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ABSTRACT

Public discourse conveys and constructs sophisticated, nuanced and often conflicting notions of place, identity, culture, and religion. Comprehending the significance of place-based discourse is essential to understanding many of the contemporary difficulties facing Native American peoples. This is particularly true of the Western Apache people who constitute their places via discursive engagement. This project examines the Western Apache in their fight to save Dzil nchaa si an (Mount Graham) from a multi-telescope observatory upon its summit. Using discourse and text analysis to examine the public rhetoric, I suggest that the Western Apache understand the mountain as a participatory partner in community viability and Apache identity. I also suggest that the discourse surrounding the Mt. Graham controversy provides a mechanism to understand how Apache discourse links past and present practices and identity as seen through four emerging thematic elements: ethics, relatedness, knowledge, and religious verbiage. Understanding how discourse reveals cultural norms and practices and sustains cultural integrity is important as communicative disjunctures impact the effective responses of Native American and other diverse groups. These issues are framed within the national debate regarding cultural significance and bear directly upon the success of other preservation efforts.
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This project deals primarily with Western Apache discourse and understandings of place. The discourse of place is connected to larger social and political struggles. Understanding how place and social practice are publicly expressed within the political arena has the potential to inform decision-making processes in social, land management, and religio-legal policy. I would assert that advancing our understanding of indigenous peoples’ places and practices is particularly important in an increasingly global world where multi-cultural encounters are on the rise and we face co-utilization of resources. For indigenous peoples this is one of the fundamental issues as their culturally significant places are often viewed as extractable resources by non-indigenous groups.

**Dissertation Structure**

This dissertation is structured to hopefully explicate these questions. It reflects both my process of discovery and the Western Apache lives it details. This introductory chapter lays out the basic research questions I seek to examine. I then proceed with a brief overview of the main events in the controversy over a multi-telescope observatory upon Mount Graham, setting the stage for my project. I also acknowledge the larger impacts of this conflict, situating this in the larger context of globalization. Chapter 2 examines the Western lens from which most research springs. Understanding how and what we ‘think’ is important if we are to understand another. This chapter also discusses theories of place, religion,
phenomenology, and social constructionism as they apply to the project. It is necessary to explicate the theoretical lens we currently employ in order to discuss the specific methods utilized in this project. We cannot completely leave theory behind as the methodologies utilized in this project, discourse and metaphor analysis, carry their own theoretical frames which are rooted in the Western perspective. Chapter 3 examines the study of language, a crucial component of discourse. I then move to the theory and methodology of Discourse and Metaphor Analysis, the primary methods utilized in this project. \(^1\) Chapter 4 examines the documentary history of the Western Apache. I discuss Western Apache history after my theoretical and methodological discussions because I felt it was important for the reader to be self-reflexive while examining this history. Much of the controversy centered upon the validity of Apache historical and cultural claims to the land. Rhetorical strategies on the part of telescope proponents centered around the refutation of these claims utilizing Euro-American documentary records. It is necessary to critically examine this history in order to analyze the Western Apache discourse. Chapter 5 moves to Western Apaches’

---

\(^1\) A note on the spelling and grammatical choices utilized in this dissertation. All Western Apache words are standardized as much as possible. Throughout history, multiple spellings have been passed down in the Western academic literature. These have been left intact when directly quoting Western Apache individuals. Wherever possible, I used the most commonly used form, or that form which corresponded to validated ethnographic research. *Dzil Nchaa Si An* has been represented in the literature in multiple forms and these forms are accepted by the Apache people. I chose the capitalized version for a variety of reasons. This form was utilized by the first elders whose statements I examined and I felt that the knowledge of elders deserved respect. Other elders used different forms. Primarily though, I felt that the mountain and the Apache people deserved to be represented with as much authority as Euro-American people and places. Euro-Americans capitalize people, places, and objects of importance and use lower case to indicate relative insignificance. While the Western Apache do not appear to use capitalization in this way, I (and other academics) write and convey our thoughts in English. I therefore wanted to convey the significance and power of the mountain in standard English forms.
own histories of their experience in Arizona. I examine these oral histories and find that much of what is passed down can be correlated with Western accounts. Having established a historical and discursive base, I move to my analysis of the Western Apache public discourse. Chapters 6 through 8 examine the results from the various analytic methods utilized. Chapter 6 begins this process with a review of the traditional Western Apache epistemological system and proceeds to examine the linguistic components in Western Apache ‘English’ discourse. I find striking similarities to traditional Western Apache ways of speaking which suggest not only cultural continuity but conceptual continuity. Chapter 7 delves into the critical discourse analysis of the rhetoric, attending to thematic domains and rhetorical strategies. It is here that we find evidence of a broad inclusive ontology and a relational epistemology. Moreover, the ethical underpinning to the discourse is strongly suggestive of continued cultural maintenance. Chapter 8 finishes the analytical discussion by examining the metaphorical structures and expressions within the Western Apache discourse. Chapter 9 concludes the study with a discussion of the results and their implications.

Displaying the analysis sheets in this project presents some difficulty due to the sheer volume of analytic texts and references. One three-inch notebook alone accounted for over 168 news articles, 21 organizational news releases, 42 editorials, 5 letters, and 4 resolutions.² Compilation of the personal statements

² The total volume of documents exceeded four document boxes of primarily single page texts, though not all documents contained public statements and duplicates were present. A conservative estimate of source documents is over 200 multi-page documents of individual statements (many of which were compilations from multiple sources), approximately 150 tribal organizational
resulted in over 200 pages, many pulled from multiple sources and formats. The analysis of these resulted in hundreds more pages. In discussion with my committee, I have therefore included in Appendix A my coding book with the enumeration of both sources and individual references. Sources are available in the References Cited section and can be cross-referenced for those who wish to reproduce my analysis. Appendix B presents a summative version of metaphor analysis (limited examples due to the same size issues) presented in Chapter 8.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

That mountain is very, very strong... That mountain sustained our ancestors’ lives, by providing food, water, medicine, herbs, shelter, for many generations. Our religion and traditions are under assault. This action shows disrespect both for the earth and for the Apache people... It hurts in our hearts. The foundation of life is tied directly to that big mountain... The Crown Dancers, Gaan, they came to our ancestors. The Crown Dancers came from there and they are still in there—in Mount Graham. They’re in there—in spirit. This is where everything comes from. Every spring that comes out of the mountain is holy water... Whatever they’re building up there is not good for our ancestors’ spirits, or their graves, or the spirit that is still inside that mountain. These are things of importance. There are so many things involved in that big mountain... They cause real pain to our mountain with their telescopes and power line. [Davis 1991a, b]

Dzil Nchaa Si An³ (Mount Graham) has been the subject of a decades-long controversy, played out on the public stage, over the placement of a multi-telescope observatory, the Mount Graham International Observatory (MGIO), on the summit. The controversy has pitted a consortium of institutions headed by the University of Arizona, the Vatican Observatory and the Max Planck Institute against the Western Apache, environmental groups, activists, and various religious organizations. To the Western Apache, this mountain is known as Big Seated Mountain and is part of a cultural landscape that comprises the Western Apache world.

Native American places have long been the focus of controversy. There is a long history of appropriation of Native American places—through inhabitance, forced removal, naming and claiming (LaDuke 2005). Native American losses, of

³ The ‘l’ in Dzil is phonetically barred, making this a voiceless lateral.
places, people, and cultural viability, are persistent and ongoing. Contested places, and the discourses surrounding them, are generally framed within the larger geopolitical context but are more than debates about geopolitics, colonialism, and legal rights. Often these places are characterized as ‘sacred’ framing the conflict as religious in nature. These framings mask an underlying problem in these types of conflicts—Native Americans may experience, understand, and maintain connections with their places differently than non-Native Americans and these differences may be fundamental. Native American peoples are tied to their places (Deloria 1992, 2004; Basso 1996; Cajete 2000, 2004). Their cultural practices are linked to and embedded in their places. Individual and community identities are created, sustained, and performed within the cultural landscape. Native and non-Native American scholars (Deloria 1992, 2004; Basso 1996, Ingold 2000, 2011; Cajete 2000, 2004; Burkhart 2004; Waters 2004) have repeatedly tried to make the point that these connections are materially, socially, and culturally formative.

Colonialization has fractured and displaced communities from their ancestral lands and neighbors. Displacement is therefore devastating for Native Americans. Displacement is physical, psychosocial, and cultural loss (Wildcat 2009:3). The current state of affairs in many of the nation’s reservations reflects this alienation. There are increasing problems with drug and alcohol addiction, chronic illness, and sustained poverty. The removal from ancestral lands is

---

4 I will discuss the problems associated with this concept and its inapplicability in the Western Apache case in Chapter 2. I use this term only to denote a Western perspective by particular individuals, agencies, or organizations.
correlated to changes in diet, occupation, lifestyles, familial bonds, and cultural identity. The problem is compounded by the essentialization of Native American peoples either through the appropriation of Native American cultures for commercial use or the refusal to accept as valid Native American cultures as dynamic changing societies.

Despite an increasingly global world, we remain local—locally placed, locally identified, locally constituted. Understanding how place, identity, and cultural continuity intertwine is at the heart of this project. Ten years ago I became fascinated with how places shape us despite our Western assumption that we are masters of our environments. I knew that non-Western societies experienced their places differently but what did that mean? All life is embodied and emplaced. Our experiences of place are perceived differentially however. What does this mean in a global society? How do we negotiate these different experiences, meanings and connections in a world that increasingly shares places? The past is certainly no rubric for the future.

This project focuses on how Western Apaches talk about their special places and if there are underlying ontological and epistemological differences which impact how places are understood and experienced by the Western Apache. The Western Apache are part of the southern Athapaskan linguistic group whose arrival into what is now the southwestern United States and Northern Mexico is still in dispute. They are thought to have migrated into Arizona from northern Canada and Alaska along the plains on either side of the Rocky Mountains sometime between 900-1350 C. E. Contacts with Euro-American explorers and
settlers were infrequent and occurred later than for other Native Americans in the region. This has implications in terms of acculturation and hybridity particularly when investigating ontological and epistemological assumptions. While most of the Western Apache presently reside on one of six reservations in Arizona, this project primarily concerns itself with public statements from the White Mountain Apache and San Carlos Apache residents in central Arizona while protesting a telescope installation. I discuss Western Apache culture and history in later chapters.

Within the context of my larger question, I focus on three interconnected questions: (1) Do Western Apache people understand and operationalize their concepts of place differently than Western peoples, and if so how? (2) Are there differences in place meanings expressed in the discourse and (3) If present, do these differences in meaning and discourse cause cross-cultural misunderstandings in the public rhetoric? I utilize the Mount Graham controversy as a frame for this examination. I do this for a number of interrelated reasons: (1) the controversy was primarily rhetorical and discursive in nature, (2) Western Apaches use places discursively in daily social acts, and (3) previous scholarship on the Western Apache specifically dealt with Western Apache and their places.

The controversy surrounding Mount Graham was above all rhetorical in nature. While physical acts played their part, it was the public discourse that characterized the conflict. Conflicts are always discursive to some extent and this conflict was played out on the public stage for over a decade. This offered a rich data set from which to examine Apache understandings in the forum through
which they themselves often understood their places. The public nature of the
discourse also offered a glimpse at the process of cultural change and continuity
through the mechanism of discourse as a social act. I felt that any explication of
place must take into account Western Apache discursive construction,
acknowledging that this is a continuing process.

Western Apaches engage with their places, socially and discursively
(Basso 1990, 1996). Discourse, as an interactive process, is an important facet in
the construction of Western Apache places and identity (Basso 1990, 1996).
Native American discourses, or ways of speaking, are critical components in the
maintenance and transformation of many Native American social practices (Basso
Native American narratives, stories, and discourses create and maintain cultural
relevance, identity, and practice and can be viewed as cultural resources for
communities. The study of rhetoric and discourse has most often been focused
upon the persuasive or artistic aspects within the political or ceremonial domains.
Discourse, however, involves shared and communicated knowledge, opinions,
and, just as important, the decisions made in how, when, what, and where to
communicate. Discourse is also a public social act. Native American discourse
concerning their places can be said to reveal ‘inclusive epistemologies’, ‘diverse
ontologies’ and normative assumptions concerning social practice as well as the
manner in which discourse should operate within the public domain (Escobar
2008:6; Kroksrity and Field 2009).
Having background materials with which to compare contemporary Apache discourse was immensely valuable. Public discourse is a conversation that can “recast meanings and realities” (Feldman 1988). Thus, examining for cultural continuity requires knowledge of the past and the present. Rhetoric and rhetorical framing were also crucial components in the public face of the various participants. It is often difficult to explicate meanings from public presentation. The ethnographic research of both Grenville Goodwin and Keith Basso provided a solid base.

Project Design and Methodologies

The semiotic issue is to understand how Western Apaches understand their places and how they convey that to other audiences. Understanding the cognitive distinctions, rooted in ontology and epistemology, which underlie Apache discourse of sacred places is crucial in this endeavor.

The research design of this project was structured to accommodate possible project constraints while maximizing attempts at a deeper understanding of Western Apache conceptualizations of place. At the beginning of this project, I hoped to conduct oral histories with tribal members concerning the Mount Graham International Observatory controversy itself, Western Apache notions of place, and possibly delving into the ontologies and epistemologies of the Western Apache. Unfortunately though oral permission was given, I was unable to obtain written tribal permission. This was due to a variety of factors, including the political instability in the San Carlos Apache Reservation community, the extreme
poverty of the San Carlos Reservation which constrains governance and political action (including the time to evaluate projects and the manpower to pursue and legally approve these), and the failing health of many of the involved tribal elders. Thus the research design allowed for possible in-depth interviews but was structured to proceed with only public statements if that was the only material available.

I contend that analysis of English statements made by Western Apache is a valuable endeavor. Western Apache language loss is unfortunately proceeding at an alarming rate. While Western Apache is spoken by many on the reservations, it is no longer the dominant language. However, regardless of whether the individuals were native Western Apache speakers or not (and the group was mixed), their concerns were conveyed using English. Moreover, this discourse occurred in a public arena rooted in Anglo-American norms and thus provided an opportunity to determine how the intersection of differing worldviews plays out in social practice. This is a frequent occurrence in indigenous land issues. We need to unpack these English statements, with a careful eye to conceptual and translational issues. Language shift is a complex phenomenon which may precede, follow, or occur simultaneously with cultural change. Unless we examine how Native Americans speak about their places in the dominant culture’s political arena, we cannot hope to understand any conceptual or communicative disjunctions which may be present. Examining these discursive and narrative resources provided an opportunity to determine how the intersection of differing
worldviews plays out in social practice. I discuss language and these implications in Chapter 3.

A multi-layered approach to analysis was taken which utilized discourse, text, and metaphor analyses. This facilitated a dialectical approach and allowed for greater in-depth analysis while helping to ensure reliability in interpretation. Statements and texts were analyzed and reanalyzed multiple times throughout this process. The project had two phases. Phase I was a review of the relevant published works, collected papers, and published research. These included oral histories, myths and tales, Grenville Goodwin’s papers, and other published ethnographic works regarding the Western Apache. Phase II addressed the public discourse surrounding the case and included the collection, coding and analysis of public documents. These documents included position papers, Tribal Resolutions, letters, newspaper and magazine articles, editorials, legal documents (depositions, declarations, court papers), public speeches (including videotapes of Apache speeches protesting the telescope construction), and orations on both sides of the issue. Subject positioning, audience, repositioning, multiple meanings and trends through time were noted.

I identified Western Apache speakers according to their position in the community, their adherence to traditional customs, their background and rearing,

---

5 Goodwin was a graduate student and anthropologist who lived with the Western Apache in the 1930s. He collected a number of detailed oral traditions and histories during that time. While he never received his doctoral degree due to his untimely death, he was a frequent correspondent with Opler and his work is generally well-regarded (Opler 1973:11, Basso 1992, Brandt 1992, Goodwin and Goodwin 2000:2).
and whether they were considered authoritative in cultural knowledge. The San Carlos Apache Reservation is host to a wide variety of individuals from multiple bands and local groups. Moreover, these individuals have lived through multiple prisms of experience. Some Western Apache have been raised in a very traditional manner, in keeping with the ‘old ways.’ Others were educated in boarding schools away from the reservation and returned only later to the area. Still others are from groups not connected to the immediate area. Finally, Christianization has occurred both early and late in life for many Apaches. This brings its own set of confounding factors in how, and what, ideas are presented and retained. Many Apaches, including even “traditional” spiritual leaders often do not see conflicts between Apache spirituality and Christian practices. (Stanley 1992b; Brandt 2012, personal communication). These differences were also apparent in Western Apache positions concerning the project. While the public discourse revolved around opposition, many Western Apaches were neutral or favored the project.

This project analyzed, public speech, and texts. Texts were thus determined to be both written and oral statements. The translation of Western Apache orality into written text is fraught with difficult choices. Writing captures a moment in time, stabilizing and making permanent boundaries that might not actually be present. Fluidity, the multiplicity of meanings, and the ongoing and evolving nature of dialogue (process) are often lost (Johnstone 2008:27). This was less a problem than it could have been. Unfortunately, only two video recordings of Western Apache orations made during the controversy were available as the
remaining tapes were too fragile to be reviewed. This primarily left those oral remarks already translated into written text during news interviews. While this meant less translational issues, much was inaccessible in terms of the richness of Apache rhetoric. Despite the absence of these orations, those oral statements captured by news personnel were important to examine not only in terms of content but in how they presented Western Apache ideas and concerns.

Analysis included both text as a whole complete thought, in sentence and paragraph form, and as individual phrases. This allowed me to tack back and forth between individual ideas and how these were presented as a complete package. Statements\(^6\) were further subdivided into oral versus written, self-composed or ghost-written, and prepared versus spontaneous. Some of the reasons for this are obvious. Statements created in collaboration or simply ghost-written by others from notes and personal statements, include other perspectives, understandings, and nuances (especially if the writer is non-Apache). Spontaneous speech or text often adds a layer of nuance that may be absent in written text, though the opposite may true as well. By attending to the context of text, I could analyze what differences these made, if any.

Initial analysis was conducted in the NVivo software program and examined the texts for domains, themes, and content. Coding categories were developed inductively and applied systematically. These domains or categories

---

\(^6\) I present restricted information only in the same detail as has previously been made public to honor the Western Apache’s requests for privacy. It is important however, to present this information as it validates Apache claims and can be cross-referenced with historical documents and cosmological narratives to paint a more complete picture of Western Apache culture and meanings.
were then recoded multiple times in order to unveil additional patterns or themes. Multiple re-coding allows for greater depth of analysis and also allows less obvious relationships and concepts to emerge from the texts. This gave not only the frame of the discussion but tone, purpose, and context. Content analysis is easily accomplished within the NVivo software also. Content analysis, a deductive coding method, was also utilized. This method is based upon the assumption that the intent of the speaker is linked with the content of the linguistic expression. Content, in the form of specific words, phrases, or statements are enumerated and quantified and this can be helpful in determining form, content, and trends. This method is usually combined with other methodologies to interpret data (Williams & Semken 2011:55).

A secondary analysis was also conducted which looked at rhetorical structure and linguistic expression to uncover more obtuse meanings and assumptions. Western Apache linguistic choices in their statements can convey important information concerning how they view Mount Graham, how they understand their world and their place in it. In this portion of the analysis, I relied heavily upon Paul Gee’s Discourse Toolkit (2011) to guide my investigation. This primarily linguistic analysis focused upon more minute distinctions. For example, what or who was the subject of the statement, how were pronouns used in connection with the subject (who or what was indexed), and how were words linked together. This gave information on Western Apache conceptualizations of themselves, the mountain, how the mountain was connected to the community
and further refined the frame of the discussion (history, orientation, etc) and purpose of the rhetoric.

How information was packaged and conveyed was also crucial to understanding Western Apache meanings. In this case, word choice, affective markers, whether the rhetoric was direct or indirect, and deixis were important. Deixis concerns those words or meanings that can only be determined in context. How are deictics being used to tie into context and what assumptions being made? Do references shift in the rhetoric? The types of words, and how these words are placed within the discourse, are also important. What is the purpose of the particular word? Does it convey emotion, connection, solidarity, exclusion?

Information can be integrated into text in multiple ways: tightly or loosely, emphasized or de-emphasized, assumed or asserted, included or excluded, imbedded within other clauses or overtly. Is there an active or passive voice; is information forefronted or subsumed within other information? Gee (2011) notes that information embedded in subordinate clauses is assumed rather than asserted. These assumptions may be linked to ontological and epistemological assumptions or they may be created linguistically to assert power or validity. This is particularly apropos in the Mount Graham International Observatory controversy.

Words or word phrases may also be nominalized (turned into noun phrases) or used actively as verb phrases, revealing speaker intent. For example, does the speaker assert action on the part of the subject or is the subject passive and the action is thrust upon the subject (abuse/abused, gave/was given…) (Gee 2011). The tone may be conciliatory, confrontational, authoritative, denigrating,
informative, appealing, etc. This also conveys information about the speaker and his/her purpose. This secondary analysis was correlated with Critical Discourse Analysis and text analysis to yield more nuanced characteristics, patterns, and properties within the domains previously uncovered and stimulated new questions.

**Research Overview**

This project is an attempt to examine how Western Apaches talk about their places and convey basic, crucial cultural understandings of Apache places as well as how discourse reveals Apache cultural norms and practices, sustains cultural integrity, and creates and maintains participatory relations with Apache places. How we approach, understand, and experience place is a product of our cultural entailments. Non-Native Americans, who are usually White and the products of a Western worldview, have historically conducted the study of Native American cultural practice. This perspective with its binary oppositions truncates understanding of non-Western worldviews and lifeways. Webster (2010:7) states this problem quite succinctly in her dissertation on Navajo *hoogans*, “The outcome of this imposition has been an intellectually ethnocentric presentation of how Native Americans live in the world.” (2010:7). Arriving at how Western Apaches understand and conceptualize their places is therefore difficult if forced into a perspective which does not recognize the other’s basic conceptual distinctions or categories. The underpinnings of our knowledge systems orient us in particular ways. Julie Cruikshank (2005) goes further and argues that our language rejects the possibility of non-human (and historically non-White)
agency. Escobar (2008:4) furthers this line of reasoning by asking the question, “Whose knowledge counts?” I would expand this to include not only knowledge (as a product) but ways of knowing and being (as processes). The loss of cultural places for Native Americans is directly linked to these questions. The transmission of knowledge is validated in specific culturally accepted venues. For Euro-Americans this is the educational and legal system, predicated upon the validity of the written word. For many Native Americans knowledge is transmitted and validated via the performative, communal gathering, based in orality and relationship. These distinctions are significant as Native Americans confront increasing development, continued appropriation, and expanded use in their ancestral lands. How do they maintain cultural identity and viability if their voices are not heard or are consistently devalued?

I contend that we must critically examine our own ontological and epistemological systems before we can hope to understand another’s. It is crucial to acknowledge and understand our underlying perspective as this colors our interpretations. Places in particular have been the subject of much theoretical discussion that for the most part remains within the Western paradigm. As places are a coalescence of lived experience (materially, socially, culturally), an examination of theoretical approaches to place as well as theories of religion, language, discourse, and sociality are necessary in order to situate this study. I arrive at a dynamic and inclusive approach for this study, an experiential approach incorporating the phenomenological apprehension and the social construction of places. Conceptual biases in theories of religion are also being re-
examined and bear scrutiny as these places are often characterized as sacred. Understanding that Native American, particularly Western Apache, sociality is practice-based rather than belief-oriented (Burkhart 2004) offers a better understanding of these places.

The public rhetoric in the Mount Graham case is particularly intriguing. I examine this discourse in an effort to understand not only how some Western Apaches understand their places and attempt to convey those understandings to other audiences, but how differences in worldviews impact the basic conversational structure of that dialogue. Moreover, Apache discourse is linked to Apache identity and culture. This discourse provides a window into the creative maintenance of identity. I suggest that the discourse surrounding the Mt. Graham controversy provides a mechanism to understand how Apache discourse links past and present practices and identity.

**Globalization and Place**

We live in a global world, interconnected through technological wonders that provide instant access to other people, places, ideas, and behaviors. The effects of globalization are resculpting the world and yet in many ways, the picture has not changed. Economies shift, governments topple, people are displaced, and societies suffer cultural assaults (Semken and Brandt 2011). Globalization is movement, change, and interconnection. It is not the process that is new, it is the pace and scale that are daunting. This is particularly true for the indigenous peoples of the world. History is littered with the devastating effects of
imperialism. Nor has this changed. Indigenous peoples face almost impossible hurdles to maintaining cultural viability. For the most part, these struggles are centered in the appropriation and devastation of their cultural places.

Globalization presents an inherent tension between the local and the global that flattens cultural diversity. There is a ‘compression of time and place’ (Bender 2001:8). The current process of globalization appears to reinforce Western notions of commerce, property, individual and corporate rights, and democratic governance. Land is understood as a commodity, a perspective at odds with Native American practice. Technological development bolsters this tendency. The search for new markets, products, ideas, and places create demands that directly impact Native Americans and other indigenous peoples. Often these technologies result in destructive practices that devastate communities and their places. The controversy surrounding Mount Graham is a case in point.

The Mount Graham International Observatory Controversy

Mount Graham is the third highest peak in the state of Arizona. The mountain itself is part of the Pinaleño range in the southeastern portion of the state and has a vertical rise greater than any other mountain in Arizona. It is a sky-island within the desert terrain, boasting five distinct ecological life zones, from desert at the base to a boreal, old growth spruce-fir forest at its peak. This unique ecosystem appeared approximately eleven thousand years ago after glaciers receded and isolated the mountain. The mountain is host to at least eighteen unique species including the endangered Mount Graham Red Squirrel.
The Pinaleño Mountains, in east-central Arizona, are a portion of the area historically tied to the Apaches. Originally within the San Carlos Apache Reservation, the mountain range was removed by Presidential order in 1873 (Brandt 1996:52). Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mt. Graham) is a central figure in Apache cosmology as well as Zuni, Hopi, Navajo, and O’odham cosmologies. To the Western Apache, this mountain is known as Big Seated Mountain and is part of a cultural landscape that comprises the Western Apache world. Traditional Apache narratives repeatedly speak of a world defined by four mountain ranges and the cardinal directions: the White Mountain Range to the east, the Pinaleño Mountains to the south, the Mazatzal Mountains to the west, and the San Francisco Peaks to the north.

In 1981 the Smithsonian Institution began collaborating with the University of Arizona, the Vatican Observatory, the Max Planck Institute, and several other institutions, to build an 18-telescope astronomical observatory in Arizona. After site testing in the Pinaleño Mountains, the University of Arizona focused on Dzil Nchaa Si An as a likely possibility for the project and made this public in 1984 (Welch 1997:76). The United States Forest Service conducted a study that revealed the presence of the endangered Mount Graham Red Squirrel and the archaeological remains of several ancient shrines. Information request cards were sent to several Native American tribes giving the tribes one month to reply and identify any issues with the proposed project (Welch 1997:76). The San Carlos Apache Tribe did not reply (it was later found to have been misdirected to
the Bureau of Indian Affairs). Zuni experts did respond and identify significant cultural sites (Simplicio 1985).

During this same time period, environmentalists, conservationists and other affiliated organizations began to protest the proposed project citing the delicate and unique ecology of the mountain and the endangered Mount Graham Red Squirrel as reasons for rejection. The outcry and increasing public debate concerning the project led the project partners to explore other avenues for the advancement of their project (Mt. Graham Coalition 2002). In 1983, Mount Graham International Observatory partners successfully lobbied for the withdrawal of 3500 acres on the topmost peak from a possible wilderness designation, resulting in the Arizona Wilderness Bill. This action by-passed the federal regulations requiring impact assessment and mitigation under the National Environmental Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. This was followed by the passage of two bill attachments or ‘riders,’ The Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act, Title VI in 1988 and the Kolbe Rider in 1996. These riders exempted the project and the University of Arizona from environmental and cultural protection laws (Welch 1997:77)

A contingent of San Carlos Apaches vigorously opposed the telescope installation beginning in 1989. Ola Cassadore Davis, the daughter of a respected

---

medicine man, spearheaded the Western Apache protests. Traditional elders, medicine persons, tribal members and groups, as well as the Tribal Council publicly denounced the project. Multiple Tribal Resolutions (1990, 1991, 1993, 1995) were passed in opposition. Other Native American and religious organizations joined in protesting the observatory.

The fight to prevent the Mount Graham International Observatory led Apache tribal members to travel to Europe to attempt to meet with officials in Italy and Germany who were enrolled in the project. The Apache Survival Coalition, a group chaired by Davis, filed a lawsuit in 1991 to stop the project. This failed due to laches (timely filing of a claim) and problems with identifying the Coalition with the Tribe (Brandt 1996:55). In 1993, the University found the chosen site to be less than optimal and petitioned for a new site not in the exempt zone. Registered letters were sent to the Tribes requesting comment (which coincided with the weekend attendance of most tribal chairmen at the out-of-state annual meeting of the National Council of American Indians). Before the tribes responded, the University clear-cut a new site on the summit. The Federal District Court did halt construction and find it illegal; however, passage of the Kolbe Rider made further legal challenges moot (Brandt 1996: 57). Further construction occurred with the installation of a microwave tower and a link to a base station at the foot of the mountain.
Due to the controversy that ensued, many of the original partners eventually dropped out of the project. Environmental concerns resulted in the installation being reduced from 18 telescopes to a maximum of seven possible scopes. The observatory, as it now stands, consists of three telescopes.

---

8 These included the University of Texas and the University of Chicago in the late 1980’s, the Smithsonian Institution and Ohio State University in 1991, the University of Toronto, Michigan State University and the University of Pittsburgh in 1994, and Georgia State University in 1995. Other institutions rejected offers to join the project. These included California Institute of Technology in 1990, and the University of Florida and Dartmouth in 2001 (Mt. Graham Coalition 2002).
Chapter 2

RELIGION, PLACE, AND THE EUROAMERICAN PARADIGM:

THEORETICAL CONCERNS

The ontologies—the figured worlds in which practice is shaped—constitute the largest or most fundamental frame out of which culture is shaped. No ontology is simply a system of knowledge; it is equally, as the term itself implies, an account of a way of being in the world and a definition through practice (and not only through cognition) of what that world is and how it is constituted. [Clammer, Poirier & Schwimmer 2004:4]

Science is not only a way of gathering data and testing hypotheses; it is also a belief system in its own right. The testing of hypotheses, for example, reflects an assumption (essentially unprovable) that two experiments will provide the same results if performed in exactly the same manner under the same conditions. I am not challenging this or any other assumption of science; I am merely observing that the study of one belief system by proponents of another is going to raise problems. [Klass 1995:xiii]

Understanding the lens through which we examine our ‘reality’ is one of the most important aspects of any study. How we frame our world impacts our view and thus our truths. Theoretical stances and their accompanying methodologies are rooted in particular ontologies and epistemologies that impact our analyses. Anthropology has a long convoluted history of attempting to deal with its own cultural barriers to understanding9. Modern Western perspectives often truncate and distort non-Western peoples’ understandings of their worlds. Multiple scholars have warned of the dangers of employing our own cultural categorizations in analysis and devaluing the epistemologies of ‘others’ (Moss & Al-Hindi 2001; Shorter 2003: 195-6; Meskell & Joyce 2003:67; England 2006; Deloria 2008; Burkhart 2008; Escobar 2008:4; Norton-

---

9 see Ingold on the biophysical/sociocultural divisioning of the discipline-2000:1-6; feminist literature; Morrison forthcoming.
Smith 2010). For many Western Apaches, Mount Graham is publically characterized as both special (and sometimes sacred) place and the narratives dealing with it. Thus, this controversy is rooted in religion, place, and discourse theories. This chapter details the theoretical lens through which I approached my project, one which moves beyond strict Western categorizations to encompass alternate ways of being and knowing. I employ a dynamic approach, one that acknowledges the experiential and constructive aspects of place, the preconceptions of my Euro-American Christian perspective, and the generative significance of discourse for Western Apache peoples. I find this approach useful and fruitful in explicating Western Apache understandings of Mount Graham and their ‘talk’ about it.

**The Western Paradigm**

Western thought and science have a long illustrious history that has fostered new intellectual discoveries and uncovered new information. Western science and philosophy have also misread, ignored, and distorted many of these discoveries. The Western paradigm is not a singular monolithic perspective, it encompasses multiple perspectives which may vary in particulars but were formed within the same intellectual crucible. However, certain underlying conceptualizations tend to be held in common. We understand this paradigm to be an on-going cumulative process, varied in its application, and incorporating multiple European, Greek, and Arabic (Mediterranean and North African) historical and philosophical traditions within a particular historical milieu, which evolved around the search for meaning and
universal laws. Indeed much of this tradition is concerned with the discovery of universal principles in science, sociality and religion.¹⁰

The Western intellectual tradition (post-Enlightenment) developed along with the emergence of Cartesian rationalism and objectivity and within the cultural history of Christianity (Balagangadhara 1994:27, 106, 252). This perspective is based upon a dichotomous structure that holds knowledge and thought distinctly separate from experience and feeling. This dualistic organization of the world rests upon several assumptions: an objective, bounded reality with universal principles of existence, rational propositional thought, evolutionary development, and the supremacy of humanity (Balagangadhara 1994; Little Bear 2000; Olson 2003:5-6; Burkhart 2004; Cajete 2000, 2004; Deloria 2004; Waters 2004; Norton-Smith 2010; Morrison n. d.). Reality is understood as a “physical presence that can be subjected to some form of mechanical testing” (Deloria 2004:6) and knowledge is acquired through logical reasoning, justified through inference, concrete data, and replicable experimentation.

Though resolutely anthropocentric and secular, much of Western thought was highly theocentric in its view of the universe (Balagangadhara 1994; Escobar 2008:308; Morrison n. d.). In exploring the limits of natural reality, early scientists retained their theistically-based cosmic dimensions by adhering to the triad of nature – culture – supernatural; the real is distinct from the unreal and independent from

¹⁰ For a thorough explication and discussion of the Western paradigm one would need to examine authors in multiple disciplines (history, anthropology, philosophy, science, psychology, literature, religion). For briefer overviews, see Balagangadhara 1994; Casey 1998; Olson 2003; Waters 2004; Morrison n. d.)
existence.\textsuperscript{11} Periodically, the subject – object distinction was explored and critiqued, particularly by philosophers of perception like Husserl (1970) and Merleau-Ponty (1966), as I discuss in the next section. However, the reliance upon binary oppositions has remained throughout much of Western intellectual thought. Feminist anthropologists in the 1980’s also began challenging the positivist tradition and a methodology which separated fact from value, subject from object, culture from nature, and domestic from public, (Rosaldo 1974:23; Monk & Hanson 2008:34). The feminist critique strove to convey the positionality of voice and the subjectivity of knowledge production and was part of a critical self-reflection movement by scholars (England 2006:287; Hansen 1992:573).

One of the most difficult obstacles in explicating others’ conceptualizations of the world is the Western tradition’s reliance on oppositional binaries: culture – nature, mind – body, objective – subjective, rational – irrational, animate – inanimate, material – spiritual, natural – supernatural, external – internal, profane – sacred, good – evil, space – place, written – oral, fact – belief, reality – myth, science – religion, concrete – abstract, etc. Western positivist theories privilege the first item in each dualism, for example, objectivity and fact, and marginalize the second, subjectivity and experience (Waters 2004:xviii; Morrison n.d.:1). The modern rationalist and positivist traditions within the Western paradigm render as subjective, irrational, or false those cultural postulates and practices which cannot be ‘objectively’ proved (though many are empirically testable). These propositions in turn constrain how we interpret other

\textsuperscript{11} The ongoing debate regarding the efficacy and value of retaining this triad can be reviewed in the Anthropological Forum of November 2003, vol. 13, no.2. See also Klass 1995, Morrison 2002.
ontologies\(^\text{12}\) (Bird-David 1999:S68; Ingold 2000: 1; Clammer et al 2003:10; Shorter 2003; Morrison n.d.). While the Western intellectual tradition encompasses many theoretical perspectives, one is of particular importance to this study and is implicated in any study of place and religious practice—phenomenology. Social or cultural constructivism is also important in this discussion. I will give a brief synopsis of both followed by an overview of the current theories of place and their applicability in the current project. This review of the current Western paradigms and theories of place sets the stage for a discussion on Native American worldviews and the cultural entailments in current approaches to religion. I then proceed to propose my own theoretical lens in this dissertation.

