash near your villages because your communities are bound to fall into ruin one day. But ashes and trash will be easily recognizable and never disappear. They will serve as markers of how much land I granted you."
>
> * * *
>
> "Do not cede your land to anyone; don't ever give it away. Above all, don't sell it to anybody. After all, it is to provide your nourishment. Hold this land dear like a mother as long as you live."
>
> * * *
>
> "Do not become bewildered or confused. Hold on to your land holdings which have been given to you. They have been given to you and therefore are yours. Don't give up the land. Above all, hold on to your tradition which is grounded in this land. If once you give your land, your tradition will begin to dry up and lose its value" (Malotki and Lomatuway'ma 1987a: 64-65, 76, [the last passage quoted from Hopi Hearings 1955:87]).

HP7576

VIII. Bibliography

Adams, Byron et al., 6-1-1924, Petition. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #259: 56804-24-059 Hopi). (Cover letter, 7-16-1924, Miller to CIA, is Hopi Exhibit 77).

Adams, Byron, 1939, Information Concerning Hopi Land Problems. Report for the Land Claims Commission (C.E. Rachford). (Part of Hopi Exhibit 399.)

Adams, E. Charles, 1987, Hopi Use, Occupancy, and Possession of the Indian Reservation defined by the Act of June 14, 1934: An Archaeological Perspective. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Adams, Eleanor B., and Fray Angelico Chavez, 1956, The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Atanasio Dominguez with other Contemporary Documents. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque. (Hopi Exhibit 4.)

Ainsworth, Allan D., 1988, Hopi Use and Occupancy of the Indian Reservation Defined by the Act of June 14, 1934: A Sociocultural Perspective in the Use of Natural Resources by the Hopi Indians. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Arizona Miner, 4-25-1866, Moqui Indians.

Beaglehole, Ernest, 1936, Hopi Hunting and Hunting Ritual. Yale University Publications in Anthropology 4. New Haven.

Beaglehole, Ernest, 1937, Notes on Hopi Economic Life. Yale University Publications in Anthropology 15. New Haven.

Boundary Hearings, Navajo-Hopi Indian Reservation, 1932, Hearing Before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, December 7, 1932. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C. (Hopi Exhibit 143.)

Bourke, John G., 1884, The Snake Dance of the Moquis of Arizona. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York.

Bradfield, R. Maitland, 1973, A Natural History of Associations, vol. 2. Duckworth. London.

Bunzel, Ruth, 1932, Introduction to Zuni Ceremonialism. Forty-Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology.

Clemmer, Richard O., 1978, Continuities of Hopi Culture Change. Acoma Books. Ramona, Cal.

HP7577

Cochise, George, 5-8-1909, Letter to Ralph Collins. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #255: 50522-09-313-Moqui).

Collier, John, 7-14-1938, Commissioner John Collier's Meeting with the Hopi Indians at Oraibi, Arizona. (Hopi Exhibit 306.)

Collier, John, 10-9-1940, Letter to the Secretary of the Interior. (Hopi Exhibit 320.)

Collier, John, 3-25-1944, Letter to Ray Seumptewa.

Collins, Ralph P., 6-24-1909, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #255: 50522-09-313-Moqui).

Colton, Harold S., 5-16-1932, Letter To Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs J. Henry Scattergood. (Hopi Exhibit 364.)

Colton, Harold S., 6-10-1932, Letter to Hopi Superintendent E.K. Miller. (Hopi Exhibit 133.)

Colton, Harold S., 1939, Report on Hopi Boundary. (Hopi Exhibit 459.)

Colton, Harold S., 1964, Principal Hopi Trails. Plateau, 36:3:91-94.

Conference on Hopi Extension Area, 4-24-1939, [John Collier and Hopi delegates]. (Part of Hopi Exhibit 397.)

Conference on Hopi Extension Area, 4-25-1939, [John Collier and Hopi delegates -- continuation of 4-24-1939, above]. (Part of Hopi Exhibit 397.)

Coochwytewa et al., 3-2-1933, Letter to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. (Hopi Exhibit 445.)

Correll, Lee, 1972, Who Really Lived in Dispute Area? Navajo Times 10-19-1972, C1-C10.

Coues, Elliott, 1900, On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer: The Diary and Itinerary of Francisco Garces (Missionary Priest) in his Travels through Sonora, Arizona, and California, 1775-1776. Francis P. Harper. New York. (Hopi Exhibit 6.)

