The Last Archaeologist to (Almost) Abandon Grasshopper

John R. Welch,
Ph.D., University of Arizona,
Professor Jointly Appointed in the Department of Archaeology and the School of Resource and Environmental Management,
Simon Fraser University

The history of Arizona Anthropology engagements with Apaches and their territory perpetuates my occupation of and with Grasshopper and other sites excavated by my forebears and benefactors. Arizona Anthropology's centennial offers occasions to both celebrate and reflect upon the sources and consequences of individual and institutional successes. My intention here is to direct attention to contributions made to Arizona Anthropology by the White Mountain Apache Tribe and vice versa. The history of the relationship and the directions taken by the Tribe in response to the relationship provide the basis for my opinion that Arizona Anthropology should abandon neither Grasshopper nor the Tribe more generally.

To paraphrase Twain: reports of the end of anthropology at Grasshopper are much exaggerated. I know this first hand. After my second season on the University of Arizona's archaeology field school staff (1984–1985), I succumbed to the seductive buttes and canyons of White Mountain Apache lands and found myself lingering well into August. In addition to the region's rugged romantic allure and understudied Apache archaeology, my Grasshopper Region infatuation led not only to four more seasons with the field school, but also to employment as a Bureau of Indian Affairs contractor (1987–1992), then staff archaeologist (1992–2005), then as the Tribe's historic preservation officer (THPO, 1996–2005) (Welch in Nicholas et al. 2008). Not even a mid-career vault from government jobs in Arizona to Simon Fraser University loosened the ties that bind me to the Tribe and its lands: I serve as an advisor to the Tribe's Heritage Program and as a board member of the non-profit Fort Apache Heritage Foundation (Welch 2001; Welch and Brauchli 2010).

The long, cordial, and dynamic relationship between Arizona Anthropology and the Tribe has had pronounced effects on each organization. The Grasshopper

Arizona Anthropologist Centennial Edition: 107-119.

Archaeological Research Project (1963–1992) was the longest-lived of the four major University of Arizona Anthropology and Arizona State Museum projects on White Mountain Apache lands (Reid and Whittlesey 1999, 2005). The other three projects—Kinishba, Forestdale and Silver Creek—operated on the reservation for about 20 additional seasons (Table 2). The research partnerships begun by Dean Byron Cummings at Kinishba in 1930 deserve continued investments. This is particularly true at Grasshopper, where work remains to be done on two final and often overlooked stages of archaeological research: (1) site restoration to pre-excavation condition; (2) site rehabilitation for ongoing use by non-archaeologists, especially descendant and steward community members (see Agnew and Bridgland 2006). As discussed below, my conclusion is that, because the Tribe has made clear in broad terms that it wants to reassert control over its territory and citizenry, sovereignty-driven research offers an apt framework for reoccupying the relationship between Arizona Anthropology and White Mountain Apaches.

Academic and Local Benefits from Grasshopper

Reid and Whittlesey (1999, 2005) ably enumerate the impacts of the Grasshopper project on anthropological archaeology—especially

Dates	Project Focus	Representative Publications
1929, 1932 1939–1941	Canyon Creek Ruin excavation (Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation); Forestdale Valley survey and excavations	Haury 1934, 1940, 1985
1931–1952	Kinishba Pueblo excavations, rebuilding, and museum development	Cummings 1940; Welch 2013
1963–1978	Grasshopper field school, surveys, excavations	Longacre and others 1982; Olsen 1990
1979–1992	Grasshopper field school, surveys, and excavations	Reid 1974; Reid and Whittlesey 1997, 1999, 2005, 2010; Riggs 2001; Triadan 1997; Van Keuren 1999; Zedeño 1994
2001–2004	Forestdale Valley survey, mapping and site damage assessment; Kinishba mapping and stabilization	Mills 2005; Mills and others 1999, 2008

Table 2. *Arizona Anthropology projects on White Mountain Apache land*

processual and behavioral archaeologies, ethnoarchaeology, and ceramic analysis. Arizona State Museum shelves sag and collections areas bulge with the materials and documentation gathered from White Mountain Apache lands. Nearly 1,000 aspiring archaeologists and physical anthropologists obtained technical and analytical skills while building personal and professional networks on White Mountain Apache lands (Haury 1985; Reid and Whittlesey 1999, 2005; Welch 2007a). The resultant object and documentation collections are sufficient for various future generations of industrious research. In the meantime, the impressive roster of staff and students educated on Apache lands indicates breadths of research and training that are readily confirmed bibliographically. For Grasshopper alone, as of 2015, Arizona Anthropology students, faculty, and affiliates have produced some 25 doctoral dissertations, 11 master's theses, 125 journal articles and book chapters, and various books and monographs (see Reid and Whittlesey 2005:218). Curriculum vitae of dozens of anthropologists are packed with publications grounded in places under Apache jurisdiction, and research continues (Welch 2013).