**Phenomenology**

Phenomenology is utilized to explain the human experience in the world. Phenomenology was coined by Lambert in 1764, but is generally considered to have arisen with Husserl. Husserl (1859-1938), posited that human experience is spatial and temporal. The body engages with the sensuous qualities of the world (Husserl 1970:107, 1973:80; Casey 1997:217). The body’s three-dimensional orientation creates experience. Phenomenology is concerned with understanding the universal nature of human experience (Adams et al 2001:xv). Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961), another philosopher, contested the mind – body duality prevalent in Cartesian thought and advocated a more inclusive notion of the human body (1966:387). His thesis was

\(^{12}\) For an excellent discussion on the multiple binary disjunctions in anthropological discourse, see Appadurai 1986; Scott 1989, 1996;Strathern 1988, 1996; Bird-David 1999, 2006; Morrison 2002, n. d.; Clammer et al 2003; Shorter 2003; Hornborg 2006; Morrison discusses the conceptual slippages inherent in the Western paradigm particularly in the explication of cultural others.
that through the lived body, we have access to the ‘primary world’ (Merleau-Ponty 1966:xvii-xix; Casey 1997:229). Phenomenology looked at subjects and objects as unified rather than sharply distinct, focusing on ‘being’ and the relational aspects of the world (Bognar 1985:183; Relph 1985:15). The lived body possesses corporeal intentionality\(^{13}\) (as distinct from mental volition). Phenomenologists reject the idea that the mind, as a distinct organ, constructs representations of the world and insist that it is the whole body (as holistic organism) that immerses his or herself within the environment. The ‘organism’ is not a separate entity but a “node in a field of relationships” (Ingold 2000:4). This connects us to the world. The experience of movement is pre-objective; it is expressiveness and orientedness (Heidegger 1962:387; Casey 1997:229). This experience of place is concerned with the perception of physical phenomena by the subject (Casey 1997:53).

**Social Constructionism**

Implicit in the above discussion is the perspective termed social constructionism. Social (sometimes referred to as cultural) constructionism arose in the 1960’s, most prominently as a response to positivist scientific theory (Hibberd 2005:1), with the work of Berger and Luckman (1966). Berger and Luckman (1996) advocated that knowledge is created, modified, and maintained within social interactions and becomes understood as objective reality through this reinforcement. Individuals and groups construct and maintain their social

---

\(^{13}\) The body (as integral to the person) is not inert, it moves, orients and reorients, and integrates itself into the environment—the body is not placed, we as persons move ourselves. This movement is not random. A person moves into and through a room intentionally, perceiving and experiencing the place in a particular way (i.e.: facing forward, eyes focused on a painting, inhaling flowers, etc.).
realities through time via the institutionalization of social traditions. Thus identity and meaning are created in interaction with others and there is no one universal social reality. Humans create their worlds and thus constitute themselves in relation to their world. This subjectivity occurs wherever knowledge is found, even in science. Scientific facts are considered objective but are in reality merely subjective overlays or constructions.

The problem is that though this perspective is primarily utilized to describe how social phenomena arise and evolve, it remains rooted in oppositional binaries, specifically the nature – culture divide. Thus all human meanings, sociality, and practice are essentially conferred upon a physical reality. Nature remains the physical substrate upon which humanity conveys meaning. Researchers need to be careful with the current anthropological fascination with social constructionism as a way to explain cultural difference. While social constructionism understands reality as an ongoing dynamic process, it advocates that sociality is relative and meaning entirely ascribed. This creates a perspective in which other groups’ social praxis and epistemologies are merely subjective exercises to attach meaning to objective events and hence less than real (with inherent power differentials). For some societies, sociality is not solely a human product but a complex interplay of multiple events, agents, and acts.

Place

Anthropology has long been embedded in place. Though never the centerpiece of anthropological theory, place has nevertheless had a role in anthropological discourse throughout its history. More often than not, place has
served merely as a setting for culture, a background where social activity occurs. As a conceptual device, place is a relatively recent phenomenon. While the history of place is tied with that of anthropology, it is also more expansive encompassing geography, philosophy, sociology, art, geology, gender studies, and more. The theoretical trajectory of place mirrors the evolving discourses within anthropology itself. A critical synthesis of the interpretive work on place finds that the many and varied approaches to place can be gathered within three general, though not exclusive, perspectives: the positivist, the cultural constructivist, and the experiential approaches. I will briefly discuss these perspectives and their trajectories in order to situate my theoretical stance and its relevance to Western Apache notions of place.

*Positivist or Descriptive Approach*

The positivist notion of place, sometimes referred to as descriptive, encompasses early anthropological and geographical theories. Prior to the 1970’s, anthropologists primarily viewed place as synonymous with a particular environment, landscape, site, or as ‘nature.’ Ethnographies almost always began with a description of the physical setting (the place). Place was thus utilized as a heuristic organizing device which allowed the anthropologist to position his or her findings, but offered little more than a backdrop to social behavior.

The positivist perspective conceives of place as a static form in which the physical substrate of place is separated from meaning and social action. Place is a concrete, objective reality synonymous with the environment. The environment is categorized as nature, within the nature – culture binary. Place is therefore
ordered and configured distinctly from human interaction but subjectively apprehended. Place, as environment, has no agency nor is it particularly receptive. These properties impact how place is viewed in relationship to other ‘realities.’ The most prominent statement in this perspective revolves around the relationship to space. Space is primary; it is abstract, universal, neutral, and prior to place. Thus place, if acknowledged, is derivative and posterior to space. Time is also separate from place. It has no interaction with the qualities of place. Place, as the environment, endures and is subjected to time but does not engage relationally with time.

The same holds true of the self and culture. While individuals and groups exist, live, and act within places, the environment as place merely serves as a neutral backdrop to activity; it does not engage. Place is the inert substrate in which individuals and groups adapt to their surroundings. Human engagement is generally seen as functional in nature, a unilateral, adaptive response to the environmental reality. Meaning is often described as detached from the experience of place, usually cognitive in nature and concerned with social forms. As place is usually co-terminous with the notion of region or environment, a macro scale/process is apparent rather than attention to the particular. We see this in the work of Wissler (1917), Boas (1915), and Kroeber (1947), as well as early Steward (1947), White (1959), ecological anthropology, and cultural ecology. Many of these same tenets, however, can be seen in later anthropological work.

This unreflexive use of place remained largely unexamined well into the twentieth century. Attention to environmental factors began gradually, evolving
from evolutionary approaches through historical particularism, diffusion theories, materialist approaches, cultural functionalism and neofunctional approaches and into ecological and environmental anthropology. Linguistic studies furthered the concept of place, at least as ‘area.’ However, linguistic geography, as exemplified by classificatory maps, remained within the framework of place as setting (Bonfante & Sebeok 1944:384-5). Political ecology and actor-based models which supplanted these approaches focused on “the interaction between political and environmental variables broadly conceived” and opened up a dialogue between geography and political economy which allowed for the notion of ‘natural agency’ to be incorporated into analysis (Little 1999:257).

_Cultural Constructivism and Place_

Geography in the 1970’s began a “cultural turn” (Entrikin & Tepple 2006:30) toward a more humanistic approach. Certain philosophical approaches supported this movement. Idealism, existentialism, and phenomenology all emphasized the significance of the human experience (Rodaway 2006:263). The onset of the feminist movement in the 1970’s stimulated a widening discourse within anthropology in response to its patriarchal and paternalistic nature (Alcoff 1994:130; Kirby 1993:127). As feminist studies evolved into feminist theory there followed a critique of the social construction of existing knowledges and a focus on identity, the self, subjectivity, power differentials, the intersection of race, gender, class, and power, and scientific objectivity (England 2006:288; Moss & Al-Hindi 2001:1). The feminist perspective highlighted the tensions within the ethnographic approach and focused attention on those aspects of societies and sociality that were often relegated to the background, for
example, the female body in space and place (Gordon 1993:110; Rosaldo 1974:23; Alcoff 1994:130). In addition, both poststructuralism and postmodernism critiqued the positivist assertion that perception of the world can be accomplished without making assumptions (Agger 1991:106, 109; Caico 2007:13): knowledge is situated, particular, partial, contextual, and locatable (Haraway 1991:291, 293). Post-structuralism rejected systematic organization of the world and viewed such claims as contingent and provisional (Wylie 2006:298). Post-structuralists posited that all power is dependent upon knowledge, which is in turn manufactured by discourse.

Postmodernism sought more broadly to explore these dynamics. A social theory that espoused multiple perspectives and a pluralistic lens, postmodernism purported that knowledge was de-centered (Agger 1991: 116). It was the attention to the historical placement of power and people within societies, and the cultural construction of reality and subjectivity (Best & Kellner 1991:287), that opened up the notion of the significance of place within social interactions, albeit in a passive mechanistic manner.

In the late 1990’s attentions shifted to the social construction of landscapes, due to the work of geographers such as Tuan (1974) and Crumley (1994). Tuan developed a theory of space and place as experiential and reflexive; knowledge of the world entails knowledge of the self (Tuan 1977:v; Adams 2001:xvi). Tuan assumed two universals: (1) space is prior, undefined, and abstract while place is derivative, and (2) place is created through human interaction in space via culture, bodily movement, and perception.
The social constructionist perspective shares many of the same concepts regarding place as that of the positivists’. In general, social constructionists advocate place as cultural in nature. It is interesting to note that while place is cultural, its substance continues to unreflexively retain the properties of a physical, neutral, ordered form. Differences become more apparent in the apprehension and agency of place. Place demonstrates receptivity or a passive agency; it receives meaning from cultures and individuals as social beings. Thus place is subjectively apprehended by individuals who reside in that place. Place results when the physical and neutral substrate that is nature is overlaid with meaning through the activities of ‘culture.’

While space remains prior and primary, time begins to articulate with place. The passage of time is primary to the development of place. Individuals become affectively attached to places through time. Individuals and social groups construct places thru cognition, emotion, memory, and activity or movement. Places then absorb and reflect these back passively. Thus the relationship of place to self and culture is passive and unilateral.

Process begins to appear in this perspective, albeit a unilateral one. We also begin to see a difference in scale. Places may be particular and local or conceived as a macro process in which the totality of places and relationships constitutes a landscape. This is evident in the work of geographers (Cosgrove 1984, Harvey 1993, 1996, Mitchell 1994, etc), feminist scholars (Dowler 2005, Massey 1993, 1994, Hansen 1992, Rose 1994, etc), and anthropologists (Bender 1993, Morphy 1993, Myers 2002, Weiner 1991, etc). Place is always a social
construction of a perceived reality. The key advantage to the approaches which fall into this broad perspective is the understanding that culture and sociality are important participants in the discovery, experience, and understanding of place.

**Phenomenological Notions of Place**

In reaction to the positivist approach, phenomenologists also proposed that the essence of human experience was found in daily interactions, including those with place (Adams 2001:xv). Heidegger theorized that ontology must concern itself with both phenomenology and hermeneutics (1969:102). Thus, ontology is always ‘provisional.’ It is ‘lived’ within its environs. As an essential component of social theory, place became multiple in its topicality. Place was explored as landscape, narrative (created through stories), inscribed, embodied, contested, site, multivocal, and bounded. Framing this exploration however was a larger dialogue between those advocates for a culturally constructed vision of place and those who argued for a phenomenological or experiential approach.

Challenging the notion that the world exists as a tabula rasa upon which humanity inscribes meaning and particularity, Casey rejects the “Cartesian-Galilean-Lockian model.” This model asserts the priority and pre-existence of space as an empty, general, and infinite medium, often co-terminous with nature (1996:15; 2001:404). Place in this model is derived from space and is merely the projection of various cultural and social processes imposed upon a neutral substrate. It is mythic, constructed, and particular. We see this repeatedly in

---

14 Casey refers to the Western assumption that place is created from a denuded void and hence less real than ‘nature’ or space. Casey deconstructs the real – myth binary used to order experience.
Western descriptions and categorizations of Native American traditional narratives and places. Casey deconstructs this binary, along with others, as problems of an oppositional perspective. The thrust of Casey’s argument is that while science postulates a homogenous, neutral void that is space, we know, experience, and perceive in place, in the particular. The characteristics of perception, its situatedness, recognition, and incorporation, are placial and active. Casey locates knowledge within the body via perception and experience and asserts that all experience is emplaced (1997:16). To know and sense one must be in a place. Thus knowledge is essentially knowledge of, with, and in place and is an ingredient in perception itself (1996:18).

In the phenomenological or experiential approach, place is process, dynamic in its organization and at once physical and cultural in substance. Place may be apprehended either pre-ontologically (pre-consciously) or, in more recent work, inter-subjectively. This allows for the experience of place through the mechanism of the holistic self (body and mind together). Place is particular in its scope and demonstrates active agency in a dialectic mutuality. It is the relationships that spell the largest distinctions to the previous two perspectives. Place is prior to space. Space is that orientation that allows positionality and movement, but which occurs within particular places. It is another order of reality all together. Time arises within place; it is embodied within place. Place is also integral to the self. The self, culture, and place emerge within the relational enactment of movement and dwelling.

Place is constructed as a second order reality, merely modifying the original scientific reality, hence it is mythic in this model.
Often advocates of this approach demonstrate unspoken assumptions that nature is the physical substrate within which the self, culture and place arise. Culture appears to be derivative; sociality and culture emerge from the interaction of the self and nature. In this sense, space and nature are abstracts, mentally constructed and as such a property of culture – place relations. Experiential perspectives of place are variable. In more recent work, place begins to demonstrate more agency and less inertness. Places and landscapes are understood to interact with the individuals who inhabit them. Incorporating Casey’s notion of the co-agency of places and persons, places are events or as Ingold terms them taskscapes (Casey 1997; Ingold 2000:190-5). Places gather, hold, and engage with bodies (both human and non-human) and with other places.

Scholars interested in the ‘spiritual’ or ‘sacred’ nature of places also explored the social and experiential connections with special places (Lane 2001:4). Lane asserted that the participatory quality of these places created landscapes, a reciprocal relationship between humanity, place, and discourse (Lane 2001:41, 53). Encounters within these places, usually defined as ‘spiritual’ or as hierophanies by traditional scholars of religion, resist definition and in this way landscape shapes and contains experience; events are placed which in turn create the sacred landscape and personal identity (Lane 2001:217).

Cultural tensions and conflicting claims generated other explorations into the nature of places and landscape. Because of the work of anthropologists on Native American land claims, and the need to prove use, dominion, and defense of lands, sacred sites and traditional cultural properties moved into the discourse
on landscape. In exploring indigenous peoples, scholars found that landscape was the product of a worldview interacting temporally and spatially through specific places (Rodman 1992:641; Humphrey 1995:143; Ingold 1993; Hardesty 2000:173). Landscapes are situated spatially, temporally, and socially. They are processes experienced by the peoples who live within them. This exploration allowed landscapes to be understood as both historic and dynamic (Morphy 1995). Interactions within the landscape reproduce social structures (Morphy 1995:186). We need to be mindful that landscape is not an object or end product but a behavior acted within the social context of the lived environment (Gell 1998:4; Hodder 1991:6). Landscape is not merely viewed, a mode of subsistence, or even a social production but rather a constituting process. Persons are constituted through their activities and conceptualizations within landscape (Smith 1989:131; Ingold 2000:87).

Native American Worldviews

The discussion above relates to Native American worldviews in that Native Americans approach the world under a “meaning shaping principle of action” (Burkhart 2004:17). In the positivist tradition, there is an entirely objective reality that is subjectively apprehended. However, in many Native American worldviews, reality is created through experience and perception (Deloria 2004:6-7). The interaction of agents, human and non-human, within the world constitutes reality; that is, how we act shapes our world. This is intimately tied to our perceptions of the world (phenomenological premise) and the principle of relatedness (roughly
subsumed within a cultural constructionism perspective) (Burkhart 2004:16, 23-41; Deloria 2004:9). Meaning, value, and truth arise within the interaction of persons and places (at their most inclusive) and this intersection shapes and sustains the world. Knowledge is constituted intersubjectively (as a psycho-sociological characteristic of individuals within relationship), it is personal, perceptual, and interpersonal, arising within the interaction with other persons as knowledge-makers and holders (Cajete 2000:81; Ingold 2000:2; Burkhart 2004:21; Webster 2010:19). Knowledge is socially constructed within these experiential relationships and is thus embodied or lived; both individually and communally (Burkhart 2004: 1,25-6; Ingold 2000:2; Norton-Smith 2010:49; Morrison n. d.). This is a relational way of “being in the world” (Husserl 1970; Ingold 2000); an “intentional, relational, and interpersonal reality…locally grounded and socially emergent” (Morrison n. d.).

Ingold describes this way of being as immersion within the world and that persons are constituted within social and ecological relations. Indeed, identity arises within this involvement and is a “condensation of histories of growth and maturation within the fields of social relationships” (Ingold 2000:3). According to Bird-David, personhood is thus ‘dividual’ in that identity, sociality, and personhood are emergent properties within the relational field (Bird-David 1999; Ingold 2000:4; Morrison n. d.). Moreover, personhood is an inclusive category; a horizontal rather than vertical field of persons (some of whom are neither human nor ‘alive’ in the Western sense) whose power varies. Power is relational; embodied in persons, differentially accessible, and ethically grounded. Thus, both cultural constructionism and phenomenology are implicated in any discussion of sacred or significant places.
Religion

Sacred place (in the Western sense) partakes of both religion and ‘land’ (place). Religion as a concept is problematic and has come under scrutiny. Strenski has asserted that the study of religion is contained within the history of the West (2006:1). Religion has been criticized as an abstract, generic term rooted in the Western intellectual tradition whose study has historically centered upon religious categorization and difference (and its perceived validity) (Balangangadhara 1994; Olson 2003:2-9; Smith 2003:28; Strenski 2006:1-3; Lambek 2008). The absence of an organized, recognizable (to Western scholars) religion was often used to deny humanity, and subsequently human rights, to non-Western peoples.

For much of the last two centuries, religion has been primarily defined as a belief system rooted in a dualistic ontology; natural – supernatural, profane – sacred, real – unreal, rational – irrational, etc. Tylor (1871) most famously defined religion as belief in ‘Spiritual Beings,’ while Durkheim (1965) asserted that religions were social institutions with unified systems of beliefs and practices centered around the ‘sacred’ or that which is set apart. Geertz defined religion as a set of symbols that evoke moods and emotions, direct behavior, and construct reality (1973). While historically there has been division between scholars who emphasize spiritual experience and faith and scholars who categorize religion as social influence, behavior, or control, perspectives like these squarely place religion in the realm of subjective experience, irrationality, and the non-real—yet universal among humanity. The post-Enlightenment Western paradigm can be summarized as conceptualizing religion as having seven basic tenets: it is (1) a human universal, (2) non-verifiable
belief, (3) monistic, (4) written as dogma, (5) mystified, (6) ritualized practice, and (7) removed or separate from secular and daily activity (Asad 1983; Balangangadhara 1994; Gill 2003; Olson 2003; Shorter 2003; Smith 2003; Strenski 2006; Lambek 2008). Religion as a separate, bounded entity centered upon belief has come under scrutiny in the recent past, particularly for its underlying dualisms (Lambek 2008: 11). However, the predominate characterization of religion remains within these tenets.

Historically, non-Christian religions have been analyzed and understood through Western and Christian paradigms which rarely reflect the reality of their practitioners (Gill 2003:23; Shorter 2003; De La Torre 2004). This is especially true of Native American cosmological thought and practice that cannot be relegated to a view of life but is truly a ‘way of life’ (De La Torre 2004). Western philosophical thought is in general theory-driven rather than practice-based. We know however that many non-Western societies have worldviews that are practice-oriented. This is particularly important in understanding Native American religious practice and cosmology. Most world religions15 are rooted in the interior of the individual and experienced as transcendental in nature (Eliade 1958; Otto 1923; Lambek 2000; Olson 2003; Winzeler 2008). Moreover, as I have discussed, world religions are based upon binary oppositions: good – evil, supernatural – natural, mind – body, sacred – profane, reason – emotion, conscious – unconscious (Durkheim 1965; Reed

15 This term has been used to denote those religions, recognized by Western scholars that encompass multiple cultural traditions, nationalities, and regions. The list has expanded over time, but generally includes Christianity, Judaism and Islam as the main religions. While the term can be problematic in its assumptions, I use it here because it conveys the historical entailments which accompany this perspective.
1998; Dubuisson 2003) and are the discursive products of specific historical relationships (Asad 1993, Masuzawa 2005).

This is particularly problematic with regard to the sacred – profane dichotomy (Durkheim 1965). The designation of sacrality presupposes separation from a profane other (object, practice, person, place). This notion imposes a classificatory system upon cultural practice that may not apply and can skew interpretation. Moreover, sacred becomes a subjective classification upon an objective reality (Durkheim 1965; Pals 2006:96). This understanding, rooted in Western dualism is problematic. Many indigenous peoples, do not make this distinction. The Western Apache consider power to be inherently neutral and the use of power to be determined by the practitioner (Goodwin 1969; Basso 1969, 1996). Moreover, the Western Apache term, diyi, has been translated by both Apache consultants and their ethnographers as power, sacred, powerful person, devil, ancestor, etc (Opler 1918: 255; Goodwin Papers, Basso 1969, 1996). These would be mutually exclusive categories in most Western religions.

Eliad (1959) saw sacred as arising from an encounter with the divine; it was inextricably intertwined with the supernatural and the moral. This not only presupposes the supernatural and a theistic frame, it also separates and places moral behavior as religious, a distinction not made by many Native American peoples (Basso 1996; Burkhart 2004; Deloria 2004). Moreover, sacrality is understood to be a permanent condition once that state is achieved (through discovery or ritual behavior); a place or object is always and continously sacred—it does not move between states of being.
Hester discusses the difficulties inherent in explicating non-Christian, non-Western cosmologies within the Euro-American perspective.

Acceptance, faith—belief is at the core of the Christian religion and, not surprisingly, at the core of Euro-American philosophy. Just think about how you would characterize different philosophical schools, or different figures in the Euro-American philosophical traditions. This school believed this…, the central tenets of that school were…, this famed philosopher thought that… Beliefs, beliefs, beliefs.” [Hester 2004:264]

The distinction can be summed up as the “difference between Euro-American religious orthodoxy (belief) and Native American religious orthopraxy (action merging theory)” (Waters 2004:xxxvii). Western philosophical thought examines beliefs or dispositions concerning reality while Native American worldviews detail how reality is experienced and practiced (Hester 2004:264; Waters 2004:xxxvii). This combined with Western philosophical skepticism produces our reliance on propositional thought and complicates our understanding of Native American religious practice and discourse.\(^\text{16}\)

If practice is at the core of Native American philosophy, then how you go about doing that philosophy may be as much or more important than what is supposedly being said. Euro-American methods, honed to their traditional use of arguing and asserting beliefs to be true, are going to have some trouble with practices that just are. [Hester 2004:264]

Most Western historical explanations of Apache songs, narratives, and rituals rest upon a theistic perspective in which beings are characterized as gods, deities, spirits, supernatural manifestations or as anthropomorphic projections (Goodwin

\(^{16}\) This very distinction is embodied in the multiple Supreme Court decisions (e.g.: Lyng vs. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protection Association, 1988) which privilege religious belief over practice, as well as restrict Native American practice via the establishment clause, essentially preventing and disabling the protection of Native American sacred places.
In the Western tradition, experience must be material, demonstrating causal properties (cause and effect mechanisms), and be replicable, measurable, and bounded. Thus the imposed categorization of non-human entities as non-real phenomena has implications in how Western Apache practices and places are understood and ‘managed’ by non-Apache political entities.

Much of early anthropology was tied into missionization and national expansion by Christian monarchs and their subjects. The Doctrine of Discovery, put forth by the Catholic Popes of the 15th Century, directed the Spanish and Portuguese to conquer and enslave any non-Christian peoples and to appropriate the land on which they dwelled (Toensing 2011; Newcomb 2008). This doctrine is predicated on European notions of land ownership, Christian personhood, and theocentric governance. It forms the basis for both international and U.S. Indian law and can be directly tied to the American notion of Manifest Destiny that heralded an era of oppression and cultural genocide for much of Native America. Essentially negating indigenous ties to their lands, Manifest Destiny can be seen in the court decisions beginning in 1823 with Johnson v. M’Intosh and extended through the Marshall Doctrine. In addition, early anthropology relied to some extent on missionaries, gentleman scholars, etc, for much of the initial exploration. This colored our early interpretations. As such, the analysis of other peoples’ cultural practice is tied to our unconscious assumptions of the nature of the world and reality.

\[17\] For an excellent discussion of the theological underpinnings in U. S. Indian Law, see Newcomb’s *Pagans in Paradise* 2008.
Christian history is not just an appropriation of the ‘past and the future’ by the present. Rather, it was an appropriation of the multiple pasts and histories of peoples on earth within the framework of one past of one people. (Balagangadhara 1994:59)

Ethno-historical accounts of Apache cosmology reveal an emplaced and embodied character of social life in which reciprocal relations with other beings possessing power and agency are evident. These social relationships with others (including places) are not internal subjective beliefs or psychological states (nor based in binary oppositions) but tangible, complex, ethical relationships (Goodwin Papers; Basso 1992, 1996; Brandt 1996; Clark 2001; Lambek 2000). Religious practice with multidimensional persons bring into being the Western Apache world. Beingness is structured within the interconnection with places as well as knowledge (Basso 1990:130). Relations are variable and differentiated and persons draw their particular qualities from their interactions (Goddard 1918; Bird-David 1999:S73; Clark 2001:xxii-xxiv; Goodwin 1994). Goodwin, Basso, and Brandt have all noted that Western Apache religious practice is experiential, emergent within social relationships and narrative events. Basso detailed (1990, 1996) the ethical and moral relationships that emerge with others through oral narratives anchored in places. This moves beyond issues of access, belief, and rigid dogma into a world of ambiguity, performative acts, generative speech, and relational interdependence (Opler 1918; Goodwin 1994; Basso 1990; 1992; 1996; Brandt 1996; Cajete 2000). Thus, characterization of Western Apache ritual practice as solely religious is particularly

---

18 These persons could manifest in a variety of forms, inhabit multiple ‘worlds,’ and generally possessed power.
problematic. I focus on Western Apache ontology and epistemology as part of a worldview to avoid miscategorization and ethnocentricity. I will discuss Western Apache cosmological understandings and social practice in more detail in Chapter 5.

**A Dynamic Approach: Integrating Casey, Ingold, Lane, and Basso**

Ethnographic research often failed to elicit “coherent accounts” of places and the manner in which “social action is structured in accordance with the…spatial topography of its enactment” (Atkinson et al 2008:156). Ingold contends that cosmology cannot be separated from the practical engagement within the world. Conceptualizing a peoples’ worldview as only cosmology removes the actor from the world and institutes an artificial distinction. I agree with Ingold that cosmology (particularly for the Western Apache) is actually a life-world in which participants are engaged in an active field of relations and in which beings emerge and take on form in relation to others (Ingold 2000:14-19).

If meaning lies in relational contexts, then understanding how native peoples understand their landscapes becomes crucial. If as Casey (1996:180) has stated knowledge of place is an ingredient in perception itself, then landscape is not merely viewed, a mode of subsistence, or even a social production but rather a constituting process. Persons are constituted through their activities and conceptualizations within landscape (Ingold 2000:87). Therefore we can understand the Iroquoian contention that knowledge is acquired through experience to encompass corporeal experience, narrative experience, dreaming, visioning, and ‘other world journeying’ (Hewitt 1895:112). Placement within the
landscape is a multi-dimensional process that is social as well as spatial.

‘Centeredness’ initiates relationship and journeying implies not only travel, but engagement with others who may not be kin. Thus, landscape is experienced as multiple ‘ways of knowing’ and the apprehension of landscape is rooted in worldview.

This understanding is further refined with the work of Basso. Rather than focusing on power and subsistence practices, Basso explored the social and ethical relationships that the Western Apache constructed and maintained with places through place-names and narratives (1996a:xv, 40, 48, 67). Places, as “vehicles of ancestral authority” (Low 2005:17), worked upon the Western Apache to guide and correct behavior, to provide knowledge, and promote wisdom (Basso 1996b:61, 76). These places focused the attention of Western Apache peoples upon a moral way of life that is culturally particular to their society. For the Apache, knowledge is enacted within places, which hold the memories of ancestral lives. In this way, place-names and narratives essentially act as normative postulates (Basso 1996a:33; Blackburn 1975:64). Wisdom and knowledge are irrevocably tied to places and are enacted through “speaking the names,” quoting the ancestors, and through narratives which belong to those places (Basso 1996a:58-9). Thus, a reciprocal relationship results which strengthens Apache identity and that of their places (Basso 1996b:76, 80).

While Basso examines Western Apache discursive practices in the apprehension of places he also, in conjunction with Steven Feld, proposes a social theory of place (Feld & Basso 1996:11). Theoretically, Feld and Basso, situate sense of place as a dynamic process of interanimation in which places and identity arise together within the
process of dwelling and that these senses (of identity and place) are embedded in
discourses (1996:11). Like many other anthropologists, Feld and Basso typify
interactions with places as a blend of objectivist and subjectivist understandings. The
physical object that is place is experienced multi-sensorially by the social subject and
shaped by that encounter; a reciprocal experience which creates and sustains both the
place and the individual (Basso 1996:55; Feld 1996:99). Social identity is enacted and
embedded within everyday activities within places (Feld 1996:13). Breaking with
Casey’s notion of the pre-ontological apprehension of place, Basso and Feld contend
that perception itself is culturally constituted and thus apprehension is variable and
culturally specific: a social phenomenology (Basso 1996:55; Feld 1996:93). Place is an
agent in self-reflection, identity, memory and emotion, hence the “process of
interanimation,” and “inherently meaningful” (Basso 1996:55; Feld 1996:103).
Dwelling within places is understood as an internal and external act (within self and
within place). Thus the phenomenon of perception as socially experienced results in
construction of world (Basso 1996:55, Feld 1996:89). This dialectical experience of
place (a mutual interdependence) invests meaning into place.

This notion of the participatory nature of place within its own construction and
identity is echoed by Lane (2001). Lane (2001:41) asserts that places, especially what
he defines in the Western tradition as sacred, are both socially constructed and
experiential. They are a combination of social, economic, and political constructions
and place’s own interconnectedness (Lane 2001:5). Social constructionism alone
ignores the particular qualities of place and relegates the creation of place to a solely
cognitive level (2001:52). Following Ingold and Casey, Lane concludes that places are
interactive and reciprocally perceived (2001:53). Place “demands its own integrity, its own participation in what it ‘becomes,’ its own voice” (Lane 2001:4). In this, place is not strictly within the binary of outside (cultural construction of reality) or inside (the intimate perception of symbolic meaning); it is relational (Lane 2001:6).

I contend that a dynamic perspective offer a better base for a theory of place. Place is not location, site, choreography, or even positionality; these are reductive conceptualizations. Scholars such as Casey, Ingold, and Basso advocate for place as incorporating cultural construction and experientiality within place as event, as expansive beginnings or emergence. Their theories incorporate cultural construction within an interactive and intersubjective approach. A dynamic approach would advocate place as an active, dialectical, multi-relational, and emergent process in which the corporeality (not just physicality in the Western sense) of place and self interact with sociality (as social institutions, habitus, habitualities) to mutually constitute each other. Place, self, and sociality engage differentially in each occurrence—the process unfolds uniquely in each event. This engagement occurs as a multi-dimensional interaction that includes perception, sentience, affect, memory, movement, dwelling, sociality, etc. We need to acknowledge, however, that the material form of place evinces a permeability or porosity. Thus place has edges, or perhaps corridors, where places, persons, and cultures encounter each other. Boundaries are then organs of engagement, inclusive and dynamic.

My dynamic approach understands places as participatory agents and co-constitutive in identity, cultural maintenance and survival, and meaning-making.
A holistic body (and place) that includes the possibility of extension beyond the ‘bounded physical’ into the realm of the ‘other’ (through interaction) and thus incorporates and co-evolves with the world adds multi-dimensionality to place as event. This emphasis on non-boundedness, and an agency which may be accidental or willful, blurs the line between subject and object and reduces the emphasis on scale. In addition, nearness becomes less essential in the relational aspects of place, self, and culture. This malleability of the self and place is strikingly similar to some indigenous understandings, most particularly Native Americans in the Americas.

Finally we need to avoid a tendency to systematize place as a unitary phenomena; place presents itself uniquely in each emergence. For the Western Apache (and many Native American peoples), places possess inherent power and knowledge that can be perceived multisensorially and which exists independently from human encounters. These places may be understood as persons embodied within the form of mountains, springs, rivers, trees, etc, or they may have indwelling persons possessing agency. Mount Graham in particular is known (to some traditional Apache persons) as the outer form of an ‘indwelling being’ of great power who guides, protects, and sustains the Western Apache people (Brandt 1996, 2011 personal communication). Places as the Western Apache experience and conceive of them exist outside of a Western ontology and epistemology.

While admittedly this approach remains Western in its orientation, we have much more potential to access non-Western notions of place with less
distortion. Place possesses agency and a corporeal substance, which can translate into beingness or aliveness (life) in a participatory encounter, without asserting some type of anthropomorphism or inscription. Place is then a qualitative process of becoming that resists stasis and quantification. Understanding how individuals talk about places necessitates not only a theory of place but an understanding of language and discourse. The following chapter moves into a brief examination of language and social theory before delving into my analytic methods.
Chapter 3

SOCIAL THEORY AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORY AND METHODS

*Orientation is more than physical context and placement...It is about how the human spirit understands itself.* (Cajete 1994:49)

How research is conducted directly relates to the answers we find. Methodologies are rooted in particular worldviews and cultural contexts (both academic and personal) which impact our findings. This cautions us to account for our cultural entailments and attempt to set them aside or minimize their effect in our analyses. Cross-cultural engagements do not occur in a vacuum; multiple worldviews, perspectives, and identities intersect in these interactions. Since these interactions are both a daily part of life and a component in research, I contend that we must take these concerns into account. My approach hopefully offers researchers an example of both the necessity for attending to these concerns and a way to achieve a richer, deeper understanding of other cultural groups' worldviews.

Having briefly explored the general Western worldview, I will expand upon the theoretical roots which underlie this project. Specifically, I examine social theory, particularly social constructionism, and its relationship to discursive theoretical stances, and what this means in explicating Western Apache rhetoric. I then present overviews of both Discourse and Metaphor Analysis, followed by an explication of the project design and specific methods used in this project.
Theoretical Concerns

Understanding the cultural context of Apache discourse surrounding this issue is important given the tight linkage among language, places, and identity. One method of understanding Western Apache conceptualizations of culturally significant places is to examine the rhetoric surrounding their concerns with Dzil nchaa si’an. How do Apache peoples speak of their places and does this language coherently present their views? Discourse analysis as employed in this project looks at meaning-making, identity creation and maintenance, and ways of acting and being in the world (Johnstone 2008:7; Basso 1996).

Embedded within any discussion of discourse is the need to define and understand language. On the macro level, we understand the capacity for language as a genetic-biophysiological ability or predisposition of humans (and some animals) to acquire and use symbols to communicate ideas and thoughts. Multiple scholars have addressed the significance of human language. Noam Chomsky (1965), for example, advocated that language was simply a mental structure or system that existed a priori and was representative in character. Thus speech in his sense was the mere performance of an abstract system. Language was seen as a self-contained conventionalized set of communicative choices (Johnstone 2008:3). Chomsky’s emphasis on linguistic competence and language as a priori mental grammar has been criticized as a search for universals without acknowledging the importance of social context, linguistic variation, and the ethnographic observation of language in use (Johnstone and Marcellino 2011:58-59). Criticism of Chomsky’s notion of language helped bring forth the field of
sociolinguistics as a new paradigm in which language must be understood by taking social context into account (Wodak et al 2011:1-2). In his criticism of Chomsky, Dell Hymes argued for understanding speech as a “diversity of the particular, not just the structured norms of an abstraction.” (Johnstone & Marcellino 2011:60).

Edward Sapir (1929), an American linguist, and his protégée Benjamin Whorf (1964), a scholar of Native American languages, were instrumental in injecting the notion of cultural specificity into any discussion of language. Sapir advocated that, “…the ‘real world’ is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group. No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality” (1929:209). Whorf extended this notion to advocate that thought was to a large extent a linguistic function rooted in rationality, culturally organized, and primarily distinct from sensory modalities. Meaning results from the patterned relationships between words and these patterns are culturally derived and organized (Whorf 1964:129-130). Language is therefore inherent in the ‘inception of thought’ and revelatory of cultural difference (Whorf 1964:134, 139-140).

Building upon Sapir’s work, Whorf developed the theory that the structure of a particular language constrains the ability of the speaker to understand cultural concepts represented by different or alien languages. Thought processes are fundamentally distinct for persons whose languages are fundamentally distinct (Whorf 1964:130, 138; Deutscher 2010; Invinson 2011:45). Whorf’s theoretical frame included two hypotheses. The first of these was interpreted as linguistic
determinism; if the mind carried no abstract symbol (word) for a concept, then the brain failed to comprehend it, thus grammar determines categorization. The second premise concerned linguistic relativity; conceptual categorization is contained within linguistic classification, overt and covert, and can be apprehended through the comparative study of languages (Whorf 1964:130-1).

Vigorous criticism of ‘linguistic determinism’ resulted in the abandonment of the so-called “Sapir-Whorf hypothesis” (Boroditsky 2001:2; Johnstone 2008:37). Sapir later refined his theoretical stance on language to advocate language as a self-contained conceptual system that arises through experience and results in conceptual categories which are unconsciously projected upon future experiences (Sapir 1964:128, my emphasis). Cultural variability could and did exist in the face of linguistic similarity, particularly with respect to certain Native American groups (Sapir 1947:3). Languages are expressive of a society’s own cultural logic and ontological and linguistic classifications arise together.

