Chapter 1

Project Description and Research Design

1.1 Introduction

The National Park Service in the spring of 2004 contracted with Gregory R. Campbell, Ph.D, Department of Anthropology, The University of Montana, to assist in identifying and documenting tribal cultural resources within the boundaries of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site and the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site that are significant to five tribes that have historical and cultural associations. In particular, the project is to identify and evaluate ethnographic values of significant flora within the two National Historic Sites.

1.2 Research Focus and Objectives

The overall objective of the project is to associate these sites with cultural practices and beliefs that are rooted in the history and cultural traditions of five indigenous societies and, document the importance of known plants to maintaining the continuity of that community's contemporary traditional beliefs and practices. The core research goal is to present ethnohistorical and ethnographic information on traditional plant uses in the context of cultural values rooted in each park's cultural landscape.[1] The research efforts include literature and archival searches as well as consultant interviews during a preliminary field investigation. To accomplish this task, the study includes:

1. A review of the available literature pertaining to the ethnobotany of the Arapaho, Cheyenne, Comanche, Kiowa, and Ute;

2. A literature review of the historic and ethnographic works pertaining to the tribes, with emphasis on tribal use of the plains ecosystem and its centrality to tribal culture and way of life, and;

3. Oral history interviews with knowledgeable tribal members for purposes of documentation, public education, and interpretative purposes, with tribal permission.

1.3 Native American Association and Involvement with the Study Areas

The Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site and the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site lie on the southern Great Plains in present southeastern Colorado. The study area is within what formerly was the traditional use range of five Native American societies: Arapaho, Cheyenne, Comanche, Kiowa, and Ute. These lands were traditionally occupied and used historically by these Native societies before they were removed and settled on reservations. Despite geographical and political changes over time, ethnohistorical and ethnological evidence indicates that each society occupied or used the study area.[2] The study areas are currently under the control and management of the National Park Service, which is charged with actively preserving and managing the site's natural and cultural resources.

The Cheyenne and Arapaho, both southern and northern tribes, are the primary interested parties directly associated with the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site study area, although the tribes also have an intimate historical and cultural relationship with Bent's Fort.[3]

The Arapaho currently comprise two federally recognized and distinct tribal-nations. The Southern Arapaho reside in western Oklahoma and the Northern Arapaho are located on the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming.[4]

The Cheyenne also are two politically separate tribal-nations. The Southern Cheyenne live in western Oklahoma. The tribal government of the Southern Cheyenne,

formed jointly with the Southern Arapaho, is located in Concho, Oklahoma. The Northern Cheyenne are located on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation, Montana, with the tribal complex located in Lame Deer, Montana.[5] Despite the geographical and political severing of the Arapaho and Cheyenne into southern and northern tribes by historical and legal circumstances, each tribe is bound together by a common language, cultural traditions, and a shared sense of history.

The Comanche, Kiowa, and Ute, particularly the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute, are the primary interested parties associated with the Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site. At particular points in their histories however, each tribe used the land and resources encompassed within the boundaries of the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site.

Today the Comanche live in southwestern Oklahoma. The Comanche Tribal Complex is located nine miles north of Lawton, Oklahoma.[6] Adjacent to Comanche communities are the Kiowa. Since 1970, the Kiowa has governed itself by it own Tribal Business Committee. Four years earlier, the Comanche drafted a constitution and by-laws, forming their own Tribal Business Committee. The Kiowa Tribal Complex is located in Anadarko, Oklahoma.[7]

The Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute live on two reservations in the southwestern corner of Colorado. Tribal headquarters for the Southern Ute is located in Ignacio, Colorado. The Southern Ute approved its constitution and by-laws on June 6, 1940.

The Ute Mountain Ute Reservation lies primarily in Colorado, but extends into New Mexico and Utah. Towaoc is the only town on the reservation and is the site of the Ute Mountain Indian Agency and Tribal Complex. The tribal government operates under a constitution, which provides for its governing structure.

1.4 Methods and Sources

In keeping with the objectives outlined in the Scope of Work, the research approach maximizes the gathering of significant data and makes most efficient use of resources. Data collected for the project is derived from an analysis of the ethnohistorical literature in combination with initial ethnographic interviews with consultants. These two methodologically distinct data collection techniques establish the historical and contemporary ties to the resources and cultural landscape of the project sites.

