FOOTPRINTS *of* HOPI HISTORY

Hopihiniwtiput Kukveni'at

EDITED BY

LEIGH J. KUWANWISIWMA, T. J. FERGUSON, AND CHIP COLWELL

Edited by
LEIGH J. KUWANWISIWMA,
T. J. FERGUSON, and
CHIP COLWELL

FOOTPRINTS OF HOPI HISTORY

Hopihiniwtiput Kukveni'at

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA PRESS
TUCSON

1

THE COLLABORATIVE ROAD

A Personal History of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office

LEIGH J. KUWANWISIWMA

IN 1985, FEDERAL AND STATE agencies sent requests to the Hopi Tribe to consult on a range of cultural issues. Recognizing the need for a special tribal office to handle such requests, then Vice Chairman Stanley Honanie pursued funding through Public Law 93-638, which provides tribal grants for self-determination and self-government through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Hopi Tribal Council passed a resolution to secure the money and establish a staff position to be supervised by Vice Chairman Honanie. Patrick Lomawaima accepted the position of cultural preservationist and the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office began.

Then the funding for the Cultural Preservation Office ran out. A subsequent vice chairman, Vernon Masayesva, shared the vision of establishing an office to deal with all of the tribe's cultural issues. He took the initiative to fund this office from his own budget and to appoint a director rather than filling the position through a competitive hiring process. When Vice Chairman Masayesva asked me to come work for him, I was unsure why I was summoned. At that time, I was the assistant director for the Tribal Health Department, primarily responsible for contracts and budgets, but also working with the elderly. I'd also served several terms on the board for the Hotvela-Paaqavi School when Masayesva was the principal. Additionally, we are first cousins.

I hesitated to accept the position because it was a political appointment, and I was a regular tenured employee. I worked with Vice Chairman Masayesva to develop a position description and had it classified as a competitive position. Vice Chairman

This chapter is based on interviews with Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma conducted by T. J. Ferguson on January 7–8, 2014, and edited by Chip Colwell.

Masayesva called me and said that the job was going to be publicly advertised and that he expected me to apply. I was hesitant because I didn't know the extent of the job; I didn't even know enough about heritage preservation to wonder about all the federal laws and state laws that affect decisions. Those concerns would all be new to me once I started the job.

Growing up in the village of Paaqavi on Third Mesa, I learned bits and pieces of Hopi philosophy. In the 1980s, I began to learn more about formal historical research. This early experience established in my mind the possibility of community-based participatory research, which directly involves tribal members and allows the tribe to review the production of documentation and reports. My village governing board called on me to assist anthropologist Peter Whiteley. For whatever reason, the board told Whiteley, "Go see Leigh. He will be the best person to help you." At that time, I didn't know how essential it was to document Hopi history. When I grew up, the oral tradition and teachings were still strong and "commoners" like me—a member of the Greasewood Clan without any religious title—didn't have to worry about documenting culture in writing. When Whiteley came along, I became fascinated with documenting Hopi history.

Previously, my life had been focused on my village of Paaqavi, but through Whiteley's research I was exposed to the whole history of Third Mesa—including the history of Orayvi, its famous split in 1906, and the subsequent establishment of the villages of Kiqötsmovi, Paaqavi, and Hotvela. My eyes were suddenly opened by the many interviews of older Hopi people, which I helped conduct and interpret. Together, Whiteley and I captured a lot of information. Whiteley proposed to publish a book on Paaqavi history and the Board of Governors agreed. This work—published in 1988 as *Bacavi: Journey to Reed Springs*—further motivated me to pursue the position with the tribe (Whiteley 1988).

After two weeks, no one had applied for the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office directorship, including me. Vice Chairman Masayesva called me again and encouraged me to apply. He advertised the position for two more weeks and I finally applied. I was the only applicant so we began to work out my transition from the Health Department to this position. Nevertheless, I was still hesitant and told the vice chairman that he needed more candidates and that there were more qualified people. He was unhappy with my response, but I was the only applicant. I told him that, if he advertised one more time and I was the only applicant, I'd accept the position. It's a Hopi custom for a leader to ask someone multiple times to take on a responsibility. The job was posted again, and again I was the only applicant. This time Vice Chairman Masayesva was serious; he called me into his office and said, "Leigh, you have the job. You know that." By this time, Ivan Sidney had become chairman of the Hopi Tribe, and he supported my hire. My first day on the job was March 18, 1989. I was thirty-nine years old.