More recently, many scholars have reexamined Whorf’s work and proposed that language categories do influence how people explore and understand their world. For example, the English language is noun-based with minimal grammatical markings of those nouns (lack of gender, mass, definition, etc). English speakers have a tendency to interpret components of their world as objects rather than events or persons (Johnstone 2008:37). However, we know that this is not merely the result of grammatical structure. Western conceptualizations of reality are influenced by previous philosophical and historical paradigms that may be reflected within the English language
Discursive interactions enact in the present our conceptualizations of the nature of the world. A Western Apache person may have a tendency to classify within a different framework. Indeed, Hoijer (1964) noted the strong verb-based nature of Athapaskan languages, that correlated with both motion and a marked processual emphasis in Diné (Navajo) language and culture (Diné and Ndeh [Western Apache] are closely related Athapaskan languages with marked cultural similarities). Hoijer stated “It is my suggestion that this phenomenon connotes a functional interrelationship between socially patterned habits of speaking and thinking and other socially patterned habits…” (1964:148).

Currently, the most widely held version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis contends that categories of language shape but do not necessarily determine how the world is construed and that this may, in turn, be shaped by how the world is perceived (the chicken and the egg dilemma). For example, apropos the research discussion at hand, English often grammatically expresses experience as possession; ‘have a coat’, ‘have a cold’, or even ‘have a good day’ (Johnstone 2008:37). This has consequences in how native English-speakers understand places and objects as property rather than as actors in a multi-dimensional world (as do some non-native English speakers). The difficulty is avoiding a deterministic or simplistic assessment of language and discourse.

Recently, several studies have been conducted testing Whorf’s postulate of linguistic relativism. Many of these studies (Agnoli 1991; Slobin 1996; Boroditsky 2001), while not conclusive, suggest that thought is influenced by
linguistic structure to some degree. Slobin (1996) noted some bias in thought during speech that suggested linguistic influence. Agnoli (1991) suggested that fluency of categorical thought was linguistically related. In a recent series of experiments, Boroditsky examined the connections between temporal thought and the linguistic expression of time through spatiotemporal metaphors. She concluded that language can significantly shape abstract thought (in this case concerning time) but that native speech, while influential, is not deterministic (2001:1, 18). The acquisition (or at least the expression of) semantic biases were inversely correlated with the age of exposure to a second language. Moreover, Boroditsky found that these differences were linguistically driven rather than influenced by other cultural forms (2001:19).

Other studies have been conducted which appear to show that grammatical genders can influence the affect and associations of speakers toward the objects around them (Konishi 1993; Sera, Berge & del Castillo 1994; Deutscher 2010). Boroditsky, Schmidt & Phillips (2002) conducted a rigorous set of experiments to address the limitations in these earlier studies (native language bias, confounding linguistic factors). German and Spanish speakers were directed to ‘grade’ objects along a continuum of characteristics. Spanish speakers characterized certain objects in line with male characteristics while German speakers tended to associate these same objects with more feminine qualities. This extended to how objects such as bridges were visualized (i.e.: strong versus slender). The results suggest that gendered languages can imprint gender traits in the mind, that these associations can exert a deleterious effect on the speaker’s ability to memorize
information outside of their language of origin, and that how individuals think
about and categorize objects is grammatically influenced (Boroditsky, Schmidt &
Phillips 2002; Deutscher 2010a). These types of associations, inculcated
throughout a person’s life experience, bear affective dimensions also. While both
Spanish and German are ‘Western’ languages, and share a gendered base, they
differ in how objects are perceived, classified, and talked about. English
speakers, utilizing a gender-neutral language, are somewhat at a loss when
confronted with this system of associations. The question posed by linguistic
scholars is how much does language influence our behavior, beliefs, values and
ideologies\(^{19}\). I do not propose to answer this question, rather I assert that
language, behavior, experience, and social practice are in dialectical relation with
each other and we must remain aware of this in any analysis (Deutscher 2010).

**Social Theory and Language**

Irrespective of the ongoing debate between Whorfian and Chomskian
notions of language, “language routinely influences us to specify certain types of
information.” (Deutscher 2010). It directs our attention to certain details and
aspects of the world and our experience in it. Speakers of other languages than

\(^{19}\) Ideology is understood here to be the fairly coherent set of ideas, meanings, and principles held
by individuals about a particular set of notions, usually political or economic in nature (Friedrich
1989:301). Ideologies have both conscious and unconscious components which perpetuate or
influence action. Individuals may incorporate multiple ideologies (incomplete or complete).
Ideologies are closely aligned with language through the adoption or incorporation of conceptual
metaphors.
our own may not be directed to notice the same details. Linguistic practices within a community have a cultural history (Balagangadhara 1994:27; Boroditsky 2001). As Deutscher (2010a) notes, speech habits are inculcated from birth and can “settle into habits of mind that go beyond language itself, affecting your experiences, perceptions, associations, feelings, memories and orientation in the world.” Much like Bourdieu’s (1991) habitus, language and sociality are created and recreated daily through our bodily and social practices. This is emphatically not in the deterministic mode, however. Rather, language and social practice arise in interaction with each other, the world, and our experiences within it. There is a mutuality present; influence and influenced, shaping and shaped.

This notion of language as social interaction was advanced through the work of Erving Goffman (1959, 1981) who contended that discursive practices were instrumental in the construction of social identities and social forms through the performative process. Goffman combined both phenomenology and social constructionism in his examination of the emergent and performative character of discourse and sociality. His interactionist approach emphasized interaction order in discourse, the presentation of the self through both framing the interaction and adoption of various ‘footings’ (personal alignments), and the situational and often structural constraints that influence not only the interaction but the language used within the discursive act (Kendall 2011:116-119). Participants are agents in their own construction and identities are multiple and distinct from the roles persons
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20 This is one reason why indigenous concepts should be referred to in the indigenous language used. An example of this is the use of the word religion (discussed in Chapter 2) which may not apply to indigenous understandings of their social practice.
perform in social acts (Goffman 1959:252-3; 1974:519; Kendall 2011; Irwin 2011:103). This is particularly apropos in this examination of Western Apache discourse, as a discursive encounter framed by multiple parties (Western Apache, academic institutions, Vatican, and the public at large) and as the performance of Western Apache identity.

Perhaps as important as the notion of discourse (or language) as an emergent and interactive social act was Goffman’s notion that these acts are behavioral; they are publicly enacted. Geertz also emphasized this in his treatise on culture; “Culture, this acted document, thus is public” (1973:10). In describing (rather than defining) culture, Geertz (1973:12) rejected the notion that culture is an internal, mental construct and instead advocated that, “Culture is public because meaning is”. According to Geertz (1973:5, 14, 19-20), social actors through ‘social discourse’ publicly enact symbolic systems, cosmological understandings, and worldviews. Culture, as webs of meaning, is the context within which individuals act, think, and interrelate and thus apprehension is always interpretive. This interpretive turn in anthropology advanced our understanding of sociality as human behavior enacted within a cultural milieu that is meaningful, multiple, and discursively produced (Geertz 1973:30, 449).

The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom they properly belong. (Geertz 1973: 452)

---

21 A symbol uses a sign, object or sound to represent something else through its relationship or association with that sign. Symbols have cultural significance. Geertz defines symbolic systems as the inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms which convey and maintain particular knowledges and attitudes toward life (1973: 89).
Language and Ontology

Social discourse is impacted by the language ideology of the people in question. These ideologies are “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (Rumsey 1990: 346). In the Western view, language is representative in nature. Field and Kroskrity (2009) have examined this difference in language ideologies. They note that one of the largest differences between Western and Native American language ideologies resides in the semantic potency of Native American language; its functional role and perceived generative power.

Whereas ‘reflectionist’ Euro-American language ideologies emphasize the denotational and referential functions of ‘words for things,’ many Native Americans possess language ideologies which view language and speech more ‘performatively’—as a more powerful and creative force that ‘makes’ the natural and social worlds they inhabit. [Field and Kroskrity 2009:10]

Magnus Course (2010) also addresses the disconnect between Western and non-Western languages, citing the standard usage of analogies rooted in European languages, and their ontologies, to describe and analyze non-Western peoples and their cultures. Taking a modified Whorfian stance, Course (2010:247-8) asserts that linguistic forms and grammars carry with them ‘implicit ontologies’ which reframe non-Western ontologies and result in conceptual slippage. The configuration of subject – object dichotomies and their representation in language is unreflexively applied in analysis and results in

---

22 The authors define language ideologies as beliefs and feelings about language and discourse that are possessed by speakers and speech communities. These are considered to be particular to the language spoken and a key component in analysis (Kroskrity and Field 209:4)
misrepresentation, particularly in understanding ontological relationships. Course contends that indigenous ontologies often fly in the face of the binary Western traditions which assign agency to subjects and deny it to objects (2010:253).

This problem is connected to Vivieros de Castro’s (1998) notion of cosmological deixism and its relation to Amerindian perspectivism, in which the point of view, or personal context, creates the subject and hence agency. Vivieros de Castro (1998: 470) asserts that in Amerindian perspectivism “all beings appear human to themselves and act accordingly.” According to Vivieros de Castro (1998: 470), certain animals (unique to specific cultural groups) see themselves as humans and their external form as a mere costume which conceals their inner form. The undifferentiated world became differentiated through a series of events, “The original common condition of both humans and animals is not animality but humanity” (Vivieros de Castro 1998: 472). Animals lost agency; they are ex-humans. The problem with this rendering on perspectival ontology is that though beings are understood to experience and understand different worlds similarly, agency can still be assumed to be a human quality (Vivieros de Castro 1998: 471). Western ontologies categorize agentive behavior as solely within the human realm and we therefore assume the analogy holds true universally. I, like Hallowell (1960), would argue that Native Americans and indigenous peoples do not necessarily attribute humanness to other beings who are agents but rather personhood, which is not exclusively human. In this sense while Course’s criticism that this subject – object structure predisposes us to create and maintain
analogies which misframe ontologies appears to be valid, he misses a fundamental assumption of Western ontological categorization, exclusive personhood.

**Author’s Theoretical Stance**

I take Gary Witherspoon’s perspective on language and culture as my starting base in this project. Language is a symbolic code (in that it uses words as symbols) through which information is transmitted and understood, interpreted, and acted upon (Witherspoon 1977:3). More than this however, language is performed and enacted; it is an integral component of human action and sociality. According to Witherspoon, culture (in the big ‘C’ sense) is also a symbolic code through which knowledge, practice, and perspectives are embodied, encoded, and enacted. Language is a vehicle in this enactment. I am not entering into the ongoing argument concerning the validity of the concept of ‘culture.’ Rather I want to stress that human sociality is intimately tied to the enactment and embodiment of the nature of reality and its operation (worldview), social forms, and normative and existential postulates, etc, through a variety of social acts, one of which is language (speech). More importantly, if culture transmits underlying normative and existential postulates and conceptions of the world, then language is one of several social mechanisms used to convey this information (Witherspoon 1977:3).

Language is a conceptual scheme but also a social practice, one that is enacted, reconstituted, and altered daily in interaction with others. Witherspoon’s premise is that culture (read: sociality or human behavior) is derived from
underlying metaphysical (ontological, epistemological and axiological) assumptions and that these are accessed, imparted, and changed through social communication and acts, including language, ritual performance, and art (Witherspoon 1977:5). The speaker constructs a frame through which the receiver responds and acts (Witherspoon 1977:7-8). Witherspoon’s analysis of Diné language is apropos here as Diné is closely related to the Western Apache language. The two groups also share many of the same social and cultural practices as well as similar cosmologies. Witherspoon discussed the importance of speech in the daily and ceremonial practice of the Diné.

Speech is an externalization of thought. Being the outer form of thought, speech is an extension of thought…Moreover, speech is a reinforcement of the power of thought; it is an imposition on the external23 world. This reinforcement reaches its peak after four repetitions… [1977: 31]

For the Diné, speech is action that creates, re-forms, and sustains reality; it is generative rather than representative. Indeed, according to the Witherspoon’s Diné consultants, saad (word-symbols) are world-constructing and existed prior to humanity (1977:43). Scholars have also noted that this appears to hold true for the Western Apache (Goddard 1918; Opler 1935, 1941; Goodwin 1939, 1969; Basso 1990, 1996; Clark 2001; Samuels 2004). If the act of speech carries this creative potential then discourse concerning significant Western Apache places, actions, persons, and events needs to be understood against this backdrop.

23Witherspoon remains in the Western perspective here (though perhaps unintentionally) when he characterizes the world as external. Diné oral traditions speak of a world called into existence by the actions and speech of powerful, pre-existing persons (Zolbrod 1984; Schwarz 1997).
Basso has spent much of his scholarly career, living and studying the Cibecue Apache and their language. According to Basso (1990:xii), language and speech are integral components in Western Apache sociality and culture, providing a means of knowing the world, creating and sustaining relationships, and are essential to Apache identity. Moreover, language is breath in performance, an important concept for the Western Apache. As one of Basso’s consultants phrased this, “If we lose our language, we will lose our breath. Then we will die and blow away like leaves.” (1990:xiv).

How, when, where, and to whom Western Apaches speak is as important as what is said (or not said). Basso (1990) has noted that Western Apache speech patterns and everyday discourse consistently display reticence, reserve, strategic silences, and an open-ended structure which allows the participants to form and voice their own opinions and conclusions. Ambiguity and reticence serve to restrict potentially harmful generative speech, expresses respect for others’ opinions, and allows Western Apache persons to gather information in context before proceeding further (Basso 1990:94-6). The world is a dangerous place and persons, places, and events must be approached with caution. Speaking carelessly can cause great harm and Western Apache oral traditions reinforce this repeatedly to the Apache people (Goddard 1918; Opler 1941; Goodwin 1994).

**Overview of Discourse Analysis**

Discourse is therefore an important component of interpersonal relations, particularly for the Western Apache. It is a social act that engages multiple participants in the exchange of information and meaning. However, the term
discourse is muddied by diverse and occasionally contradictory understandings, especially in the academic arena (Johnstone 2008:1). Definitions vary by disciplinary context and are more often than not, defined by exclusion. This fluidity of definition causes problems in analysis (Mills 1997:3). Definitions of discourse, and how closely these adhere to a definition of language, are intimately related to the investigators approach to discourse analysis. Hawthorne (1992) has defined discourse as linguistic communication that is in effect an interpersonal activity whose form is determined by its social purpose (Mills 1997:4). While this definition includes both spoken and written communication, it excludes bodily communication and perception from our analysis. People communicate not only linguistically, but through their facial expressions, posture, movement, breath, silence, and their unspoken perception of these same factors. These bodily cues can significantly affect the perceived meaning of discourse. Blommaert defines discourse more broadly, as “meaningful symbolic behavior” (2005:2), while Johnstone (2008) states:

Discourse is both the source of this knowledge (people’s generalizations about language are made on the basis of the discourse they participate in) and the result of it (people apply what they already know in creating and interpreting new discourse). [2008:3]

In general, there are two broad perspectives or paradigms in defining discourse: those definitions which equate discourse with language and those that broaden discourse to include ways of talking, speaking, and communicating about ideas, values, and opinions. In the first, discourse is singular and grammatically based. The second approach sees discourse as plural—discourses within any
particular language group. Certain parameters appear to be inherent in either
approach to discourse: (1) there are at least two participants, both of which send
and receive information (cognitive and affective); (2) there is engagement in the
social exchange, to varying degrees; and (3) that “different modes of discourse
encode different representations of experience” (Mills 1997:5).

Johnstone asserts that, “analysis involves various ways of systematically
taking things apart and looking at them from multiple perspectives or in multiple
ways.” (2008:30). Discourse Analysis is as much a perspective as it is a
methodology involving multiple methods to achieve this goal. The analysis of
discourse falls into three major approaches, which are directly connected to the
larger perspective held by the researcher: (1) linguistic or discourse analysis
(DA), (2) social-psychological/conversational analysis (CA), and (3) critical
discourse analysis (CDA). Each of these approaches espouses a particular view
of discourse and a method to analyze and investigate it. I will briefly review these
approaches before addressing the methodology used in this project.

The linguistic approach (Discourse Analysis) views discourse as language
in social context, an extended piece of text (either verbal or written) that displays
internal organization and coherence (Widdowson 1995:2). Early DA was rooted
in Chomskyan linguistic theory that understands language as an abstract system,
performed by individuals and groups (Wodak et al 2011:2). The problem with
this early perspective is that language, as a prior mental grammar, does not
account for the contextual use of language as being shaped by sociality and
praxis, nor does it account for cultural diversity (Johnstone & Marcellino
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In response to these criticisms, DA has more recently shifted to recognizing language as a social entity and moved to asking questions about the role of language in cognition and social praxis (Johnstone 2008:7). Language is conceived as related to reality and this dynamic influences linguistic correctness, communication, articulateness, and identity (Johnstone 2008:66-70). Analysis is not solely focused on language as an abstract system but also on how people use language (Johnstone 2008:3). How are linguistic choices affected by individual conceptualizations of language? Is language referential or generative in its use?

Discourse is defined by the context of the ‘utterances’ that determines the internal structure of the communication. In this type of analysis, attention is paid to structure and function; the mechanics of communicative language. How do speakers indicate their intentions and how does the audience interpreted this? Significance, connection, identity, knowledge, and relationships are conveyed through linguistic structures that reveal positionality, intent, and culturally shaped principles (Johnstone 2008:6). Discourse Analysis in this modality concerns conventionalized sets of choices in communication. As a methodology, DA is driven by the specific research question but in general focuses on grammatical patterns, word associations, subject-verb relations, semantics, social categories and relations, and internal versus external causes of change in meaning, structure and translation (Johnstone 2008:6-9).

Conversational Analysis (CA) arose out of social psychology and a concern with the interactional quality of language (Schriffrin et al 2003:217).
Social action is ongoing and reflexive; actors make sense of their world through observation and reflexive interactions (Schriffrin et al 2003:252). Conversation is seen as a dialogic process embedded within complex social processes (Schriffrin et al 2003:254). Analysis focuses on uncovering shared social patterns through which individuals orient themselves and others to particular normative concerns and assumptions (Schriffrin et al 2003: 53). This is accomplished by analyzing the conversational structure (sequential organization, topic placement and orientation to the ‘other’) in an attempt to reveal the normative order of talk.

Often placement within the structure of conversation, how interactions are breached, and the connection to previous talk reflect and constrain the force and meaning of the utterance (Schriffrin et al 2003:85, 217). Meaning, relationship and power are revealed within the sequential structure of verbal exchange. The focus is on the everyday communicative structures that reveal the social order underlying human experience (Schriffrin et al 2003:253, 726)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as originally conceived, differed from DA by moving beyond description to look at how power relations and ideologies shape discourse and how discourse participates in identity construction, knowledge systems, and social relations. In this manner CDA advocated the premise that discourse is part of social practice (Fairclough 1992:12; Widdowson 1995:158). The antecedents of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are attributed to British linguists of the 1970’s who were concerned with the use of language in social institutions and the macro level relationships between power, ideology, and language (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000:453). This notion of discourse was built
upon a foundation in social theory, specifically Michel Foucault’s discussion of knowledge and power. Foucault (1972) purported that discourses (plural) were conventional ways of speaking which were essentially born from conventional ways of thinking and that this linkage resulted in ‘ideologies’ (as individual or group political action, both verbal and physical) which helped power circulate within a society (Johnstone 2008:3). Foucault’s definition of discourse is still the most often cited in CDA: “the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualized group of statements, and sometimes as a regular practice that accounts for a number of statements” (1972:80). This idea of discourses as habituated patterns of language, belief, and behavior stems from the notion that discourses are ‘ideas’ held by individuals and groups, and ways of talking about these are influenced by others’ ideas. Discourse in this sense builds upon not only Foucault’s notion of the circulation of power but also Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* (1991). Discourse according to Bourdieu (1991:2) is the “everyday linguistic exchanges as situated encounters between agents endowed with socially structured resources and competencies, in such a way that every linguistic interaction, however personal and insignificant it may seem, bears the traces of the social structure that it both expresses and helps to reproduce.”

CDA came into prominence in 1989, with the publication of Norman Fairclough’s *Language and Power*. Fairclough (1989), Ruth Wodak (2001), and Teun Van Dijk (2003) are most often associated with the school of CDA, though others have influenced this type of analysis. Early CDA has been described as based upon a fusion between linguistic and cultural theory and primarily
concerned with the interaction of discourse, speech, or language and social forms, looking critically at hegemonic processes and their effects on discursive practice, identity construction, and social categories (Mills 1997:9; Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000). Thus, discourse is both socially constituted and conditioned; a social act engaged in by both speaker – writer and listener – audience. It is situated within the larger social institutions and practices within which actors engage and is intimately involved in the production, circulation, and representation of power, meaning, and ideology (Mills 1997; Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000).

Critiques of CDA stressed that it does not allow for multiple interpretations and meanings of text in its analysis, nor does it analyze the multiple social dimensions under which text is produced and consumed (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000:455). Interpretation is based within the investigator’s socio-political perspective. This can skew meaning and context, especially when applied to non-Western societies, allowing patterns to be missed (Widdowson 1996:68).

CDA has more recently broadened its focus beyond power to include multiple components of social praxis and cultural meaning or framing. It integrates concerns with power relations and structure with methodology from DA. Discourse is always situated in the social. Critical Discourse practitioners

---

24 CDA now moves beyond a concern with hegemonic processes, to look at individual social and discursive practice in micro and macro contexts. Power relations influence how people present themselves and relay information. We need to also remember that hegemony is paradigmatic in its basis, which is important in this particular situation.
advocate the analysis of social structures and how these condition language patterns, social relationships, identity, etc. Fairclough conceives of discourse as tri-dimensional: (1) as text (linguistic structure and organization); (2) as discursive practice (produced, circulated, distributed, and consumed); and (3) as social practice (a component of hegemonic processes and ideological in nature). (Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000:448).

Methodological Frame

This study is engaged in a multi-disciplinary critical discourse and metaphor analysis of the Western Apache public statements and rhetoric surrounding the Mt. Graham controversy. Discourse analysis in this project is defined as the careful study of performed language, as a communicative action, based upon the notion that culture emerges through social interaction and negotiation (Bloor 2007:2; Johnstone 2008:2). There is a cyclical, on-going process in which language and social reality interact, shape, and serve as mutual resources for discourse and social praxis (Johnstone 2008:46). Social roles, relatedness, patterns, structures and conceptualizations are both reflected and constrained through language and social action. Discourses are purposeful, contextual events that reveal patterns of belief, systems of rules, structural relationships, knowledge, thoughts, and emotions. Ideologies and power can be discerned through the systematicity of ideas, opinions, and values exhibited within particular contexts through language, action, and behavior (Foucault 1972:49). Meaning is fluid within the dialogue and discourse can be both an object and the site of struggle. How meaning is created, conveyed and interpreted
can reveal “culturally-shaped interpretive principles” and normative and existential postulates (Blackburn 1975; Basso 1997: Johnstone 2008:6). It is for this reason that I utilized CDA (along with DA and metaphor analysis) in my examination of Western Apache rhetoric. On the one hand, the observatory partners held a significant amount of power, legally, politically, and economically, while the San Carlos Apache were particularly impoverished. However, both parties were effective rhetoricians.

This type of analysis, a combination of DA and CDA, can uncover external social and material influences on language pattern change and power distribution, the role of language in cultural competence, cognition, sociality, and power (Johnstone 2008:6-7). Through the identification of themes, contextual issues, structural, and linguistic features, analysis enables access to the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions within oral or written discourse, bringing to light meanings and understandings of the parties involved (Bernard 2006:486). Discourse locates the subject (and often the speaker) “geographically, historically, ethnically, ideologically,” (Chilton 2004:148). It can combine schema and project visual images, metaphorically link distinct phenomena or subjects, and frame arguments within a particular perspective or worldview.

The discourse examined in this project is framed within the political arena as the discourse of controversy. This discourse is part of a larger national and international debate concerning sovereignty, traditional cultural places (TCPs), sacrality, and power. Though I am primarily concerned with the Western Apache as speakers in this project, they are also present as an audience. While the larger
audience is the general public, within any discursive act the audience also includes parties-as-speakers. In this case, this includes the Western Apache, conservation activists, scholars, telescope proponents, local, state, and federal government officials, and Arizona citizens.

Analysis in this project was performed on multiple levels: thematic, dialogic, and critical discourse analysis along with examination of linguistic or discursive elements. Dialogic analysis examined discourse in context; speakers, audience, positionality, intent, modality of discourse and rhetorical strategies. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) looked at how language was used and to what purpose (Fairclough 1989). Linguistic analysis looked at a few of the basic linguistic structures to uncover nuanced and hidden meanings that might offer a glimpse into the ontological and epistemological systems of the Western Apache.

In order to more easily convey my interpretive results, I have separated my analysis into three chapters: methodological structure and linguistic analysis, thematic and critical discourse analysis, and metaphor analysis. These chapters discuss the Western Apache discourse and rhetoric concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An and telescope proponents’ actions with an aim to understand how Apaches currently understand the mountain and other significant places.

**Triangulation and Process**

Translating the larger theoretical concepts of CDA into methodology is always difficult as each project is unique in its scope, scale, and subject. In this study, it was important to keep in mind that Western Apache discourse is a social
 Bringing grand theory down to the middle and micro ranges was necessary in order to study those social acts. Using Goffman’s (1974, 1981) and Geertz’s (1973) notions of social interaction, combined with Scollon’s (2001) mediated discourse analysis as a methodological frame, was helpful in this case. Scollon is concerned with intercultural communication and links discourse and social action on both the micro level of daily acts, through which actors produce their personal histories and habitus, with the macro level of communities as produced and reproduced via these same social acts (Scollon 1998:140; Wodak & Meyer 2001:22). The emphasis on the mediation of meaning and practice, which is enacted in discourse and linked to broader social issues, allows us to examine these links (Wodak & Meyer 2001:152; Scollon & Scollon 2001: 43-5). This type of analysis also fits with Western Apache sociality and discourse as discussed previously; social enactment and embodiment of meanings through daily discursive interactions.

 Discourses are “inherently polyvocal, intertextual, and interdiscursive.” (Meyer & Wodak 2001:148). The issue is how meanings (read cultural conceptualizations) are produced and reproduced within discursive acts. The problem in this particular project is how to determine which statements, meanings, and underlying concepts are not only significant, but widely held. I examined the discourse of over seventy Western Apache individuals including elders, medicine people, tribal members, and community advocates in both individual and group encounters. The pertinent discourses of affiliated Native American individuals and groups were also analyzed. These included national
groups as well as statements by tribes within the southwestern United States, specifically Navajo and other Apache tribes. The majority of these individuals opposed the observatory.

Multiple discursive types were analyzed: speech and text from orations, narratives, depositions, editorials, written letters, and public statements, both extemporaneous and prepared. The public statements were news releases, news interviews, recorded speech in informal settings (large protest gathering, etc.), or statements made to anthropologists, telescope proponents, or government officials concerning the mountain. Therefore sites of engagement were public and semi-private, large and small, direct and indirect. Statements were compiled for each individual then coded and analyzed. Analysis in this manner allowed me to uncover how many Apaches speak publicly about the mountain. It also exposed the wide range in understandings which correlate with what is already known concerning Western Apache cosmological knowledge; knowledge is conveyed in ‘levels’ of understanding (similar to the Diné) in which religious specialists and particular elders hold restricted knowledge, and tribal members acquire knowledge through personal means (dreams, visions), through ceremonial practice, and through narratives relayed by other community members (Goodwin Papers, Goodwin1969; Basso1990, 1996).

**Metaphor Analysis**

Conceptual metaphors, or ways of thinking, are another way to access Western Apache cultural knowledge about places. Metaphor analysis is based
upon the premise that our conceptual system is metaphorical in nature and that
metaphors reveal patterns of thought through everyday linguistic patterns.
how we perceive, experience, and understand our world (Lakoff and Johnson
1980:3-4). Our present day understanding of metaphor arose within the cognitive-
linguistic perspective which acknowledges metaphor as a property of concepts not
merely words; a part of human conceptualization not just linguistic expression
(Chilton 2004:51). Metaphors are classified as conceptual or linguistic.
Conceptual metaphors are “ways of thinking” about the world while metaphorical
linguistic expressions are ways of talking which reveal the underlying conceptual
metaphors a society holds (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:7; Kovecses 2002:4).

Metaphors allow us to understand one conceptual domain in terms of its
relation with another unrelated domain. According to Lakoff and Johnson
(1980:16), it allows us to understand an abstract concept by linking it to a
concrete experience. It is a set of mappings that actually create relationships
between domains (Kovecses 2002:7). Metaphors are partial in that they never
map completely onto another domain and often multiple metaphorical expressions
are used to convey multiple aspects of a particular concept (Lakoff and Johnson
1980:10, 53). Metaphors are chosen within a cultural group on the basis of their
coherence within the overall system—those metaphors that do not fit the
conceptual system are either not used or tend to die out (Lakoff and Johnson
Metaphor is thus systematic in quality (Kovecses 2001:4). Two concepts are related through linguistic expression. Conceptual elements on one domain are mapped onto a set of correspondences in another domain. Generally, the target domain is either poorly understood, abstract or very complex and by linking conceptual components of the first concept with corresponding components of the second source domain, the target concept is more easily understood or presented in a particular light (Kovecses 2001:6, 2006:117). These metaphorical mappings are intuitively understood by groups who use them (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Chilton 2004:52; Kovecses 2006:122). Cognitive approaches to metaphor therefore understand metaphorical mappings to frame larger stores of cultural knowledge (Chilton 2004:52). Metaphors are a part of discourse, which is itself a component of individual and collective mental processes in which knowledge is both generated and stored, both memory and interaction (Chilton 2004:51-2). Metaphor allows us to access the normative and existential postulates upon which a society is based through access to this stored cultural knowledge. Fundamental values are coherent with (and entrenched in) the metaphorical structure of a culture (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:22).

At this point, it is important to mention metonymy. Metonymy is a cognitive process that allows mental access to elements within a domain by linguistically linking one element to another (Kovecses 2006:126). Like metaphor, metonymy is also conceptual, cultural, and systematic (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:36; Kovecses 2006:97). However, while metaphor maps across conceptual domains, metonymy maps within the same domain. It is a linguistic
expression in which a part of a concept is substituted for either the whole or another similar part. This ‘standing-for’ relationship links elements to the ‘whole’ or relates them to other parts (Kovecses 2006:98). For example, we understand the face of a person to be the person or the White House to also encompass the President and his staff (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:37; Kovecses 2006:99, 107,126). If domains are conceptual structures or cultural models then how one element stands-for another is culturally particular, demonstrating entrenched or culturally resonant relationships (Kovecses 2006:99). In the context of Western Apache statements, we find the individual standing for the tribe, Mount Graham as an arm of the person standing for the tribe, and the Western Apache language standing for Western Apache tribes.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980:19-20), metaphor is based within concrete experience. This basis for metaphorical expression is divided into three groups: physical, social, and experiential. Within these bases, there are multiple mapping sets of metaphors: structural, orientational, ontological, etc (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:19-40). These mappings tell us something about how a society views the world. For example, orientational metaphors are generally spatially oriented; they link concepts to bodily posture or orientation while ontological metaphors allow us to map concepts as objects, substances or persons. Several potential problems present themselves here. This type of categorization can be problematic in its Western assumptions. Ontological assumptions can color our investigation of metaphor. Spatialization as a mapping is another concern. Here we find the Western framing of space versus place, object rather than subject,
structure rather than process. Much of the Western world uses an egocentric orientation—the world is oriented according to our bodily coordinates (left – right, front – back, above – below). Many indigenous groups (including the Western Apache) use a geographic orientation—the self is oriented according to the world’s directions (north, south, east, west). While Western societies can and do use both of these orientations, depending upon the context, some indigenous peoples (for example, Guugu Yimithirr speakers in northern Queensland) do not (Deutscher 2010a). Haviland and Levinson have independently demonstrated that Guugu Yimithirr do not use egocentric designations to position objects (Haviland 1998; Levinson 1998; Levinson et al 2002). In fact, many indigenous groups orient themselves and others, including objects, in this way. Moreover, this type of language use implies a view of the world in which the individual or group orients him or herself *into* the world rather than the reverse.

Other scholars, not previously discussed, need to be brought into this discussion. Kari (2011) has examined Athapaskan languages with regard to landscape orientation and perspective. Kari (2011: 245) posits that the Athapaskan simple-complex grammatical dichotomy which is often reflected in place names (like Dzil Ncha Si An) are both informative and classificatory. Names are classificatory in that they generally describe the quality and morphology of particular places within the landscape (Kari 2001: 229-231). Names can be informative by revealing which features are considered more significant, the associations made conceptually between various qualities of places, and the ways in which Northern Athapaskan speakers relate to their places
For example, river names generally reference particular features and change at different points along its course, so that the river is conceived as multiple different rivers. In one case the entire valley was referred to as the river itself, an association which may reveal valuable social connections (Kari 2011: 243). Kari was interested in the generative geographic capacity of the language to orient the individual or community within the landscape.

More than just spatial orientation, many indigenous and non-Western people are placially oriented. This has implications in how the world is perceived, experienced, and expressed. That said if we are cognizant of our preconceptions, this might actually aid us in uncovering conceptual metaphors.

The influence of language on spatial orientation is of particular note in this project. Cross-language translation and metaphorical expressions are difficult in that these expressions may not actually be metaphorical but appear that way due to the difficulties of translating alien cultural concepts into English. Not all Apache concepts translate accurately and fully into English. This appears to be particularly true with regard to personhood. While an English-speaker reared in a Western society would see the attribution of personhood as metaphorical or as personification, this does not appear to be correct for some traditional, native Western Apaches. Personhood is actual and experiential.

Discussion

Language is both performative and transformative. People use languages purposefully, to create ideas, convince others, convey thoughts and intentions,
connect with others, and institute action. Language is intimately connected to history. History is said to be written by the victor but history may also be transmitted in the stories of the ‘conquered.’ Historical discourse reveals patterns that help us understand the how place was experienced by Western Apaches in the past and how these places are presented in the current controversy. In the next two chapters, I examine both the Euro-American documentary history and the ethnohistory of the Western Apache within Arizona and the Pinaleños. This examination is an important piece in Western Apache discursive practice as historical references featured prominently throughout the controversy. Western Apache history places the Apache in their ancestral grounds and reiterates their social and cultural connections to places, an important component in Western Apache social practice. Observatory proponents forefronted the documentary ‘history’ in their attempts to move the mountain into the public domain. This was consistent with pro-development policies within the economic and legal frame of United States sovereignty.
Chapter 4

HISTORY OF THE WESTERN APACHE IN ARIZONA

Western Apache Overview

The Western Apache are part of the Southern Athapaskan linguistic group of peoples who arrived in what is now called the Southwest\(^{25}\) from the northwestern North American continent. The exact route of entry for this linguistic group is disputed but is generally believed to have started in Alaska, northwest and central Canada (Basso 1971:12; Perry 1991:39-41). Two routes have been proposed for this migration: one via the Plains with gradual movement into the Southwest, the other via Utah and Colorado, along either side of the Rocky Mountains, directly into Arizona and New Mexico (Wilcox 1981: 15-6). Arrival into the southwestern region is also disputed, with dates ranging from 900 A.D. to around 1540 C.E., when Spaniards first documented an Apache presence (Hall 1944; Wilcox 1981:214-7; Basso 1971:12; Brandt 1996:51). The settlement area for Southern Athapaskans consisted of a broad region encompassing what is now northwest Texas, parts of Oklahoma, Kansas and Colorado, through New Mexico, central Arizona and into northern Mexico (Goodwin 1942:1). It is important to note that migration and arrival are processes, not events, which occur over and through time and landscape (Seymour 2008:44).

\(^{25}\) I use this term for ease, but it should be noted that this area was historically considered Native American and then Northwest Mexico. Vigorous expansion by the United States, coupled with subsequent war and treaties, resulted in the area’s inclusion into the United States, though indigenous and Mexican inhabitants still consider the area to be part of their original sovereign territories.
Southern Athapaskans were divided into seven major groups: Jicarilla Apache, Lipan Apache, Kiowa-Apache, Navajo, Mescalero Apache, Chiricahua Apache and Western Apache. The Spanish recognized these groups as the Llaneros, Lipanes, Mimbreno, Chiricaguas, Gileños, Mescaleros, Tontos (Coyoteros), Faraones, and Navajo (Cortés 1799:49-51; Ogle 1970:xv; Moorhead 1968:170). Edward Spicer used Mimbreno, Pinaleños, Coyoteros, Chiricahua, Mescalero, Tontos, and Navajo as cultural designations (Spicer 1962:244). Many of these designations were landscape-based: referencing the landscape itself, the topographical features of the landscape or the subsistence patterns upon the land that these groups inhabited (Goodwin 1942: 1-31). In addition, Brandt (2011, personal communication) notes that Spanish terms were incorporated into names. For example, Mescaleros harvest mescal; Pinaleños reside in the pines and harvest timber or wood (leños). These tribal groups occupied distinct ecological regions and demonstrated distinct cultural and social characteristics. Linguistically, these tribal groups are further divided into eastern and western groups, the first three (Jicarilla, Lipan, Kiowa) are classified as eastern and the remainder (Navajo, Mescalero, Chiricahua, Western Apache) as western Southern Athapaskan (Goodwin 1942:1).