1.5 Ethnohistorical Method

Ethnohistory is the critical examination of historical documents to reveal and ascertain an anthropological problem. The technique involves the use of historical methods and criticism to evaluate the reliability and validity of historical information. Quite often the documents are evidence generated from observers outside of the society under examination. Thus to produce an accurate account of historical events from a perspective that embodies indigenous interpretation of events requires the integration of various methods and data to elucidate data from the cultural perspective of the involved society.[8] Ethnohistory, parallel to historical method, also requires the critical use and reflexivity with the evidence.[9]

A distinguishing feature of the ethnohistorical method is the application of anthropological theory to events within the context of a particular ethnic group.[10] In indigenous studies, an ethnohistorical approach allows for the analysis of diachronic cultural changes and continuities of a society. Ethnohistory is a complementary approach to ethnography that enables the researcher to assess the continuities of cultural traditions.[11]

1.6 Ethnographic Method

Ethnography is the description of cultural patterns and behaviors of contemporary people. Ethnography emphasizes current and ongoing patterns of behavior and thought of a particular, recognized ethnic group.[12] Ethnographic data document contemporary cultural patterns associated with the continuance of practices, beliefs, values of a particular community.

To carry out the oral history objective, an ethnographic interview sample was developed that represents a section of the concerned populations. Contact for interviews was made by referral through National Park Service personnel and by contacting appropriate tribal authorities. Some consultants met during the initial phases of the project at the appropriate sites.

Because of time and funding limitations, the interview sample included only representatives that were referred by the National Park Service or the tribe. This is not a random sample of interviews, but allows the research to focus on only pertinent data. It is a directed information approach.[13] Since the method does empower interested parties to direct the researcher to individuals that have special knowledge and interest in the study area, the methodology complies with the mandate of Bulletin 38 to collect relevant cultural information.

1.7 Ethnographic Interview Structure

Within the methodological structure outlined, the researcher conducted preliminary ethnographic interviews. Given the limitations and opportunities to conduct in-depth unstructured interviews and the cultural inappropriateness of conducting highly structured interviews, the ethnographer opted to use a semi-structured interview format. A semi-structured interview technique maintains explicit research aims, but affords flexibility in the interview process.

Ethnographically, the format has four advantages. First, a semi-structured thematic interview technique is a verbal approximation of a questionnaire designed around the explicit research goals. An "interview guide" directs the interview. The guide is a list of cultural themes, topics and specific inquiries, designed to elicit pertinent information relevant to the study.[14] This structure is designed to elicit representative and comparable data in the context of group beliefs and cultural themes about the cultural resources under consideration.[15]

Second, a semi-structured interview ensure data quality through eliminating unnecessary obstacles in data collection and analysis. Third, the technique permits the interviewer to elicit ethnographic information specific to the research problem while maintaining the flexibility to allow the cultural expert to volunteer information beyond the "interview guide" that they feel is important. Fourth, and finally, the interview technique empowers the cultural expert through active participation in the interview process.[16]

The interview guide follows a basic format. Questions are designed to map out the cultural parameters of the interview. The initial questions allow the cultural expert to introduce himself/herself, explain his/her cultural relationships, and explain in their own words why he/she is qualified to speak about specific cultural issues concerning the project area. The follow-up questions are structural and attribute questions designed to elicit specific cultural information about cultural categories of meaning and activities in the area. The interview concludes with open-ended questions to allow new levels of cultural categories and meanings to emerge for the interviewer. Concluding the interview in this manner permits continual feedback and analysis of the data as each interview is completed as well as opens new areas of inquiry in future interviews.[17]

1.8 Ethnographic, Ethnohistorical Data, and Public Policy

The present project is a cooperative joint venture undertaken to collect and present ethnohistorical and ethnographic information on traditional plant uses in the

context of cultural values place on each park's cultural landscape. Although the current effort involves in-depth ethnohistorical and historical ethnological research, supplemented by oral interviews, the continuation of the project will involve having knowledgeable Elders, religious practitioners, and other interested community members relay the continuity of cultural practices within each park's boundaries.