Bibliography speaks to the beneficial impacts of the Grasshopper project on careers, on Arizona Anthropology, and on the discipline, but fail to fully index the real contributions of Apaches and their lands. In this regard, notes in Grasshopper publications provide at least some insights. Reid and Whittlesey (1999:xiv) give voice to many colleagues' sentiments: "acknowledgements cannot express fully our heartfelt thanks to the White Mountain Apache, who encouraged, assisted, and worked alongside….this book is dedicated to the Cibecue Apache." They also write, "As friends and coworkers, the Apache help us achieve a more intimate knowledge of the land…and teach us the importance of spiritual beliefs to everyday existence" (Reid and Whittlesey 2005:xv). In a reflection on his professional development, Shimada (2014:1-2) writes: "working with the Apache crew… [fostered] profound appreciation that archaeological practice, regardless of where one… [works] is fundamentally an affair involving live people and complex interpersonal management. The Apache crew instilled a strong appreciation that … the archaeologist must commit to and communicate effectively with team members and be mindful of the broader social context of fieldwork." If advances in other

anthropologies—social, linguistic, and physical (for example, Basso 1996)—were to be included, or if contributions from the neighboring San Carlos Apache Tribe and its citizens, especially to the Point of Pines field school (see Haury 1989) were also to be tallied, the Arizona Apache benefits to Arizona Anthropology would be that much more impressive.

Given the varied benefits and subsidies that have flowed from White Mountain Apache to Arizona Anthropology, it seems reasonable to ask whether the reverse is also true. The question is especially fair in light of uniquely favorable geographical, social, and archaeological attributes of Apache lands. Where else, within a day's drive from Tucson, lies a suite of largely undisturbed village ruins under the jurisdiction of generous and tolerant stewards? No better context for multiple decades of archaeological research and field training during Arizona's scorching summer months was available in 1963 and none is in 2015.

Table 3 spotlights benefits flowing from the Grasshopper project to Apaches. The initial agreement, negotiated by Emil Haury and Raymond Thompson and unanimously endorsed by Tribal Council Resolution 63-48, provided Arizona Anthropology with permission for surveying anyplace west of Highway 60/77, for excavations, and for use of five acres for the Grasshopper camp. In exchange, Arizona Anthropology paid $200 per year, agreed to hire tribal citizens "for such labor as is required in connection with the construction and maintenance of the buildings," and committed to giving the camp buildings and improvements to the White Mountain Apache Tribe following the conclusion of the project.

Apache Responses to Grasshopper

Grasshopper's benefits for the Tribe and its citizens are substantial, but I find no clear basis or point in attempting to assess which party got the better deal. Instead, I think questions about Grasshopper's still-reverberating consequences for the White Mountain Apache Tribe are more meaningfully assessed through a consideration of the Tribe's responses, direct as well as indirect, to opportunities and challenges arising from Grasshopper. Table 4 lists some of these responses, admittedly biased because of limits to my knowledge, of projects and programs implemented in accord with Apache values and in pursuit of the Tribe's interests.