The Western Apache are further divided into five subtribal groups: the White Mountain Apache, the Cibecue Apache, the San Carlos Apache, the Northern Tonto, and the Southern Tonto (Goodwin 1942:2). These divisions are somewhat arbitrary as the classification was created by Anglo or Spanish explorers and did not necessarily reflect Apache designations or nomenclature.
Most subtribal names were regional and place-specific in character. Moreover, as was the case with the larger tribal groups, several names were often applied to the same Western Apache group or band creating confusion. Still more confusion resulted when several distinct groups were lumped together based upon their residence in the reservation, as in the case of the San Carlos Apache. Pinaleñe (Pinaleño) was applied to the San Carlos people at times but was most consistently used to designate those White Mountain Apaches who lived among the Pinaleño Mountains (Goodwin 1942:2; Spicer 1962:244). White Mountain was a regional name that included those peoples whose territory lay in the White Mountains. This designation often included Cibecue Apaches, who do not consider themselves related to other White Mountain groups, and at one time some Mescalero Apaches (Goodwin 1942:3).

These subtribal groups were further divided into smaller units of varying size, often termed ‘bands’, though this designation is imprecise as these groups were not synonymous with other bands of Southern Athapaskan peoples. Western Apache ‘bands’ were primarily linguistic and territorial groups centered around subsistence activities, whose names reflected the landscape they occupied (Goodwin 1942:6). Two to four bands were common within a subtribal group. Bands were composed of local kinship-based groups that were matrilineal in organization and maintained specific hunting and farming territories. These bands were not political structures as we understand the term, though a chief generally led them. They were cooperative groups centered around one or more sets of kinship relationships with a shared language. As Western Apaches
practiced exogamy, local bands usually consisted of more than one clan (Goodwin 1942:10, 309). Local groups were self-sustaining and varied in size from thirty-five to approximately two hundred persons related by blood or through marriage. Western Apaches retained a clan system in which clan membership (through both parents) extended across band and subtribal groups, creating a broad, spatially diffuse network of familial relationships (Basso 1971:15). Clans held farming sites through their maternal line at the ancestral place of origin (Basso 1971:15). As of 1850, there were approximately four thousand Western Apache divided into twenty distinct bands and sixty-two clans (Goodwin 1942:5; Basso 1971:12, 15). Prior to that time Apache bands were more numerous and were often residential groups consisting of a single family. Goodwin classified Western Apache groups and bands for ease in discussion. These are listed below.

**Western Apache Groups and Bands**
(adapted from Goodwin 1969:2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Mountain group</th>
<th>Cibecue group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern White Mountain</td>
<td>Carrizo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western White Mountain</td>
<td>Cibecue proper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canyon Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Carlos group</th>
<th>Northern Tonto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>Mormon Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravaipa</td>
<td>Fossil Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Proper</td>
<td>Bald Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache Peaks</td>
<td>Oak Creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern Tonto</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mazatzal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First semiband</td>
<td>Fourth semiband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second semiband</td>
<td>Fifth semiband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third semiband</td>
<td>Sixth semiband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goodwin reported that the Western Apache people had no particular Apache nominal designation, though in more recent times, Western Apache have used the terms nnee, ndeh and ndee meaning ‘the people’ to designate themselves (Goodwin and Goodwin 2000:3; Jacoby 2008:143). The White Mountain subtribe occasionally used the term lé dàgùdnlt’í’, that translated to “joined together” for themselves, implying an external joining of disparate groups (Goodwin 1942:11). The forced amalgamation of small bands and larger groups into reduced territories and reservations is important to note. These larger groups are often considered by researchers and others as distinct, cohesive cultural groups and treated as such, assuming a unified social and cultural logic and frame. In reality, loosely related groups were forced into close proximity which allowed for cultural borrowing and change yet distinct familial bonds, cosmological understandings, and social practices still remained (Goodwin 1942:2-9; Record 2008:4, 26).

The overall territory for the combined Apache tribes is thought to have exceeded 90,000 square miles, from the Rio Grande up to Colorado and from the San Francisco Mountains to the middle of Chihuahua, during the seventeenth century (Spicer 1962:229-235; Ogle 1970:2). This area possessed significant topographical and ecological diversity including desert, transitional and mountain terrain, with a wide range of flora and fauna. Climatic extremes were present in much of the territory. Territories for each group were large, distinct, and generally exclusive areas (Goodwin 1942:9; Spicer 1962:14, 242; Harte 1972:2; Basso 1971:12-3). The White Mountain Apaches were one of the largest groups
and were divided into two large bands, Eastern White Mountain, known to other Apaches as the dzilyá́’á or “on top of mountains people,” and Western White Mountain, called lq nbà h’a or “many go to war” for their large raiding parities into Mexico (Goodwin 1942:15). The Apaches ranged over an area bounded by the Blue Mountains to the east, the Pinaleños to the south, the San Carlos River to the west, and the White Mountains to the North. Their primary farming sites were located along the White and Black rivers (though there were farming sites along the eastern edge of the Pinaleños), with the northern White River settled first, according to oral traditions (Goodwin 1942:12). The Cibecue group, t’lùk’à aig`aid’n or “people of the row of white canes”, ranged from the east at the Cedar Creek area (the Western White Mountain boundary) to the Black River Canyon to the south, to Cibecue Mountain to the west, and the Mogollon Rim on the north (Goodwin 1942:17-23). Each individual band had a least one name and often several by which they were identified, rather than the larger group name.

The San Carlos group had no one unifying name for themselves, reflecting the distinct nature of the bands which were arbitrarily placed in this grouping, though the White Mountain Apache sometimes call the San Carlos people the “west people” or by a name which refers to their particular way of speaking through their teeth (Goodwin 1942:34). The Aravaipa and Pinal bands within this larger grouping considered themselves to be close relatives; while the San Carlos and Apache Peaks bands were considered to be separate at one time (Goodwin 1942:27). The Pinal bands considered the Upper Salt River between the Mazatzal Mountains and Cibecue as their ancestral home, from which they migrated. They
primarily farmed along Pinal Creek (Wheatfields area) and spent the warmer months in the Pinal Mountains and as a base for raids into Mexico. The Pinal band claimed a territory that was bounded by Apache Peaks to the east, the Gila River to the southeast, the west portion of the Pinal Mountains to the west and the Salt River area to the north; an area centered primarily along the San Pedro River valley (Goodwin 1942:24-5). The Aravaipa are thought to have occupied the San Pedro River valley in the eighteenth century after successfully pressuring the Sobaipuri to move westward. Their territory extended from the Pinaleños to the east, the southern end of the Galliuro Mountains and the Santa Catalina and Tanque Verde Mountains to the south, the Gila River to the west and the Mescal Mountains and the San Carlos River to the north.

The San Carlos band were primarily located in the San Carlos River Valley and claimed a territory bounded by the Triplets Mountain to the east, the Mescal Mountains to the south, the Apache Peaks to the west and the Gila River to the north (Goodwin 1942:30-1). The Apache Peaks band was primarily composed of one clan whose oral traditions claim they migrated from north of the Salt River. They claimed the Apache Peaks as their territory and ranged over an area bordered by the Upper Salt to the south, and the Seven Mile Mountains to the north (Goodwin 1942:32-3). The band had no designated farmlands and therefore used sites along the east side of the Pinal, sharing with that band.

The Tonto groups were somewhat distinct from the previous three groups, though intermarriage with other groups was common. Southern Tonto peoples ranged over the landscape from Tonto Creek and the Sierra Anchas south to the
Salt River. They also included the western slopes of the Mazatzal Mountains and extended north to the Mogollon Rim. The Northern Tonto people were the only Western Apache who resided entirely north of the Mogollon Rim. Their territory was bounded by the desert country west of the Little Colorado River in the east, Stoneman and Hay Lakes in the south, Bald Mountain and the area just west of the Verde River and the southern foot of the San Francisco Peaks in the north (Goodwin 1942:46-7).

Western Apache groups were highly mobile, engaging in a seasonal round of subsistence practices that included farming, hunting, gathering, and raiding. These seasonal rounds were determined by a complex interplay of factors, including seasonality, rainfall, topography, and inter-tribal relations (Lindeman & Whitney 2005:255). Agricultural activities comprised approximately twenty-five percent of their subsistence. Planting in the early spring and harvesting in late summer and fall required a period of settled residence in river valleys. The remainder of the year was spent most often in the foothills and mountains. Rocky locations were sought for both safety and ease in construction of residences (wikiups). Settlements were of two types; permanent and seasonal. Seymour notes that highly mobile groups seek residence sites based upon their intrinsic characteristics that aid in the quick and easy establishment of shelter (2008:131). These places are most often in mountains that also possess abundant water, flora and fauna. Mobile groups also tend to reside in defensive positions on the fringes of sedentary groups. While proximity to water is important, mobile groups rarely establish their settlements at known water sites, preferring close proximity while
maintaining defensive distance (Seymour 2008:131). Each band had an established farming sites and hunting territories. These were occasionally shared, though more often encroachment resulted in hostile encounters (Goodwin 1969:9-10, 18-19).

**Territorial Claims**

Territorial claims are important. These claims not only ‘place’ the Western Apache in their homeland within a particular temporal span but have
bearing on contemporary sacred sites issues. Western notions of property, ownership, and landscape rest upon both temporal and spatial documentary histories. This has been problematic for the Western Apache, especially given their historical pattern of mobility and avoiding direct confrontation, particularly with settlers in the area. Additionally, as noted before, migration and residence is a process; one in which multiple patterns of organization, residence, and material culture exist for any one particular group. Most mobile groups send out small parties to explore and establish base camps that are then expanded upon over time. This combined with the Apache custom of restoring the landscape to maintain a hidden presence, and travelling lightly to avoid unplanned conflicts with other Native American or Western peoples, make documenting territorial claims problematic. Archaeological evidence of Apache presence in Arizona reflects this process (Seymour 2008:144).

**Archaeological Record**

The archaeological record has been scant in determining the timing and extent of Western Apache residence in the region. Until recently, the best archaeological evidence pointed to a post-1300 C.E. date (Brandt 1996:51; Clark 2001:1; Lindeman and Whitney 2005:13). A significant problem in identifying Western Apache sites is the nature of Apache residence patterns and subsistence modalities. Western Apache peoples were extremely mobile, and the temporary structures they built were primarily found, unaltered or living branches on a base of one to two rows of stone (Seymour 2009b:159-160). Often the numerous
wickiups, created after a ceremony, were dismantled and the branches spread in different locales and the ground brushed. These structures were ephemeral and left little imprint on the earth and therefore have low archaeological visibility (Brandt 1996; Seymour 2009:160). While the Western Apache excelled at basketry, they less commonly made scraped plainware pottery. This pottery was generally undecorated with conical-shaped bottoms and occasional incised or tooled rims (Newton 1995:2; Wood 2008, personal communication).

Additionally, Apaches often reused previous sedentary groups’ sites, tools, and lithics, adding a layer of material culture which was usually easily degraded (Lindeman & Whitney 2005; Seymour 2009b:162). Burials are difficult to locate, as the dead were generally cremated, placed in rock crevasses, little used canyons, or buried under rock piles. Ceremonial artifacts were often repurposed from previous ceremonial sites (Apache and others’) or were items that would not preserve through time.²⁶ Bourke’s informants in 1891 stated that offerings of baskets, pine and cedar boughs, stone and petrified wood were often used in hunting ceremonies (Bourke 1891:439). Gaan (often called Mountain Spirits) masks were interned in rocky crevices and caves, but could be moved if the Apaches felt they were in danger of being exposed (Brandt 2011, personal communication).

²⁶ There are both practical (mobility, rocky surfaces) and cosmological reasons for Western Apache burial practices. Apaches respected other people’s ritual objects and practices and considered re-use both practical and respectful. Burial in the rocky earth is understood to be returning the body back to Earth (Newton 1995; see Cosmological Significance, Chapter 5).
Sites are usually datable after a critical population level has been reached which thus sets a later date for arrival than may actually have occurred (Seymour 2008:145). This is particularly important with regard to highly mobile populations who reside in small groups. Moreover, movement into a new region is often done through an exploratory pattern of small temporary camps prior to settlement in the region. Additionally, Apache residence patterns changed over time as they adapted to new social and ecological variations (Seymour 2009a:269-217).

Archaeological evidence in the Safford Basin has recently come to light, demonstrating an Apache presence in the region that predates Spanish incursions. Seymour (2008) identified nine separate Apache sites dating from 1220-1580 C.E. These sites are within the Gila and Safford area as well as the Mogollon uplands; including the Mogollon, Dragoon, Hueco, Peloncillo and Whitlock Mountains (Seymour 2008:139-140). Several common characteristics were apparent: suitable terrain, proximity to water, wood, food sources, and rocks for wikiups. The sites also demonstrated line of sight views of the area and neighboring mountains. Seymour speculates that not only did this offer defensive advantage but also allowed dispersed mobile groups to find and connect with each other (2008:131). Several of these are within thirty to forty miles of the Pinaleños. Other archaeological evidence points to large Chiricahua and Mescalero Apache sites of possibly 100 wikiups, the equivalent of 500 people, deep in the mountains where historical documentation had previously declared nothing was seen (Seymour 2008:137). Seymour notes that the Apache people tended to use
mountains rather than valleys and operated in a distinct landscape which offered particular topographical features both for subsistence and defense (2008:133; 2009b:163) and this is reinforced by ethnographers (Opler 1941:427; Goodwin 1942:26-67).

The cosmological significance of Mount Graham itself is suggested by several disparate finds. An ancient cotton cache was found in 1983 on the northeastern edge of the Pinaleños (Haury and Huckell 1993). This ceremonial site demonstrated evidence of revisitation, by multiple unaffiliated groups, spanning several centuries. Pottery vessels were dated at approximately C.E. 500-900 and two baskets were dated at C.E. 650-870. The cotton however was dated to C.E. 1100-1360, a time period consistent with Apache use of the mountain (Haury and Huckell 1993:116). A very limited archaeological survey of Mount Graham completed in 1985 revealed the presence of two prehistoric high altitude shrines and two small rock cairns on High and Hawk Peaks (part of the Mount Graham configuration) (Downum 1985; Spoerl 1986; McDonald 1999:4). The cairns were covered with lichen and not associated with artifacts but were located upon the western ridge and possibly represent trail markers. Downum noted that high altitude shrines are considered rare and considered to be special “sacred places” (Downum 1985b:2). The High Peak shrine was determined to be consistent with prehistoric Mogollon affiliations and, based upon the pottery sherds present at the site, possibly utilized through time by several other Native American groups (Downum 1985:3). The Zuni tribe visited and claimed intimate knowledge of the shrine site (Simplicio 1985). Traditional Zuni practitioners
noted that the location of the shrines was central to their purpose and their presence, whether the site was used recently or not, remained important to religious practice (Simplicio 1985). Notification was supposedly sent to the other tribes in the area. However, the San Carlos Apache Tribe never received this notification and therefore information on Western Apache use was not documented. An Apache presence in the area was noted (Downum 1985b:3) and museum records document that gaan headdresses and wands were collected from Mount Graham in the 1930’s (Brandt 1996:54).

Ethnographic study was proposed for the sites by the Arizona State Museum, but to date has not been accomplished. The Hawk Peak site was located within a heavy fir forested area overlooking a spring. It was covered with a thick layer of forest duff. The shrine consisted of a circular rock cairn with Mimbres27 black-on-white sherds, unidentified white and plain brown pottery sherds (associated with Apachean peoples) and a single turquoise bead (Downum 1985a:3, 5, 7). The mix of sherds suggested use of the site as early as the fourth century and continuing into the 15th century C. E. (Downum 1985a:8). This is consistent with the Apache practice of visiting and use of previously established ceremonial sites. McDonald notes that shrines and rock imagery are often significant to Apache peoples despite their previous association with other more ancient peoples, as these are understood to have been created by the gaan (McDonald 2001:15). Archaeologists noted that the shrine first appeared to be a

---

27 This pottery is associated with early Mogollon groups around 11th to 12th century A.D.
natural feature of the landscape and discussed the possibility of other unidentified sites (Downum 1985a:3; 1985b:3).

The survey also noted the existence of two other rock features upon the ridge near the area. These could not be identified definitively as prehistoric as several modern features were noted indicating subsequent use of the area. In particular a brush lean-to was noted. Additionally a small petroglyph site was discovered overlooking the San Simon valley. The rock imagery included anthropomorphs, cloud terraces, quadripartite motifs, and spirals (Benskin 1989). This was identified as a Marijilda Salado site\textsuperscript{28}. Two other sites, both caves, have been found on the mountain. These sites contain rock imagery and at least one, Fresco Cave, is considered to demonstrate Apache elements as well (McDonald 2001:15). Additionally, the Cheny Cowles Museum in Spokane, Washington houses gaan paraphernalia (mask and wands) taken from an unspecified cave in Mount Graham (Welch 1997:90; McDonald 2001:15).

**Nominal Classification and Context of Mount Graham (Dzil Nchaa Si An)**

The history of Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mount Graham) is embedded within the larger history of what is now termed the Southwest. Multiple peoples have had a presence on the mountain, though little is documented systematically. The mountain itself has a long and convoluted naming history, tied up with European exploration, appropriation, and settlement. The first recorded name for the Pinaleños, and Mount Graham itself, was Sierra de Santa Rosa in 1695. This was

\textsuperscript{28} This site has been identified as ancestral Puebloan, probably inhabited around 1300 C.E. (Gillespie and Farrell 2006)
followed by the name Sierra de la Rosa de la Florida, as recorded by Father Kino’s party in 1696 and also by Captain Manje in 1697 (Granger 1983:268-9; Wilson 1995:10). By the late 1700’s, the name was shortened to Sierra de la Florida. Other names appeared infrequently on maps and in reports. Sierra Bonita was used in the 1800’s by the Mexicans (Bourke 1891b:207; Granger 1983:268), and occasionally the Pinaleños were lumped in with the Santa Teresa Mountains to the immediate north (Wilson 1995:11).

The claiming of the area by the United States resulted in a mix of old and new names. As the Army arrived in the area, names were reapportioned. Lieutenant William Emory, of Brigadier General Kearney’s Army, used a map designating the La Florida range as the Pinon Llano in 1846 (Ross 1951:113; Granger 1983:269). He renamed the highest mountain in the range, Mount Graham, supposedly in honor of Lieutenant James Duncan Graham of his Army Corps of Topographical Engineers, or possibly honoring William A. Graham, the Secretary of War and acting Secretary of the Interior at the time. There is some debate concerning this, as another officer, Major Lawrence Pike Graham of the Second Dragoons also journeyed in the area in 1848 (Granger 1983:269; Wilson 1995:10). The La Florida Mountains, Floridian Mountains, Pinaleño Mountains, Graham Mountains, and Mount Graham were all still in use in reports in 1857 and 1868.

Significantly, Lt. Emory noted Apaches in the area as Piñon Lanos (Wilson 1995:10-1). Other American officers referred to the mountains as Pinal Leños and the Apaches who resided in the area as Pinal Leñas. These names
stabilized as the Pinaleño Mountains and Mount Graham by the middle of the 19th century (Wilson 1995:11; Bourke 1891b:207; Bloom 1944:68-9). Names for the various Apache groups in the area were not as stable, however. Bands were called by multiple names and multiple bands had a presence in the mountains. This leads to some confusion in the historical record which has been problematic in issues of Western Apache claims regarding Dzil Nchaa Si An.

**Historical Documentation**

The timing of Athapaskan arrival into central and east-central Arizona has long rested upon the historical documents of the European explorers. Documentary evidence expressed the opinion that the Apache homeland was *despoblado* prior to the 1600’s (Seymour 2008:139), a vast uninhabited wasteland. The lack of traditional villages and few personal encounters supported this notion. This assumption rested both on the European notion of what constitutes civilized life as well as the expedition itself, which failed to look for an Indian presence beyond the fertile valleys (Seymour 2008:122, 139). The Spanish idea of habitation rested upon a village orientation with defined ownership and cultivation of land. Expeditions in the area were quick forays in which a large force of Europeans covered as much ground as possible in a short time period. No doubt, this did little to encourage direct encounters with Apaches. Thus, the lack of observed villages and direct encounters translated as ‘unsettled’ and therefore uninhabited territory (Seymour 2008:128).
Castañeda, Coronado’s chronicler during the years between 1540 and 1542 A.D., noted the first documentary evidence of Apaches. Coronado’s most probable route to Cibola followed the Gila River from the San Pedro. Castañeda reported encountering ‘Querechos’ (probably Apaches or Navajos) in eastern Arizona along this river (Spicer 1962:229; Lockwood 1938:6-8). Over fifty years later in 1581-15833, Antonio de Espejo noted the presence of Indians of a warlike nature who maintained a reliance on agriculture in central Arizona (Bourke 1889:122; Spicer 1962:229). Juan de Oñate noted the presence of Apaches, most probably Jicarilla, north of the Pueblos in 1598 and found the Gila River area “thickly inhabited” by Apaches in 1604 (Bancroft 1889:156; Spicer 1962:229).
By 1625, the Spanish had distinguished Apaches from village or rancheria Indians, the dominant indigenous group north of the Opata and south of Zuni (Harte 1972:9; Spicer 1962:233). Padre Benavides reported to the King of Spain in 1630 that the Apaches de Xila, Apaches Vaqueros, and Apaches de Navajó were present bordering the pueblos where missionization was taking place and had caused little trouble (Bancroft 1889:162). This state of affairs soon
changed and by 1685 the Spanish had established presidios and Apache hostility had increased (Harte 1972:10). Captain Juan Fernández de la Fuente reported during a summer campaign in 1695 that “many Apaches were assembled in the woods along the Gila River” and that the captives taken reported residential sites in the arroyos and marshes rising upon the north side of the Santa Rosa (Pinaleños) (Seymour 2008:125; Naylor and Polzer 1986).

Both the Spanish and the Americans noted that the Apache were mountain peoples (Cortés 1799:58; Bancroft 1889; Goodwin 1942; Haley 1981:46; Perry 1991:132). Cortés reported that Apache rancherias were located in the most steep canyons and ravines in the mountains and mountain passes (1799:65). Camps were situated for visibility over the wider terrain. Throughout the 1700’s, Apaches conducted raiding within the San Pedro and Santa Cruz valleys to the west of the Pinaleños (Brinckerhoff 1967:6; Spicer 1962: 38). Several missionary expeditions by Jesuits in the upper Gila River area also reported encounters with Apaches (Bancroft 1889:365). Multiple campaigns were waged to reduce the ‘Apache threat’; however, few were recorded. In 1756 to 1758, four expeditions were carried out up to and around the Gila River where Apaches were encountered and a few were killed (Bancroft 1889:371; Spicer 1962:238). During this time period, in which Apaches continued their raids29 throughout the area and into Sonora, Cortés noted that Apaches fled to the mountains to avoid Spanish depredations and to survive (Cortés 1799:28). Captain Anza reported

29 Apache raiding was primarily concerned with resource acquisition, particularly in times of food shortage, but also included taking horses. Apache raids extended to non-Apache Native American inhabitants of the region as well as the Spanish and Mexican settlers (Basso 1971:17-19)
encountering over a hundred Apaches harvesting mescal, a staple food, in the Pinaleños in 1766 during his search for a favorable route through the mountains (Bancroft 1889:371; Wilson 1995:54; Welch 1997:81). In August of 1771, the captain surprised another village of Apaches on his forays into the Sierra de la Florida (Pinaleños), killing nine and capturing eight (Wilson 1995:54).

A report by Marquís de Rubí in 1768 led King Carlos III of Spain to institute regulations to halt Apache depredations in 1772. The resulting Regalmento de 1772 established a defensive barrier of presidios along the northern frontier of Nuevo Vizcaya (Bancroft 1889:378; Brinckerhoff 1967:7). This Regalmento changed Spanish action from religious conversion to a military operation whose focus was Apache extermination rather than control and included guidelines for the deportation of captured Apaches to the interior of the province (Brinckerhoff 1967:7; Ogle 1970:xix). This new wave of military operations had little success and by 1774, Anza had recommended against the establishment of missions along the Gila River due to continued Apache hostilities (Bancroft 1889:390). Juan Bautista Peru surprised the inhabitants in several Apache rancherias on Sierra Florida in 1777. His letter details the number of Apache prisoners taken, ears removed from dead Apaches, and livestock appropriated (Welch 1997:81). A year later in 1778, the Relacion of Narcisco Tapia detailed the exchange of three Apache girls captured on the mountain in exchange for two Spanish boys and one mixed-blood male (Welch 1997:81).

Spanish operations were again halted from 1779 to 1783 due to the hostilities encountered (Brinckerhoff 1967:8). By 1783 however, operations were
again instituted. Don Pedro Allande de Saabedra led sorties into the Gila River area and engaged Apaches in the Pinaleños throughout the period of 1783 to 1785 (Brinkerhoff 1967:8; Wilson 1995:5). Captain Echeagaray under the command of Anza also reported multiple hostile encounters with Apaches in the same mountains in the fall of 1788 (Moorhead 1968:193). The captain detailed in his report the finding of a large camp of over one hundred Apaches in the Pinaleños (Moorhead 1968:194). Nicolas Soler reported at least one Apache campaign was conducted in the Sierra Florida range in 1790, enlisting the assistance of Pimas and Opatas (Welch 1997:81).

During this same time period, Viceroy Bernardo de Galvez began attempts to establish Apache reservations (*establecimientos*) near Tucson, Bacoachi, Tubac, Fronteras, and Janos. These settlements operated for over twenty years attempting to create “pacification by dependency” (Cortés 1799:25; Bancroft 1889:379; Spicer 1962:240, Harte 1972:11). These Apache peoples became known as Apache Mansos. Separate treaties were instituted with individual bands and farming was encouraged along with the issuing of rations, liquor, and substandard firearms for hunting. Only intra-band and Spanish trading was allowed (Bancroft 1889:267; Spicer 1962:239; Ogle 1970:xix). Raiding in the southern portion of Arizona and northern Sonora slowed during this period and settlement resumed. However, this settlement remained outside the larger Apache

---

30 This was a designation given to those Apaches considered ‘tame’ or under control by the Spanish (Spicer 1962:240).

By 1811, the policy had broken down, in part due to the refocusing of Spanish efforts with regard to the Mexican War of Independence, and new raids in the northwest frontier had begun (Spicer 1962:240). Reports were filed in 1832 regarding Gila and ‘Mountain Apaches’ (just south of the Gila River) who raided Spanish and Native American settlements into Sonora and took advantage of the Yaqui, Sera, and Opata Revolts (Lockwood 1938:33). A corridor coined “the Great Stealing Road” (Wilson 1995:66) located between the Santa Teresa and Pinaleños was reported and by 1835 authorities in Sonora had instituted a system of bounties for Apache scalps which resulted in increased hostilities with not only the Spanish but also the Anglos in the area (Harte 1972:4; Spicer 1962:240; Ogle 1970:xxi).

Pinaleño Apaches continued to have a documented presence in the area over the next decade. In September of 1847, Pinaleño Apaches were reported to have made peace overtures with Tucson while continuing hostilities in the Tubac region. Three presidios combined forces and engaged the Apaches, killing seventeen and capturing fourteen according to the El Sonorense, a newspaper published at the time (Bancroft 1889:474n5). Similar attacks were reported in the area until 1853 with varying success by both parties (Bancroft 1889:476n5). The Gasdson Purchase31, which followed on the heels of the Treaty of Guadalupe  

31 This treaty purchased a large tract of land south of the Gila River for the construction of a transcontinental railroad. While primarily concerned with U.S. expansion, it was also an attempt to
Hidalgo, officially added 27,305 square miles south of the Gila River to the United States in 1854 (Wilson 1995:74) opening up the area to American settlers and miners. By the end of the Civil War in 1865, six companies of Arizona volunteers (350 men under the command of General McDowell) remained in the area to deal with the Apaches. As late as 1881, Apache hostilities in the area of the Pinaleños were still being documented (Wilson 1995:121-2).

resolve on-going territorial issues from the Mexican-American War (1846-48) to the advantage of the United States.
Euro-American history in the Western Apache homeland begins in earnest with the opening of the Santa Fe trade route in 1822 (Ogle 1970:30). This time period was characterized by on-going expansion by the United States as part of its policy of Manifest Destiny. Documentation of Apache residence in the Gila River area and the Pinaleños is sparse during the early part of the 1800’s. Four
fur traders in the Upper Gila River are reported to have made contact with friendly Apache groups in 1825 (Bancroft 1889:406-7) and in 1826 Mexico granted licenses to one hundred Anglo trappers to operate within the Gila River area. That same year, twenty trappers were reported killed by Pinaleño Apaches along the Gila River (Harte 1972:15; Spicer 1962:245). The year 1847 saw the opening of a wagon road and possible railroad route (the eventual Southern Pacific line) through the area south of the Gila River. This was followed by a survey of the Gila River area by Gray and Whipple (Whipple 1854) and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo32 in 1848.

Verified Anglo contact with the Western Apache was first documented in 1852 by an Indian agent named Calhoun who made treaty with the Gila Apache. Later in that decade a Mexican officer, who was perhaps an envoy from James Calhoun in the Fort Defiance region, was reported to have visited occasionally with Diablo, the chief of the Eastern White Mountain band (Goodwin 1969:13). This officer encouraged Diablo to travel to Apache Pass and obtain rations in the form of red cloth, brass kettles, and foodstuffs. According to Goodwin, this officer announced his plans to move to the Gila River region and within the year had reached the Pinaleños (called Graham Mountain) by 1864, eventually establishing Fort Goodwin in the area (Goodwin 1942:14). For over two years several bands from the Eastern and Western White Mountain, and the San Carlos

---

32 The United States policy of expansion necessarily resulted in conflicts with Mexico, who had asserted prior claim and sovereignty. This treaty and the Gadsden Purchase were highly contentious. Santa Ana’s need for financial stability in reforming his government, relentless pressure by American settlers, and continued hostilities with Apache groups combined to force the issue. For an excellent discussion of the ramifications of American political maneuvering during this time, see Jacoby 2008: 95-105).
Apache bands camped around the area and received rations. Trouble eventually broke out causing the Apaches to retreat into their mountains until 1868 when Diablo allowed a road to be built to a site, which later became Fort Apache (Goodwin 1942:14).

Another incident was reported in Goodwin Springs in which Apaches were purposely given poisoned dried meat, resulting in scores of deaths. This incident is still related and sung about by the Western Apache (Goodwin 1942:14-5). By 1871, a reservation was established along the Gila River and by 1875 all Apache groups were moved to this area (Goodwin 1942:15).

**The Pinaleños and Mount Graham (Dzil Nchaa Si An)**

There was a more specific documented Apache presence in the Pinaleños and the Aravaipa valley in the Anglo historic period. Clum noted the Aravaipa Apache were mountain people who often resided in the Pinaleños (Clum 1936:56, 62). Their territorial range did extend to the western edge of these mountains. Lieutenant Emory traded for mules with Pinaleño Apaches on Mount Graham in the fall of 1846 and tried to buy a young boy who was apparently enslaved by the Apaches. The young boy himself refused to leave his Apache family (Ross 1951:118-120; Barnes 1951:184).

Bourke discussed the Apache dwelling in the mountains and their use of springs, streams, and water-holes, as well as abundant food sources on the mountain tops in the Camp Grant area (1891b:36). A fort, originally established as Fort Breckenridge in 1859 at the confluence of the Aravaipa and San Pedro
Rivers, was located in the area due to the significant Apache presence here (General Order No.1, Part II: 1866; Barnes 1935:188). It was abandoned in 1861 and reestablished in 1862 and named Fort Stanford. The fort was finally renamed Fort Grant in 1866, moving once upstream approximately five miles. The camp was later transferred to the western edge of Mount Graham in December of 1872 by Crook because of the rich variety of water, timber, stone, adobe, flora and fauna (Bourke 1891b:36, 207; Barnes 1935:188).

Aravaipa, Pinal and Eastern White Mountain Apaches use of, and residence in, adjacent areas were also noted, specifically the San Simon Valley, Cedar Creek, and the area around what is now known as Safford. Bourke noted the area was a staging ground for Western Apaches raiding into Mexico (1885:119-121). Ogle reported that in 1859 Dr. Steck convened a council with approximately 2,500 Apache in the eastern foothills of Mt. Graham in an effort to bring peace to the area (Ogle 1940:43; Welch 1997:83). More significantly, Clum reported a narrative by Eskiminzin, chief of the Aravaipa band, in which the Aravaipas lived for five years in the Pinaleño Mountains. The band of approximately one hundred fifty Apaches, removed to the mountains following an 1864 incident in which Anglo prospectors killed several Apaches who then returned fire (Clum 1936:56). Eskiminzin and his people moved into the Pinaleños until after Lieutenant Whitman’s arrival at Camp Grant in 1870 (Clum 1936:56-7. 60-1). Eskiminzin reported that his people lived in the Pinaleños without wikiups, moving periodically throughout the area (Clum 1936:63). The absence of housing structures would certainly make it difficult to document this
presence in the archaeological record. On March 1, 1871, Eskiminzin’s Aravaipa band came down out of the Pinaleños and settled at Camp Grant (Clum 1936:64).

Bourke, in his treatise *On the Border with Crook*, recounts his experiences as a staff member in General Crook’s army between 1870 and 1886. In one incident he described an Apache woman leading troops into the Pinaleño Mountains and across the summit, demonstrating an intimate and detailed knowledge of the flora, fauna, and topographical features (1891b:47-8). He also reported a trail beneath ‘Sierra Pinaleno’ (Mount Graham) that was used by Western Apaches in raiding. This trail was cited by Tucson merchants as validation for the Camp Grant massacre (Bourke 1891b:104). The Pinal, Mescal, and Pinaleño ranges were consistently recorded as the territorial ranges of the Western Apache, most specifically the Pinaleño, Aravaipa, and Coyotero Apache groups (Schroeder 1962:55).

The U.S. Cavalry slaughter of twenty-eight Apaches in the Santa Teresa mountains in 1869 is thought by Welch to have been a local residential group in the Pinaleño-Santa Teresa range who then withdrew from the area after their substantial losses (Welch 1997:84). Military reports cite the presence of a rancheria of sixteen wikiups and over sixty inhabitants upon the summit of the Pinaleño range in 1872 (Wilson 1991:18-9; McDonald 1999:10) and another hostile encounter in 1874 (Welch 1997:81). Camp Grant housed Aravaipa and Pinaleño bands until 1873 when they were relocated to the San Carlos Reservation. This reservation, one of four Apache reservations established in 1871, was placed at the junction of the Gila and San Carlos Rivers. Multiple
distinct bands were relocated to San Carlos between 1875-6, including Chiricahua, some Mescalero, Yavapai, Tonto, and White Mountain groups (Spicer 1962:252). This mix of distinct Apache groups, with distinct traditions and oral traditions, plays a role in how the surrounding landscape is known and remembered.

The modern period saw increased Anglo settlement and development in the Pinaleños. In 1873, the army initiated timber cutting in the region while constructing a new Camp Grant (Wilson 1995:211). Commercial logging and consequent road construction began in 1882 with the introduction of the Mormon Sawmill on the west fork of the Nuttal Canyon on the north slope of the mountain (Wilson 1995:212). At one point, a sawmill was placed on the top of Mount Graham and by the end of the decade there was another mill at the headwaters of Ash Creek and a tram to haul logs off the mountain. Though these operations ceased in 1925, at one time illegal sawmills operated in almost every canyon in the Pinaleños (Wilson 1995:212). The military also used the mountain range to facilitate their efforts monitoring and controlling Native Americans in the region. General Miles ordered the construction of a system of thirty heliograph towers across the Southwest, one of which was placed on Mount Graham (Basso 1971:314).

In 1902, Theodore Roosevelt declared Mount Graham a forest reserve, though by 1911 the United States Forest Service (USFS) again allowed logging. Eventually the difficulty in access resulted in the cessation of logging on the mountain (Wilson 1995:212). A new form of Anglo use began in 1929 when the
USFS opened up thirty-nine lots at Turkey Flats for lease, and a summer colony on the mountain was established (Wilson 1995:248). The increased use of the area resulted in some commercial development in the early 30’s, a dairy and grocery store. By 1937, the summer colony had expanded to sixty homes, eventually reaching seventy-seven homes, a lodge and a public campground (Wilson 1995:248).