We have been fortunate that the Cultural Preservation Office has not been politicized by changing administrations. All of the seven administrations I've worked under have provided good support. What motivates all of us is that we are Hopi people. Because it has always been clear that the Hopi would face a tough future, cultural preservation and the integrity of the tribe's culture have been important. In my years on the job, I have come to learn the wisdom of the tribe's older leadership. Chief Loloma, who lived a century ago, declared that the Hopi people have a mission to maintain and sustain their culture for as long as possible amidst dramatic change. I admired the traditional leadership of my grandfather's and my father's generation. I sought to learn from them the philosophy of the Hopi—to be who they are in their Southwest home and to maintain the integrity of their culture in ceremonies, farming, social and kinship systems, and every other part of their lives. It was their philosophy to maintain their culture as much as possible so that the future generations of Hopi would benefit from it, learn from it, and hopefully carry it on. I understood my mission to be simple: to uphold the Hopi philosophy of unity, reciprocity, cooperation, industriousness, respectfulness, and most importantly humility.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE HOPI CULTURAL PRESERVATION OFFICE

The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office quickly undertook an array of projects and programs including creating Hopilavayi, a language preservation program; conducting extensive research to support lawsuits, such as those pertaining to water and land rights; and protecting sacred places. The tribe also became more involved in evaluating the potential impacts of development projects on the environment.

One of the first and largest environmental protection efforts began when I attended a public meeting in Flagstaff, Arizona, about Glen Canyon, a region north of the reservation with deep spiritual and cultural connections to the Hopi. There I learned that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was representing all of the Arizona tribes as part of its trust responsibility to assist tribes with the protection of treaty rights, lands, assets, and resources related to the mandates of federal law. I returned home and convinced the tribal council and Vernon Masayesva, who by then was tribal chairman, that the Hopi Tribe needed to represent Hopi interests. With the assistance of Kurt Dongoske, a non-Hopi archaeologist, I developed a proposal, and the Hopi Tribe became the first tribe to engage in research for the Glen Canyon environmental impact statement as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The tribe focused on this work until 1997, but even today it remains a member of the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Working Group. These were huge responsibilities for the office.

Another major area of work revolves around assisting the tribe in consultations with federal and state agencies, museums, and private institutions. This involves reviewing and commenting on federal compliance activities related to historic preservation and environmental protection legislation. I developed a rule of thumb that the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office would respond to everything that comes to the Hopi Tribe. This, too, represents a big investment of time and energy. Assisted by a non-Hopi employee, Terry Morgart, I typically edit, review, and sign about ten letters a day.

I did not always have as much help or as many resources. On my first day, I walked into Vice Chairman Masayesva's office and said, "I'm reporting to work." He looked at me and said, "I don't even have a place for you to work yet." He told me to wait for a couple of days while he figured it out. I talked to my former boss, Leon Nuvayestewa, at the Health Department, and he allowed me to stay in my former office and gave me the supplies I needed because I didn't have a budget for supplies. My first budget included only salaries. Today, the Hopi Tribe invests about $380,000 each year into the office. We once had more than $500,000, but in 2005 with the shutdown of the Black Mesa Mine, which supplied coal to the now defunct Mohave Generating Station, tribal royalties dwindled and the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office budget was reduced. The Hopi Tribe funds the core staff and the office receives additional funding from a variety of sources for specific projects. Project-specific funding comes from the Bureau of Reclamation to monitor Glen Canyon Dam and for river trips in the Grand Canyon. There are other grants for the Hopi language program and numerous research contracts for historic preservation projects, many of them focusing on traditional cultural properties. The Hopi Cultural Preservation Office is the only program within the Department of Natural Resources that deals with issues outside the political boundaries of the Hopi Reservation. It's a huge responsibility to conduct the consultation that informs the tribe's decisions on various projects—whether to support a project or to reject it and whether adverse impacts can be mitigated. We're currently working on several major initiatives, including the Four Corners Power Plant environmental impact statement, the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project, and the Navajo Generating Plant environmental impact statement (including the power grid, rail spur, and two coal mines). All of these projects require funding from external sources.