Dates	Benefit Types; Sources	Aims and Notes
1963–1972	Lease payments; University of Arizona Grasshopper field school	Compensate Tribe ($200 per year; $2000 over 10 years) for exclusive seasonal use of camp and non-exclusive use of sites under investigation.
June 1965	National publicity; Lynda Bird Johnson and presidential press corps	President Johnson's daughter attended 10 days of the field school, focusing favorable attention on the Tribe, its lands, and its commitments to education.
1969–1992	Seasonal employment; University of Arizona	Engage Apache men to assist with excavation, cornering, mapping, facility construction and maintenance, etc. At least $150,000 paid to about three dozen Apache employees over 24 seasons.
1973–1992	Lease Payments; University of Arizona Grasshopper field school	Compensate Tribe ($500 per year; $10, 000 over 20 years) for exclusive seasonal use of camp and non-exclusive use of sites under investigation.
~1978–1982	Long-range site preservation planning; University of Arizona and Arizona State Parks	Site surveys to assess distribution and intensity of damage from collectors; Arizona State Historic Preservation Office grants W. A. Longacre and J. J. Reid.
1984–1986	Plan for Apache crafts cooperative; University of Arizona	Proposal by J. J. Reid and W. Jernigan (not funded) to fund initial development of a beadwork, basketry and juniper woodworking enterprise.
1992–continuing	Donation of Mogollon exhibit and book royalties; J. J. Reid and S. Whittlesey	Enable interpretation of regional archaeology and other educational programs through donations, including all royalties ($175 and counting) from Reid and Whittlesey (1999) to the Programming Endowment managed by the Fort Apache Heritage Foundation.
Occasional, ~1964–1982, 1988–1989	Wildland firefighting on Reservation lands; University of Arizona students and staff	Provide supplies, equipment, firefighters, and site location information in support of wildland fire suppression efforts.
1967–1992	Cultural and historical site surveys; Grasshopper field school	Document and assess significance of sites, including Apache sites, as pioneered by J. Ayres, Longacre, Reid, Welch, H. D. Tuggle, and M. W. Graves in his work with K. H. Basso.
~1986–1990	Purchase of field school food and other supplies; Grasshopper field school	Help local economy by buying camp food (~$2000 per season) at the Cibecue Commercial Center during the years it had a full grocery.
1997–1999	$33,420 grant to White Mountain Apache Tribe; University of Arizona Provost Research Fund	Stabilize exposed masonry architecture at Grasshopper Ruins and Cowboy Camp; Restore Grasshopper camp to pre-1963 conditions; Backfill dangerous areas and remove dead trees and industrial intrusions; Rehabilitate vehicle tracks.

Table 3. *Benefits to the White Mountain Apache Tribe from the Grasshopper Project*

Direct responses include questions raised by some of the Tribe's leaders about the merits of the Grasshopper project, as well as the Tribe's initiatives to restore and rehabilitate the Grasshopper site. In late 1973, the Tribe limited the archaeology permit to territory well to the west of their reservation's most westerly town, Cibecue. In 1979, the year Reid took over as the field school direc-

tor, his consultations with Tribal Council Chairman Ronnie Lupe led to a halt in intentional burial excavations (Reid and Whittlesey 1999:x, 2005:143-144). By the early 1980s, resolutions from the Tribe's governing body no longer passed with unanimous endorsements for the project. Judy DeHose, a councilmember from Cibecue, began opposing the project's continuation on the grounds that the excavations were disrespectful and could have unforeseen negative consequences. By about 1984, the terms of the permit further reduced the size of the Grasshopper study area and included University responsibilities to restore all excavated areas and otherwise leave "the area in as near to original condition as possible" as well as to return all collected materials "to the Tribe after analysis and report preparations unless otherwise directed." In 1991, Jeff Reid and Joe Ezzo requested and received the Tribe's permission to conduct bioarchaeological research, possibly the first such proj-

Dates	Response	Aims / Partners / Notes
1969–continuing	Establish and operate the White Mountain Apache Tribe Nohwike' Bágowa (House of Our Footprints) Museum at the Fort Apache and Theodore Roosevelt School historic district (National Historic Landmark since 2011)	Collaborations with elders to gather oral histories; Partnerships with the Arizona Historical Society and, since 1997, the Fort Apache Heritage Foundation to develop collections and exhibitions for the primary benefit of the Apache community and for a secondary audience of Fort Apache visitors.
1992–continuing	Authorize a Cultural Advisory Board of Apache elders and cultural practitioners	Assist the Tribe and the Tribe's cultural resources director in repatriation efforts pursuant to NAGPRA, in the protection of Apache sacred sites, and in the perpetuation of Apache language and culture
1996–continuing	Establish and operate the White Mountain Apache Tribe Historic Preservation Office	Maximize local capacities in heritage site recording, significance assessment, and preservation; Minimize State of Arizona participation in resource and project planning and management on the Tribe's lands.
1997–continuing	Charter the Fort Apache Heritage Foundation as a 501(c)(3) entity recognized by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service	Assist the Tribe's historic preservation, cultural and language perpetuation, and other heritage efforts, especially through the preservation and redevelopment of the Fort Apache and Theodore Roosevelt School National Historic Landmark
2001–2004	Broaden and redirect field school training through Arizona Anthropology's Silver Creek Archaeological Project Research Experience for Undergraduates	Obtain National Science Foundation support (Mills and Welch) to include ethics seminars, Forestdale Valley survey, mapping and site damage assessment; Kinishba mapping and stabilization
2010–2012	Create the Western Apache Ethnography and GIS Research Experience for Undergraduates	Obtain National Science Foundation support (Hoerig) for a field school focused on the creation of a Western Apache cultural atlas