Generally the continuity of traditional uses and beliefs of cultural resources, even after several decades, is proceeding within a still evolving legal framework. Tribes and appropriate agencies most directly responsible for implementing historical preservation laws, are still garnering necessary practical experience and knowledge about how best to implement historical preservation laws in complex situations involving indigenous peoples' heritages and their concerns.[18]

There is growing recognition that cultural resource preservation laws are somewhat inadequate in managing indigenous and ethnic heritages.[19] Legal criteria, material artifacts, and values cannot exclusively bind a people's heritage. Heritage is a living force that is rooted in history, but provides people with a sense of identity and place. Heritage is dynamic force that includes tangible and intangible expressions of cultural practices and beliefs that link generations over time. Aspects of heritage are rooted in landscapes and places that are important to a people in the continuation and development of traditions, the expression of beliefs and values, history, and current practices.

1.9 Cultural Constructs of Nature: Cultural Places and Cultural Landscapes

Cognitive research strongly suggests that environmental perception begins to emerge in childhood while enmeshed in a particular cultural and historical context. Gradually, through experience, a person develops the appropriate symbols and relationships to frame a generalized abstraction of the spatial environment. Conceptions of nature therefore are created from emerging, but experiential social, cultural, and historical contexts. Within this evolving context, the natural environment becomes a

medium of culturally meaningful phenomena that define and sustain cultural groups.[20] The dialogue between the natural and cultural perceptions of that reality, the environment, includes a differentiation of phenomena, whereby select environmental features are "clearly registered while others recede…or are blocked out."[21] These spatial attributes of cultural recognition, whether tangible or intangible, natural or manufactured, become cultural places; sites or resources that have current or potential significance.

As numerous ethnographic studies reveal, the meaning of place for Native peoples is inherent or embedded in the landscape. Attachment to place reflects a human-nature relationship imbued with meaning that through continuous interaction or recognition retains significance through time. As a result, the landscape is composed of numerous interrelated places whose meanings are interconnected and cannot be disjoined often without distorting the environmental context. Although the networks of places and the meanings of landscape vary between indigenous societies and individuals living in those societies, even with respect to the same landscape, there remains a generalized cultural consistency about the concept of embedded meanings.[22] In general places are sources and repositories of knowledge that often define identity. Specifically, place, according to Lippard;

> …is a portion of a landscape…entwined with personal memory, known and unknown histories, marks made in the land that provoke and evoke. Place is…temporal and spatial, political and personal. It is about connections, what surrounds it, what formed it, what happened there, what will happen there."[23]

Places therefore have social and moral impact, often associated with oral traditions and living memories. Places also often provide a cultural code for living that requires interaction through reciprocal appropriation. Kiowa scholar and author N. Scott Momaday, over three decades ago, emphasized this point about Native American attitudes toward the landscape. Momaday wrote:

> …the Native American ethic with respect to the physical world is a matter of reciprocal appropriation: appropriation in which man invest himself in the landscape, and at the same time incorporates the landscape into his own fundamental experience…I think his attitude toward the landscape has been formulated over a long period of time itself suggests an evolutionary process…His heritage has always been rather closely focused, centered upon the landscape as a particular reality.[24]

That is, societies construct a shared, interactive cultural model of their world often associated with environmental aspects. Cultural groups believe in the models of the natural environment or landscape because as members of a specific community, they interact with people who, within a range of individual variation, share the same cultural constructs and use those constructs in their interaction with the natural and social world.[25] As Tilley explains, "Humanly created space is the space of social reproduction…" which provide a source of adaptive strategies that contribute to a cultural group's sense of tenure on a landscape.[26] Landscapes are socially constructed entities that include human agency that "…reflect and configure being in the world."[27]

The concept of landscape denotes the interaction of people and place, usually focusing on the opportunities and constraints that environmental variables place on human societies, their social development, and adaptations. The concept of cultural landscape, not only encapsulates the long-term human-nature relationship of a society, but also embodies tangible and intangible cultural characteristics of a particular society's shared knowledge, values, beliefs, activities, and interactions about a physical landscape.

Federal land managers are challenged to recognize and respond to assigned, embedded, and connective meanings of landscape, some of which may conflict with other cultural perceptions and uses of the same area. To adequately incorporate heritage, studies have moved away from defining heritage sites as bounded entities, clearly defined by boundaries and material criteria. Recognizing the necessity to preserve and manage heritage in a more encompassing manner the National Park Service instituted the Cultural

Landscapes Program.[28] Cultural landscapes are "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife and domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values."[29] Cultural landscapes, as a component of historical preservation and heritage management, views integrated relationships between a group of people and their environment.