In 1989, my staff consisted of three people: Merwin (Lefty) Kooyahoema (who was technically still with the Health Department); Rhonda Kyasyousie, a volunteer secretary; and me. Over the years, the staff size has varied from a handful to more than a dozen people, depending on the projects being conducted and their budgets. Currently the staff consists of seven people: Mike Yeatts, senior archaeologist; Sue Kuyvaya, administrative manager; Lee Wayne Lomayestewa, research assistant; Terry

Morgart, legal researcher; Joel Nicholas, archaeologist; Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa, archivist and project manager; and me.

Although this staff has been central to the success of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, I also depend on help from Hopi religious leaders and community elders. During the office's first year, I was charged with the reburial of an infant whose remains had been excavated from an archaeological site. This was a traumatic moment for me because I had never anticipated having to oversee reburials of ancestral remains and I had no idea how to deal with it. I quickly understood that repatriation and reburial are not a one-man job; I would have to draw upon the resources of the tribe itself. That's when I brought in Dalton Taylor, a Sun Clan member from Songòopavi, Second Mesa, as one of our first advisors.

Early on I realized I needed help—I'm a commoner, not initiated into any major Hopi religious societies. Therefore, I formed a core of central advisors, the Cultural Resources Advisory Task Team (CRATT), which consists of eighteen men representing the Hopi clans and villages on the three mesas. Meeting monthly, CRATT includes many of the tribal members whom we engage in historic preservation research. For field and museum research projects, a team of CRATT members joins us to share their knowledge of our history. During fieldwork, ideas are passed around among cultural advisors, and there are many diverse opinions. Hopis belong to different clans—so that clan identity helps to shape CRATT contributions to a project—but no matter which clan they belong to, all Hopis share a common way of thinking. I rely on CRATT as the first sounding board for issues that I need help with. The team's cultural advice is valuable, even though I ultimately have to make executive decisions.

People have come and gone from CRATT. Some have passed away and some new people have joined, but the group has been stable over the years. The influx of newer, younger cultural advisors is consistent with the culture; it's a natural thing to bring in younger people and new thinking. As older advisors retire or pass on, we must prepare for a transition to the next generation. New, younger advisors can be listeners and learners as they start to work on projects.

There is a transition on the horizon for my position as well. I've been engaged in developing a new cadre of young academics. Lyle Balenquah worked for the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office for a time and received a master's degree in anthropology from Northern Arizona University (NAU) in 2002. Lloyd Masayumptewa received his MA from NAU in 2001 and has since worked for the National Park Service. He is currently superintendent at Hubble Trading Post. Stewart Koyiyumptewa has a BA in anthropology from the University of Arizona and is completing a master's in anthropology at NAU. Joel Nicholas received his BA in anthropology from the University of Arizona. From an academic and technical standpoint, we must prepare. Although I had no formal background, I had a lot of help from outside professionals. But one of

these days, we must take the reins ourselves. I'm engaging other Hopi staff members to apply their real world experience to tribal and legal responsibilities. There is a political part of the job for which you have to tough it out and develop a strong skin to survive. That is part of the challenge—to find someone who is willing to do that.

COMPLIANCE ISSUES

In terms of compliance, especially with regard to eligibility issues concerning the National Register of Historic Places, there is still much work to do. Early on, we worked with Kurt Dongoske, who began to understand how the Hopi think and to explain that to non-Indians. Part of the technical debate in the compliance process of determining eligibility for the National Register concerns whether or not an archaeological site is a traditional cultural property. The site is fifty years old, but regulators have argued that archaeological sites are not a living part of our culture today because they are ruins. Why are we calling ancestral archaeological sites traditional cultural properties? Under the National Register criteria, they are a part of our history, part of our "footprints." We use ancestral sites to teach young Hopis about their history and culture. Therefore, to me, they qualify as traditional cultural properties. Nonetheless, that issue is still under debate. Often when we read reports we realize that unfortunately not all archaeologists agree that archaeological sites are traditional cultural properties. Therefore, this needs to be further argued in the compliance process.