**Historical Issues in the Mount Graham Controversy**

The history outlined above became a central fixture in the controversy surrounding the Mount Graham International Observatory. Proponents of the Mount Graham International Observatory utilized historical documentation and theological arguments to bolster their assertions. This argument became one of the primary motivators in Western Apache discourse becoming more explicit regarding their special places. Primarily led by the United States Forest Service (USFS), the University of Arizona (U of A), and the Vatican Observatory, a two-pronged effort was conducted which advocated (1) the absence of any historically significant Western Apache presence on Mt. Graham and the Pinaleños and (2) the absence of a cultural or religious connection with Mt. Graham. More specifically, Western Apaches were characterized as (1) late arrivals to the area, (2) not a mountain-dwelling people, (3) present on the mountain in only “the most casual and ephemeral” manner (Polzer 1992a) and (4) having no religious utilization or connection to the mountain, having only asserted these claims after
The US Forest Service conducted a preliminary study concerning Mt. Graham shortly after the proposal for the Mount Graham International Observatory was made public. While these investigations revealed the unique nature of the ecosystems present on the mountain, investigation of any cultural impacts that the observatory might have was not conclusive (Dougherty 1993a; Welch 1997:76), although the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) suggested that Apache and other tribes likely had culturally significant ties to the area and should be contacted. One abbreviated surface study was conducted by the US Forest Service which documented the presence of ancient shrines upon the summit and two other limited studies were conducted which did not uncover any cultural sites (Downum 1985a). Postcards, regarding the archaeological sites, were sent to the Arizona tribes in August of 1984. The Zuni tribe responded to this notice and sent cultural experts to examine the sites. Zuni religious specialists identified the shrines as likely ancestral Zuni, along with the need to protect the area from any disturbance. The San Carlos Tribe did not respond and maintained that they never received the notice. The notice, later found to have been misdirected, became an issue in the rhetoric surrounding the controversy due to a lack of an immediate Apache response. Coronado Forest Supervisor Robert Tippeconnic, who supervised both the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements, acknowledged later in court to having knowledge of the cultural
significance of the mountain to the Western Apache and of failing to elicit Western Apache input (Doughtery 1993b).

Father Charles Polzer, S.J., Curator of Ethnohistory at the Arizona State Museum, and Father George Coyne, Director of the Vatican Observatory (a partner in the Mount Graham International Observatory enterprise), were instrumental in contradicting Western Apache claims. The Arizona State Museum is located on, and closely affiliated with, the University of Arizona. A wide variety of research documents and materials are housed in this facility, including the Documentary Records of the Southwest (DRSW) and the Grenville Goodwin Papers. Father Polzer asserted the absence of historical or contemporary ties to Mount Graham and cited any “appeal to this court regarding the sacredness of Mount Graham to the Apaches is little more than a preposterous misuse of academic status and the poorest manifestation of sound methodology…” (Polzer 1992b). Citing his credentials as an “internationally recognized Spanish Colonial Historian” (Polzer 1992b), Polzer criticized the conclusions of Arizona State University anthropologist Elizabeth Brandt, who disagreed with his assessment in a series of letters. Polzer also called into question the work of Goodwin, whose papers were featured in Brandt’s rebuttal. Polzer’s statements were based upon Spanish documentation in the museum’s collection and were produced within the Spanish colonial legacy. Thomas Sheridan, the Associate Curator of Ethnohistory at the Arizona State Museum and a colleague of Father Polzer, addressed these issues in a letter of concern, refuting Polzer’s assertions on Western Apache culture and residence in Arizona and
Northern Mexico. In particular he noted the inadequacy of Western documentary evidence, Polzer’s “questionable use of the ethnohistorical evidence,” the lack of a comprehensive survey of the Documentary Records of the Southwest to ascertain Apache claims, and the ethnocentricity of the historical Spanish chroniclers (Sheridan 1992). More specifically, Sheridan critiqued the continued misinterpretation of Western Apache culture and religion by utilizing Western and Catholic paradigms and Polzer’s lack of genuine understanding of Apache spirituality and behavior (Sheridan 1992).

The Vatican Observatory was a key player in pushing forward the project. Father Coyne, an associate of Father Polzer, circulated a statement in his capacity as Director stating,

"After extensive, thorough investigations by Indians and non-Indian experts, there is to the best of our knowledge no religious or cultural significance to the specific observatory site.... There are not clear written records of any group of Apaches using Mt. Graham prior to the mid 1600’s. Ethnohistorical research indicates the most probable time of their arrival in the vicinity to have been about 1620. Some oral traditions of the Apaches refer to the Pinaleño range, but there is no clear documentary or archaeological evidence that corroborates any continuous, permanent or extensive use of the summit of Mt. Graham by Apaches for seasonal dwellings, burial grounds, or religious rituals. [Coyne 1992b:1]."

The statement by Coyne relied upon information supplied to him by Polzer and echoed those of his colleague. Many of Coyne’s assertions were placed in the context of religious universalism. The priest gave a series of press interviews and wrote a statement on the nature of sacrality and its inapplicability to Western Apache claims (Coyne 1992a). Coyne arguments were rooted in the paradigm of religious universalism, in which underlying tenets of Christianity (or
other World Religions) are applied to all religious practice, when he stated that “No mountain is as sacred as a human being and there is no desecration more despicable than the use of a human person for self-serving purposes.” (1992a:7).

He also noted, “We are not convinced by any of the arguments thus far presented that Mt. Graham possesses a sacred character which precludes responsible and legitimate use of the land.” (Coyne 1992b:6).

Polzer’s and Coyne’s remarks are problematic, as Sheridan noted. Experts were either Euro-American colonizers or those ‘Indians’ who agreed with the colonizers. Native Americans are grouped into one large category of generic ‘other,’ who share presumably identical cultural and religious norms. Authenticity of Native American status is conferred upon these individuals by American authority and Coyne only acknowledged those who resided on the reservation as authentic (Coyne 1992b:4). Evidence must be concrete and documented in written form by Western researchers and framed within the Western paradigm concerning reality and sacrality. The absence of written evidence was presented as the absence of data and oral history was either discounted or relegated to a secondary role. Thus the stage was set for a dispute regarding Apache cultural concerns that remained located in the Western intellectual tradition, written documentation by colonizing others, and the primacy of Western ontology and epistemology.
Chapter 5

WESTERN APACHE ORAL TRADITIONS AND ORAL HISTORIES

Must Indians build stone monuments or have a written Testament to have spirituality? (B. Harney 1993)

We’re a ‘we’ people, not an ‘I’ people, which means we are willing to share our knowledge with non-Native people so all can live. (Unidentified participant at Sacred Lands Forum 2001)

Understanding the history of non-Western peoples requires moving beyond the traditional Western historical paradigm that equates history with (bureaucratically structured) civilization, literacy, and Western notions of objective analysis (Welch 1997:96). History in this sense stresses the primacy of written texts and documentation, espousing analysis of event-based history. The Western paradigm conceptualizes history as static and bounded with defined events that are chronologically ordered. This type of analysis, though increasingly critiqued as politically and culturally biased, constrains, redirects, and obscures ‘other’ histories. History is also a “vehicle of power” and moral discourse (Focault 1972; Galloway 2006:8; Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:5); it advances a particular past and obscures others. What is relegated to the sidelines reveals more about the writers of history than those placed on those sidelines. History then is a messy business; it is “not inherited through the generations but rather is made every day” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:6). Southwest indigenous peoples’ histories are usually orally based, ongoing, participatory processes in which history and knowledge is personally related to and recreated.
with both individuals and groups. Vansina in his treatise on oral history noted that these histories are the “past and present in a single breath” (1985:xii). Moreover, for the Western Apache these histories are intimately connected with places (Basso 1996; Welch 1997:96).

Apache Landscape and Culture

Early ethnographic work done by Goodwin, Opler, and Goddard revealed strong Western Apache connections to the land and the mountains in particular (Goddard 1918; Goodwin papers, 1942, 1994; Opler 1996). Origin stories discuss the emergence places of various clans within the Apache homeland. These clan places are primarily in mountains, near water sources, or in fertile places with trees and food sources. One particular clan place rests upon a rock art site with red paint (Goddard 1918:44-7). The White Mountain and San Carlos Apache have multiple oral histories that place each of the clans within their homeland (Goodwin 1942:600-629, 652-653). Most clan names are descriptive place names related to some local feature of the landscape considered the origin place of that clan.

The Apache landscape is also the Apache homeland, a place of belonging emphasizing the ongoing nature of Western Apache culture and ties to the land. The homeland is a place where Apaches can live and prosper; both a moral and a knowing landscape (Basso 1992; Brandt 1996). Movement away from the homeland is considered both dangerous and difficult for Western Apaches. Traditionally, Western Apache conceptualized the world as a dangerous and
uncertain place that must be approached carefully. The Apache also migrated to the region from northern Alaska and Canada, certainly an uncertain and dangerous journey that moved them beyond their previous homelands. Raiding and warfare also combined to make life within the homelands, and forays outside the area, difficult and dangerous. The subsequent warfare against Apache groups and forced relocation probably contributed to this conceptualization of the world (Goodwin 1942; Basso 1971).

As Basso and Brandt have documented, contemporary social practice remains rooted within the landscape. Knowledge comes to the Western Apache through, in, and from places within the landscape (Basso 1990:133-4, 1996:xv). The Apache root work *ni* is translated as both ‘mind’ and ‘land’ (Long, Tecle & Burnette 2003:4). Basso’s extensive work with the White Mountain Apache demonstrated how places in the landscape ‘work’ on the Apache. Places situate the minds of Apache people in “historical time and space” bringing knowledge and understanding into the present (Basso 1996:89). Ethics, wisdom, and social relationships are intertwined with Apache places. Places and place-names evoke and affirm ethical precepts, offer guidance, heal emotional wounds, re-create history, provide support, and offer respite (Basso 1990:xv, 117, 1996: 100, 134). When Western Apaches speak of their places they take care to “constitute [them] in relation to themselves” (Basso 1996:xvi, 102). Oral traditions and narratives have continually “establish[ed] enduring bonds” between the Western Apache people and their places and these bonds guide their behavior and nurture their culture (Goodwin 1969; Basso 1990:102).
Western Apache Cosmology

The cosmology of Apache peoples is intimately tied to the places they traditionally inhabited (Basso 1992; Brandt 1996:51; Battiste 2000:44, 67-8; Clark 2001). There is little separation between what we who operate within the Western paradigm perceive to be religion and Western Apache sociality (Bourke 1889; Opler 1935:70; Goodwin Papers; Basso 1990; Brandt 1996:53). Rather than an abstract philosophy, religious behavior in this social system is a “living reality” grounded in everyday social practice and “socially emergent.” (Basso 1996; Samuels 2004; Morrison n. d:19). This practice is centered around respect, responsibility, and reciprocity (Basso 1992; Brandt 1996:53; Morrison n.d.:20). This “living world charged with power” (Brandt 1996:53) does not recognize the theistic triad of supernatural – natural – cultural as in the standard Western theocentric model (Morrison n.d.:18). Both Goodwin and Basso noted that the Western Apache consider personhood to be an ethical state, which arises in engagement with others and places (Goodwin 1942:532, 555; Basso 1992, 1996:28, 33, 50-81).

Beingness is structured within interpersonal relations that are always placed, convey knowledge, and sustain social relatedness and identity (Basso 1990:130). Apache ontologies and epistemologies thus tend to be inclusive rather than exclusive. This differs radically from our Western theistic ontology. The modern Western notion of self or person is understood to be subjectively apprehended (Thomas 2007:213); it remains predicated upon the notion of a rational, animate being possessing language and reason. Personhood is
categorized to privilege humanness; to be a person is to be human and vice versa. Native American notions of personhood are based upon experience and behavior. Hallowell (1975:154-7) and later Black (1977:103) noted that for the Ojibwa persons emerge; personhood is a behavioral system in which behavior and relationship determine personhood. Strathern (1988), Ingold (1999, 2000), Scott (2006), Viveiros de Castro (1998), Bird-David (1999, 2006) and Nadasdy (2007) reinforced this understanding. Personhood is located in the attributes of sentience, volition, memory, and speech in beings who interact with others (Hallowell 1975, Black 1977: 99; Ingold 2000; Bird-David 1999:S68, 72). It is agency—a “responsive relatedness” (Bird-David 1999:77) centered in mutual engagement and the capacity to transform—that are the attributes of personhood. Clinton Padilla, Tribal Chairman of the Ft. McDowell Yavapai-Apache Reservation, offers an explanation of why trees are persons. According to Padilla, trees possess a lifespan, a home, individuality, responsiveness to others, and trees change through time (Brandt 2012, personal communication). These attributes demonstrate a rational coherence centered around transformation, mutuality and engagement. Thomas (2007:216) sums up the distinction between Western and Native American ontologies as “personhood is something which one is, as opposed to something which one does.”

This type of worldview has been classically termed animism by Western academics: a non-theistic ontology incorporates “all forms of being within the category of person—entities with will, voice, desire/intention, sometimes physical form and interdependent existential needs: hunger, thirst, sociability” (Morrison
Humans are not considered separate from other beings within this world. There is a field of interacting persons whose power varies and these persons draw their particular qualities from their variable and differentiated relations with one another (Goddard 1918; Goodwin 1994; Bird-David 1999:S73; Clark 2001:xxii-xxiv; Morrison n.d.:19).

Morphological structure is of secondary importance. Landforms, springs, caves, plants, and animals may be considered living kin who participate in relations with the Apache people (Basso 1971:311fn73, 1992). Enrique Salmón and Dennis Martinez have discussed this kin-centric model as a relationship model in which all are equal and difference is based upon the actions of different beings on the earth (Martinez, Salmón and Nelson 2008:87-8). Thus the substance of life may manifest in a variety of forms and this transformational process is pivotal in the inter-relational character of Apache cosmology (Clark 2001:26). Power is “locally grounded and socially emergent” (Morrison n.d.:19); it manifests within interpersonal relations between persons, human or otherwise (Norton-Smith 2010:47, 70). Thus power is neutral but embodied in the moral and social choices of specific persons. According to Morrison (N.d.:19), in this system reality is interpersonal, relational, and intentional, and causality rests with ‘who’ not ‘what.’

Cosmogonic narratives are important sources of knowledge, wisdom, and connection (Goodwin 1994:ix-xi; Basso 1992, 1996). The oral traditions and histories in this paper proceed from both the non-restricted and restricted
information in Goodwin’s papers that were accessed and presented during the Western Apache protests of the Mount Graham International Observatory.

Basso noted that the designation godiyihgo nagoldi’’e, often termed myth by Western anthropologists, is translated as “to tell of holiness” (Basso 1990:114). These narratives are ‘religious histories’ which reveal “cosmic and cultural principles” of the Western Apache (Morrison n.d.:22). Godiyihgo nagoldi’’e transfer knowledge and re-create the Apache world in the present; they reaffirm ethical precepts and reconstitute Apache identity (Basso 1990:115; 1996). Both the White Mountain and San Carlos cosmogonic narratives speak of a unformed world which is considered unpleasing and unfit for life because it “was devoid of mountains” (Goddard 1918:27-8; Goodwin 1994:1-3, 53). This world is created and molded by the cooperative efforts of four persons (later subsumed into one ‘chief of the people who lives above’ [Goodwin 1994]). Only when through a long series of ritual acts these four persons create four mountains can water and food become available and the people live on the earth (Goddard 1918:27-9; Goodwin 1994:1-3). Through various ritual acts, these mountains establish spatial distance from the sun and proper sustenance (Goodwin 1994:2). Palmor Valor of the White Mountain Apache, for example told the narrative below to Goodwin.

*Four people started to work on the earth. When they set it up the wind blew it off again. It was weak like an old woman. They talked together about the earth among themselves. “What shall we do about this earth, my friends? We don’t know what to do about it.” Then one person said, “Pull it from four different sides.” They did this, and the piece they pulled out on each side they made like a foot. After they did this the earth
stood all right. Then on the east side of the earth they put big Black cane, covered with black metal thorns. On the south side of the earth they put big blue cane covered with blue metal thorns. Then on the west side of the earth they put big yellow cane covered with yellow metal thorns. Then on the north side of the earth they put white cane covered with white metal thorns.

After they did this the earth was almost steady, but it was still soft and mixed with Water. It moved back and forth. After they had worked on the earth this way Black Wind Old Man came to this place. He threw himself against the earth. The earth was strong now and it did not move. Then Black Water Old Man threw himself against the earth. When he threw himself against the earth, thunder started in four directions. Now earth was steady, and it was as if born already.”

But the earth was shivering. They talked about it: “My friends, what’s the matter with this earth? It is cold and freezing. We better give it some hair.” Then they started to make hair on the earth. They made all these grasses and bushes and trees to grow on the earth. This is its hair.

But the earth was still too weak. They started to talk about it: “My friends, let’s make bones for the earth.” This way they made rocky mountains and rocks sticking out of the earth. These are the earth’s bones. [Goodwin 1994:1-20

The narrative continues with the four persons giving breath to the earth by using lightning, which also makes water appear. The Earth lies with her head to the east. The cooperative transformation continues with the creation of Sun, who at first travels too close to the earth, and so is moved farther away so that the people may live comfortably. This creative effort is accomplished by Black Metal Old Man, Black Wind Old Man, Black Water Old Man and Black Thunder Old Man. Some Western Apache bands tell of these persons as corresponding to the colors in the ritual circuit, but all versions understand ‘creation’ as a cooperative effort that occurs through much trial and error. It is an ambiguous world until ritual action, in a quadripartite cycle, creates structure and function. A

---

33 Earth is referred to as a woman. According to Welch and Riley (2001:5), many Western Apaches use the term Ni’Gosdzán--meaning earth as mature woman.
shorter version of this was told to Pliny Goddard by Antonio and is attributed to the San Carlos Apache. Antonio was born in the Pinal band’s territory, near Wheatfields (Goddard 1918:7-8).

There were no people but there were some persons existing who were without parents. These were Bec dilxil xastin, Black Metal Old Man, Nal’uletcu dilxiln, Black Big Spider, Nltcj dilxil, Black Whirlwind, and Godiye, Mirage. These were the four who did this. There was neither earth nor sky. Bec dilxil had no house. Spider had no house but his dwelling place was where his web hung crosswise. Although there was neither earth nor sky Whirlwind had his home in the space between the earth and sky. Mirage had nothing on which to dwell but he trembled about where there was no earth and no sky.

These came together and talked about what there might be on which they could dwell. They said they would live on the sky and that they would also make the earth. They determined that there should be something. These four persons were discussing with each other how it should be done. Black Whirlwind did this way; he rubbed his hand over his breast and removed some of the cuticle. Taking this between his thumb and forefinger he asked how the earth should be. He pressed the cuticle between his thumb and finger repeatedly. He then walked to that which he had made and the earth nearly moved into its place. White Whirlwind came up to it and stood there. The earth moved a little way. Yellow Whirlwind came up to it and took his station. The earth moved nearly to its place. Blue Whirlwind went to it and stood by it. Then the earth that was to be settled to its place.

They now discussed what should support the earth. They concluded to make four supports [mountains] for it of bec dilxil. They added a black whirlwind to these to help hold it up. They all agreed it was satisfactory. [Goddard 1918:7-8]

These two oral traditions reveal ontological distinctions in traditional Apache religious understandings. There is no supernatural, omnipotent or omniscient God who creates the world in one bold stroke. Rather, council is taken among four persons who try various stratagems within the process of transformation. Transformative practice is emphasized from the start; quadripartite ritual acts result in the transformation of morphology and the
transfer of power. Other oral traditions (for example *He Goes to His Father: Slaying of Monsters*) demonstrate this repeated pattern; cycles of four (often specifically ‘placed’) which result in the gifting of power or transformation of the individual. This is an important distinction in how the Apache conceptualize and act in their world, both in the past and the present.

Despite the incorporation of various forms of Christianity into Apache religious practice, there appears to remain a core structure, as we shall see later in Chapter 7. Historically, missionization was not a primary function of Euro-American interactions with the Western Apache. Even in the 1890’s when several Christian denominations established a presence in the region, traditional practices were maintained (Spoerl 2004:5). This is apparent in a later version of this oral tradition that subsumes the four persons into one transformative being (Sun in one version and Usen in another) but the structure of the narrative remains the same; four sets of quadripartite acts which transform the world.

The Apache world is thus defined and supported by these four mountain ranges that are generally correlated with Western cardinal directions. These mountains possess wind, lightning, water, and metal (which is flint). They support the world and those within it. Within these ranges are four mountain chiefs. To be named a chief is to possess the power to enter into relationship with the Apache, to bestow gifts and protect life (Goodwin papers; Goodwin 1938:24-5; Goodwin 1994:73). Mountains are the outer form of multidimensional beings of power who sustain and nurture others; animals, plants, waters, and the Apache (Brandt 1996:52). Not all mountains are considered persons of power, though
most are understood to be ‘living places’ on or within which significant beings reside (Goodwin papers; Basso 1992; Goodwin 1994; Brandt 1996:52). They are persons by virtue of their breath, intent, agency, knowledge, and power. They come to the Apache through ceremonies, ritual, and in daily practice (Goodwin Papers; Goodwin 1994; Basso 1990). Their gifts to the Apache people are what allow them to survive and thrive and they border the Apache homeland (Basso 1990:113).

Graham Mountain, Turnbull, Chiricahua Peak, the White Mountains, together with the Blue Range...are all holy mountains, and can be prayed to because the clouds hang on them sometimes and Lightning People are on them, pray for crops, life, and hunting. [unidentified Apache consultant in Goodwin Papers, reported in Spoerl 2004: 9].

Clouds meet on these mountains, creating rain and allowing the diyi to walk the earth. Diyi are recognized as living beings who possess power and include Deer, Bear, Eagle, Horse, as well as gaan, thunder-beings, and lightning persons (Goodwin Papers; Basso 1992; Brandt 1996:3; Clark 2001:86). The gaan are living, sentient beings who protect, guide and aid the Apache and engage in reciprocal relations with them (Basso 1992; Newton 1995:8.11). Both cosmological and historical traditions speak of gaan and the mountains (Goddard 1918: 9; Goodwin Papers; Opler 1942:96, 110-20; 199, 206, 241, 267-9,272-283; Goodwin 1969:64,116, 447, 491, 662). Gaan reside within the mountains and are “critical agents” in healing and puberty ceremonies where they are embodied by Crown Dancers (sometimes referred to as Mountain Spirit Dancers) (Basso 1992, Brandt 2012, personal communication). Other critical components of ceremonial
practice, such as eagle feathers, stones, minerals and special plants, are also found on Mount Graham.

*Mount Graham is the chief, the most important sacred mountain. Mount Graham must be treated with the greatest respect.* (Stanley 1992b)

Other places within the landscape are also named and storied (Basso 1990:113). Cosmological narratives concerning Monster Slayer, Coyote, Spider, Horse, and Deer take place in mountains and involve ritual circuits of four emplaced in mountains. These stories reinforce the importance of mountains as places of sustenance, protection, and knowledge. Ceremonies occur on mountains and within caves but may also occur elsewhere, as it is not necessary to be on the mountains to access their gifts of power (Goodwin papers; Basso 1992; Spoerl 2004:13).

**Cosmological Significance of Dzil Nchaa Si An**

Generally, the Western Apache identify their mountain chiefs as Mount Baldy in the east, Mount Graham in the south, the Mazatzals in the west, and San Francisco Peak in the north. There are slight differences between Western Apache bands. For example, in Goodwin’s time period, one consultant named San Mateo as the eastern mountain while currently the White Mountain Apache Tribe claims Four Peaks as the western mountain chief and the Mogollons as the north (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:48). These differences are indicative of the very separate nature of Western Apache groups. There are also concerns about revealing dangerous protected knowledge at play. Mount Baldy is openly
acknowledged as a mountain chief but is under the sovereignty of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and hence protected.

The San Francisco Peaks have been long contested and may have been revealed, like Dzil Nchaa Si An, only when the Apache felt the mountains were at serious risk for harm. That said, it is significant, that there are eleven separate, specific references among Goodwin’s informants that attest to the cosmological significance of Dzil Nchaa Si An (in the 22 pages of restricted notes available, though these were specific to the mountain). These statements, by three separate individuals from different local groups and bands, are explicit though sparse, in keeping with the dangerous nature of this knowledge. Several of these references link back to specific oral traditions, while others are specific to particular powers, attributes, and qualities which the mountain possesses. The consultants claimed Dzil Nchaa Si An as one of the four mountain chiefs,

There are four mountains that are like chiefs of all the mountains. These four are [Apache place-name for Mount Graham], [Apache name], [Apache place-name], [Apache place-name]. (Goodwin papers)

Specifically, Dzil Nchaa Si An is seen as a great mountain chief, a person of power and knowledge, and one of the four powerful mountains which encompass the Western Apache world. According to one consultant, this can be verified by the mountain’s possession of four names (Goodwin Papers). The mountain is male and most associated with the color blue (black is also associated with Dzil Nchaa Si An in a powerful way). Dzil Nchaa Si An possesses a “unique constellation of spiritual power[s]” (Basso 1992; McDonald 1999:10). Water,
Cloud, Wind, Thunder, Lightning, Eagle, Deer, and Horse people have all been named as powerful beings who make their home on the mountain (Goodwin Papers; Goodwin 1938:24-5; Basso 1992; Brandt 1996; McDonald 1999:10).

One medicine man directly linked Dzil Nchaa Si An as the home of Blue Horse in the story which relates Na ye’nezyane’s (Monster Slayer) journey to his father Sun’s home to ask for horses. This story called He Goes to His Father: Slaying of Monsters documented by Goodwin and Basso (and Goddard in 1918), is a complex narrative which details Monster Slayer’s engendering by Sun, his quest to meet his father, his becoming a person of power through Sun’s testing and molding, the bestowal of gifts through inter-relationships with other persons of power, and the choice of Na ye’nezyane which resulted in the Apache’s way of life (Goddard 1918:36-41; Goodwin 1994:16-39). Monster Slayer begins a journey to find his father, receiving gifts along the way to aid him in his quest. He proves himself to his father and is then molded by Sun into a full-fledged person through a quadripartite cycle of ritual acts. Sun then offers Monster Slayer a choice between two mountains. Monster Slayer’s choice results in the Apache homeland and their possession of the bow and arrow, in contrast to the White Man’s use of guns and richer lands. This was subsequently considered to be the only time that Monster Slayer failed to choose correctly. Monster Slayer rids the earth of several monsters, who are known by their selfish anti-social behavior, and is thus given his name. He returns to Sun and requests horses from his father, a pivotal gift that aids the Apache in their life and molds social practice (Goodwin 1994:3-12, 16-38).
“My father, give me something good. The people on the earth do not have much. My father, give me a horse.” “I have no horse. Do not talk this way, because we have no horses here. Where could I get a horse for you? What horse would I give you?” Sun said to him. But all the same Sun went off to the east where was Black Wind Horse. When Sun rode this horse the earth went down and the sky went up. “No, not that one. I do not want that one,” na ye’nezyane said. Then Sun went to the south where there was Lightning Horse, and he led this horse back with him. But he (na ye’nezyane) said, “No, I do not want that one.” “Then what horse shall I give you? These are all the horses I have,” Sun said. Just the same he (na ye’nezyane) kept on asking. After a while Sun went off to the west and led back a black stallion34. This seemed like a good one, so he took it off home with him. But this horse was not a good enough horse for him...So in the morning he went back to his father again and said to him, “That was a bad horse you gave me. He was nearly running away all night.” Then Sun gave him a good, tame horse; the kind he wanted. It was a yellow mare. Now he said to him, “Take this mare with you back to your home and put her with the black stallion. If you do this the stallion won’t want to get away any more.” (here follows a series of ritual acts which are directionally placed and occur at night)...When he went in the morning to where he had put the rope, there were lots of horses, all kinds, black ones, white ones, blue ones, and others. From that time on there were horses on the earth. [Goodwin 1994:36-38].

This complex narrative is also linked to specific places on the landscape.

Goodwin notes in his footnotes that Apache Peaks and a spot near old San Carlos are places where specific cosmogonic acts took place in other parts of the narrative. Two other consultants told Goodwin,

*Four mountains are mentioned in horse songs. One of these is Mt. Graham. They said they possessed horses, so were sung to. A giant blue horse and other ordinary horses lived on Graham Mountain, but no one ever saw them, except horse sign.* [Goodwin Papers, reported in Spoerl 2004: 10].

---

34 Some narratives describe Horse as Blue, others Black. Blue is the color of the South, where Dzil Nchaa Si An is located. Black is considered the most powerful color and though usually placed in the east, is often associated with other powerful entities. Additionally, powerful entities are said to possess all the ritual colors (Goodwin 1969; Clark 2001).
The oral tradition, *He Goes to His Father*, is considered the origin of the horse ceremony (Goodwin Papers; Goodwin 1994:16-39). These mountains possess specific horses and thus are petitioned for help (Goodwin Papers). The mountain was prayed to for aid in hunting, raiding, and warfare\(^{35}\) (Goodwin Papers; Basso 1992; McDonald 1999:10). The oral tradition quoted above continues on with Na ye’nezyane’s instructions on how to live well and not lie. The narrative is also credited with the origin of raiding\(^{36}\) into Mexico (Goodwin 1994:38). In another direct linking of the narrative to Dzil Nchaa Si An, two of Goodwin’s consultants mention that Dzil Nchaa Si An is the place where Na ye’nezyane fought and killed *Gusilise* and the other monsters, who murdered their relatives (Goodwin Papers, Goodwin 1994). Thus, Dzil Nchaa Si An is a place where foundational cosmogonic events have occurred. Events are emplaced within the Western Apache world and those Apaches who are keepers of this knowledge know the names of the places.

Both the version quoted above and Goddard’s documented version associate Lightning with the south as a powerful person (Goddard 1918:37; Goodwin 1994:37). In Goddard’s version Lightning returns Monster Slayer to the earth after he receives horses while Goodwin’s version speaks of Lightning Horse in the southern direction. Cloud and lightning beings associated with mountains

\(^{35}\) Warfare was distinct from raiding and generally occurred to avenge the death of a kinsman. These conflicts often occurred with Navajo, Yavapai, O’odham, and other Native American groups as well as American, Mexican, and Spanish settlers throughout Arizona and Sonora (Goodwin 1942: 63-87; Basso 1971:16-21).

\(^{36}\) Western Apaches and Chiricahuas consistently raided Mexican settlements (as well as indigenous villages) to acquire foodstuffs and horses (Basso 1971:19).
are petitioned for rain and for assistance with farming (Goodwin Papers; Basso 1992). Lightning is a source of power that is directly associated with Dział Nchaa Si An, both as the southern mountain and as a powerful being (Goodwin Papers). Stories concerning Lightning are not spoken during the summer months to avoid drawing Lightning’s dangerous attention. It should be noted that the Apache do not necessarily view these powerful beings as totally distinct from Dział Nchaa Si An; they are part of the power of the mountain and intimately linked with both the mountain as a whole and specific places on and within it (Basso 1992). Power is multi-dimensional in nature; exhibiting multiple forms, modalities, and meanings. For the Western Apache, power is locally grounded and socially emergent within an interpersonal and relational reality (Basso 1992). According to Opler, power pervades the universe but works through agency of non-human persons, in the form of sun, lightning, mountains, gaan, eagle, deer, horse, etc (Opler 1935:66). Thus, power is neutral but inherently dangerous and must be controlled, accessed, and used through prayer, songs, chants, and respectful actions (Basso 1983:477; Brandt 1996; Spoerl 2004:9). Dział Nchaa Si An is a place where power is manifested. Consultants in both Goodwin’s era and today have asserted that Apache practice is rooted in this power.

Bourke noted that Apache ceremonies were specific to particular places and these were usually in mountains (Bourke 1891:44, 447, 453). Goodwin’s consultants made mention that gaan lived in mountain caves and that Apache men traveled to the mountains to sing and dance for the gaan, receiving power and knowledge in return (Spoerl 2004:8). Gaan ceremonial masks were buried in
caves or rock clefts when they were decommissioned, thus returning the mountain’s gifts to their maker (Goodwin 1942:491; McDonald 2001:9, 11). Dzil Nchaa Si An as a chief possesses deer as well as horse power. A medicine person who worked with Goodwin extensively stated that Dzil Nchaa Si An “was mentioned in hunting for deer, and the songs and power associated with deer.” (Goodwin Papers). Bourke’s informants (possibly Chiricahua or Mescalero) spoke of their ‘veneration’ of the parrot and macaw and specifically noted that these powerful beings were seen on Dzil Nchaa Si An (Bourke 1891:441). A significant portion of Mt. Graham’s power is from the clouds that form upon his summit and create rain.

_Graham Mountain, Turnbull, Chiricahua Peak, the White Mountains, together with the Blue Range...are all holy mountains, and can be prayed to because the clouds hang on them sometimes and Lightning People are on them; pray for crops, life, and hunting._ [Goodwin Papers, reported in Spoerl 2004:9].

Turnbull and Chiricahua Peak are not mountain chiefs but remain significant places rich in particular powers and gifts. The ability to bring rain and nurture healing plants and food sources was (and still is) an important component in the Western Apaches’ relationship with Dzil Nchaa Si An. This conceptualization of power as interpersonal behavior is important to grasp as it has often been glossed as ‘sacred.’ This has several implications: the designation of sacred implies a supernatural category which imposes an ontological categorization not demonstrated in the historical texts, it removes power and the person from daily sociality, and it relegates and limits this power to a property of
religion only. This implies that traditional Western Apache understandings of the potency of powerful beings is a matter of belief and hence subjective and emotional; outside the realm of the real and verifiable—something that the Apaches themselves would not agree with (Basso 1992; Stanley 1992b, 1992d; Davis 1992b, 1992e)

Goodwin’s consultants specifically described plants upon Dzil Nchaa Si An found at different elevations. Consultants mentioned that the mountain also provided guidance and knowledge specifically tied to places within or on the mountain. One elder told Goodwin that when learning ceremonies, the apprentice was taken to the mountain and instructed which medicines were to be used, how they were to be harvested, and the ceremonies which accompany them (Goodwin Papers in Spoerl 2004:8). Dzil Nchaa Si An also possesses ‘holy grounds’ at which ceremonies are performed or burials are present.

As we have seen, numerous hostile encounters with Euro-American explorers, military groups, and settlers have occurred on the mountain and this coincides with Apache consultants’ assertions of burials hidden upon the mountain, particularly on the western end of the Pinaleño range (Basso 1992; Brandt 2001:3-4; McDonald 2001:15). Burials in rock outcrops, called ‘rock gloves’ appear to be consistent with the Apache understanding of the earth as Changing Woman’s body and a source of life and sustenance. Thus Apaches are enfolded into the earth-as-body and returned to her care (Newton 1995:Appendix E.12).
Specific lifestage and healing ceremonies are associated with Dzil Nchaa Si An. There are thirty-two ceremonial songs that reference the mountain specifically, according to modern consultants (Stanley 1992b; Brandt 1996:52). Sand paintings, used in curing and Sunrise ceremonies, were created with four winds on the four mountains of power, one of which was Dzil Nchaa Si An. One of Goodwin’s consultants (a medicine man possessing much restricted knowledge) asserted that Silas John Edwards created sand paintings in ceremonies with the four Winds on the four “sacred mountains” and specifically named Dzil Nchaa Si An as one of these mountains (Goodwin papers). This information is significant because telescope proponents referred specifically to Silas John, a charismatic leader in a revivialist movement in the 1920’s, as an elder who did not espouse the significance of the mountain. This knowledge also highlights the continuing and evolving nature of Apache religious practices. While Western Apaches incorporated new religious ideas and practice into their culture, these behaviors appear to be set within a cosmological structure that remained Western Apache.

As Hoijer found with the Navajo, significant events both historical and cosmological are “spatially anchored” (Basso 1990:107). However, this is more than the mere anchoring of memory. Apache places are lived places and ethical participants in Apache sociality. They gift the Apache with health, sustenance, and knowledge and are both powerful and wise. Puberty ceremonies, often called Sunrise Ceremonies, and gaan dances continue throughout the historical and modern period. The gaan are an integral part of the puberty ceremonies and
appear on Saturday night and Sunday morning (Brandt 2012, personal communication). They are dynamic, creative, and central aspects of social life (Perry 1993:176-9, 182), though the Western Apache are reticent in revealing knowledge about their customs and ceremonies to both Apaches and non-Apaches. This reflects both an effort to preserve ceremonial knowledge and, more importantly, an understanding that knowledge can be dangerous to the possessor and those who receive it (Haley 1981:9; Basso 1990, 1992; Brandt 1996). Some sixteen to thirty-two songs were reported to Goodwin to be sung during the puberty ceremony, depending on the individual singer. These songs are linked to specific mountains and places; specifically Dzil Nchaa Si An (Goodwin Papers; Goodwin 1994:17, 37).

**Western Apache Oral Histories**

The Western Apache maintain native histories of the region. Much of this knowledge has been documented by Goodwin (1929, 1942, 1994), Goddard (1918), Basso (1971, 1992, 1996), Brandt (1996) and to some extent by Opler (1935, 1941), as much of his work with the Chiricahua is applicable. Goodwin’s expansive, detailed, and comprehensive work proceeded from nearly ten years of ethnographic study while living with the Western Apache in the 1930’s (Goodwin 1942:xi). His original papers currently reside in the Arizona State Museum at the University of Arizona in Tucson. These documents are rich with first person accounts and oral histories, parts of which were presented in his posthumously published book (1942). Though the tribes restrict access to some of his original
papers to protect powerful knowledge from misuse and exposure, much is still available to researchers.

As Colwell-Chanthaphonh (2007:11) states, oral histories are rich sources of internal cultural logics which may reveal cultural conceptualizations and relationships. Western Apache narratives are an important source of knowledge and history. One Apache medicine man emphasized this point, “Don’t call these myths, because then white people will think they aren’t true.” (Goodwin 1994:ix). For the Western Apache knowledge must be something that is experienced and this experience related to others through narratives that not only relay events but link members of the community together with their places. An event is not just an action or occurrence, it is an interpersonal act which occurs in (and with) a specific place. Basso’s (1996:16) consultants emphasized that Apache history is recorded in places and their stories; history is emplaced and places embodied through place-names and narratives. Landscapes are polysemic in that they shape and express multiple meanings and connections. Western Apache narratives proceed from a model in which narrative discourse has power to establish interpersonal bonds with places and also to direct behavior and shape identity (Basso 1996:40).