Of the four defined cultural landscapes, the ethnographic landscape, by definition, is "…a relatively contiguous area of interrelated places that contemporary cultural groups define as meaningful because it is inextricably and traditionally linked to their own local or regional histories, cultural identities, beliefs and behaviors.[30] Ethnographic landscapes, moreover, transform nature into culture.[31]

1.10 Transforming Nature into the Cultural: Ethnographic Landscapes

Cultural practices and beliefs of living people permeate landscapes with meanings that are often imperceptible to others. Some landscapes are places filled with locations or aspects that have traditional and sometimes, sacred importance. Such places may include camping sites, natural formations, and materials for religious, health, and well-being. Landscapes also may be associated with origin stories, spiritual beings, and significant cultural events.[32]

Landscapes viewed through the eyes of a specific culture that is imbued with meanings that mirror the system of meanings, ideologies, beliefs, values, and worldviews are ethnographic landscapes. Ethnographic landscapes reflect a distinctive way of transforming nature into culture.[33] The transformations affect land use, responses to the natural environment, and the assignment of meaning to aspects of land.

Constructing an ethnographic landscape is not static, but an on-going process of cultural creation and construction. The transformation is dynamic, but also involves past history with the location and current relationships. Thus ethnographic landscapes to

retain their meanings and cultural relevance must evolve as the people and their culture changes.[34]

Transforming nature into culture involves part of world-making, whereby people create a landscape that fits past experiences and present circumstances. To accomplish this task involves several processes and actions.[35] Components of landscapes contain two dimensions. First are areas of explicit awareness and recognition of landscape features by members of a cultural community. There are also unrecognized places where a previously unmade cultural connection is made connecting the place to a tradition, a practice, a belief, or a piece of the community's cultural history.[36] Therefore ethnographic landscapes contain unrealized cultural potential through its encapsulation into a framework of cultural meaning.

Components of ethnographic landscapes may be either material or non-material. Locations also may be physically modified by human activity or have no evidence of human modification. Other specific components of ethnographic landscapes include the ambiance of sound, sight, smell, or emptiness. Ethnographic landscapes comprise a wide variety of places and qualities that are structurally arranged on a continuum from the secular to the sacred.[37]

1.11 Preserving and Managing Ethnographic Landscapes

While the primary focus of this project involves the cultural perspectives derived from five indigenous societies, ethnographic landscapes are diverse. Often the same landscape embodies a wide range of meanings emanating from indigenous and non-indigenous communities. How to recognize, preserve, and manage the diversity of any landscape, especially if a politically dominant group imposes its uses, treatments, and conceptual meanings, remains problematic. Despite the extant problems, at present, the preservation and regulation of ethnographic landscapes is situated in a statutory and regulatory framework.[38] Within this legal context, ethnographic landscapes are offered various avenues for recognition and preservation, but not without some difficulties.[39]

A perennial contradiction in the assessment and management of ethnographic landscapes is significance. Significance, as reflected in historic preservation laws, defines cultural resources that should be acknowledged, protected, and managed based on their potential to yield scientific knowledge important to history or prehistory.[40] Assessing significance by the criteria of research potential or historical, legal, public educational, and monetary importance places emphasis on the materiality of resources. Many resources although, especially from an indigenous perspective, emphasize ethnic significance or the roles that particular resources play in the cultural traditions, histories, and identities as a people. Indigenous people also often incorporate the symbolic meaning of natural elements into definitions of self. As Greider and Garkovitch conclude:

> Cultural groups socially construct landscapes as reflections of themselves. In the process, the social, cultural, and natural environments are meshed and become part of shared symbols and beliefs of members of the groups. Thus the natural environment and changes in it take on different meanings depending on the social and cultural symbols affiliated with it.[41]

In other words tangible aspects of landscape are intimately intertwined and interconnected to intangible cultural qualities.