Similarly, archaeologists considered a cairn documented on a recent Arizona Public Service (APS) survey (Ferguson et al. 2015; Hopkins et al. 2014) to be an isolated feature; therefore, it's not eligible for the National Register. If you collaborate with the Hopi Tribe, you understand that those cairns are in fact part of a greater landscape, part of a living culture, probably associated with ruins nearby. The Hopi have cultural knowledge about some of the clans that came from the Grand Canyon and areas to the north as part of the final footprints. Things like this, as well as the designation of the law as a "national" historic preservation act are still bothersome. It's ironic that this act caters to development. I have a hard time dealing with how the law encourages compliance through mitigation, which for archaeological sites means testing or full data recovery. Cultural and spiritual values are intangible and the law cannot accommodate that; it deals with the tangible. For example, within a coal mine there may be thousands of archaeological sites, and many of those are bulldozed while the mining company and federal agencies tell us that they have complied with the law. We've taken this question to administrative law hearings and had the judge decide that the federal agencies have complied and that they are required to notify the Hopi only when burial remains need to be recovered—if anyone reports them.

I still wrestle with compliance issues such as these because the process is simply not good for tribes. That's the irony of the National Historic Preservation Act. It's bothersome because we lose sites, and once we lose them, either through data recovery, which is an adverse impact, or through outright destruction, Hopi culture is diminished. We just don't agree that burial sites should be disturbed but legally we can't do much about it.

The problem with NEPA is that it's a remandable law; therefore, someone who doesn't agree with the act can sue for noncompliance. If the suit goes to court, the judge may decide that the proponents must bring their work into compliance with the law and regulations. It's remandable but that doesn't mean much for the tribes. The case is remanded to the proponents or the federal agencies, and then it goes back to court and the decision is up to one judge. Changing the law is not feasible because of the political process, so unfortunately nothing is going to change for a long time.

REPATRIATION

The motivation for some of the research that the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has endorsed is the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Under NAGPRA, anything that we can produce to fight for ancestral history is important—anything that will support NAGPRA's ten lines of evidence, ranging from biology to kinship to oral tradition, that are used to establish cultural affiliation between the tribe and claimed cultural items or human remains. For example, the baseline data on corn DNA being documented by Mark Varien and his colleagues at Crow Canyon is important. Crow Canyon funded that research for us, and the Hopi Tribe agreed on the research protocols and intellectual property rights issues. As a result, Varien and colleagues produced the first DNA study on eight Hopi varieties of corn compared to the current database of Hopi corn (see chapter 10, this volume). That study will be useful in NAGPRA research because it points to continuities of cultural practices and social identities between Hopis and our ancestors over the millennia. Frances E. Smiley at NAU is ready to do similar work.

With the help of John McClelland at the Arizona State Museum in Tucson, we've looked at dental morphology in terms of physical anthropology lines of evidence. Christy Turner, a physical anthropologist at Arizona State University, held a collection of 200 Hopi dental casts. No one knew what to do with the casts after he passed away. When the university offered to return the dental casts, I recommended to the tribal chairman that the Hopi Tribe should get custody of the dental casts. We'll have to work through the ethical issues if the casts are from living people or if they are from deceased people who have descendants. In any case, the dental casts are important for

NAGPRA research. There's a lot more work to be done. People who are majoring in physical anthropology can talk to the Hopi people about what we want in terms of research.

More generally, diet is of interest to the Hopi. We sometimes romanticize about the old times of our people, but they struggled to survive. They dealt with drought and environmental changes, and they didn't live very long. When they were sixty, they were old. Our ancestors foraged for food before they became farmers. They were gatherers. They knew about edible food such as the wild grains and what the Hopis call starvation food, such as the new leaves on greasewood. The salt from salty clay supplemented their diet. They knew the environment. We've lost some of that knowledge.

The diet of our ancestors can be determined from their remains. Anomalies in bones are important. Once there was an oil leak at Springerville, Arizona, that affected an ancestral cemetery. In the cemetery were stacked burials of people of all ages, interspersed with brush, like a mass burial. Dalton Taylor and I agreed that these remains should be recovered. We told the archaeologists that we needed to know why there were stacked burials; we needed to know if there was disease because there are special prayer feathers for different kinds of events. We found out that the lack of calcium caused a huge epidemic of rickets and these people couldn't survive. Once we knew what had happened, Dalton made the right prayer feather to ask that these health problems never come back again.