Crane, Leo, 3-12-1918, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (Hopi Exhibit 55.)

Cushing, Frank H., 1922, Oraibi in 1883. In "Contributions to Hopi History," edited by E.C. Parsons, pp. 253-68. American Anthropologist 24:3:253-98.

HP7578

Cushing, Frank H., 1965 [1882], The Nation of the Willows. Northland Press. Flagstaff.

Defrees, W.S., 4-8-1874, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. National Archives.

Dockstader, Frederick J., 1985 (rev. ed.) The Kachina and the White Man: a Study of the Influences of White Culture on the Hopi Kachina Cult. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.

Donaldson, Thomas, 1893, Moqui Pueblo Indians of Arizona and Pueblo Indians of New Mexico: Extra Census Bulletin. U.S. Census Printing Office. Washington, D.C.

Earle, Edwin and Edward A. Kennard, 1971, Hopi Kachinas (second edition). Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation. New York.

Eggan, Fred, 1950, Social Organization of the Western Pueblos. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Eggan, Fred, 1986, The Hopi Indians, with Special Reference to their Cosmology or World View, as Expressed in their Traditions, Religious Beliefs, Practices, and Social Organization. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Ellis, Florence H., 1974, The Hopi: Their History and Use of Lands. Garland. New York. (Hopi Exhibit 2.)

Euler, Robert C., 1988, Aspects of Hopi Land Use and Occupancy. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Fewkes, Jesse Walter (assisted by A.M. Stephen and J.G. Owens), 1894, The Snake Ceremonials at Walpi, A Journal of American Ethnology and Archaeology, vol. IV. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Boston and New York.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter, 1900a, Tusayan Migration Traditions. In Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, pp. 573-633. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter, 1900b, Property-Right in Eagles among the Hopi. American Anthropologist, 2:690-707.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter, 1906, "Hopi Ceremonial Frames from Canon de Chelly, Arizona," American Anthropologist 8:346-75.

Fewkes, Jesse Walter, 1922, Oraibi in 1890. In "Contributions to Hopi History," edited by E.C. Parsons. American Anthropologist, 24:3:268-83.

Flake, David K., 1965, A History of Mormon Missionary Work with the Hopi, Navaho, and Zuni Indians. M.A. Thesis, Brigham Young University.

HP7579

Fredericks, Oswald et al. (Hopi Committee), 3-7-1934, Letter to John Collier. (Hopi Exhibit 180A.)

Frigout, Arlette, 1979, Hopi Ceremonial Organization. In Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 9, The Southwest, edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 564-76. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.

Gallup Independent, 7-25-1988, Hopis Have Gathered Raptors for Centuries, pp. 1-2.

Geertz, Armin, 1984, A Reed Pierced the Sky: Hopi Indian Cosmography on Third Mesa, Arizona. Numen, 31:2:216-241.

Geertz, Armin, and Michael Lomatuway'ma, 1987, Children of Cottonwood: Piety and Ceremonialism in Hopi Indian Puppetry. University of Nebraska Press. Lincoln.

Geertz, Clifford, 1966, Religion as a Cultural System. In Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion, edited by M. Banton. Tavistock. London

Godfrey, Anthony, 1988a, First, Second, Third Mesa and Moenkopi Livestock Grazing outside the 1882 Hopi Reservation. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Godfrey, Anthony, 1988b, Hopi Agricultural Report, 1540-1934. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

Gunderson, Carl, 3-24-1910, Letter to Commissioner of Indian Affairs. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #259: 25690-10313 Moqui).

Gunderson Carl, 4-5-1910, Letter to Matthew Murphy. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #259: 25690-10-313 Moqui).

Hafen, LeRoy R., and Ann W. Hafen, 1954, The Old Spanish Trail, Santa Fe to Los Angeles. Arthur H. Clark. Glendale, Cal.

Hammond, George Peter, and Agapito Rey, 1953, Don Juan de Onate, Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628. 2 vols. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.

Hagerman, H.J., 6-2-1932, Letter to Commissioner of Indian Affairs C.J. Rhoads. (Hopi Exhibit 366.)

Hopi Hearings, July 15-30, 1955. Mimeograph. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Phoenix Area Office, Hopi Agency.

Hough, Walter, 1898, Environmental Relations in Arizona. American Anthropologist, 11:133-55.

HP7580

Hough, Walter, 1900, A Collection of Hopi Ceremonial Pigments. Annual Report of the U.S. National Museum, 463-70.