Table 4. *Some indirect White Mountain Apache responses to Grasshopper*

ect authorized post-NAGPRA. In the fall of 1992, Bureau of Indian Affairs Fort Apache Agency Superintendent Ben Nuvamsa initiated discussions with the Tribal Council that led to a sustained campaign by Apache, Zuni, and Hopi cultural and elected leaders to restore and rehabilitate Grasshopper and other sites on Apache lands investigated by Arizona Anthropology (Welch and Ferguson 2007). Intertribal consultations held at Grasshopper identified specific concerns that were addressed by clean up, backfilling, re-contouring, and architectural stabilization work completed by the Tribe's historic preservation office (1997–1999). The University provided funds; the U.S. National Park Service provided technical assistance through workshops led by staff members that included Mickey Estrada, Todd Metzger, and Jim Trott (Table 3; Welch 2001, 2009).

The Tribe and its people also responded indirectly to Grasshopper. Nick Laluk, a citizen of the White Mountain Apache Tribe who received his anthropology doctorate under Barbara Mills' supervision in 2015, participated in the restoration and stabilization workshops while an intern with the historic preservation office. Laluk later enrolled in the Arizona Anthropology summer field school as an undergraduate (Mills et al. 2008; Laluk 2015). The Tribe also hired Arizona Anthropology Ph.D, holders—first me then Karl Hoerig, who has dedicated much of his career to service as the director of the Tribe's Cultural Center (since 2001) and non-profit Fort Apache Heritage Foundation (since 2005) (Hoerig et al. 2015).

The responses mentioned here suggest to me a suite of Apache values and interests relating to cultural resources that are local (non-extractive), centered on Apache oral traditions and other intangible aspects of living traditions (not Ancestral Pueblo material culture), and connected to a broader and longer-term program of tourism-based economic development (non-academic and value-added). It is no coincidence that these values and interests stand in clear contrasts to those underlying the Grasshopper project. Grasshopper, in other words, helped the Tribe to define and pursue a distinctive heritage program. Instead of building upon Arizona Anthropology investments in Grasshopper or Kinishba, the Tribe focused on creating local knowledge and capacity to document, interpret and otherwise manage Apache cultural resources for Apache benefit. The Tribe's initiatives constitute and

indicate a constructive critical reaction to external, term-limited, extractive research.

Toward Sovereignty-Driven Research

It may be many years before the White Mountain Apache Tribe re-prioritizes research engagements with academic proponents. The Tribe is otherwise occupied. As is true for much of Native America, Arizona's Apaches are among the least healthy, wealthy, and educated people on the continent (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014). The Tribe's struggles with climate change consequences, population growth, underemployment, and the gradual withdrawal of government support and trusteeship are nothing less than existential (Wagner 2014). As we await the release of tribally authored calls for research partnerships and proposals, the Tribe's direct and indirect reactions to Grasshopper, coupled with my own experience and the success of Hoerig's four (2010–2013) Ethnography and Geographic Information Systems field schools (Hoerig et al. 2015; UA School of Anthropology 2013), provide interim guidance on ways to align academic and Apache research interests and initiatives. As authentic expressions of what Apaches want in relation to cultural resources, the Tribe's initiatives illustrate at least four attributes for collaborative research designs related to cultural resources:

1. Community-orientated—grounded in local values and interests in places, traditions, or other forms of heritage.
2. Value-added—committed to leaving more than taking.
3. Minimally-intrusive—committed to the preservation of authentic integrities existing at various social, spatial and temporal scales.
4. Sovereignty-enhancing—supportive of effective and sustainable local governance of territory and associated people and communities.

This list, while starkly contrasting with the research precepts implicit in Burge's 1947 request for assistance (from the 1947 *Atlatl* article, "What Good is an Anthropologist?" reprinted on page 122 of this issue), is a natural outgrowth of discussions centering on "Haury's idea that a people should be allowed to work out its own destiny."