The technical and scientific sides of research can benefit the Hopi people. Over time, we've become more open in our thinking about research and capacity building. Working with outside researchers helps train tribal members in research techniques, and that benefits us. The Hopi Tribe continues to need more NAGPRA research.

Implementing NAGPRA is difficult, and since the 1990s we've been handling reburials all over the Southwest. We didn't have a tradition of reburial, but Dalton Taylor said, "Let's help our ancestors out." Later, Wilton Kooyahoema, a Kookopngyam (Fire Clan) leader from Hotvela, took over the reburials. When Wilton retires, who will come forward? If no one wants to, I'll do it even if I'm retired. It's been a rollercoaster of decisions. There are so many ancestral remains: 600 at Bureau of Land Management in Dolores, 800 at Chaco Canyon, 3,000 at Coconino, and 1,500 at White River.

At Mesa Verde, a region in southwestern Colorado filled with Pueblo sites, there are remains of 1,500 ancestors. The cultural advisors and I had seen the spreadsheet of data, but when we opened the boxes and the remains were handed to us, we saw the cradle boarding—the flat backs of the skulls that had been shaped by continuously placing the children's soft heads against the hard wood of a cradle board. We had to ask who they were. I don't dwell on it, but when I talk about it now, it comes

back and I visualize it again. So we cleansed ourselves. There were twenty mummies. I handled those. There were four mummified remains of mothers and infants in swaddling. Mummified remains are the most challenging visually and emotionally. There is a personal reaction, an anger that comes with the reburial process. We felt this anger and we tried to balance it with what the Hopi Tribe and the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office have decided to do, which is to rebury these people, hopefully for the last time. There is a sort of ledger where you ask why these people were exhumed and then you try to balance that emotion by personally accepting that the tribe's decision was the best thing that could be done. After every reburial, there are strong emotional responses that are balanced by knowing that reburying these people is the right thing to do. Even so, it's tough to do, especially because of the spiritual aspects.

Now we're turning our attention to Hopi sacred objects. There are so many in museum collections. In the late nineteenth century, Frank H. Cushing raided our shrines to get prayer sticks and J. Walter Fewkes raided our cemeteries to get funerary objects. Nancy Parezo at the University of Arizona finally decoded their notes so that we can figure out how much they got from cemeteries and shrines. These are stolen material that shouldn't be subject to NAGPRA. We never released those items to anybody, but when NAGPRA was passed, Congress gave property rights to museums and federal agencies—"possession and control" as the law calls it—and the Hopi Tribe has to beg for them and prove that they belong to the Hopi.

Hopi ceremonial and sacred objects in museums outnumber those of other tribes. Repatriating these objects is a long-term project. Consultation and including the right people from the Hopi villages to help takes time, not to mention the whole process of making a claim. Both the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office and the Flute Clan from First Mesa were needed to prove that the Flute Ceremony artifacts in Cambridge, Massachusetts, had to be returned (McManamon 1997). They opened the medicine bundle and altar to prove that the paraphernalia found at Tseigi Canon is the same as that found at First Mesa today. These struggles are draining.

The Paris auctions of Hopi sacred artifacts taught me a lot (Hopi Tribe 2015; Mashberg 2013). Time was not on our side. When we finally received legal help from Jim Scarborough (legal services are expensive), we learned that French law is different from U.S. law in that it requires a certificate of rightful possession. The auction house deals with that issue. If stolen items are bought and sold several times, rightful possession is established. A sacred object that is commodified under French law loses its sacredness. That was a problem for us. However, under NAGPRA, sacred objects can't be sold so we wanted a delay to determine if the sale to French citizens occurred after 1990, when NAGPRA was passed. Also there were eagle feathers and we wanted to know if there was any French law that applied to endangered species. France and the

United States are signatories to the UNESCO treaty that was stimulated by Nazi theft of art; because Hopi artifacts were looted, we argued that the treaty should apply to the Hopi. We lost the case. Whether there is room for appeal is uncertain. We need a new law; it's frustrating.

Without our knowledge, the Annenberg Foundation (2013) bid on twenty-four items at the Paris auction, and those are now being returned to the Hopi Tribe. Unfortunately, someone profited from the sale. Culturally the return of these items is probably satisfying, but the market for such items remains.