One aspect of ethnographic landscapes is cultural resources that are faunal and botanical resources. Animals and plants play significant cultural roles in the maintenance and performance of cultural practices. Plants are often ethnic identity symbols for many Native American people. They serve as identity symbols because they permeate almost all aspects of life. Cross-culturally, there is often a deep, spiritual relationship between people and plants.[42] Some species for example are considered traditional foods, connecting a cultural community to their history and ethnic identity. Through community labor concerning resource collection and use, some faunal and flora species magnify community solidarity. Other resources are necessary components in a wide

variety of social, rituals, ceremonies, and religious activities. Some flora resources offer properties that promote health and well-being.[43] Still other plant species are valued for their aesthetics. Thus plants express a wide range of cultural activities that may be deemed culturally significant by various tribal members.

The legal framework for designating species and areas of importance as part of a cultural landscape requires that traditional activities be professionally documented. That is the primary purpose of the ethnohistorical and ethnographic work contained in the report. Such anthropological knowledge about contemporary cultural and religious values and practices is necessary to guide responsible agencies to institute sound culturally sensitive management practices.

To accomplish this task, this document addresses the major issues central to the study objectives. First, tribal land tenure is discussed from the ethnohistorical and ethnological data (Chapter 2). This discussion also includes the ecological erosion of resources and the political alienation of the indigenous societies from the land base that historically encapsulated the project sites. Political and economic circumstances ultimately resulted in their complete removal from study areas.

Second, in Chapters 3 through 12, traditional beliefs, customs, and practices are described using the published ethnographic and ethnohistorical record. A chapter elucidating the uses of plants in each society follows each tribal historical ethnography and ethnohistory chapter. Chapter 13 discusses the cultural and religious oppression of the early reservation era noting the systematic attempts by the federal government and other organizational forces to alter indigenous life ways. The section concludes with a critical examination of indigenous attempts to assert their cultural and legal rights.

Chapter 14, using ethnographic interviews collected by the ethnographer, supplemented with published ethnographic and historical data, highlights the cultural importance of the cultural landscape to the five tribes. Finally, Chapter 15 summarizes

the cultural practices in the project areas and offers recommendations for assessing further the cultural significance of flora species.

1.12 Cooperation in Resource Management and Preservation

The Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site and Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site cannot achieve its management and preservation goals without input and cooperation of an array of stakeholders, including the tribal contributions. Consideration of Native American cultural mandates regarding the values they hold for the land is central to implementing sound management and public educational policy decisions inside the boundaries of project sites and serves to connect those bounded entities to the larger cultural landscape.

[1]. Thomas W. Kavanagh, "Comanche," In. Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 13. Part 2 of 2. Raymond J. DeMallie, volume editor. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), The identification and evaluation of ethnographic values were guided using the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes, see, http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standards/; http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/hli/landscape_guidlines/index.htm; http//www.cr.nps.gov/hps/TPS/briefs/brief36.htm.

[2]. Zachary Gussow, Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians. David Agee Horr, editor. (New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1974); Virginia McConnell Simmons, The Ute Indians of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000).

[3]. See, George E. Hyde, Life of George Bent Written from his Letters. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968); David Lavender, Bent's Fort. (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954).

[4]. Loretta Fowler, "Arapaho," In. Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 13, Part 2. Raymond J. DeMallie, volume editor. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001),849-857.

[5]. John H. Moore, Margot P. Liberty, and A. Terry Straus, "Cheyenne," In. Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 13, Part 2. Raymond J. DeMallie, volume editor. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), 876-879.

[6]. Thomas W. Kavanagh, "Comanche," In. Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 13. Part 2. Raymond J. DeMallie, volume editor. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), 899-900.

[7]. Jerrold E. Levy, "Kiowa," In. Handbook of North American Indians. Volume 13, Part 2. Raymond J. DeMallie, volume editor. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), 919-920.

[8]. See, Dennis Weidman, guest editor, Ethnohistory: A Researcher's Guide. Studies in Third World Societies. Publication Number Thirty-five. (Williamsburg: Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary, 1986).

[9]. Two articles that provide excellent overviews of the methods and goals of ethnohistory are: Robert M. Carmack, "Ethnohistory: A Review of its Development, Definitions, Methods, and Aims," Annual Review of Anthropology. 1(1972):227-246; Bruce Trigger, "Ethnohistory: Problems and Prospects," Ethnohistory. 29(1982):1-19.

[10]. Mildred Mott Wedel and Raymond J. DeMallie, "The Ethnohistorical Approach in Plains Area Studies," In. Anthropology on the Great Plains. W. Raymond Wood and Margot Liberty, editors. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 121.