Hough, Walter, 1915, The Hopi Indians. Torch Press. Cedar Rapids.

James, Harry, 1974, Pages from Hopi History. University of Arizona Press. Tucson.

Johnson, Rev. Caleb H., 1-19-1974, The Basic Position of the Hopi Traditional Chiefs on H.R. 10337 and S. 2424. Oraibi.

Kennard, Edward A., 1939, Background for Interpretation of the Hopi Constitution.

Komalentewa et al., 4-8-1930, Petition of Hopi Indians to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, including map of traditional Hopi claim.

Kotchungva, Dan et al., n.d.[1938], The Tradition of the Hopi Lands. Wilmington Federal Records Center. Bureau of Indian Affairs. Field Records. Navajo Service, Window Rock, Ariz. FRC No. 72920, File 080.

La Farge, Oliver, 1937, Notes for Hopi Administrators. (Hopi Exhibit 386.)

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 1966, The Savage Mind. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Little, James, 1881, Jacob Hamblin, a Narrative of his Personal Experience as a Frontiersman, Missionary to the Indians and Explorer. Juvenile Instructor Office. Salt Lake City.

Lomaheftewa, Viets et al., 2-27-1933, Letter to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. (Hopi Exhibit 444.)

Lomaheftewa, Viets et al., 3-8-1934, Letter to John Collier. (Hopi Exhibit 376.)

Lomavitu, Otto, 2-13-1937, Letter to Oliver La Farge.

MacGregor, Gordon, 8-6-1938, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (Hopi Exhibit 205.)

Malotki, Ekkehart, 1978, Hopitutuwutsi -- Hopi Tales: A Bilingual Collection of Hopi Stories. Museum of Northern Arizona Press. Flagstaff.

Malotki, Ekkehart, and Michael Lomatuway'ma, 1987a, Maasaw: Profile of a Hopi God. University of Nebraska Press. Lincoln.

HP7581

Malotki, Ekkehart, and Michael Lomatuway'ma, 1987b, Stories of Maasaw, A Hopi God. University of Nebraska Press. Lincoln.

Mateer, William R., 5-1-1879, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mateer, William R., 1879, Moquis Pueblo Indian Agency -- Arizona and map showing proposed reservation. National Archives.

McCawley, Paul F., 1987, Report on Hopi Range Use in 1934 Outside of the 1882 Boundary. (Hopi Expert Witness Report.)

McNickle, D'Arcy, 2-21-1952, Letter to G. Warren Spaulding, Director, Program Division, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Meeting at Flagstaff, 11-6-1930, Minutes of Conference on Navajo-Hopi Boundary Controversy Held at Flagstaff, Arizona.

Meeting at Moencopi, 11-5-1928, Minutes of Meeting of the Hopi Indians (with Inspector H.H. Fiske) at Moencopi Village, Arizona. National Archives (Microfilm #255: 62176-28-154 Western Navajo.)

Meeting at Polacca, 12-4-1939, Regarding Hopi Reservation Boundaries [meeting of Hopis with C.E. Rachford]. (Part of Hopi Exhibit 399.)

Miller, Horton H., 10-27-1910, Letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #259: 45096-5-10-313 Moqui).

Mindeleff, Cosmos, 1900, Localization of Tusayan Clans. Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, for the years 1897-98, pp. 635-53. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C.

Montgomery, Ross G., Watson Smith, and J.O. Brew, 1949, Franciscan Awatovi: The Excavation and Conjectural Reconstruction of a Seventeenth-Century Spanish Mission Establishment at a Hopi Indian Town in Northeastern Arizona. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology Papers, 36.

Murphy, Matthew M., 7-9-1910, Letter to Commissioner of Indian Affairs. National Archives (Microfilm Roll #259: 45096-510-313 Moqui).

Murphy, Matthew M., 1-19-1911, Letter to R.G. Valentine. National Archives (Microfilm #259: 45096-5-10-313 Moqui).

HP7582

Murphy, Matthew M., n.d. [ca. 1910], Map "B" -- Hopi clan migration routes and "Territory Claimed by the older Moquis." National Archives (Record Group 75, 45096-10-313 Moqui).

Nabokov, Peter, 1981, Indian Running. Capra Press. Santa Barbara.

Nagata, Shuichi, 1970, Modern Transformations of Moenkopi Pueblo. University of Illinois Press. Urbana.