Of paramount interest for the White Mountain Apache Tribe and its elected and cultural leaders is expanding and enhancing sovereignty as an antidote to colonialist policy and practice, including extractive research. A shift

from academic or discipline-driven research to sovereignty-driven research begins with the understanding sovereignty as dependent upon five "pillars" or constituents:

1. Self-sufficiency—creation and maintenance of sustainable supplies of the food, water, shelter and human relationships essential for people to survive and thrive;
2. Self-determination—policies and practices that foster and enable futures concordant with longstanding and emergent community values and interests;
3. Self-governance—internal capacities to pursue and sustain self-determination;
4. Self-representation—first-person portrayals of cultures, histories and aspirations;
5. Peer-Recognition—establishment of government-to-government and other peer relationships based on legitimate authority over territory, citizens and resources.

Arizona Anthropology has, at least for the time being, abandoned Grasshopper and other Apache-controlled loci of excavation, collection, and training. Sovereignty's five pillars offer guidance toward re-occupying and refreshing the partnership and for strategic research planning with tribes and other indigenous and place-based communities. The needs to create and mobilize knowledge relating to sovereignty and its constituents transcend short-term political motives. In this sense, sovereignty-driven research is a logical response to the manifold challenges of global change and to the retreat from large scale experiments with social and biophysical engineering. Sovereignty-driven research includes limitless opportunities for serving and integrating the needs and interests of indigenous and non-indigenous citizens, communities, institutions, and researchers with social and "softer" biophysical science expertise ranging from, anthropology, economics, geography, law and political science to agriculture forestry, hydrology, and watershed management, etc. Designing and implementing research using the four attributes derived from Apache reactions to Grasshopper and intended to bolster one or more of the five pillars of tribal and local government sovereignty offers a path to not merely avoiding harms but achieving research relevance, benefits, and meaning on individual, disciplinary, and communal levels.

I close with the suggestion that anthropologists assess research designs, project legacies, and even

careers not only in terms of knowledge gathered and applied—that is, what has been taken from research contexts—but also in terms of knowledge and capacity left behind to catalyze and sustain further inquiry, understanding, and local development. I appeal to all who have benefitted from Grasshopper and other Arizona Anthropology on Apache lands—a list that surely includes every holder of an advanced anthropology degree from the University of Arizona—to learn more and consider doing more to assist the White Mountain Apache Tribe in their efforts to survive and prosper in the wake of intensive and prolonged engagements with Euro-Americans and Western institutions, including anthropologists and anthropologies.

Afterword: One Way to Help

The Fort Apache Heritage Foundation is the non-profit arm of the White Mountain Apache Tribe dedicated to the preservation of the Tribe's tangible cultural heritage (especially the Fort Apache and Kinishba Ruins National Historic Landmarks) and the perpetuation of Apache culture and language. The Foundation provides scholarship and leadership support to Apache youth and interpretive and outreach programming for Apaches and visitors to the Nohwike' Bágowa (House of Our Footprints) Museum. Visit www.fortapachearizona.com for more information or to donate.

References Cited

Agnew, Neville, and Janet Bridgland, editors
2006 Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation, Proceedings of the Conservation Theme at the 5th World Archaeological Congress, Washington, D.C., 22-26 June 2003. Getty Conservation Institute Symposium Proceedings Series. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute. http://hdl.handle.net/10020/gci_pubs/of_past_for_future.

Basso, Keith H.
1996 *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Cummings, Byron S.
1940 *Kinishba: A Prehistoric Pueblo of the Great Pueblo Period*. Tucson: Hohokam Museums Association and the University of Arizona.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne
2014 *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Beacon Press, Boston.

Haury, Emil W.
1934 *The Canyon Creek Ruin and the Cliff Dwellings of the Sierra Ancha*. Medallion Papers No.14. Gila Pueblo Globe.
1940 Excavations in the Forestdale Valley, East-Central Arizona. Social Sciences Bulletin 12. *University of Arizona Bulletin* 11(4). Tucson.
1985 *Mogollon Culture in the Forestdale Valley, East-Central Arizona*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
1989 Point of Pines, Arizona: A History of the University of Arizona Archaeological Field School. *University of Arizona Anthropological Papers* No. 50. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hoerig, Karl A., John R. Welch, T. J. Ferguson, and Gabriella Soto
2015 Expanding Toolkits for Heritage Perpetuation: The Western Apache Ethnography and Geographic Information Science Research Experience for Undergraduates. *International Journal of Applied Geospatial Research 6*:60-77.