[11]. For a discussion of oral history and oral tradition in the study of ethnohistory, see, J. Bryan Page, "The Use of Reminiscences and Oral Tradition in the Study of Ethnohistory," In. Ethnohistory: A Researcher's Guide. Dennis Weidman, guest editor. Studies in Third World Societies. Publication Number Thirty-five. (Williamsburg: Department of Anthropology, College of William and Mary, 1986), 275-296.

[12]. Micki Crespi, "Ethnography and the NPS: A Growing Partnership," CRM Bulletin. 10(1,1987):1-4; "Inventorying Ethnographic Resources Servicewide," CRM Bulletin. 10(4,1987):3-5.

[13]. Ideally, once the contacts are made with the initial consultants, the ethnographer will conduct the next set of interviews that are based on their recommendations. After that interview, the researcher would ask the recommended interviewee for names of other interested parties that the ethnographer should contact because of their particular knowledge about the region or topics. These named consultants would then be contacted and form another tier of the "snowball" interviews. This process would continue until individuals began referring earlier interviewees. This is a strong indication that most of the key actors and the information gathered was as complete as possible. The structural flow of the interviews would have served a number of important methodological functions. The interview structure ensures a consistent mechanism of data collection whereby representative viewpoints from a variety of perspectives are collected for analysis. The methodology avoids favoritism and selective data collection from interested parties. Thus the interview structure minimizes data bias and maintains confidentiality, see, David M. Fetterman, Ethnography: Step By Step. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 17. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1989); Allan J. Kimmel, Ethics and Values in Applied Social Research. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 12. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1988); Maurice Punch, The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1989); Jim Thomas, Doing Critical Ethnography. Qualitative Research Methods Series, Volume 26. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1993).

[14]. H. Russell Bernard, Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology. (Newbury Park: Sage Publishers, 1988).

[15]. See, Fettermen, Ethnography: Step By Step.

[16]. Susan Guyette, Community-Based Research: A Handbook for Native Americans. (Newbury Park: Sage Publishers, 1983); Fetterman, Ethnography: Step By Step; Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin, Basics of Qualitative Research. (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1991).

[17]. See, H. Russell Bernard, Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology; Research Methods in Anthropology. Third Edition. (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2002).

[18]. See, Nina Swidler, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, editors, Native Americans and Archaeologists. (Lanham: AltaMira Press, 1997); Joe Watkins, Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice. (Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2000).

[19]. Refer to, Janet Blake, "On Defining the Cultural Heritage," The International and Comparative Law Quarterly. 49(1, 2000):61-85.

[20]. Refer to, Francis T. McAndrew, Environmental Psychology. (Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1993); Thomas Greider, and Lorraine Garkovich, "Landscapes: The Social Construction of Nature and the Environment," Rural Sociology. 59(1, 1994):6; Barbara Bender, "Theorising Landscapes and the Prehistoric Landscapes of Stonehenge," Man. 27(4, 1992):735-755.

[21]. Yi-Fu Tuan, Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 4.

[22]. Anthropology has a vast literature, empirical and theoretical, concerning the meaning of place and landscape among indigenous societies. Some of the works that have informed the current study are Keith H. Basso, Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996); "'Speaking with Names': Language and Landscape Among the Western Apache," Current Anthropology. 3(2, 1988):99-130; R. Bauman, Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Vine Deloria Jr., Sacred Lands and Religious Freedom. (New York: Association on American Indian Affairs, 1991); J. Goody and I. Watt, Literacy in Traditional Societies. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); K. Kelly and H. Francis, Navajo Sacred Places. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); M. Rodman, "Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality," American Anthropologist. 94(1992):640-656.

[23]. Lucy Lippard, The Lure of the Local: Senses of Places in a Multicentered Society. (New York: The New Press, 1997), 9.

[24]. N. Scott Momaday, "Native American Attitudes to the Environment," In. Seeing with a Native Eye: Essays on Native American Religion. Walter Holden Capps, editor. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1976), 80-81.

[25]. See, Willett Kempton, James S. Boster, and Jennifer A. Hartley, Environmental Values in American Culture. (Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997).

[26]. Christopher Tilley, "Art, Architecture, Landscape (Neolithic Sweden)," In. Landscape: Politics and Perspectives. Barbara Bender, editor. (Providence: Berg Publishers, 1993), 81.