While only a couple of local groups farmed the Pinaleño region during the summer months, as the year passed into fall and winter, more groups moved into the area. Juniper berries were collected on the slopes of the Pinaleños and the area between the mountains, and the Santa Teresas were rich in Emory Oaks and thus prime acorn grounds. Agave, yucca, manzanita, and mesquite were
harvested on the slopes of Dzil Nchaa Si An (McDonald 1999:8; Spoerl 2004:10). Particular medicinal and ceremonial plants were also present on the mountain, along with springs whose waters were used ceremonially (Goodwin Papers). Places where ceremonial and medicinal plants are found are usually culturally significant. Such places may be said to be rich in power (Basso 1992; Brandt 1996:52; McDonald 1999:9). Goodwin noted that the slopes of the Graham Mountains were a favorite location for winter residence and that multiple groups could be found in the area, both for the natural resources and as a place to visit relatives (Goodwin 1942:157-8). Several oral histories confirm this information. Goodwin, for example, recorded the following oral histories in the early 1930’s. These histories were relayed in Western Apache and translated by Western Apache interpreters (Goodwin 1994: xii).

Anna Price was 100 years old at the time she was interviewed by Goodwin. She was the eldest daughter of Chief Diablo of the Eastern White Mountain band and a respected elder and keeper of knowledge. She possessed two important ceremonies, which gave her knowledge not shared with other members of her band (Goodwin 1994:xii). This places her narratives temporally between 1840 to 1932 for her own life experience, but gives us access to knowledge gained from the generation previous to her; essentially opening up a history that goes back to the 1770’s, roughly one hundred sixty years.

*Whenever father wanted to talk things over and have a social visit with the other chiefs, he would send his men to the various places these chiefs were living: the Graham Mountains, the San Pedro, Cibecue, Cedar Creek, with word that they should all meet at his place in eight days.* [Goodwin 1942:683].
This story by Anna Price reveals an intimate knowledge of the Apache homeland, validating a continued presence for multiple Western Apache groups. The story that is presented here in part is rich with specific details of geologic and ecological features intertwined with the individual events that happened in each locale upon the mountain.

*When I was fifteen years old this story happened. We were living on the highest part of the Graham Mountains. Down below where we were camped, we had some mescal cooking. We were afraid of the Americans, and Mexicans attacking us, and that is why we were camped away up there. At that time, my father, and most of the men were away on a raid, down into Mexico, and we were waiting for them to come back here. So it was while we were waiting here that the soldiers surrounded us....They shot at us, and when they did this, we all started out of there, as fast as we could. There were a lot of children in our camp, and women also, but none of us were killed there. We got away. Some of the children crawled under the grape vines that were growing near there, and hid. I and my niece ran off together, ahead, making for some trees, in front of us. We finally got there, to a little open place, with a lot of Oak trees growing below us, just a little ways. My niece said, “We are just as well to jump down here, because we will be killed anyway;” so we jumped down, and hid for a little while and then started on again, running. Then the soldiers came out on the rocks above us, and saw us, so they started shooting at us. We kept on running as fast as we could. My niece, ahead of me, had a lock of her hair shot off, at the side of her head, and also a shot through her shirt, which didn’t scratch her. ...We kept on a ways, till the canyon forked, and there were some rock tanks, with lots of water in them. I knew this place well, as I used to swim here.* [Goodwin Papers].

Anna continues her story speaking of a woman who accidentally smothers her own child while hiding from the soldiers on Graham Mountain during this same incident. She relates that the woman put dirt in the infant’s mouth to quiet the child’s cries and not to reveal her hiding place.
The soldiers hadn’t seen her yet, but her baby started to cry. She was scared the soldiers would hear it, and so she picked up a handful of dirt, and put it in the baby’s mouth, to make it quiet. (Goodwin papers).

The incident resulted in Diablo moving his people away from the Pinaleños.

Then my father said to the others, ‘Leave the cattle right here. Cattle can’t talk to us, but our families will, so we better go right on to where they are.’ It was dark then, but they all came on, and got at last to where our horses and mules were, on the mountain…We left that place and moved away from there right away. [Goodwin Papers]

Other stories by Anna Price demonstrated the repeated use of the mountain by Eastern White Mountain bands.

This was two months after the first time that [unidentified person] brought us provisions, over at [specific place], that we met him at the foot of the Graham Mountains. He said that he had forgotten to bring us farming tools, but had intended to, and would when he came back next time. So later on we met him at Graham Mountains again, and this time he brought to us a lot of hoes, and blankets and other things. [Goodwin papers]

My father was a great chief. He was the only one among the White Mountain people who had friends at Zuni and Santa Fe. He was like a captain. Whenever a man came to see him, he had to take his hat off before he entered father’s wickiup. Whenever a woman came, she had to hold up her hand in salute…One time the mother of the chief nà ginlt’á [Pinaleño subchief] came to visit us…This old woman had brought some wild gourds for father from the Graham Mountains. [Goodwin 1942:Appendix 679].

Anna Price related many stories of her father, Diablo, and his people.

Diablo had seven subchiefs, one of whom nà ginlt’á (he scouts ahead), resided in the Pinaleños with his band. This area was thus part of the Eastern White Mountain territory (Goodwin 1942:679, 682-3, 685). One story, told by Price discusses a council that her father, Diablo, held at Camp Grant with all his subchiefs (Goodwin 1942:683).
Each visiting chief and his men sat in a group by themselves. On the southeast side of the enclosure sat nà ginlt’á and his men, because his country lay in that direction. On the southwest side sat hàckì bànz’in (Eskiminzin) and his men, for the same reason. [Goodwin 1942:685]

In this same tale, nà ginlt’á replies to Diablo’s joke that he should move to the White Mountains where the water is reliable and cold.

Well, there is no mescal over there. At the place where I live (the Pinaleños) there is lots of it, and my belly is full every day. If I go where you say, there will be no food for me. I would be too cold, and I would catch cold...You speak about my land and wish to have me come over to the head of the Gila River and settle. I think you say this because you want my land about the Winchester Mountains, Graham Mountains, and mouth of Bonito Creek. But I won’t give it to you. I am like Gray Fox, for I run along the mountain and stop at my springs and make a little farm there, living by it. I use all kinds of wild foods. [Goodwin 1942:686].

Nà ginlt’á continues to extol the virtues and rich resources of his lands within the mountains and specifically locates on the landscape by stating that his camp is only one night of traveling from Camp Grant into the Graham Mountains.

Then he asked nà ginlt’á, “How many days will it take you to get home?”
“Only one. Graham Mountain is not far off. [Goodwin 1942:690]

Diablo continues in the narrative to instruct his subchiefs to always live in rough places on the side of a mountain with sufficient brush to hide the people and to make sure there are line of sight views.

Then father addressed nà ginlt’á, “I want you to live on the side of a hill, so you will always know when anyone is approaching. We have many bad animals about. You must save your children from them. That is the way to do it. If you are in thick brush, you never know want will come up on you. I was thinking of your people, all relatives of mine. I don’t know what’s in your mind, but I think you are the same as any man. That is why I tell you to always think about your people. That’s why I tell you all this:
to always camp on a mountain, so you can see far off. If you camp in thick brush, the Papago might come along and get you before you see them. [Goodwin 1942:687-688]

Another tale told by Price discusses the difficulty nà ginlt’á and his people had in traveling the long distance to Diablo’s camp to obtain sheep. Diablo particularly wished for this as nà ginlt’á was of his clan and his subchief’s wife belonged to the same clan as one of Diablo’s wives (Anna’s mother). Nà ginlt’á’s wife sang a victory song in thanks for the gift and a dance was held. Because of the long distance to ‘Graham mountain’, nà ginlt’á petitioned Diablo for help in returning and was give several young boys to help drive the sheep

*When they were ready to start home, nà ginlt’á spoke to his people, saying, ‘Help me my brothers, my cross-cousins, my maternal uncles and nephews, my maternal aunts and nieces. Help me to drive these sheep back over the Gila Valley.’ He wanted to take the sheep back to Graham Mountain with him, so he spoke to my father, ‘My brother, let me have some of your boys.’ Father let him take some of the boys from our encampments, relatives of ours, and with them and his own people he drove the sheep off.* [Goodwin 1942:244-5]

John Rope, another of Goodwin’s consultants, spoke of raiding into Mexico and resting by the ‘Graham Mountains,’ “When we had come almost to the south side of Graham Mountain, we divided the cattle among us.” (Goodwin 1942:665). The mountain range was also used as a place of refuge and staging ground in hostilities against Anglo soldiers.

*While we were all camped here at Fort Apache, some Eastern White Mountain people and Western White Mountain people went on the warpath. They went south to Graham Mountain and stayed there quite awhile.* [Basso 1971:101]
Conversely, the Western Apache scouts, of whom John Rope was one, frequently rested in the foothills of the Pinaleños. These scouts traced a familiar route that included resting spots at well-known springs. John Rope repeatedly places his travels in relation to Mount Graham and a spring, Antelope’s Water, to the south of these mountains. It seems apparent that this was a major pathway through Apache territory that coincides with the Mexican designation of the Great Stealing Road (Basso 1971:104, 115, 129, 130).

I had been a scout for quite a while at San Carlos after the Chiricahuas and Warm Springs were sent away. There was lots of trouble going on then on account of all the renegades who were out. The soldiers had a big glass on Graham Mountain, on Turnbull Mountain at Fort Apache, and at another place near which they kept some soldiers and scouts camped. One day two scouts set out from San Carlos for Turnbull Mountain. When they got to the foot of Turnbull Mountain, they tied their horses up and went up the mountain on foot. When they go back down their horses were gone. Some renegade had taken them. The tracks led toward the Graham Mountains. [Basso 1971:179]

Rope also corroborates the territorial claims of ná ginłt’á of the White Mountain clan, nádòts ’ùsn, nádò hò ‘ts’ùsn (‘slender peak standing up people). Rope recalls the presence of farm sites along the east foothills of Pinaleños and the range as part of the group’s territory. According to Rope, this clan owned Black Corn, a powerful being and a color associated with Dzil Nchaa Si An specifically (Goodwin 1942:609-610, 662-3).

Basso’s Western Apache Raiding & Warfare (1971) offers access to other oral histories as recorded by Grenville Goodwin. This book, not only documents oral histories, it provides cultural references supplied by Western Apache
consultants, and it maps out these histories on the landscape. Mrs. Andrew Stanley, a White Mountain Apache, recalled the following:

> From the first remembrance I have, the soldiers were at Fort Apache [1868-1870]. I don’t remember or know about the first time the soldiers came to Goodwin Springs [1864]. We lived quite awhile at Fort Apache. Then some of our people killed some White people and so we were enemies with them. For this reason we scattered out all over the country, down this way in the Graham Mountains. [Basso 1971:205]

Mrs. Stanley goes on to relate a portion of her life history in which she journeys to her brother among the Chiricahuas. “So we started. On the other side of Graham Mountain by Solomonville we went.” (Basso 1971:207). When her brother dies she becomes a captive and eventually escapes and finds her way back to her people. The narrative is rich in detail and these details are place-based.

Another consultant, David Longstreet, recalls the capture of his mother by Anglo soldiers near Tucson. Her escape and journey are cemented in places (laid down in places).

> My mother and the other woman climbed up on the Santa Catalina foothills, and from there they could still hear the drums down at the dance...They stayed on the Santa Catalinas that night and the next day traveled toward the Galiuro Mountains, making camp about halfway to them. The next day they go to the Galiuro Mountains. Here they saw some tracks but they said, ‘These tracks are of the Arivaipa Apaches and they are no good, so we will stay away from them. ‘But these tracks had been made by their own people, who were camped by the Galiuro Mountains, and it would have been all right if they had followed the tracks. My mother and the other woman camped at some springs in a rocky place here. That Apache Manso chief’s wife [who helped them escape] had also given my mother a knife and some matches, so here they cooked some mescal stalk to eat. Then they moved to the west end of the Graham Mountains and then to Red Knolls. [Basso 1971:193]
Longstreet’s narrative recalls his mother’s odyssey through each place-event; details are placed within and remembered through place-names rich with specific details of the journey, his mother’s thoughts and emotions. David Longstreet also spent time as a scout for Crook’s 1883 expedition into Sonora, Mexico. His account of his journey is also rich in place-events, cultural detail, and thoughts told in the succinct style of the Western Apache.

Adela Swift recalled her grandfather, Andrew Noline (kitsáha), telling stories of his life and his experience during the Camp Grant massacre. According to Swift, in 1871, her father came down from the Graham Mountains, where his family originated, to live at Camp Grant. He was approximately eight or nine years old at the time of the massacre (Record 2008:57).

As I previously discussed, John Clum recorded that Lt. Royal Whitman held several conversations with hàckí bànz’in (Eskiminzin) and his people at Camp Grant. While the presentation of these conversations is probably a recreation of the facts as relayed by the camp interpreter and subsequently written down, the text reinforces other Apache narratives. According to Clum, Whitman met with five Aravaipa women who descended from the Pinaleño mountains into Camp Grant. One of these women, the mother of Eskiminzin, told Whitman,

*I am the mother of the Chief Eskiminzin. We are the Arivaipas, and for a long time had our wikiups and grew our corn here on the broad, flat land by the little running water. We were happy and at peace. That time has gone. We now live in the mountains, afraid of soldiers and all palefaces. We have no food, no blankets. Our children die. We want peace. Our chief, Eskiminzin, would make treaty with paleface chief and asks for powwow with coming of the third sun.* [Clum 1936:61]
Eskiminzin and twenty men then travel to Old Camp Grant to meet with Whitman and discuss the situation.

My people have always been peaceful. We have never harmed an American except once, and that was in self-defense. Other Apaches may have, but not the Arivaipa, not Eskiminzin. Yet Americans hunt us as they hunt the wildcat, and we live like the wildcat; no wikiups, sleeping under the stars, and eating only those things that grow wild in the mountains. Most meat we kill, we dry and eat uncooked, for campfires show smoke to Americans, who then come and shoot my people. Five days ago, we Arivaipas held a council meeting, and we said, let us go to new soldier chief at Camp Grant, to our old home in Arivaipa Cañon; let us make a peace and roll a great rock upon it, so it shall last until the rains wear away the rock to the level of the ground. [Clum 1936:63]

The five year period of Eskiminzin and his band corroborates other Western Apache narratives of residence and use of the mountain during the 18th and 19th century. Whitman used an interpreter to both receive accurate information and, according to Clum, to give himself time to assess his visitors (Clum 1936:63). This oral history is reaffirmed by an oral tradition published by Richard van Valkenburgh in 1948 (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:22). Lahn, possibly Lonnie Bullis, a descendent of Chiquito who resided with the Arivaipa for years, relays much the same information in his narrative though he places Eskiminzin in the Santa Teresa and Galiuro Ranges.

Then came a time when Santo and haské bahnzin [Eskiminzin] stopped their people from coming down here to the Little Running Water [Arivaipa Creek] to plant crops. For years the Arivaipa lived like hunted beasts in the Santa Teresa and Galiuro ranges. And—against haské bahnzin’s wishes—some young men did accompany the Pinal on raids, lest they starve.

Then came news that there was a new white nant’an at Camp Grant. It was four moons before the chiefs agreed to ask for peace. Haské bahnzin won because he said, “It makes no difference where we die. I’d rather we be killed down by the Little Running Water than have death sit beside us
here in the mountains!” With suspicion deep in their hearts the Aravaipa sent five old women, one of whom was haské bahnzin’s mother to Camp Grant to ask for peace. In two days they returned with the news that the nant’an would hold council...at the rising of the fourth sun. [Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:23]

There are several possibilities for the change in place given above. Lahn was not present in the Aravaipa camps at this time, making this an oral tradition rather than oral history or first person account (see Vansina 1985:12-3). The gathering of this narrative also took place over a decade after the event. Details may be confused or changed to emphasize particular points, in this case the ancestral territory of the Aravaipa is highlighted to identify them and place them in their homeland. This is apparent in Lahn’s version that stresses the desire to return to the homeland to die rather than remain in hiding, presumably in a place not Aravaipa. Alternatively, the place of refuge may have been hidden to preserve it for future use. We also know that at least part of the Pinaleños were part of the territory of nà gínl’tá, and Western Apaches honored these boundaries except in times of great need (which this obviously was). To continue to mention use of another’s territory might be less than polite. While it is possible that this is accurate information, it seems highly unlikely that Whitman and Clum would misplace the refuge of the Aravaipa. By 1964, geographical placenames had stabilized. It would be doubtful that Whitman would confuse mountain ranges and it would be imperative for a commander to know where the Apaches resided, hid, and traveled. However, it is possible that Eskiminzen relayed incorrect information to confuse the Anglos or that Clum was incorrect.
A further oral history given by bija kush kaiyé to Goodwin tells the story of the time of the massacre as a sequence of place-events (Goodwin Papers reported in Colwell-Chanthaphon 2007:33-7). In this narrative, Eskiminzen and his wives hold a conference with Whitman, which is attended by bija kush kaiyé and her husband. Bija kush kaiyé relays her information by traveling a path through the landscape, detailing events, thoughts and emotions as they occur in specific places. This oral history matches details given in the two previous narratives. In the end, bija kush kaiyé relates how she and her husband take her uncle to a medicine man’s camp nearby to ‘sing over him’ and thus escapes the massacre. She survives in and through her places. Events are made meaningful in their emplacement within the landscape.

The above native oral histories identify the character of places within their indigenous worldview. These places are part of the historic identity of the Western Apache. They are melded as place-events that are integral parts of their cultural identity as a people, embedding moral precepts and emplacing social life.

Analysis of both the cosmogonic narratives and oral histories reveal striking similarities in discursive style, purpose, and content. Narrative purpose is centered on reality construction, a sense of belonging and identity, and legitimization. Despite a change in the histories towards a more informational or communicative form, both the oral traditions and histories employ dialogic components, relational style and content, image schema (embedding events, time, and persons in specific places), and convey ethical propositions concerning ways of acting in the world.
Reality construction is evident in both the oral traditions and histories. As discussed earlier in this chapter, origin stories detail the birth of Earth and the normative and existential postulates which maintain the world. Four powerful persons cooperate to mold Earth and transform life. This is reinforced in the oral histories through the use of word choice, naming, and sentence structure. Persons act within specific places in ways which sustain Apache life. We hear this in David Longstreet’s recounting of his mother’s journey to safety,

> But these tracks had been made by their own people, who were camped by the Galiuro Mountains, and it would have been all right if they had followed the tracks.

And again when Anna Price tells of her father’s life,

> When they were ready to start home, nà gínlt’á spoke to his people, saying, ‘Help me my brothers, my cross-cousins, my maternal uncles and nephews, my maternal aunts and nieces. Help me to drive these sheep back over the Gila Valley.’ He wanted to take the sheep back to Graham Mountain [Goodwin 1994].

Reality is constructed through image schema within the narratives, memorializing specifically placed events, while temporality is backgrounded. This reality is remembered, sustained, and re-created through these narrative histories, which are always personal in tone, and embodied within the landscape,

Belonging or inclusivity is also demonstrated repeatedly in the narratives. Chilton reminds us that clusivity is “dependent on the cognitive frames that embody conventional shared understandings” (2004:56). A sense of belonging is consistently intimated through the relational style and content of the narrative. This ‘belonging’ is crucial in the oral traditions to the creation of reality through
moral acts specifically placed within the Apache world. This is conveyed through grammatical structure, word choice, and repetitive tropes (discussed below) that reinforce content. Oral histories reveal similar patterns of inclusivity. Anna Price creates belonging and sustains identity by relaying her father’s actions through his words, continuing the dialogic format we have seen in the oral traditions.

Dialogue, with or without the reply of the unseen other, implies relationship. It also establishes common ground and a sense of inclusivity, encompassing the Western Apache people and sustaining identity. A ‘thesis-antithesis’ pattern is also evident (Wieczorek 2008:39) in which the repetitive use of inclusive pronouns (we, us, our) is balanced against the negative acts of American soldiers or Mexican raiders (they). This sense of belonging is framed spatially, or more accurately placially.

Legitimization of the speaker’s authority is demonstrated through the presentation of self. Anna presents her father as a great chief and herself as his spokesman; his voice in the world. She speaks of his authority in the community, his acts to nurture and protect his people, and the respect shown him by the community. Diablo’s words also create a moral imperative that legitimates Western Apache life in the landscape. This moral imperative highlights partnership with each other and the landscape, an important component of Apache life. Diablo instructs his subchiefs of the value of relationships rather than objects and the necessity to nurture and protect their peoples through specific emplacement within the landscape. This echoes the oral traditions emphasis on cooperative acts and combined with the relational style sustains and re-creates
identity, both individual and communal; a continuation of a way of being in the world. Legitimacy is anchored in placed events which also create and recreate reality. John Rope’s account of his time as a scout, David Longstreet’s narrative of his mother’s escape, and Mrs. Stanley’s stories reinforce this relational way of being in the world specifically placed within the Western Apache landscape. The histories also reinforce that this life is a journey.

Within the oral traditions we see dialogic features and an open-ended structure when four persons discuss how to aid Earth and later Sun and Monster Slayer discussing the gifting of horses. Oral histories suggest this same structure. Dzil Nchaa Si An is “mentioned,” stories are ‘told’ about the mountain, and songs are ‘sung’ to the mountain, implying dialogue with unknown others. The style is suggestive rather than persuasive, allowing the audience to reach their own conclusions. Action and information is relayed in a brief, succinct, and often oblique manner. The statement, “Four mountains are mentioned in horse songs. One of these is Mt. Graham,” leads us but does not persuade or manipulate our conclusions. Doing so is considered wrong and impolite in Western Apache culture. Western Apaches use an egalitarian style of speaking to avoid an insult to a person’s face. No one is told what to do or think directly. A potential face-threatening act calls for the use of a spokesperson to avoid conflict (Brandt 2011, personal communication). It is also indicative of the existence of shared normative and existential assumptions on the part of the audience that the speaker does not have to explicitly state to be understood (Basso 1990; Johnstone 2008; Johnstone & Barcellino 2011:59). Narrative prose in the present tense reveals
unfolding action and suggests the actuality or reality of events. Even within the creation narratives, in which events are relayed as occurring in the deep past, the dialogue remains in the present.

Oral histories concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An are also present-oriented; “are all holy mountains, and can be prayed to because the clouds hang on them sometimes and Lightning People are on them...” Narrative structure, according to van Dijk (1986) and Johnstone (2008), reflects the cognitive schema of the speaker, revealing clues as to the underlying assumptions held. This mix of past and present, a stylistic component of many Western Apache oral narratives, suggests that temporality is circular and the past is recreated in the present (Basso 1990:114-115; Basso 1996).

The origin narratives employ circularity, repetitive tropes, and the transposition of image schema to emphasize quadripartite action as transformative, a key aspect of the traditional Apache world. Power is addressed obliquely as the embodiment of will acted in a quadripartite set of behaviors. Causation resides in cooperative, personal action. The narratives are relational in style, cycling through repetitive acts between persons that build upon one another, emphasizing the personal, rather than impersonal, nature of the world and those acting within it. Time and action exist within space, or more accurately cooperative cyclical action is directionally specific within a specific place (earth). Four persons institute a cooperative cycle of four actions that is spatial in nature and transformative through the molding of a person. This trope (repetitive, quadripartite, circular progressions) is also seen in the narrative He Goes to His
Father: Slaying of Monsters and is embodied in the Western Apache Puberty Ceremony (Opler 1941:82-134; Goodwin 1969:477fn18, 1994; Itule 1992; Clark 2001:236, 251-3). Circularity thus demonstrates the embodiment of will and also cultural continuity (Sancho Guinda 2009:137). Repetitive structure naturalizes assumptions into ‘common sense’ (Reyes-Rodriguez 2008:35). Given the oblique nature of Western Apache narrative, and the corroboration of Goodwin’s consultants, this spatiality is anchored in specific places, left unnamed (Goodwin Papers).

Analysis of the narratives also suggests ontological and epistemological distinctions transmitted through propositional content. These distinctions are roughly transmitted as: (1) the world is ambiguous, (2) the world is interpersonal, (3) knowledge is an empirical process (the world can be understood through experience, observation, and testing), (4) knowledge is an ethical relationship, a responsibility, and (5) personhood is an interpersonal process. The ambiguity and interpersonal nature of the world is demonstrated by its unformed presence and the actions taken to mold the earth. These acts however are taken only after council between four persons and after evaluating the effects of each action, reinforcing this ambiguity through a trial and error process. Empirical knowledge gleaned through careful action and evaluation allows for moral behavior in which four persons cooperate to convey key qualities upon the earth. Knowledge is thus embodied in persons. Reciprocal relationships are necessary to initiate acts of power that serve others, in this case the Earth, who then creates a home for the Western Apache. Thus, relationships appear to be primary to understanding and
acting within the world. The earth becomes a person through the cooperative and ceremonial efforts of the four persons. Personhood is intimated in the narrative through this process: Earth possesses life (as water), corporeality, and movement but lacks breath (air), warmth, steadiness, strength, and firmness which must be given through the groups’ efforts. Personhood is therefore understood to be constituted interpersonally within specific places (directions).

This notion of the importance of interpersonal relationships, connection to places, and identity construction through narrative has been discussed by Basso (1990, 1996); specifically the significance of steadiness and smoothness of mind in acquiring wisdom and maintaining resiliency (1996:126-135). Basso has evocatively discussed the importance of the past as placed within the Apache world, re-creating identity and the world through narrative. Thus the world is an ambiguous, interpersonal place in which relationships are primary and respectful behavior, the sharing and gifting of power, and cooperative action and service are necessary.

**Metaphor Analysis of the Narrative**

Metaphors influence how we think and act within our world and therefore are important in the social construction of reality (Todoli 2008:58). I will only briefly touch on the key conceptual metaphors present in this section as I deal with these in more detail in Chapter 8.

Farrer has previously noted the base metaphor of the quartered circle for Mescalero Apache (1991). This same metaphor is present as quadripartite action
and orientation in Western Apache narratives. Other conceptual metaphors center around the notion of cyclical action resulting in birth and ethical behavior. Thus we see EARTH IS A PERSON, WIND IS A PERSON, etc. The narratives also present Earth as an unformed substance. EARTH IS A SUBSTANCE conveys the sense of unformed corporeality, but may more accurately reference form, movement, and intention as attributes necessary for personhood. This coincides with the notion of personhood as a process; in this case, interpersonal interactions with four persons who mold, push, pull, shape and give form to Earth. This has its ceremonial counterpart in the female Puberty or Sunrise Ceremony in which the girl is massaged and molded into a woman by her female sponsor (Opler 1941; Goodwin 1969; Itule 1992; Clark 2001).

One caveat is necessary. The personhood of Earth (and certain mountains, springs, animals, plants, etc) was generally not understood by traditional Western Apache to be metaphorical. Metaphors link two unrelated concepts to convey meaning, which does not reflect Western Apache ontological distinctions as intimated by traditional Western Apache medicine persons (Goodwin Papers). We need to take into consideration the actuality of personhood in the Western Apache world as a way of understanding and interacting with others. Mountains are respectfully addressed and sung to as kin and may reciprocate with gifts of rain, knowledge, and healing. Therefore, ontological concepts such as EARTH IS A PERSON and PERSONHOOD IS A PROCESS are probably not metaphorical expressions but rather Apache ontological premises or assumptions. The actual
metaphorical concept may reside in the simile “like an old woman” rather than corporeality or personhood itself. This would account for word phrases emphasizing standing, weakness, and unsteadiness as qualities relating to age and movement as an attribute of persons.

Spatialization of the process of personhood is seen in the metaphor, PERSONHOOD IS A PATH OR JOURNEY: spatialized, quadripartite acts which result in Earth as firm, strong, and steady (Goodwin 1994:1-2; Lakoff & Johnson 1980:91). CREATION IS BIRTH, MOVEMENT and COLLABORATIVE WORK are also important metaphorical concepts in the narratives. In order to give Earth form and movement “as if it was born,” (Goodwin 1994:1-2), the exchange of ideas, shared responsibility and goals, patience, intent (will), work, evaluation of the situation, and the cooperation of the four persons is required. Perhaps most significant are the metaphors indicating MORAL BEHAVIOR IS A LANDSCAPE and MORAL BEHAVIOR IS A PATH OR JOURNEY. This is conveyed within the quartered circle metaphor and through the use of cyclical movement across a surface creating a path. We find walking, moving, pushing, and standing by four persons also giving power and form to Earth (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:139-140). These metaphors express a coherent pattern that causation resides in cooperative, personal action within the

37 While in this text the earth is discussed as an old woman, it is important to remember that, for the Western Apache, Earth is Changing Woman. Changing Woman transforms between the four stages of life (birth, youth, maturity and age) and is identified as the mother of Monster Slayer and Born from Water. Changing Woman is also closely identified with farming and sustenance of the Apache people. (Goddard 1918; Goodwin Papers, Goodwin 1969; Clark 2001; Brandt 2011, personal communication)
landscape. The structure of the narrative, as open-ended and hedging (discussed above) reinforces this.

**Discussion**

Oral histories and traditions are discursive links to the landscape that not only place the tribal past, but re-create the Apache present and future. The historical and cosmological narratives presented here concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An were recorded prior to 1940. What we saw in the previous narratives is both a compelling Western Apache presence on Mount Graham and a cosmologic interconnection with the mountain. The cosmogonic traditions show remarkable similarity despite the distinct bands and groups that resided in the larger Apache homelands. While there were differences in the north and west mountain chiefs, there was congruence concerning Mount Graham in the south. Apache bands and local groups, according to their own oral histories, considered the mountain as both a base for residence, raiding and refuge, and as a place of significance.

“Apache tribal history as crafted by Anglo-Americans proceeds on different assumptions, produces a different discourse, and involves a different aesthetic” (Basso 1996:34). The problem with the Apache despoblado has always been the problem of constructing a history of a people “without consulting those whose history it is.” (Basso 1996:340). When we hold oral histories to a standard not actually achieved in written histories we denigrate the voice of others. We also fool ourselves into believing our histories are ‘the whole truth and nothing but the truth.’ Colwell-Chanthaphonh noted in his discussion of the Camp Grant
massacre, that history is not just facts or events but is what is added and subtracted from those occurrences (2007:92). Western Apaches have been subtracted from their own histories, homeland, and identity. These histories are real and valid accounts of Apache life. They are recorded events that are placed and “held within their names and stories” (Basso 1996:10).

Ian Record (2008:11) asserts that incorporating oral histories and traditions grounds historical events and sociality into cultural frameworks, uncovering meanings that are absent in Euro-American-based history. If history is the chronicle of events written in narrative prose, as Colwell-Chanthaphonh and White suggest, then we must acknowledge oral traditions and historical narratives as histories also (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007:6). History as socially constructed is multivocal, inherently “dialogic and multilayered,” telling us about the past and the present (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:159; Smith 2004:254). It is not entirely subjective or objective; it is relational in its dialectic recreation of events with a present audience. These histories may not map perfectly onto “our Cartesian notions of time and space” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006:150).
Chapter 6

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS IN THE CURRENT CONTROVERSY

Words differently arranged have a different meaning, and meanings differently arranged have different effects. (Pascal)

Discourse, as social exchange, is a situated encounter between actors that reveals underlying social structures, norms and assumptions as well as reproducing these through the process of these exchanges (Bourdieu 1991). Of particular importance are the social conditions within which knowledge is produced, reproduced, repressed or distributed. Differing ontologies and epistemologies, that are negotiated in social practice, pertain to the broader issue of why indigenous peoples have difficulty protecting and maintaining both their communities and their culturally significant places. These differences may be instrumental in the production of communicative disjunctures within the overall discourse. As differences in epistemological systems impact both the analysis and understanding of discourse, an overview of both Western and Native American epistemological systems is presented below in an attempt to clarify fundamental distinctions. This is followed by a brief summary of Western Apache epistemology previously addressed in Chapter 5.

Epistemological Systems

Western epistemologies are based upon propositional thought and rooted in mathematical measurement. Kant divided knowledge into appearance, reality, and theory (1965). The result, as I have discussed, is dualistic framework for
epistemology: objective – subjective, body – mind, matter – spirit, nature – culture, real – unreal. Knowledge is justified either through propositional analysis or through empiricism. Implicit in this is the notion that knowledge is impersonal and therefore objective, verifiable, and generalizable. Experience is purposefully removed from the ‘world’ and then tested to determine if it is replicable and hence real (Smith 1998: 416; Cajete 2004:46). The process of acquiring knowledge revolves around a sequence of acts whose ultimate function is to produce absolute verifiable truth. We know this process as: observe, record, analyze, theorize, repeat, and generalize. This notion of reality and knowledge acquisition underlies much of the Western perspective—empiricism, skepticism, rationalism, and absolutism. Reality exists independent of the human mind and personal interactions, or as Deloria terms it, “matter produces mind” (2001:8). The quest to ‘know more’ is conjoined with the quest to find universal laws. Whereas for many Native American epistemologies mind produces matter; reality derives from, or relies on, experience and careful behavior and knowing more may be undesirable.

In recent years, Native American scholars have begun addressing issues in epistemology and ‘philosophy’ (Waters 2004) with an eye to distinguishing Native American thought and knowledge while at the same time positioning these epistemologies as commensurable with Western paradigms (Waters 2004:xv; Cajete 2000; Long et al 2003; Deloria 2004; Burkhart 2004). According to Burkhart, Native American epistemologies are rooted in four basic principles: relatedness; the limits of questioning; the meaning-shaping principle of action;
and the universe as moral (2004:xvii, 16-20). We as persons are always related in some manner to others in the world.

Questioning lies at the heart of knowledge-as-experience. How we ask questions guides us to truth, rather than the reverse; it is intention and interactions in the world which reveal knowledge (Burkhart 2004:16). These two principles, or ways of being, are in turn connected to the third principle, the meaning-shaping principle of action. Persons participate in shaping meaning and this in turn shapes the world. How we act is crucial to the construction and maintenance of reality which creates ethical constraints in both language and social acts. This leads to the principle that the universe is moral. Reality and truth arise from correct or right practice; what is right is true. Life and behavior within the world is normative. What becomes crucial then is finding the right path or behavior (Burkhart 2004:17; Fienup-Riordan 2001:549; Dongoske & Damp 2007).

Burkhart subsumes these four principles under the larger premise that Native American knowing is moral investigation. Epistemology is practice; a way of being and acting in the world which creates the world. Thus, the epistemological process is experience, evaluate, determine action, correct action, and understanding. Each encounter is new and particular; knowledge is gained through experience in context (inter-relationship). Morrison (N.d:3) terms this process, a relational epistemology, while Norton-Smith (2010: 55-63) characterizes Native American epistemologies as relatedness, participatory and performative. This is an experiential process of knowing within the framework of inter-relational interaction among a broad class of persons, some of whom are
other-than-human (Hallowell 1975; Scott 1996, 2006; Feit 2001; Fienup-Riordan 2001; Watson et al 2003; Shorter 2003; Morrison n.d.). This process mediates between the self and other as ‘dividuated’ persons (Bird-David 1999). A *dividual* constructs and sustains his or her identity through interpersonal relationships and interactions within the community and the world; he or she becomes and knows through this process (Strathern 1988; Bird-David 1999). “We relate, and therefore we are.” (Morrison n.d:4). Martinez (2008:90-1) notes that this relational orientation is kin-centric, a broad diversity of persons who engage in practical reciprocal relationships. In these types of epistemological systems, relationships hold priority and these relationships are discursively embodied at least in part.

As noted in Chapter 5, Western Apache epistemology is rooted in places (Basso 1990, 1996; Long et al 2003). Discursive practices and constraints operate within the experience of place to bring knowledge and wisdom into the present (Basso 1996:xiv, 11, 31, 62, 89). Discourse is a reciprocal, moral engagement in which knowledge is experienced, relational bonds constructed, and identity created and maintained (Basso 1996:31, 102). Western notions of reality and knowledge are at odds with this system. There is a profound disconnect between Native American and Western epistemologies and within the rhetorical conversation. The two following statements exemplify this, one by Father George Coyne, Director of the Vatican Observatory, regarding Western Apache assertions of ritual and cultural practice specifically tied to the mountain, and the other from a Western Apache medicine man, Franklin Stanley, protesting the telescope installation.
Nature and Earth are just there—blah! And there will come a time when they will not be there....I find that it is precisely the failure to make the distinctions I mention above that has created a kind of environmentalism and a religiosity to which I cannot subscribe and which must be suppressed with all the force that we can muster. [Coyne 1992b]

The mountain is like a road that leads our prayers to the Almighty Being. The mountain leads the prayers into God's presence all the things that are sacred on the mountain, plants, animals, the very very important trees at the top, all of these must be left the way they were because they were made for us. Like Christians, we believe that our religion, that our way, was given to us by God. It must be treated with respect or there will be consequences. You can only talk about these things you have the knowledge and you must show respect. [Stanley 1992b]

Father Coyne is embedded in the Western perspective that nature is a reality that is independent of human experience; nature is physical, objective, and distinct from belief. In this view, Western Apaches attribute animacy to inanimate places. This attribution is entirely subjective and hence modification, or even destruction, of a place (as inanimate object) does not interfere with religious belief and behavior. Franklin Stanley in contrast, paints a picture of a multi-dimensional reality, that of the mountain as mediator, protector, and home. Even more specifically, Stanley reinforces the notion that the relationship with the mountain creates and sustains both the Mountain and Apache identity and reality. Stanley experiences the mountain as a relational agent. The epistemological differences suggested in the rhetoric above and throughout the controversy, make it imperative to take into account the ontological and epistemological system of the speakers in any analysis.
Western Apache Discursive Practice

Basso (1996) categorized Western Apache speech forms into three major categories: ordinary talk, prayer, and narrative forms. Note, however, that speech shifts between and through these forms within the same rhetorical encounter. Narrative form is also distinguished by temporality and purpose. These genres include myth, historical tales, sagas, and gossip (Basso 1996:49-50). Origin narratives relate events that occurred during the formation of the world and the persons within it. These narratives are instructional, explanatory, and performative. Performance, as an interpersonal encounter, re-creates the world or brings it into the present.