There are changes every year. Repatriation is frustrating, but it stimulates your thinking; it triggers you to be proactive and to anticipate issues and how you want to deal with them. It's rewarding to learn so much.

COLLABORATION

The Paaqavi project with Peter Whiteley set the precedent for successful collaboration. Although this project required working with an outside researcher, it produced a significant resource for the village and for the entire Third Mesa. I'm seeing the same results today. We control the research and we hire the contractors or we have a key role in determining who is hired. Over time we've engaged with different consultants and now Stewart Koyiyumptewa is getting into fieldwork and acting as lead on some of the smaller projects to gain the experience he needs.

It's the legacy that is important. The tribe is under a lot of stress, and like the prophets of old, the old leadership teaches you to be a visionary. You must look not only at the next twenty years, but at a hundred years from now. You look at your grandchildren and you ask yourself what is their future going to be like in these rapidly changing times. Language loss is a huge problem. The ceremonial way of life is slowly being eroded. It bothers me to say that one day we may need to rely on written documentation for our culture. I hope not, but research preserves Hopi knowledge and will be a resource for future generations.

As I reflect back over the last twenty-five years and all the people whom we've engaged with over the years—from Hopi Cultural Preservation Office employees to the tribal constituency to the highest political levels of the tribe—what stands out most in my mind is trust. Trust is what matters with us. In particular, scholars from outside the tribe need to understand where the tribe is coming from and where the tribe is heading in terms of, in some cases, the legacy of researchers who exploited the Hopi people. Today we are in the driver's seat in controlling research. It's trust that a lot of our villagers, advisory team, and others need to feel about people coming in to work with the Cultural Preservation Office.

Over time, I've tried to guide the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office to embrace research. I'm impressed with the type of research—ethnographic and applied collaborations—that we've accomplished (see appendix). Consider, for example, the curriculum development for several schools that has been accomplished by NAU with Hopi teachers and elders (see Clark and Gumerman, this volume). That's a direct benefit to the Hopi constituency. Another example is Wesley Bernardini's work to map a lot of our archaeological sites with state-of-the-art equipment and to train our staff to learn that technology (see Bernardini, this volume; Hedquist et al. 2015). We've engaged with the APS to build a fence around one of our major petroglyph sites, Tutuveni, which was being heavily vandalized (Bernardini 2007). In addition, with APS and World Heritage Fund support, we now have cameras to monitor the site. Over the last four years, although the site is publicly accessible, we haven't seen any more vandalism. Yet another benefit is the 1997 language fluency survey completed with the University of Arizona and a Hopi linguist (Hopi Cultural Preservation Office 1998, Hopi Language Assessment Project 1997). We still use these data to help guide the Hopi language program.

There are bridges that have developed over time. For example, during the initial stage of his master's degree, Wes Bernardini chose to come to the Hopi Reservation. When he became a doctoral student he continued to interact with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, and now as a professor he still works with us. There is also a bridge between the generations of older archaeologists and younger students. Patrick Lyons, now the director of the Arizona State Museum, also approached us as a student. He had been tutored and mentored by people like Chuck Adams, who has long worked with us. Chip Colwell is also someone who has worked with us for a long time, as is Wolf Gumerman. The transition has happened; the bridge has been created.

This story is about both how the tribe has dealt with research and academia and how it has been able to attract a high level of technical support from scholars who mean what they say when they say they want to work with the Hopi Tribe. The current generation of students is the beneficiary of that.

Many students contact the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office through their professors who have worked with the Hopi Tribe. Those students have a way of getting in touch with us. Other students come in cold without a referral from their professors. Over time we have developed a standard research protocol. If students are interested in research, we ask them to look at the research protocol on our website (Hopi Cultural Preservation Office 2016). If they have something in mind that they want to do, we ask them to answer those questions first and then see what happens. Eventually we meet students one-on-one. Through reciprocity, we learn from the students.

Students and scholars who want to work with the Hopi are always welcome to come to the regular CRATT meetings. We like to hear what they are doing. There is

always a way to build a relationship with them so that they can help meet tribal needs. Some undergraduate students like Tai Johnson, who eventually wrote a master's thesis on diet and nutrition (2007), develop a working relationship with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office that carries them forward into their graduate work. We deal with all types of interests, and we try to accommodate students. We'll sit down and talk about any research that is of interest to the Hopi.