[27]. Edward W. Soja, Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertaion of Space in Critical Social Theory. (London: Verso, 1989), 25.

[28]. See, Melody Webb, "Cultural Landscapes in the National Park Service," The Public Historian. 9(2, 1987):77-89.

[29]. National Park Service, Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment, and Management of Historical Landscapes. Electronic document, 1994. (http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/briefs/brief36.htm).

[30]. Michael J. Evans, Alexa Roberts, and Peggy Nelson, Ethnographic Landscapes. CRM Volume 24. Number 5. (Electronic Document, http://crm.cr.nps.gov/archive/24-05/24-05-20.pdf, 2001), 54.

[31]. Jeffery H. Altschul, "Significance in American Cultural Resource Management: Lost in the Past," In. Heritage of Value: Archaeology of Renown. Clay Mathers, Timothy Darvill, and Barbara J. Little, editors. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 192-210; Boyd, W. E., Maria M. Cotter, Jane Gardiner, and Gai Taylor, "Rigidity and a Changing Order, Disorder, Degeneracy and Daemonic Repetition: Fluidity of Cultural Values and Cultural Heritage Management," In. Heritage of Value: Archaeology of Renown. Clay Mathers, Timothy Darvill, and Barbara J. Little, editors. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 89-113; Clay Mathers, John Schelberg, and Ronald Kneebone, "Drawing Distinctions:" Toward a Scalar Model of Value and Significance," In. Heritage of Value: Archaeology of Renown. Clay Mathers, Timothy Darvill, and Barbara J. Little, editors. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 159-191; Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy, "Places People Value: Social Significance and Cultural Exchange in

Post-Invasion Australia," In. After Captain Cook. Rodney Harrison and Christine Williamson, editors. (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2004), 171-190.

[32]. Donald L. Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture," In. Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America. Arnold R. Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, editors. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 169.

[33]. Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture," 169.

[34]. Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture," 169-170.

[35]. Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture," 170.

[36]. Thomas F. King, "Beyond Bulletin 38: Comments on the Traditional Properties Symposium," Cultural Resources Management, Bulletin 16 (1993):60-64.

[37]. Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture," 175.

[38]. The key statutes are the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Management Policy Act (FLMPA), the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), among others legal mandates, refer to the National Center for Cultural Resources, Federal Historic Preservation Laws. (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 2002); Jennifer R. Richman and Marion P. Forsyth, editors, Legal Perspectives on Cultural Resources. (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press. 2004).

[39]. Despite being defined as a cultural landscape, ethnographic landscapes are distinct under National Register of Historic Places (NPHP) criteria and determinations of integrity. Ethnographic landscapes do not have to qualify under NPHR criteria, but can be eligible as a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). However, ethnographic landscapes are based on intrinsic meanings people assign to place rather than extrinsic qualities. Hence they are often "symbolic landscapes," encompassing multiple components of meanings over vast amounts of land, refer to, Susan Buggey and Nora Mitchell, Cultural Landscape Management Challenges and Promising New Directions in the United States and Canada: The Challenges of Conservation. Electronic document, (http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_07_en.pdf, 2002); Tonia W. Horton, "Writing Ethnographic History: Historic Preservation, Cultural Landscapes, Traditional Cultural Properties," In. Northern Ethnographic Landscapes: Perspectives from Circumpolar Nations. Igor Krupnik, Rachael Mason, and Tonia Horton, editors. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2004), 65-80; see also, Evans, Roberts, and Nelson, Ethnographic Landscapes.

[40]. See, Alan D. Reed, "A Technique for Ranking Prehistoric Sites for Archaeology," American Archaeology. 6(1987):95-109; Thomas F. King, Thinking About Cultural Resource Management. (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2002); Thomas F. King, Cultural Resource Laws and Practice. (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2004).

[41]. Greider, and Garkovich, "Landscapes: The Social Construction of Nature and the Environment," 8.

[42]. Michael J. Balick, "Transforming Ethnobotany for the New Millennium," Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden. 83(1, 1996):65; David B. Halmo, Richard W. Stoffle, and Michael J. Evans, "Paitu Nanasuagaindu Pahonupi (Three Sacred Valleys): Cultural Significance of Gosiute, Paiute, and Ute Plants," Human Organization. 52(2, 1993):143.

[43]. Hardesty, “Ethnographic Landscapes Transforming Nature into Culture,” 175-177.