Naquayouma, Otto et al., April 1929, Petition to Vice President Curtis. National Archives (Microfilm #255: 21141-29-056 Hopi).

Nequatewa, Edmund, 1936, Truth of a Hopi: Stories Relating to the Origin, Myths and Clan Histories of the Hopi. Northland Press. Flagstaff.

Nequatewa, Edmund, 1946, How the Hopi Respect the Game Animals. Plateau 18:4:61-62.

Ortiz, Alfonso, 1969, The Tewa World: Space, Time, Being, and Becoming in a Pueblo Society. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Ortiz, Alfonso, 1972, Ritual Drama and the Pueblo World View. In New Perspectives on the Pueblos, edited by A. Ortiz. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.

Page, Jake, and Susanne Page, 1982a, Hopi. Harry N. Abrams. New York.

Page, Jake, and Susanne, 1982b, Inside the Sacred Hopi Homeland. National Geographic, 162:5:606-29.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1925, A Pueblo Indian Journal. Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association, 32. Menasha, Wis.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1936, Early Relations between Hopi and Keres. American Anthropologist, 38:4:554-60.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, 1939, Pueblo Indian Religion. 2 vols. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Peterson, Charles S., 1971, The Hopis and the Mormons, 1858-1873. Utah Historical Quarterly, 39:2:179-194.

Reichard, Gladys A., 1945, The Distinctive Features of Navaho Religion. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 1:199-220.

HP7583

Rhoads, Commissioner C.J., 5-21-1932, Letter to Special Commissioner H.J. Hagerman. (Hopi Exhibit 130.)

Riley, Carroll L., 1987, The Frontier People: The Greater Southwest in the Protohistoric Period (revised and expanded edition). University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque.

Sakhongva et al., 5-18-1931, Petition to Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs. National Archives (Record Group 46 Senate 83a/59 Box 84).

Saloftoche et al., 5-15-1926, Petition to President Coolidge and Members of Congress. National Archives.

Stephen, Alexander M., 1929, Hopi Tales, edited by E.C. Parsons. Journal of American Folklore, 42:1-72.

Stephen, Alexander M, 1936, Hopi Journal, edited by E.C. Parsons. 2 vols. Columbia University Press. New York.

Ten Kate, Herman F.C., Jr., 1885, Reizen en Onderzoekingen in Noord-Amerika. E.J. Brill. Leiden.

Titiev, Mischa, 1944, Old Oraibi: A Study of the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology Papers, 22 (1).

Turner, Victor, and Edith Turner, 1978, Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives. Columbia University Press. New York.

Twitchell, Ralph E., 1917, The Leading Facts of New Mexican History. Torch Press. Cedar Rapids.

U.S. Government, 3-28-1911, Conference between the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Yukeoma, Hopi Indian. In File "Re: Delegation of Moqui Indians coming to Washington." National Archives (Record Group 75). Washington, D.C.

Voth, H.R., 1905, The Traditions of the Hopi. Field Columbian Museum, Publication 96, Anthropological Series 8.

Voth, H.R., 1912, Notes on the Eagle Cult of the Hopi. In Brief Miscellaneous Hopi Papers, by H.R. Voth, pp. 105-109. Field Columbian Museum, Publication 157, Anthropological Series 11(2).

Walther, Genevieve, 10-15-1945, Letter to Joseph Mahoney, Chairman, Committee on Indian Affairs.

Waters, Frank, 1963, Book of the Hopi. Viking. New York.

HP7584

Whiteley, Peter M., 1987a, North American Indians: Indians of the Southwest. In Encyclopedia of Religions, edited by Mircea Eliade, vol. 10, pp. 513-525. MacMillan New York.

Whiteley, Peter M., 1987b, The Interpretation of Politics: a Hopi Conundrum. MAN 22:4:696-714.

Whiteley, Peter M., 1988, Deliberate Acts: Changing Hopi Culture through the Oraibi Split. University of Arizona Press. Tucson.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee, 1956, Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press. Cambridge.

Witherspoon, Gary, 1986, Land and Livestock in Navajo Culture and Society. (Navajo Expert Witness Report.)

Woehlke, Walter, 12-15-1939, Memo for Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (Hopi Exhibit 461.)

Young, Robert W., and William Morgan, Sr., 1987, The Navajo Language: A Grammar and Colloquial Dictionary. Revised Edition. University of New Mexico Press. Albuquerque

HP7585