Historical narratives also relate events. These events may be concerned with Western Apache emergence into this world, journeys, and events and ways of living prior to the Euro-American intrusion. This genre is evolving to include some post-Euro-American events. The primary purpose of this genre is ethical guidance and critique and is almost always associated with places (Basso 1996). Sagas are told for the purpose of relaxation, conviviality, and entertainment. These stories are primarily set in modern or more recent times. The last genre is gossip, which primarily informs individuals of community events, persons, and happenings. Gossip is present and community-focused.

We know discourse is contextual but more than that, Western Apache knowledge is often restricted in both time and place. Certain oral traditions (and

---

38 Basso used this designation to indicate a group of narratives concerned with the origin of life and reality. Historically, this Western term implied falsehood and superstition. I prefer to call these narratives oral traditions or origin narratives.
the knowledge they contain) will not be relayed during the time of Lightning or in particular places due to the danger of bringing Lightning’s attention upon the people (Goodwin Papers; Basso 1992; Brandt 1996:3; Clark 2001:86). The same holds true for personal knowledge. Knowledge carries risk to both giver and receiver. How the mountain was discussed varied according to the participants in the dialogue (who may be Apache or not), the knowledge of the Western Apache ‘speaker’, the relationship between the participants, the setting, and the assumed intent and receptiveness of the audience.

Western Apaches have a long history of designating ‘spokespersons’ to address certain important issues (Basso 1990; Brandt 2011, personal communication). Western Apache societies have historically been egalitarian in organization and the wielding of power. Direct confrontation is avoided if possible as these may be face-threatening acts that disrupt the relationships within the group (Basso 1996; Brandt 2011, personal communication). Therefore, personal critique, admonishment, and even compliments are often delivered through particular individuals and in an indirect manner. This also holds true for sensitive and dangerous knowledge, in both intra and extra-tribal contexts. Information, meaning, and significance are presented differentially. Organizations such as the Apache Survival Coalition, the Apaches for Cultural Preservation, and the Mount Graham Coalition (an organization comprised of environmental, religious, and Apache peoples) were important sources for understanding how Apaches wished to present information.
Another factor in contextual analysis is change through time. Does the discourse change in focus, tone, style, or intensity? Do new motivations appear and how do changes impact meaning and sociality? The Apache rhetoric examined in this project ranged in temporal span from 1989 to the present, though the bulk of rhetoric occurred within the time frame of 1992 to 2001. The motivation and focus of most Apache opposing the observatory did not appear to change throughout the controversy, however, tone, style, and intensity did change significantly in some individuals. Historical references made present in Western Apache protests were one example. These references often displayed not only social critique but also appeared to establish Apache authenticity, which came under fire by telescope proponents. In particular, observatory partners utilized the academic record to assert the lack of Western Apache connection to the mountain and hence the invalidity of Apache claims.

As Andrew Wiget (1982) discusses in his critique of Eggan and the authenticity of oral traditions, motivation plays a large part in any historical account (native or non-native). However, in focusing on accuracy we may miss the opportunity to really understand true significance, which lies not within the accuracy of specific details relayed in a Western temporal sequence but in what the other deems significant within the events (Wiget 1982:183). As I have discussed in Chapter 4, Western Apache claims are supported in American, Mexican, and Spanish accounts of particular events. Differences in historical discursive styles have often facilitated non-Native American claims regarding the accuracy of events. Collapse of temporal sequencing and date-specific timing is
frequent in oral traditions as temporality is generally emplaced. Placement of events, rather than timing is often considered of greater significance as events that are placed are true and have experiential effects. This emphasis on placement rather than time and the compaction of events held true in some of the Western Apache rhetoric in this controversy also.

**Linguistic Analysis**

Analysis of linguistic elements was performed through key word analysis, word choice, sentence structure, and grammar. Word choices and their frequency reveal emphasis, tone, and often intent and meaning. Sentence structure can relay information about agency, connection, intent, authority, and legitimacy. Structure can be passive or active, linear or non-linear. Structural choices, including verb, noun and adjective choice, positioning, and grammar may affect meaning and reveal intent. Discursive elements are particular to the language they inhabit. We know that the Western Apache language is a verb-based language focused upon action within the world (Basso 1990). Basso’s work has offered clues to how this emphasis translates into English in specific Apache contexts. Discourse in the Mount Graham controversy was analyzed to determine if these same linguistic choices were utilized in speaking publicly about significant Western Apache places and what these choices conveyed.

While all tense categories are present in Apache rhetoric, active present-tense is most often used to convey Western Apache intent and meaning.
...the Apache Survival Coalition feels that they must appeal. This decision not only hurts the Apache’s sacred mountain, it insults the tribal council... (Apache Survival Coalition 1994)

Our people believe that the mountain is sacred and is a holy mountain for it is considered the resting place of our mountain and spirit dancers, the Gan. (Wesley 1995)

You are asking us to set aside what we know and understand about the mountain...” (Stanley 1992a)

UA mocks our beliefs and our Sunrise Dances where the Gaan Mountain Spirit Dancers which live inside places like Mount Graham, convey healing and wisdom to our Apache women. (Harney 1997)

In discussing the mountain, ‘being’ verbs were utilized, usually in connecting the mountain to Apaches, or subjunctive case in keeping with the restricted nature of knowledge.

Dzil Nchaa si’an is an essential part of the Western Apaches’ homeland and religious life. (Apaches for Cultural Preservation 2002)

Mount Graham is the chief, the most important sacred mountain. (Stanley 1992a)

If you take Mount Graham from us, you will take our culture. (Stanley 1992a)

If they are built traditional Apaches who learn from the mountain won’t be able to see what to do, won’t know what to do, or learn what we need to learn through revelations and our prophecies. (Stanley 1992b)

Past-tense verb choices, as exhibited below, depended on the content of the rhetoric and the situational context. These choices reveal the exercise of power but also the re-creation and maintenance of Western Apache culture. Active past verb phrases were utilized in discussing both Apache and non-Apache acts. In these statements agency, ethics, and community tended to be highlighted.
Participants in the run carried a baton...called on the creator (Moccasin 1993)

These white people came to America and took away our land. (Upshaw 1995)

He told them they were not from here, they were not Apaches...He talked about how unfair it was... (Rambler 1995a)

Our spiritual leaders, the medicine men and women signed a petition opposing the telescope project on our sacred peaks of Mount Graham. Our tribal government passed a unanimous resolution opposing the telescope project. (O .Davis n. d.)

When discussing historical and current events, verb choice became more complex. Non-Apache thoughts and acts were portrayed via active past-tense verb choices, while the remainder of the statement used a passive past-tense verb phrase in connection with Western Apache experiences.

The Apaches massacred at Camp Grant had been relocated from Mt. Graham… (Moccasin 1992)

Cusanovich tried to conceal his deceit ... (Victor 1994)

During that age, the traditional nations and peoples of the Western Hemisphere have endured what historian David Stampard has referred to as the worst Holocaust in the history of humanity. (Victor 1991)

The second day took the runners to Aravaipa Canyon, site of the Camp Grant massacre of 1871 where Apaches, mostly children, women and old people were slaughtered. (ASC 1992b)

The traditional Apache have been blocked from meeting with the Pope by Father Coyne and Vatican Sec. of State Cardinal Angelo Sodano. Father Coyne and Cardinal Sodano even cancelled a recently scheduled meeting with the Pope after a delegation of traditional Apache had arrived at the Vatican for their appointment. (ASC 1992a)
This mix of active and passive past-tense verbs conveys the notion that non-Apaches wielded power, usually in an unethical manner, and that Apaches were victims of these exchanges. This could merely be indicative of Western Apache rhetorical style rather than an indication that Apaches still feel marginalized and powerless. However, this combination was utilized so often when discussing historical events that we need to consider that the style may be chosen to discuss the Apache-experienced reality.

Western Apaches are in dialogue with the descendents of people who negatively impacted them. Bringing that past into the present is necessary but also confrontational. Throughout the controversy, relationships were constantly being renegotiated within these discursive interactions. If the audience members were observatory proponents, verb choice was often active and loaded (i.e.: massacred, sold, or violated).

*If we’re in your way, why don’t you just exterminate all of us and just get it over with?* (Stanley1992a)

*...allowing the Forest Service to bulldoze and desecrate Indian sacred places nationwide.* (Charley 1993)

*Through years of lobbying, litigating and lying about our beliefs, the University of Arizona has circumvented all Native American cultural protection laws.* (Lorenzo 1995)

*They’re trying to do away with the Apaches, our belief in the spirits, our heritage, the sacredness of the mountain.* (Thompson 1993)

*In January 7, 1992, he voted for a UA Mount Graham study (Booz-Allen) which included a strategy of bribing us Apaches and attempting to make outcasts of traditional Apaches.* (Jordan 1994)
Apaches who opposed the observatory used more passive verb phrases (i.e.: were hurt, were here, had been relocated) in public contexts where the audience was the public at large. The result was often a softened accusation and suggested that the Apaches were not comfortable with directly confronting these unknown others even though the ultimate audience was the telescope proponents.

Passive verb phrases were also used when a narrative genre was present. This was particularly evident in articles written by Sandra Rambler, a columnist for the San Carlos Apache Moccasin, who later became the cultural advisor for the San Carlos Tribe. This form was highly evocative of traditional historical narratives, incorporating relationships, and cultural norms and practices, while telling of events.

*It was a beautiful morning, with the sun shining brightly, the brisk feeling of fresh air rising as she danced with her arms and shoulders in position to the beat and rhythm of the drum beat. She seemed to be listening intensely to the word of the Medicine Man as he sang and looked straight as if she was praying silently and determined to accomplish a goal she had set before arriving to participate in the Apache sunrise ceremony. The campdress she wore was colorful and descriptive as the lines of age in her face.*

*Her name was Ola Cassadore Davis, a San Carlos Apache who had returned for a visit from Tucson. There had been many visits, but this particular one was to visit some friends and relatives. One of the other visits she had had, which was a long one, was to become a godmother and it was through this experience that she realized that prayers become stronger, step by step... She had come from a family with medicine men. Her father was one and her late brother, Philip Cassadore, was also one. She had been taught the ways and customs of the Apaches and she was a traditionalist. [Rambler 1991]*

Analysis of verb choices also reveals the active linking of the past with the present through the use of both present and past forms within the same rhetorical
statement or speech act. This is consistent with Western Apache discourse which utilizes historical or past events to instruct others regarding appropriate social behavior (Basso 1996). Historical references “speak the past into being,” allowing the audience to participate in the experience (Basso 1996:32). How these events were spoken of depended in large part on the perceived audience and the situational context. If the audience consisted of tribal members, the historical form was more often utilized and past and present verb tenses referenced Apache acts and culture. These statements were highly evocative and meaningful, spoken to remind Western Apaches of their past, their heritage, and their community.

Toward the public at large and telescope proponents, Western Apache statements generally referenced devastating events experienced by the Tribe. In this case, discourse brought the Apache voices, past and present to the fore, while instructing others of the potential consequences of their actions (Basso 1996:33).

*They brought devastation to the Indigenous People here, and now their descendants are continuing to destroy a race that was created by Usen (God).* (Nosie 1998)

*I have testified before Congress twice about how this project will hurt my people. I speak on the radio and in public...* (O. Davis 1992a)

*I can tell you the true stories of other medicine men who were slaughtered even as they were drumming our sacred songs and prayers.* (Stanley 1992a)

*You have killed many of us, you killed my grandfather. You have tried to change us, you forced me to go to your schools. Still I treat you with respect.* (Stanley 1992a)

Not only does the linking of past and present within discursive practice bring the past into being but it also demonstrates the flexibility of time. While not
precisely in the historical narrative form, it appears that many statements are structured for the same purpose. Circularity, rather than linear time sequences, is often present in keeping with the ‘bringing into the present’ purpose of these speech acts (Basso 1996:32-33).

How can a university advocate cultural annihilation? Easy. Tucson has done it for years. War profiteering Tucson merchants in 1871 ordered the slaughter of our women and elder and sold 29 of our children into slavery to try to keep the war going. The Tucson judges let the merchants off because they were ‘upstanding’ citizens. Now U of A astronomers, profiteering on millions in federal astronomy grants, follow that path 122 years later. Ironically, many of the Apaches massacred were those who had been forcibly relocated by the Army from Mount Graham. [Valenzuela 1993]

In this statement, the present is addressed, connected to past events, and brought forward into the present again and re-linked into the past. This mix of suffering past, painful present, and potentially devastating future reinforces for the group that the Apaches as victims of cultural and human genocide. The past is implicitly linked to current behavior and to the mountain. The statement is somewhat open-ended, allowing the audience to draw their own conclusions. This discourse re-creates and reinforces cultural connections and identity, while reprimanding observatory proponents.

Obligatory verb forms were also present in much of the discourse surrounding the mountain. Obligatory verbs suggest necessity, obligation, expectation or command (for the audience), depending on the remaining context and structure of the sentence (Oxford Dictionary 1998). Generally, these verb forms create force and importance in a sentence and focus the audience upon the
subject. These forms were most often utilized concerning the disclosure of knowledge or how the mountain should be treated.

*Why should we try to explain why the telescopes are a terrible thing to do to the Mountain?* (Stanley 1992a)

*Mount Graham therefore should be treated with reverence and respect...Finally due to the sacredness of Mount Graham, to Apaches an observatory should not be built because it destroys our sacred places and prayers.* (Kenton 1990)

*You need to stop everything that has been done to Dzil Nchaa Si An so far.* (Burnette 1995)

It is interesting that obligatories were often present in conjunction with subjunctive case or in propositional sentences. This softened the obligation while still conveying urgency and intent. This is very much in keeping with known Western Apache discursive practice; instruction, teaching, and critique are presented but conclusions are left to the audience (Basso 1996; Samuels 2004). Occasionally, obligatory verbs were used to motivate Apache protest or to explain the actions of Apache advocates. These statements were often linked to cultural preservation, community continuity, and identity. Obligatory forms increased in frequency in the later years of the controversy, along with more strident statements by Western Apache advocates. All statements with obligatories possessed a strong ethical tone.

*If you build the telescopes on the top it would be like damning a river, a spiritual river. The telescopes will be holding back all of our prayers.* (Nosie 1993)

*...the Apache Survival Coalition feels that they must appeal.* (Apache Survival Coalition 1994)
Propositional sentence structure was also prevalent. This took the form of subjunctive case, if – then and thesis – antithesis pairings, and rhetorical questioning. This structuring is consistent with the Western Apache discursive practices I have previously alluded to; open-ended and allowing for participant evaluation and behavioral change. Subjunctive case was utilized in both narrative form and in statements that discussed the mountain, particularly in reference to the effects of telescope construction or the mountain’s characteristics.

*If they were to try to put telescopes on Mount Sinai, the world would be outraged.* (O. Davis 1995)

*She prayed that through their strength of prayers that the telescope would not be built on top of such a sacred mountain...* (Rambler 1991b)

*The telescopes will stop us from collecting our medicinal herbs; it will contaminate our spring water. It will have an effect on the physical parts of these things and on the spiritual parts of these things...The telescope project will destroy our way of life.* (O. Davis 1992a)

*If you desecrate Mount Graham it is like cutting off an arm or a leg of the Apache people.* (Stanley 1992a)

These statements are in keeping with the propositional nature of ethical behavior and the restricted nature of knowledge. Propositional statements in the form of rhetorical questions, if – then, or thesis – antithesis structures conveyed needed information in an open-ended manner and non-confrontational manner. This also allows for the focus to be on behavior rather than belief.

*If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain.* (O. Davis 1992a)

*If the telescope is built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.* (O. Davis 1992a)
If this mountain continues to be desecrated, our God-given spiritual life and beliefs will be destroyed. (O. Davis 1992b)

If you build the telescopes on the top it would be like damning a river, a spiritual river. The telescopes will be holding back all of our prayers. (Stanley 1992b)

If this mountain is further desecrated, then what will I inherit from my ancestors? (Cassadore, n. d.)

If they are built traditional Apaches who learn from the mountain won’t be able to see what to do, won’t know what to do, or learn what we need to learn through revelations and our prophecies. (Stanley 1992b)

A close examination reveals more is implied than actually conveyed in these statements. We are not given exact information about the mountain, or what specific knowledge will be lost. We only know that great harm has happened or will occur. Another consideration regarding the use of propositional forms is the very real danger of bringing these possibilities into reality. Western Apache people use discourse to bring events into the present reality. In this case, construction on the mountain (and its impact on the Apache community) is not desirable, therefore Apaches may have framed their concerns in such a way as to protest without either exacerbating or ‘creating’ the problem. If – then and thesis – antithesis forms are ethical propositions. Rhetorical questions were also used to convey ethical breeches. These became more frequent as Apaches lost patience with the process. This form was particularly evocative of Apache frustration and pain.

Pacheco and Gee’s astronomers might as well ask us why we didn’t complain when we were rounded up, and force marched to distant
reservations and when sacred places like Mount Graham were taken from us in the 1870’s? (Harney 1993b)

How can a university advocate cultural annihilation?...Will you take what’s out there [in space] and destroy it the way you are now destroying the Indians? (Valenzuela 1993)

How can they learn our concerns if they won’t let us speak to them?...Who is Father Coyne to tell us what is sacred and what isn’t? (Victor 1992)

Personal nouns or pronouns were almost exclusively utilized in the Western Apache rhetoric examined. A key word analysis conducted on all discourse found that plural inclusive pronouns accounted for three of the ten most frequent words. In fact, if the only elders of the tribe were analyzed, the word most used was either ‘we’ or ‘our’ (see below). ‘Apache’ or ‘mountain’ followed in frequency. Overall word analysis found that the top five words used by all Apaches were (in order): Apache, Graham, our, we, and mountain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>our</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>Mount</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>sacred</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>us</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacred</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Apaches consistently used inclusive pronouns, (we, us, our) when discussing the mountain, often contrasting these with exclusive pronouns (they, their, them) in a thesis – antithesis format.

“The mountain is sacred to our people. Our songs, our dances and words and prayers of our medicine people were derived from that mountain, and today we still honor and practice the same songs and dances that were passed down to our generation from our grandparents. How can we allow you to build telescopes on a mountain sacred to our Apache people? (Lorenzo 1995)

Just because we have no written Bible, and we don’t build shrines at our sacred places, some German astronomers think they can ignore our religious freedom. (O. Davis 1995)

These white people came to American and took away our land. And now they are trying to take our mountain away! (Upshaw 1995)

To some extent we would expect to see this in any confrontation over ideological, religious or property concerns. Deeper analysis showed inclusive pronoun use extending beyond reference to the mountain, however. Statements discussing tribal concerns, cultural continuity, and linking of the land to the Apache people exhibited this word choice pattern.

To the World, I give you our medicine men, whom you will find loyal and true. They have joined the brave men who have come from far and wide to keep aloft our heritage, customs and pride.” (Rambler 1995a)

“All we have is words for you, words from our heart. We are hurt to see one people hurt by another group of people. We have a right to pray, to do it our way...You are taking my words and saying they are worthless. We are the People of this land, and I’m talking for a host of people yet to come. (Burnette 1995)
However, inclusive pronoun use was more complex than mere ownership of a position or piece of property. Discussions of ethical and unethical behavior also displayed this usage, referring to normative behavior in a group or communal situation.

Recently candidate Basha wrote in a Navajo newspaper that our Apache beliefs are "not altogether unfounded." Imagine a Congressman saying to Christian constituents that their beliefs and Jesus are "not altogether unfounded." Basha knows for well our traditional spiritual leaders, the tribal Council and elders have signed many petitions and resolutions opposing this desecration. (Jordan 1994)

What is “crappy” about the whole situation is the fact that our Indian people were not given the right to vote until 1948, years after our Dzil Nchaa SiAn was taken from us by executive order. (Rambler 1995b)

I was at the meeting and I noticed while our people were offering their testimonies to these Germans, these guys were laid back and would occasionally snicker to one another. Is that respect? (Rambler 1995a)

I am in Apache elder and one of the medicine people from the San Carlos Apache. Although our ancestors were the first Americans, we were not recognized as US citizens until 1924. We were not given the right to vote until 1948. We were not even allowed to practice our Apache religion until the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978. (Johnson 1996)

UA mocks our beliefs and our Sunrise Dances where the Gaan Mountain Spirit Dancers, which live inside places like Mt. Graham, convey healing and wisdom to our Apache women. (Harney 1997a)

Moreover, singular pronouns were consistently found in conjunction with plural pronoun use (see above). Western Apaches referenced the larger community when speaking as individuals, using both singular and plural pronouns in the same sentence or speech act. This suggests individual identity is understood within the communal context. Telescope proponents, in contrast, used impersonal nouns or
singular pronouns (I, me) and noun choices were more distanced or object-centered.

Pronouns were present as indicators of inclusivity, connection, and personhood. Personal connection and personhood were inferred through the use of personal pronouns rather than impersonal connecting words such as ‘the,’ ‘a,’ or ‘an’ in discussions concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An. Pronoun usage also coincided with both the naming and capitalization of the mountain (i.e.: Mountain, Mount Graham, Dzil Nchaa Si An, The Sacred Mountain).

...after our Dzil Nchaa Si An was taken from us...” (Rambler 1995)

Mount Graham has been the Sacred Mountain to those brothers that roamed that area since time immemorial. (Valencia Torin d.)

If you are willing to understand the lessons from our culture and history then the University of Virginia (Minnesota) will avoid any and all association with the telescope project, thus avoiding additional damage to Apache people, and Apache culture, and our Sacred Mountain. (Massey 2002)

But for us there is no other Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mount Graham). (Harney 1997b)

We won’t be the people we’re capable of being...That’s how it affects us with Mount Graham. (Nosie 1994)

Word choices often centered upon personal characteristics. Verb choices in particular suggested agency, sentience, and sensory reception.

...these mountains teach us... (Riley 1995)

That is a very, very strong mountain. (O. Davis 2006)
Mt. Graham is the chief, the most important sacred mountain... On this mountain is a great life-giving force (Stanley 1992a)

The spirit is in the rock.” (Allison 1995)

...the mountain can take a deep breath and savor the victory...
(Unidentified Apache person, Phoenix Gazette 1995)

The combination of verb choice and personal pronouns coupled with cultural references and the absence of impersonal descriptors suggested the mountain was understood as a community member. For example, Mount Graham was described as ‘suffering,’ or as ‘a protector.’ The agency of Dzil Nchaa Si An was demonstrated through word choice and metaphor (discussed in Chapter 8).

Key word analysis revealed a strong emphasis on Apache culture, inclusivity, and a flexible ontology of personhood or beingness. Linguistic analysis suggests meaning is enacted in discourse and emplaced in the landscape. This was evident not only in word choice but in the active linking of past with present in dialogue. Western Apache discourse during this controversy is structured and approached as generative, reflected in linguistic choice (inclusive pronouns, proper nouns, active verbs), grammatical structure (open-ended or propositional statements), and careful or restricted communication. This discourse re-creates and reinforces cultural connections and identity. This discursive strategy, like those of Basso’s Cibecue consultants, suggests that multi-faceted relationships play a central role in Western Apache epistemologies. The ethical and relational nature of reality is forefronted throughout the examined rhetoric and links back to statements found in historical traditions (Chapter 4). These understandings are reinforced by the analyses in the following chapters.
Chapter 7

THEMATIC AND CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

*Something from there, from down there, is talking to you. You could hear it.
You listen.
Listen, you can hear.*
*The stones in the earth rattling together.* [Ortiz 1985:45]

Western Apache speakers have been described as engaging in a highly succinct yet ambiguous style of communication that relies upon the active participation of the listener (Basso 1990; Field and Kroskrity 2009). Meaning within the Western Apache language is created, recreated, and maintained through the cooperative process of discursive engagement. This engagement is a social act which creates a relationship with the other and allows for the layering of meaning. The audience, then, is as integral to the process as the speaker.

Even though most of the Western Apache speak English, Apache ways of speaking remain to some extent highly expressive and performative. Both history and the present are discursively shaped, situated, and experienced; past and present brought into “co-presence” with one another through the social act of discourse.39 This was important to remember in examining Apache public statements; they may be both communicative and generative, depending on who is speaking. Apache meanings are embodied within the discourse performed.

---

Discourse, therefore, may be more than an interactive process between two or more participants; it may be a public enactment—of ideas, concerns, meanings and power—particularly in this case. Foucault has noted that relations of power cannot be established or maintained without discourse (1980:93). Discourses (along with other social forms) allow power to circulate and this power organizes and circulates knowledge (1980:102). Truth according to Foucault (1980:133) is an ordered system of discourse that is linked to circular relations of power and intimately connected with hegemony. In the Mount Graham controversy, the presentation of knowledge (of Apache connection to the mountain) was a demonstration of this. Observatory partners had access to Ph.D level astronomers, consulting firms, and the funds to enlist expertise. Moreover, Arizona retains a political climate that sees nothing wrong with the continuation of Manifest Destiny as a United States policy. There is both an established pattern of rhetoric within the state and a federal legal framework that supports this policy. Western Apache opposed to the project responded with their own ‘truth,’ by talking about the mountain in an increasingly explicit manner.

Rhetorical Strategies

Western Apaches in opposition to the observatory utilized several strategies in attempting to protect the mountain. It should be noted that not all Western Apaches opposed the observatory. Many were neutral on the matter and some favored the project, though these individuals’ opinions were only infrequently publicly shared or documented. The San Carlos Reservation is an
amalgamation of multiple local groups with varying connections to the specific area in question. Multiple religious traditions are practiced within the communities. The project also offered hope for increased economic security and much-needed development for a reservation characterized as one of the poorest in the nation. Additionally, both the San Carlos and White Mountain Apache reservations maintain long-standing relationships with the University of Arizona, which operates several educational programs for the Apache, and is generally seen as a positive contributor to Apache communities.

Western Apache protestor’s discursive strategies were linked to the rhetorical and political efforts of the observatory partners and supporters, most particularly the University of Arizona and the Vatican Observatory. Rhetorical strategies by both parties provided a frame for statements about the mountain. These framings were instrumental in how information was presented and what information was revealed. Specifically, Western Apaches protesting the installation began to speak more clearly and more intimately concerning how they understood the mountain.

Early in the controversy (1989-1992), U.S. Forest Service (USFS) reservations concerning an Apache presence in the area led Western Apaches to utilize an explanatory frame in discourse. This discourse centered upon Apache ties to the mountain and social and ceremonial practice, aimed at the observatory partners, the US Forest Service, and the public. Apache statements specifically addressed historical and cultural ties but were reticent with knowledge concerning the mountain. By 1991-1992, observatory proponents moved to institute a
delegitimizing strategy. Two Jesuit priests authored the core of the rhetoric; Father George V. Coyne and Father Charles Polzer as discussed in Chapter 4. Through both a series of letters to various state officials and public statements, Apache claims were called into question. The rhetorical strategy combined invalidation, re-establishment or narrowing of material boundaries, an erudite, scholarly style in the description of Western Apaches and their claims, and the presentation of the Apache as ‘other.’

Invalidation took the form of forefronting several San Carlos Apache tribal members and presenting these individuals as the sole authentic Apache voices, disputing the claims of ‘misled’ activist Apaches.

*The opposition to telescopes and the use of Native American people to oppose the project on religious grounds are part of a Jewish conspiracy that comes out of the Jewish lawyers of the ACLU to undermine and to destroy the Catholic Church.* (Polzer 1992)

*The new opposition is ridiculous since it comes from one person who possesses no competency concerning the Apache Tribe...One is puzzled as to what this ‘Apache Organization’ is when neither it nor the “Apache Survival Coalition” has any meaning for the Apaches in Arizona...* (Metzger 1993)

*It has been difficult for the Vatican Observatory to identify the responsible persons within the San Carlos Apache Tribe with whom to discuss the concerns of the Apache people with respect to the Observatory. Because we do not wish to enter into the internal political or juridical affairs of the San Carlos Apaches, we have taken the position of welcoming any meeting with anyone who claims to represent the San Carlos Apaches. If, however, such meetings are to result in any important decisions on our part, it will be necessary to identify the true constitutionally established representatives of the San Carlos Apache People.* [Coyne 1992c]
Local city governments, in pursuing the observatory agenda, ably assisted in this approach. Former San Carlos Tribal Chairman Buck Kitcheyan, and a small group of relatives and elders, began to speak publicly in support of the project. Kitcheyan directly contradicted the medicine people of the tribe who had asserted the sacrality of Dzil Nchaa Si An in a signed statement. His support, after previously opposing the project, became a highly contentious issue.

I’m sad and my heart hurts because these people [non-Indian observatory opponents], simply to reject progress and development, approached some of my tribal members and used them as token Indians. To be blunt, I can safely say with the support of my elders and the medicine people of the tribe, that there’s absolutely no religious or sacred significance to Mount Graham. [Kitcheyan 1992]

Western Apaches opposed to the project responded by characterizing Kitcheyan’s public support as a resumption of historical pacification tactics in isolating Apaches using their own people. They cited a report by Booz Allen, a well-known firm of national consultants hired by the University of Arizona, and linked the report to Kitcheyan’s statements.

Circle/Courier readers should know that the University of Arizona’s confidential Mount Graham telescope report contained a top secret U of A strategy to make traditional Apache people “isolated outliers” [read: tribal outcasts]. (Valenzuela 1993)

Rhetorical statements also operated to limit Western Apache public claims to the mountain by re-establishing the Apaches within circumscribed material boundaries, specifically the reservation, and thus narrowing their connections to the surrounding landscape. Foucault (1980:50, 101) noted that to induce invisibility is the exercise of power. Knowledge and truth (in this case the
scholarly record) are discursive mechanisms of power which work to guide, control, dominate, limit or repress; to legitimate some and exclude others (Foucault 1980:94-5). Emphasis was placed on the lack of evidence of Apache residence or use of the mountain, that Apaches were not a mountain people, and that Apaches were recent interlopers into southeastern Arizona.

Rarely did the Apaches use these mountain heights, and the sacredness is about as specific as references to the sky. (Polzer 1992)

These claims were reinforced through public statements by other observatory officials.

I profoundly respect anyone who would declare Mount Graham sacred [but] a declaration of sacredness has to have some substance to it. ...I’m not telling another culture what’s sacred. All I’m saying is there’s no documentary or archaeological evidence to establish a sacred character to Mount Graham. I know of no Apache religious practices that are taking place there. [Coyne 1992a]

Spanish documentary evidence, much of which was present in the Documentary Records of the Southwest (DRSW) archived in the Arizona State Museum on the University of Arizona campus, was spotty. However, even excluding U.S. military, historic and ethnographic accounts, there is documentary evidence in Spanish documents, and in the Goodwin Papers, also in the Arizona State Museum library, to demonstrate an Apache presence in the area. A public scholarly dispute followed that brought the museum’s assistant curator into the mix. (Polzer 1992b).

It was with anger and regret, then, that I finally read ... your affidavit of April 6, 1992...Your erroneous comments about Apache society and culture, your questionable use of ethnohistorical evidence, your
misunderstanding of Apache spirituality, and your dismissal of Grenville Goodwin as a “graduate student, not an accomplished anthropologist,” all contribute to the process of distortion and confrontation so antithetical to the goals of scholarship… [Sheridan 1992]

It should be noted that both the Apache and observatory proponents utilized public forums frequently and effectively throughout the controversy. This particular debate was highly contentious and characterized by strong language, but was one of many such exchanges played out in public newspapers and editorial columns.

Rhetorical strategies consistently dismissed both oral traditions and the ethnographic work that supported them as invalid. Implicit in this discourse is the notion that as ‘late arrivals’ to the area, Apaches aggressively displaced more peaceful Indians. This is consistent with the Spanish colonial record.

Sentence structure and style also worked to portray Western Apaches and their concerns as less valid or without legal substance. Letters discussing the Vatican Observatory’s position were written in an erudite, abstract style emphasizing scholarly arguments. This combination resulted in effectively narrowing the rhetorical space to written documentation and classically defined religion. Scholarly and legalistic prose are often utilized in hegemonic discourses and in the institutionalization of power (see Foucault 1980).

Yes, they [protestors] live in the Dark Ages. (Coyne 1992a)

Rhetorical limiting strategies could also be seen in discursive suggestions of the Western Apache as ‘other.’
I don’t want to give the impression that the Indians are being duped... The Apache were happy up until they were stirred up again by other opponents of the Mount Graham Observatory... This is a sign of desperation. (Coyne 1991)

Since no credible argument has been presented for not doing so, the Vatican Observatory will continue with the construction and operation of the Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope on Mt. Graham... (Coyne 1992b)

We are not convinced by any of the arguments thus far presented that Mt. Graham possesses a sacred character which precludes responsible and legitimate use of the land. Such use has not been precluded in the past; we fail to see why it should be precluded now. In fact, we believe that responsible and legitimate use of the land enhances its sacred character. Land is a gift of God to be used with reason and to be respected. [Coyne 1992b]

As the controversy began to revolve around religious connections, Coyne elaborated upon the nature of sacrality and religious practice in a paper entitled “Personal Reflections on the Nature of Sacred in the Context of Mount Graham International Observatory” (1992b). This particular rhetorical event, the appearance of the paper and subsequent news articles on Father Coyne, bears mentioning as it appears to be the catalyst for subsequent statements by Western Apaches stressing religious freedom and the sacred nature of the mountain.

The paper begins with a series of existential statements about what constitutes the sacred—an interior relationship with God—and how the world is constructed. These statements are consistent with the Catholic faith and emphasize mind – body and reason – emotion dichotomies. Sacred is an internal truth that may be expressed externally. Coyne proceeds to establish practice as an expression of belief or truth, a representation of the actual condition. Therefore,
the restriction of practice can in no way restrict belief\(^{40}\). Coyne moved to separate civil and religious society within the frame of civil as communal and religious as individual. This framing of all religions within the Catholic model maintains enactment as individual expression, rather than religious embodiment or ceremony, subject to individual eccentricities and the greater good of civil society. The establishment of ‘fundamental’ universal truths in his first paragraph (displaying the chain of being conceptual metaphor, binary oppositions, and the temporality of expression as separate from truth) is in keeping with historical notions of religion as universal in presence, construction, and experience.

\[I \text{ don’t think this reasoning is peculiar to any culture, but that it is based upon a common human view of things. It is not Anglo-European, Greco-Roman, Judaic, Asian, Indian, etc. It is human. (Coyne 1992b)}\]

By reaffirming the nature of sacred place and space within a Judeo-Christian, particularly Catholic paradigm, Coyne (and observatory proponents) extends these notions to Western Apache practice. Coyne’s understanding of religion is not just a philosophical difference but a power issue as well. These views are enshrined in the United States legal system and used to define others’ religious practice. This extension attributes Western Apache practice as simply one of many ways to express belief (as human attribution of sacred upon a pre-existing ‘nature’). This rhetoric tends to reinforce the notion of Apaches as ‘other.’

\(^{40}\) This is consistent with the Supreme Court’s 1988 Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protection Association ruling that the restriction of religious practice does not violate the First Amendment as it does not interfere with religious belief. The ruling also stated that Native American practices could not be allowed to prevent the government from using the land as it saw fit—consistent with U.S. sovereignty and a continued policy of Manifest Destiny.
While I admit that these are very personal views, based upon a limited religious outlook, I do think that they indicate how extremely important it is, in any view of things to carefully distinguish Earth, nature, cultures, human beings. [Coyne 1992b]

These strategies moved the concerns of the Apaches to the periphery so that observatory officials could deal with the legal challenges posed by environmentalists, who were extremely active in the protests also. However, Western Apache protestors critiqued this discourse as perpetuating the historical power relations which had devastated Western Apache communities in the past. The reductive placement of their peoples, through the use of material boundaries and rhetorical frame, to a people with no real ties to the landscape evoked a strong response. If you remove the Apache from the center (of controversy, of place, of history) to the periphery you deny them agency and power (Smith 1999:53). Moreover as Basso (1996) has noted, the moral systems of Western Apache peoples are connected to the landscape. These types of exclusionary boundaries were reproduced throughout the telescope proponents’ discourse and figured in the Apache response.