Laluk, Nicholas
2015 *Historical-Period Apache Occupation of the Chiricahua Mountains in SE Arizona: An Exercise in Collaboration*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Mills, Barbara J.
2005 Curricular Matters: The Impact of Archaeological Field Schools on Southwest Archaeology. In *Southwest Archaeology in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Linda S. Cordell and Don D. Fowler, pp. 60-80. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

Mills, Barbara J., Mark Altaha, John R. Welch, and T. J. Ferguson
2008 Field Schools without Trowels: Teaching Archaeological Ethics and Heritage Preservation in a Collaborative ontext. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 25-49. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Mills, Barbara J., Sarah A. Herr, and Scott Van Keuren (editors)
1999 *Living on the Edge of the Rim: Excavations and Analysis of the Silver Creek Archaeological Research Project 1993-1998*. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series No. 192. Arizona State Museum. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

George P. Nicholas, John R. Welch, and Eldon C. Yellowhorn
2008 Collaborative Encounters. In *Archaeological Practice: Engaging*

Descendant Communities, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson (Walnut Creek, Ca: AltaMira Press, 2008), 288-90.

Olsen, John W.
1990 Vertebrate Faunal Remains from Grasshopper Pueblo, Arizona. *Anthropological Papers* 83. Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Reid, J. Jefferson, and Stephanie M. Whittlesey
1997 *The Archaeology of Ancient Arizona*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
1999 *Grasshopper Pueblo: A Story of Archaeology and Ancient Life*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
2005 *Thirty Years into Yesterday: A History of Archaeology at Grasshopper Pueblo*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
2010 *Prehistory, Personality, and Place: Emil W. Haury and the Mogollon Controversy*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Shimada, Izumi
2013 Lessons from Working with the Cibecue Apache Youth (1973-4). Paper presented at the Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Honolulu.

Triadan, Daniela
1997 Ceramic Commodities and Common Containers: Production and Distribution of White Mountain Red Ware in the Grasshopper Region, Arizona. *Anthropological Papers* 61. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

University of Arizona School of Anthropology
2013 "Summer Research Experience for Undergraduates in Ethnography and GIS." http://anthropology.arizona.edu/content/western_apache_ethnography_and_gis_research_experience_undergraduates, consulted April 11, 2015.

Van Keuren, Scott
1999 Ceramic Design Structure and the Organization of Cibola White Ware Production in the Grasshopper Region, *Arizona. Archaeological Series* 191. Arizona State Museum, Tucson.

Wagner, Dennis
2014 Apaches Approach Crossroads. *The Arizona Republic*. February 2, 2014. http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/20140106white-mountain-apaches-crossroads.html

Welch, John R.
1997 White Eyes' Lies and the Battle for Dzil Nchaa Si An. *American Indian Quarterly* 27(1):75-109

2000 The White Mountain Apache Tribe Heritage Program: Origins, Operations, and Challenges. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by Kurt E. Dongoske, Mark Aldenderfer, and Karen Doehner, pp. 67-83. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

2007a 'A Monument to Native Civilization': Byron Cummings' Still-Unfolding Vision for Kinishba Ruins. *Journal of the Southwest* 49(1):1-94

2007b Kinishba Bibliography. *Journal of the Southwest* 49(1):117-127.

2009 Reconstructing the Ndee (Western Apache) Homeland. In *The Archaeology of Meaningful Places*, edited by Brenda Bowser and M. Nieves Zedeño, pp. 149-162. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Welch, John R., and Robert C. Brauchli

2010 "Subject to the Right of the Secretary of the Interior": The White Mountain Apache Reclamation of the Fort Apache and Theodore Roosevelt School Historic District. *Wicazo Sa Review* 25(1):47-73.

Welch, J.R., and T. J. Ferguson

2007 Putting Patria into Repatriation: Cultural Affiliations of White Mountain Apache Tribe Lands. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7:171-198.

Zedeño, María Nieves

1994 *Sourcing Prehistoric Ceramics at Chodistaas Pueblo, Arizona: The Circulation of People and Pots in the Grasshopper Region*. Anthropological Papers 58. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.