THE FUTURE OF RESEARCH AT HOPI

I hope that this book summarizes the research that the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office has conducted and sponsored so that it can be used in school curricula and public education programs. It must be available in different venues, including schools and villages. This book can be a road map to all the research so that people can read the synopses and then seek more detailed information.

What does the future hold for collaborative research between the Hopi Tribe and anthropologists (archaeologists and ethnographers)? I can speak only for the Hopi. The tribe, through the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, has embraced both the traditions of the Hopi ancestors and the need to have our culture documented in different ways. We now have a large collection of oral history interviews for language preservation. From some of the older folks we interviewed, we captured the old style of Hopi talking and the dialects. We hope that people can benefit from that.

I see the tribe's effort to maintain the collaborative road, whereby in many cases traditional Hopi history is being corroborated. Science has come in and taken a look at some of our traditions and, lo and behold, they do support each other. We are discovering new bridges between science and tradition. I think we can do more with Wesley Bernardini's and Kelly Hays-Gilpin's work in ceramic typing. That is a research area that hasn't been fully explored to trace the literal footprints of the Hopi people.

There is room for even more exciting collaboration between people who want to work together. My vision is to also look at capacity building and to encourage our Hopis to go through the academic world and come back, as Joel Nicholas and Stewart Koyiyumptewa have done. It's about challenging them to go farther, to develop the capacity for the tribe to eventually take full control and leadership in research about the Hopi.

This book can be an outreach to both the Hopi Tribe and the academic world. I think the book is also a legacy of all the people who have gone through the last twenty-five years with the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, including the early cultural advisors. This book, with all its contributions, is something I leave for my family.

REFERENCES CITED

Annenberg Foundation. 2013. Annenberg Foundation and Hopi Nation Announce Return of Sacred Artifacts to Native American Tribe. Electronic document, http://www.annenberg foundation.org/node/51351, accessed January 30, 2016.

Bernardini, Wesley. 2007. *Hopi History in Stone: The Tutuveni Petroglyph Site*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series 200. Arizona State Museum, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Ferguson, T. J., Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa, and Maren P. Hopkins. 2015. Co-creation of Knowledge by the Hopi Tribe and Archaeologists. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3(3):249–262.

Hedquist, Saul L., Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa, Wesley Bernardini, T. J. Ferguson, Peter M. Whiteley, and Leigh J. Kuwanwisiwma. 2015. Mapping the Hopi Landscape for Cultural Preservation. *International Journal of Applied Geospatial Research* 6(1):40–59.

Hopi Cultural Preservation Office. 1998. Hopi Language Preservation and Education Plan. Hopi Tribe, Kiqötsmovi, Arizona.

———. 2016. Protocol for Research, Publication, and Recordings: Motion, Visual, Sound, Multimedia and Other Mechanical Devices. Electronic document, http://www8.nau.edu/hcpo-p/ResProto.pdf, accessed January 30, 2016.

Hopi Language Assessment Project. 1997. *Presentation of Hopi Language Survey Results*. Hopi Cultural Preservation Office and Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Hopi Tribe. 2015. Hopi Tribe Demands Return of Sacred Objects Being Sold Illegally in Paris Auction. Press Release, May 20, 2015. Hopi Tribe, Kiqötsmovi, Arizona.

Hopkins, Maren P., Saul L. Hedquist, T. J. Ferguson, and Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa. 2014. *Talwi'pikit Tuuwubiyat Ang Hopit Navoti'at*: Hopi Traditional Knowledge on the Arizona Public Service 500kV El Dorado Transmission Line Corridor on the Hopi Reservation. Prepared for Arizona Public Service Company. Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, Kiqötsmovi, Arizona.

Johnson, Tai. 2007. *Surviving the Transformation, Hopi Farming, Food, and Labor*. Master's thesis, Department of History, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

Mashberg, Tom. 2013. Hopis Try to Stop Paris Sale of Artifacts. *New York Times* 3 April:C1.

McManamon, Francis P. 1997. Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items from Arizona in the Possession of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. *Federal Register* 62(48):11462.

Whiteley, Peter M. 1988. *Bacavi: Journey to Reed Springs*. Northland Press, Flagstaff, Arizona.