Apache Rhetoric

Western Apaches launched a counter-narrative in response to this public rhetoric. Apache individuals and organizations sought to reclaim agency and assert the validity of their claims by adopting a strategy that fore-fronted the work of Goodwin as a scholar of note, enlisted contemporary anthropologists to reinforce both Apache claims and Goodwin’s work, discredited Kitcheyan as an
embezzler and ‘good Indian,’ and adopted a public campaign presenting Apache concerns and formal declarations. This strategy was similar to observatory proponents in circulating ‘institutional knowledge’ (Foucault 1980:131-133) and followed the realization that there was a lack of legal protection available for the protection of culturally significant places. Money was raised for an independent lawyer and for the dissemination of protestors’ concerns (Brandt 2012, personal communication). The rhetoric also resulted in Western Apaches speaking more clearly about how the mountain was understood and experienced.

While the San Carlos Tribal Council had already published two resolutions in opposition to telescope installation, a more pronounced effort was made to publicize these to the public at large. Public statements and news releases emphasized that these same resolutions were being ignored. The Tribal Council continued to pass a series of resolutions in opposition and broadcast these publicly. Additionally the Tribal Council officially recognized the Apache Survival Coalition (ASC) as an organization pursuing a tribal agenda (Resolution DC-91-200, December 10, 1991). This was in direct response to the dismissal of the ASC as an organization “…only some of whom were San Carlos Apaches living on the San Carlos Indian Reservation.” (Coyne 1992c), and confusion in court over whether the Coalition was equivalent to the San Carlos Apache Tribe. The passage above characterized the Apache Survival Coalition as non-tribal and isolated Ola Cassadore Davis, who resided in Tucson at the time, as an outsider and agitator. In response, discourse in this time period became centered on ethics and community connections and relationships.
Naming was another rhetorical strategy used to reclaim Western Apache agency, heritage, and places (with limited success). The San Carlos Tribal Council and traditional Western Apaches began to refer to the mountain as Dzil Nchaa Si An, one of four Apache names for the mountain. The four names for the mountain were found in Goodwin’s notes from the 1930’s (though only one was used publicly) and thirty-two songs reference the mountain. The mountain’s Apache name was not exclusively used in public discourse. Many Apaches may have never known the mountain’s Western Apache names as knowledge is restricted (and also dependent upon personal investigation, relationships with elders, visions, etc.). This change in naming was something that observatory partners pointed out and which lessened the desired impact.

*There is not even an Indian name for the mountain... The mountain has had an Indian name for only one year... nobody knows where these sacred places are supposed to be.* (Metzger 1993)

Apaches continued to use the name ‘Mount Graham’ in discussing the mountain, particularly in public. However, when discussing sensitive knowledge or customs, in formal declarations and resolutions, and in interactions with proponents, Dzil Nchaa Si An was frequently used. This tacit and indirect reminder to the public was powerful, ideologically and psychologically, for the Western Apache and in keeping with a succinct, open-ended discursive pattern. Re-claiming the mountain’s name provided active resistance, without overt and direct confrontation, and an indirect commentary on Western appropriation and colonization by the re-naming of places (Smith 1999:51). Naming, as we have
seen in Basso’s (1990, 1996) work, is also a mechanism for communal identity, belonging, and moral guidance. Cultural ties are strengthened and maintained in this process. In publicly naming the mountain, Western Apache asserted their agency, commitment, and legitimate claim to the mountain as well as re-confirming and maintaining their communal ties.

Normative assumptions and a strong ethical frame were used throughout the entire controversy and extended beyond allusions to observatory opponents. Apache discourse referenced specific acts as well as general concerns. For example, multiple Apache speakers characterized Kitcheyen, the ousted Tribal Chair, as a person who switched allegiance for the sake of money and employment.\(^{41}\)

*Coalition leader, Ola Cassadore Davis said that the former chairman supported the group’s opposition a few years ago when he wrote a letter to the U.S. Forest Service calling Mt. Graham sacred. “He told me since I was his relative,” Mrs. Davis said, “He would support us. Now he has changed sides. It’s like in the old days when the white people used other Apaches as scouts to defeat those opposing the white people. They still want to divide us to against each other to win something. [Moccasin 1992]*

Other statements focused on all Western Apaches taking the right ethical path with regard to the protecting the mountain and Apache culture. Western Apache rhetoric demonstrated a frequent emphasis on moral practice as a necessity of continued Apache existence.

*Despite our cultural desecration, we native people must fight on if we are*

---

\(^{41}\) Mr. Kitcheyen was accused of embezzlement and later found guilty in tribal court on seven counts of theft and seven counts of embezzlement. He pled guilty to three counts of embezzlement and theft in Federal District Court, after his request to dismiss the case was denied. (Open Jurist, accessed 2012).
to survive and maintain our culture for future generation. (O. Davis, n.d.)

That is why we need to come together and make a stand. (Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998)

The above statements address kinship and community as markers of ethics, validity, and belonging. Discourse focused on anchoring the present with the historical events and thus emphasizing the Apache legitimate complaints, but also cultural continuity linked to the land.

Polzer’s dismissal of Goodwin’s work (1929-1939) brought validity claims to the fore. In response, Sheridan’s letter to Polzer was widely circulated and supported by the official testimonies of Basso (1992) and Brandt (1992).

This acceptance of Western anthropologists as Apache ‘experts’ combated telescope proponents’ assertions and served several purposes: it facilitated knowledge transmission, tried to counter reliability issues, supported links between the historical past and present, and helped reclaim agency.

The validity of the traditional beliefs has also been supported by the two leading anthropologists of the Western Apache (Dr. Keith Basso and Dr. Elizabeth Brandt), the University of Arizona’s own cultural advisor (Mr. Gordon Krutz), as well as over 60 Native American and human rights groups around the world. All US partners (eight) have withdrawn from Mount Graham except for the University of Arizona. (Apache Survival Coalition 1992)

Utilizing Western scholars as spokespersons (discussed earlier) facilitated knowledge transmission with less danger to the Apaches themselves. Dzil Nchaa Si An was consistently referred to as a powerful force or being that must be treated with respect. Traditional elders continued to speak carefully in public; however the enlistment of Western scholars suggests Western Apaches began to
reveal more restricted knowledge in select situations. Apache advocates also knew and tried to counteract reliability issues with regard to oral traditions. Acceptance was at least a tacit acknowledgment of Apache fears that proponents would discount traditional knowledge.

Because our traditional knowledge is passed from one generation to the next orally, there are no records of much that is known. In order to know about sacred place, the spiritual leader who has the knowledge would have to be consulted, and only under certain conditions could some of the information be obtained. Ordinarily, these matters are not spoken about it all. It is very likely that there are only a few Apache who know what is sacred about Mount Graham, and if they did and were asked, a truly traditional Apache very well may not answer or admit to knowing. [Stanley 1992a]

Goodwin (Goodwin Papers, 1942) lived with the Western Apache for several years and thus his written accounts could support oral accuracy. Brandt and Basso had both worked cooperatively with Western Apaches for many years, had spent time on the San Carlos and White Mountain Apache reservations, and knew various spiritual leaders well. Western Apaches reclaimed agency by determining who spoke for them, who possessed accurate knowledge, and who ‘told’ the truth. Scholarship, Goodwin’s and others, also provided links between current and historical Western Apache practice. This discourse both directly and indirectly validated Western Apache speakers. Apaches who opposed the project linked historical events to present social practice, links to the mountain, and claims concerning unethical treatment. This rhetoric asserted cultural continuity and their ‘authenticity’ as Western Apache people linked to the land. Direct refutation by Western Apache speakers, when present, was often emotionally
laden, which compounded communicative disjunctures as Westerners tend to
categorize emotion within the irrational sphere (outside of reason and fact) and
thus unreliable as sound judgment. More often, direct refutation was left to
scholars who utilized a written text in the form of a letter or article.

The Apache counter-narrative also included an appeal to the historical
devastation suffered by Western Apache peoples, often centered upon removal
from their land. This appeal was an attempt to contradict the stereotypes
perpetrated by telescope proponents and highlight Apaches as historical and
contemporary victims of unethical acts by Tucson citizens in pursuit of economic
gain.

The second day took the runners 69 miles to Aravaipa Canyon, site of the
Camp Grant Massacre of 1871 where nearly 100 Apaches, mostly, women
children and elderly were slaughtered while the tribal men were out
hunting. Also 29 captured Apache children were sold into slavery. The
massacre was organized by a ring of Tucson merchants and businessmen
who hired others to do their killing. The Tucson merchants wanted the
government in Washington D.C. to believe the Indian wars in Arizona
were not over. The Apaches had been peaceful and were under army
supervision. This threatened the wartime profiteering of the Tucson men
who handled large lucrative army supply contracts connected with the
Indian wars. The ringleaders hoped the attack would let the tribesmen see
they were not under army protection and thus start another war. The
Apaches massacred at Camp Grant had been relocated from Mt. Graham
and had been promised protection at Camp Grant...One hundred years
later, the Apache are again being attacked by “respected, upstanding”
Tucson business leaders. The UA lens manufacturing astronomy industry,
and Tucson itself thrive on huge federal contracts and funding.
[Moccasin August 25, 1992]

Western Apache advocates constructed a political and historical narrative that re-
told the history of the Western Apache peoples and brought that history into co-
presence with present events in a very real way. These included narratives of separation from the homeland, identity loss, and community destruction.

Now, the continuing development of this telescope project seriously damage the sacred relationship between the San Carlos Apache and this holy mountain. I represent the younger generation of Apaches. My generation has already lost most of the knowledge of many sacred ceremonies. It this mountain is further desecrated, then what will I inherit from my ancestors? Where will my culture be? What culture will I have? [Cassadore 1992a]

This turn in discursive strategy and content could be seen as both a form of resistance and a type of ethnogenesis, especially for the San Carlos community, who were originally a mix of sub-tribes and local groups forced into a defined, confined, and regulated ‘concentration camp’ (Smith1999: 2). Western Apaches from several communities within the San Carlos Reservation (particularly Bylas and Peridot) began to emphasize belonging, community as a whole, and agency as a self-governed, though wronged, people.

Once we lose these things we will lose our identity and cease to be a people.” (Francis 1991)

If we don't stand and fight for our Apache culture, who will? (Rambler 1995c)

The new San Carlos Apache Tribal Council stands united with the tribal people opposing this desecration, and reaffirming the resolutions passed by the former Tribal leaders. (Apache Survival Coalition 1993)

We now have become the backbone of each other. We now have become the reliance of each other. We now have become family. We’re relatives.” “But our relatives teach us better. They teach us we’re one people, we have one language, and we the one purpose... (W. Nosie 2010:19, 67)

Discourse as a component of identity, community viability, and connection with the mountain was referenced several times within controversy.
All we have is words for you, words from our heart. We are hurt to see one people hurt by another group of people. We have a right to pray, to do it our way. You need to stop everything that has been done to Dzil Nchaa Si An so far. You are taking my words and saying they are worthless. We are the People of this land, and I’m talking for a host of people yet to come. We can’t negotiate this. [Burnette 1995]

We have a sacred mountain in four directions. We make sure—they’re listening—that your voices will be heard in a proper place. (Lupe 2010: 153)

Discourse as an ethical, constitutive act was also apparent in rhetorical dialogue, particularly when the audience included other Native Americans.

...the last battle is our religion, our identity because, once that is removed we are a numb people...The Mother Earth made it...And what she tells me, if that is ever lost, then we’re no longer. The word has no longer morals, no longer integrity, no longer respect (Nosie 2010:15)

Who is the Pope anyway? The pope’s medicine is his mouth (Stanley 1992b)

As discussed earlier, this marked a shift in explanatory discourse to one emphasizing commonalities with Western religions coupled with an increasing use of religious language. This strategy both identified the Apaches, and their concerns, as ‘religious’ and thus of equal value as Western peoples, while separating their community as distinct. Rhetorical statements usually coupled religious behavior with legal and human rights in an effort to give weight to Apache claims. Rhetorical strategies revealed broader themes regarding how Western Apaches understand and act within their world and demonstrated a striking sense of cultural continuity enacted through places. Analysis of Western Apache public statements revealed four thematic elements: (1) a distinct ethical
component, (2) a strong *relational* approach in social interaction, (3) the sharing of *knowledge* as a complex social act, and (4) an increasing use of *religious* *verbiage* through time in an effort to protect their mountain.

**Ethics**

One of the most striking features in the Apache discourse during this time period was a strong ethical component. Particularly pronounced in Apache discursive acts with the observatory partners, this ethical orientation was expressed in complex ways and appeared to be the underpinning of most discursive acts, particularly in discussion of the mountain. The emphasis upon ethical concerns could be either overt or oblique and was present throughout the range of Apache discourse: in Tribal resolutions, news releases by the Tribal Council or tribal organizations, individual newspaper interviews or statements, editorials, and public orations. Within this dialogue three ‘ethical’ threads were apparent: (1) a sense of stewardship; (2) community and kinship with others; and (3) normative assumptions about what constitutes ethical behavior in the world.

> When we walk upon Mother Earth we always plant our feet carefully, because we know the faces of our future generations are looking up at us from beneath the ground. We never forget them. (unidentified elder, Moccasin 1995)

Ethical behavior as stewardship was demonstrated repeatedly in Apache public statements concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An. However, this was not just a sense of stewardship in the classic ‘noble savage’ idiom but rather a connectedness and relationship with others (some of whom may not be human or
even alive in the Western worldview) that necessitates responsible, respectful action and behavior. This behavior doesn’t preclude ‘use’ of the living environment but is rather a thoughtful, reciprocal engagement that acknowledges connection, exchange, and responsibility toward all others through time and place.

*You must always show respect and take care of those holy places. Each one helps us in some way. We depend on them to help us live right, to live the way we should.* (N. Thompson 1992)

*That mountain sustained our ancestors’ lives, by providing food, water, medicine, herbs, shelter, for many generations. Our religion and traditions are under assault. This action shows disrespect both for the earth and for the Apache people.* (O. Davis 1991a)

This notion of ethical behavior in conjunction with significant places embedded within Apache culture was a common pairing in Apache advocates’ public statements. ‘Respect’, ‘living right’, and ‘taking care of’ the land were frequent phrases. Respect is considered essential when discussing Dzil Nchaa Si An as the mountain possesses enormous power, in the hot springs at the base, streams, cloud formation and rain, and storms. The above statements, though brief, hint at particular practices, knowledges and traditions which continue in contemporary Apache life. Other statements mention the use of medicinal or “sacred” plants, springs, and ceremonial sites. Intertwined in these statements is an acknowledgement of places as participatory partners in Apache culture and life.

*When they survived this holocaust, [it was] because of these mountains. If the mountain was not here maybe the Apaches won’t be here too.* (M. Davis 2006)

*If they are built traditional Apaches who learn from the mountain won’t be able to see what to do, won’t know what to do, or learn what we need to learn through revelations and our prophecies.* (Stanley 1992b)
In addition, a majority of the statements, like the statements above, reveal the emplaced communal aspect of Apache life and identity through the repetitive use of the inclusive pronouns, as discussed in the previous chapter. To some extent this language would be expected in pushing forth the Tribal agenda to protect the mountain; however this linkage, of the individual to the larger Apache community, was repeatedly found in extemporaneous statements by Apache individuals not necessarily formally involved in the protests. These discursive elements highlighting communal identity and ethical behavior were most often linked with references to specific places, the landscape as a whole, and with memory. Thus, temporal persistence and cultural integrity continue to be established and maintained via ethical and discursive acts which are anchored within the land.

_Since time immemorial, Mt. Graham has been sacred to the Apache. It is the spring of our life and the protector of our existence._ (San Carlos Apache Tribal Council 1999)

_I thank my grandmother, who taught me about Dzil nchaa si an and why it is sacred to our Apache people. I thank those who continue to teach our children our traditional beliefs and values in order to preserve our Apache culture, so we can survive as a people. It is important to pass resolutions and to file lawsuits and to do all we can to protect our traditional beliefs, which give us an identity. I thank those who take these actions._ (Rambler 1994)

To value and depend upon the mountain implies a reciprocal arrangement in which relationship is apparent. Ethno-historical accounts of Apache cosmology reveals an emplaced and embodied character of social life in which reciprocal relations with other beings possessing power and agency are evident. The above
examples also express a sense of connectedness with others. Most of the individual and oratorical statements displayed a strong sense of community and kinship—in the sense of relatedness which therefore necessitates ethical behavior. For example, multiple Apache individuals referenced their ancestors in connection with Dzil Nchaa Si An. This might take the form of relaying oral traditions regarding the mountain passed down the generations, buried ancestors, or more nebulous connections drawn between current and past kin, the mountain, and Apache people.

_The medicine men sing about the mountain when they pray, generation to generation, all the way down through the years. They say there is holy water on top of that mountain and sacred herbs and a burial site. To us Apache, it is a very sacred place. It’s really important to my people to not have those things built up there._ [O. Davis1989]

_Leave the mountain alone. The Eagle feathers come from the eagles that live up in the mountains. We have our ancestors up there. Tell your people that we will not forget what you would do. It will go down for generations. Our kids will remember what you’ve done. We pray from our hearts. You will be reminded over and over._ [Rohrige 1995]

_Dzil Nchaa Si An has given guidance, strength, knowledge and direction to our Apache people for centuries and shall continue to do so until the end of time._ (Rambler 1995b)

Kinship and community are seen as important markers for cultural continuity and identity. Past and present are linked through the kin and community bonds that are re-enacted in discursive acts. Both Basso (1996) and Samuels (2004) have noted that the past is brought into the present through Apache performance and discourse. This re-enactment becomes enactment; by expressing these connections, the connections are re-forged and maintained.
Meaning is created through the give and take of the cooperative process that is discourse—through absorption, repetition, form and structure (poetic), and the generative power of language in performance that creates a relationship between the subject and the ‘other.’ This engagement (whether as public oration, personal interview or ‘ad lib’ remarks) “embodies personal and historical relationships” creating a “thickening of experience” which increases the intensity and layering of meaning (Samuels 2004:133)

I am the son of a traditional Apache medicine man. My father spoke to me of the sacred importance of Mount Graham. This mountain is where my ancestors received the 32 sacred songs of life, 16 of which directly refer to Mount Graham. (Cassadore 1992a)

If this mountain is further desecrated, then what will I inherit from my ancestors? (Cassadore 1992b)

I thank my grandmother, who taught me about Dzil Nchaa Si An and why it is sacred to our Apache people. I thank those who continue to teach our children our traditional beliefs and values in order to preserve our Apache culture, so we can survive as a people. It is important to pass resolutions and to file lawsuits and to do all we can to protect our traditional beliefs, which give us an identity. I thank those who take these actions. [Rambler 1994]

The Mount Graham telescope project has already begun the destruction of our ancestors’ grounds and our old ceremonial grounds. Our hidden secret ceremonial sites’ sleep will be revealed. Our history and traditional values will be destroyed. (O. Davis 1989b)

...the mountain spirits are still in there, the spirits are still around and when the mountain is disturbed they are disturbed too. They really need our help to stop the telescope because they really are disturbed. It is like you’re going to tear off a person’s arm or a part of their body, it hurts. That’s the way they are hurting today, us Apache and those mountains. [O. Davis 1992a]
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Multiple statements throughout the controversy referenced community ties and kinship bonds which often extended beyond death but were expressed as continuing in the present. Links to non-human persons who may qualify as ‘kin’ by virtue of their reciprocal and respectful relations with Western Apaches are also referenced. The mountain is discussed as a community member who teaches, provides, and embodies Apache culture in some manner. The active present is linked with the past in the same sentence, or the same discursive thread. This moving between active past and present creates circularity and reinforces the notion of cultural continuity and identity emplaced within the land. Repetitive word choices intensify meaning and proper behavior. Certain ethical behaviors are discussed in reference to Apaches as a people: thanking, gifting, sharing, reciprocity, teaching, and memory. These are all behaviors we expect from our relatives and these behaviors are also necessary for the maintenance of culture and identity.

*How can a university advocate cultural annihilation? Easy. Tucson has done it for years. War profiteering Tucson merchants in 1871 ordered the slaughter of our women and elder and sold 29 of our children into slavery to try to keep the war going. The Tucson judges let the merchants off because they were ‘upstanding’ citizens. Now U of A astronomers, profiteering on millions in federal astronomy grants, follow that path 122 years later. Ironically, many of the Apaches massacred were those who had been forcibly relocated by the Army from Mount Graham. [Valenzuela 1993]*

*I can tell you the true stories of other medicine men who were slaughtered even as they were drumming our sacred songs and prayers. (Stanley 1992a)*
In public speeches to the United Nations (and other legislative or authoritative bodies), initial speech is in Apache, not only documenting and relating lineage and belonging, but establishing relatedness from the very beginning. For example, Ola Cassadore Davis states,

*How are you, my relatives? I came here so I can talk to you people. I’m very happy that you came a long way to listen to us and we will tell you all of the problems we have here with our sacred mountain, Dzil nchaa si’an.*

(O. Davis 1998)

Kinship immediately establishes a relationship with the other and brings with it certain standards or requirements for ethical behavior. In this case there were assumptions: discourse that is true and relates Apache concerns, which may be restricted in extra-kin – Apache interactions or due to consideration of the material conveyed, and service to others within the kin group are the assumed standards of ethical behavior. Apache speech also highlights issues of cultural otherness in an oblique manner; the audience is included as kin but unless they can participate in Apache language interactions they are excluded as ‘other.’ This is consistent with the Western Apache speech pattern which conveys much through a succinct, oblique, and often opaque discursive style. The style is also reminiscent of oral traditions in that there is an opening sequence which presages a narrative and the expressed expectation that the audience will listen to the narrative.

We see this pattern again in the speeches given by tribal leaders in the Southwest Tribal Summit addressing ongoing cultural abuses of Native Americans. Then San Carlos Apache Tribal Chairman Wendsler Nosie remarks,
The repeated emphasis on ‘hearing’ the participants and the repeated
acknowledgement of familial connection within the discursive interaction
highlights the interpersonal nature of discourse, and the responsibilities that
kinship brings as an ongoing social act. This emphasis on belonging, familial ties,
and responsibility is echoed throughout the conference by each tribal participant.

Western Apache advocates’ correspondence and oral discourse also
displayed certain normative assumptions about what was appropriate ethical
behavior and increasing Apache frustration when this was not reciprocated.
These assumptions were expressed by multiple Apache speakers in multiple
situational contexts and in a variety of formats, both formal and informal. There
was an obvious progression through time in the content and tone of this dialogue.
In the beginning, Apache opposed to the observatory consistently expressed
normative assumptions of appropriate ethical behavior on the part of Apaches and
the observatory partners regarding the mountain. This discourse conveyed an
undertone of expectation that by establishing a relationship with the observatory
partners, the telescope proponents would begin to demonstrate behaviors which
followed Apache moral parameters.

*You can’t educate these people. But we have to stay within our boundaries and not have bad thoughts and pray for them in their wrongdoing, because their wrongdoing will ultimately destroy them. But*
even if we win, they’ll still blame us. They need to look deep within themselves and see what it is they’re doing. [Victor 1992c]

So we leave them [sacred places] alone except when we really need them. We pray to them to help us. If we hurt them they would stop helping us—and then we would only know trouble. (Thompson 1992)

Elders will not give you answers until they know and trust you—until they see you are coming from the heart. You have work within the patience of the elders and not expect answers immediately. Everything you do must have respect. (Riley1995)

As time went on, Apache discourse reflected shock, dismay, and increasing anger.

Statements identifying negative acts (outside the bounds of ethical behavior) perpetrated by telescope proponents moved to the forefront of the dialogue.

If you make an effort to listen to one side of a debate, you must make an equal effort to hear out the opposition. If not then you cannot make any claims to fairness, honesty or objectivity (Miles 1992)

The Forest Service and the University of Arizona should be ashamed of their continued campaign to restrict the free exercise of traditional Apache religion. They stole our mountain from us, and now they want to take away our spiritual way of life. (O. Davis 1998b)

President Yudof [President, University of Minnesota], you must now understand the grief, pain, anger, and despair when we Apache find out there are great universities like yours that would, without provocation, inflict such disrespect upon us and a place that has been sacred to us since time immemorial [Rambler 2001]

What is it that makes a “center of higher learning” do things like that to defenseless people when there are other places for telescopes that don’t cause suffering? (Rambler 2001)

In contrast, the observatory partners retained a legalistic and sometimes distanced tone throughout the extended dialogue. Both individual and official statements by observatory-affiliated organizations, in favor of the telescope
project, demonstrated little evidence of ethical themes or practice. Indeed, public discourse by these entities remained abstract and only occasionally connected to Apache discourse as evidenced in the following statements by Bishop Moreno of the Tucson Roman Catholic Diocese and Father Coyne.

*I see no purpose for my attending the meeting since the matter is before the courts. I have stated that I would abide by the Courts’ decision. They should be deciding and judging the validity of the claims and rights that are presented.* (Moreno 1992)

*[This land] is a gift from God to be used with reason and to be respected. We believe [our] responsible and legitimate use of [this] land enhances its spiritual character.* (Coyne 1992b)

**Relational Orientation**

As seen in the above Western Apache statements by Miles, Davis, and Rambler, there was evidence of a strong relational approach in social interaction within the ethical framework of Apache discourse. This was apparent in both rhetorical attempts to build relations with telescopes proponents and in a persistent demonstration of a social or cultural relationship with the mountain and the larger landscape. As noted earlier, connection and community were emphasized heavily in the Apache side of the dialogue. Western Apache rhetoric, especially in the beginning of the controversy, was focused on attempting to establish relationships with telescope proponents and to ascertain the intent of these others. This was exhibited by language that focused on negotiation, explanation, and tacit (or overt) requests for direct dialogue and information.

*That is my Apache people’s historic homeland and my ancestors, my grandmothers and their grandmothers are all up there.* (O. Davis 1995b)
I need your help, you religious people. I put out my voice: please don’t build the telescope atop Mount Graham! Help me—pray for him! (O. Davis 1996)

This relational approach maintained the ethical underpinnings found in other discursive acts and was evident in statements attempting to resolve the situation without conflict or acrimonious confrontation. Discourse for elders is often about a ‘way of proceeding’ or an acknowledgement of the establishment and maintenance of ‘proper relations,’ as we saw in previous statements. Relationships are not quickly formed but rather evolve over time as each party becomes aware of the other’s character and intent. This approach followed the discursive style both Basso (1996) and Samuels (2004) have noted; a succinct yet ambiguous verbal style which is strongly relational yet tentative in the initial stages.

Our traditional heritage has taught us the ways of honor and respect for all living things, and that we must confront those who oppose our path in an effort to avoid conflict. (Victor 1991)

I gave the chancellor information on our way of life, our prayers, our ceremonies, our songs. Now I’m in his system. He’ll dream about me, and think about our tribe. I pray he makes a good decision on behalf of my people. (R. Thompson 1993)

Apache discourse reiterated the importance of Dzil Nchaa Si An in Apache life and identity. The mountain choreographs and informs Apache ‘being-in-the-world’. This is consistent with ethnohistorical accounts, oral traditions, and the growing body of work that acknowledges Native American peoples as being tied to the land. Vine Deloria has written of Native American religions as ‘Land-
based’ religions—religious and spiritual practices which acknowledge responsibility, respect, and connection to specific places and landscapes. The Western Apache advocates continue to steadfastly maintain the significance of Dzil Nchaa Si An in their cosmology and cultural identity; a mountain chief of great power whose relationship with the Apaches is necessary to their religious practice (Goodwin Papers; Brandt 1996:52).

The rhetoric employed by the Western Apache emphasized that religious behavior (as understood in the Western sense) is dependent upon special, sometimes called sacred places. However, the language used by Apache speakers made clear that there is not necessarily a perceived difference between social and religious behavior.

*When I arise in the morning and look into the rising sunlight from the front door of my house, what do I see? I see Dzil Nchaa Si’An, the spiritual strength and source of our Apache way of life.* (Rambler 2001)

*No where else in this world stands another mountain like the mountain that you are trying to disturb. On this mountain is a great life giving force. You have no knowledge of the place you are about to destroy...Mt. Graham is one of the most sacred mountains. The mountain is holy. It was holy before any people came, and in the mountain lives a greater spirit....If you take Mt. Graham from us, you will take our culture.* [Stanley 1992a]

*Any religious person knows that it is a sin to be disrespectful of another’s religion. For us, religion and culture are not so separate. ...Respect, and the rights granted to us by certain laws are what we ask for...We pray to the mountain.* (Stanley 1992a)

---

Multiple levels of understanding are present in the above statements. Traditional Apaches often rise and greet the Sun through doors oriented toward the east, a direction of power and knowledge. In addition, the mountain is characterized as both ‘holy’ and cultural; a source of strength, well-being, sociality, and knowledge. Public statements repeatedly demonstrated the inseparability of sociality, religion and culture; a way of life that is holistic in form and content.

*For us, religion and culture are not so separate. I hope you can understand what I say, it is about spiritual things, even if it is called ‘culture’, it is the same.* (Stanley 1992b)

Harm to the mountain is equated to harming the Western Apache and was repeatedly stressed in oral statements and written depositions. The actual relationship with the mountain appeared to be as important as the qualities that the mountain possesses. This relationship was characterized over and over again as one of kinship, community, and mutuality. Discussion of the importance of Dzil Nehaa Si An demonstrated a multifaceted, interconnected interaction between the mountain and various specific persons (whether God, Apache elders or Mountain Spirits) as well as the community as a whole. This suggests the significance of place and cultural landscapes are tied to moral behavior that is not the sole domain of religion and has implications for shared knowledge, sense of community, and identity.

*We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain. The mountain is part of spiritual knowledge that is revealed to us. The mountain gives us life giving plants and healing...Our prayers go through the mountain, to and through the top of the mountain... If you put that telescope on Mount Graham, it will be like cutting off an arm and a leg of the Apache. We have suffered enough.* [Stanley 1992a]
[Mt. Graham] is a source of the Ga’an, the home of a Mountain Spirit and other sacred beings, which gave creation, guidance, strength, knowledge and direction to the Apache people. (Apache Survival Coalition 2001)

Our medicine men are our spiritual leaders. They go there to receive all the gifts so that the culture can continue. We’re Catholics but what comes first is our culture. (W. Nosie 1991)

The Apache believe that you can’t lie about that mountain or it will turn back on you. We’ve seen that when (former) Congressman Udall fell down the stairs. He once had the power to stop that observatory, but he didn’t. Senator DeConcini also got into trouble over the Keating affair. The Apache know those signs, but it’s not the way of Native American people to tell the public everything they know. People who are close to Mother Earth, who see it as sacred, understand these things [M. Davis 1992]

Knowledge as a Complex Endeavor

We are instructed by our elders and religious leaders to protect and preserve our traditions and culture. For once we lose these things we will lose our identity and cease to be a people. Sacred places are a vital part of this culture and tradition. They play an important role in the shaping of our lives and so much more. (Francis 1991)

My mother told me that Mt. Graham is one of the sacred mountains,... these mountains teach us...They and the stars guide us. (Riley 1995)

The sharing of knowledge is a complex social contract that is carefully established. Knowledge can be dangerous and must be carefully guarded, not only to safeguard traditional practices, but also to protect the person who may unwittingly receive it.43 The actual Apache discourse shows the sharing of

---

43 Both Basso (1992) and Brandt (2001) discussed the dangers of sharing restricted cultural knowledge with the larger public. Brandt stated “It is a mountain which is extraordinarily powerful. This power is considered dangerous in the hands of those who do not know the proper ways of dealing with it and who do not have the requisite gift, training, and mental discipline to deal with it. For these reasons, it is greatly respected. This respect is partially conveyed by refraining from revealing the true extent and nature of its cultural significance to the Apache people. There is certain knowledge about the mountain that is restricted to Apache spiritual leaders, often called "medicine men". This knowledge should not be revealed, and if revealed, can
knowledge as an inter-relational social act. While some knowledge is restricted, attempts were made by Apaches to give limited information concerning the significance of the mountain. As was evident in previous sections of this paper, public statements revealed several things: relationships are necessary in order to reveal knowledge, respectful behavior towards others (including the land) is part of ethical behavior, knowledge is complex and transferred slowly, and answers are not assured. This fits in with a worldview in which ambiguity and uncertainty is ever present. Relations must be established slowly so as to uncover the intent of the ‘other’ as we saw in the earlier quotation concerning Apache elders. Too often Native Americans have revealed traditional knowledge only to lose their land and their practices.

The continuing development of the University of Arizona’s telescope project would seriously damage the sacred relationship between the San Carlos Apaches and this holy mountain. I represent the younger generation of Apaches—a generation that has already lost most of the knowledge of sacred ceremonies. If this mountain is further desecrated, then what will I inherit from my ancestors? [Cassadore 1992a]

In order to understand why there cannot be any telescopes on Mount Graham you would have to understand our religion, language and culture, and you would have to know how to show respect. Why should we try to explain why the telescopes are a terrible thing to do to the mountain, if you will use what is said disrespectfully? [Stanley 1992a]

The Court insults the courage of our elders and spiritual leaders to talk to the public for the first time since we were forced to live on reservations. (Apache Survival Coalition 1994)

result in extremely negative consequences to the person and his family.” (2001). Ramon Riley of the White Mountain Apache tribe also publicly addressed these issues in a series of letters to observatory partners (1995, 1998).
These statements also intimate that knowledge is embedded within the landscape and embodied in special places; loss of the land results in loss of knowledge. Basso (1996) has demonstrated the links between places and instructional narratives, ethical and historical. The discourse in this controversy reinforces this notion and asserts contemporary links to identity, community viability, and social institutions.

_The mountain is sacred to our people. Our songs, our dances and words and prayers of our medicine people were derived from that mountain, and today we still honor and practice the same songs and dances that were passed down to our generation from our grandparents. How can we allow you to build telescopes on a mountain sacred to our Apache people?_ [Lorenzo 1995]

...the crowndancers considered Mount Graham as one of their havens, a place where they would dance and only medicine men could hear the songs and dances of the Gan even if they were standing below the mountain. One did not argue with the noble way which information was given out about the Gan, it was sacred and not to be toyed with or misbelieved...Why can’t they understand that once the telescope project is underway, this takes away the power of the prayers of the Apache people through their Gan, the Crowndancer, and the Medicine Men of the Holy Grounds? [Rambler 1991]

**Religious Language**

Several trends were apparent in the Apache advocates’ discourse over time. The first, as mentioned previously, was the increasing frustration and anger over the behavior and rhetoric produced by telescope proponents; behavior considered unethical by the Apache. This behavior was often linked to historical depredations on the part of the United States government.

_You have pushed us to the edge of our wonderful and beautiful tradition...We have suffered enough. You have pushed us too far. You_
have killed my grandfather. If we’re in your way, why don’t you just exterminate all of us and just get it over with? (Stanley 1992a)

You have tried to exterminate us, and much of who we are and what we had is gone...If you desecrate Mt. Graham it is like cutting off an arm or a leg of the Apache people. I can tell you the true stories of other medicine men who were slaughtered even as they were drumming our sacred songs and prayers. Building the telescopes on Mt. Graham is like ripping off the arms of the singers. [Stanley 1992a]

The other trend was evidenced by a discursive shift toward emphasizing religious freedom as a mechanism for protection of the mountain. This was seen in the increased use of religious language in describing both Dzil Nchaa Si An and the Apache relationship to the mountain. There was a move away from the discussion of traditional practices and culture toward a dialogue that characterized Western Apache social practice as religious and the mountain as sacred. In the beginning, cultural continuity was stressed through language which demonstrated ancestral connections to the mountain and its importance in cultural lifeways. As time went on the mountain was more consistently described as holy and sacred and cultural practices were characterized as sacred or religious. Explanatory links between Apache thought and culture and Western notions of religion were emphasized in this dialogue. Eventually, as anger and frustration mounted, the Apache public discourse shifted again and became even more explicit.

In the interest of avoiding any lingering confusion, you will forgive me for being blunt: Mt. Graham is sacred to the Apache people and the observatory project has significantly harmed our already damaged culture in a profound and almost unforgivable way. (Riley 1995)

The Forest Service and the University of Arizona should be ashamed of their continued campaign to restrict the free exercise of traditional
Apache religion. They stole our mountain from us, and now they want to take away our spiritual way of life (O. Davis 1998)

This shift coincided with the pre-emptive actions by the University of Arizona that resulted in clear-cutting the forest and the laying of concrete foundations prior to the fulfillment of National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) regulations. At this point, the Apaches began to speak very clearly in the Western idiom in an effort to make explicit their concerns about the mountain.

_We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain. We worship on the mountain...I am not saying that the waters, the plants or the mountain IS our god, like some would say, as in pagan idol worship. Our idea of what is a god is not that. Much of it is closer to what Christians would recognize, since Catholics, for instance, have holy water, saints who have healing powers, believe in visions and have sacred sites where respect is essential. [Stanley 1992a]

The mountain was specifically and frequently referenced as a place of ceremonies, to gather sacred plants, spiritual instruction, a ‘conduit’ for prayer and blessings, and as a home to ‘holy beings’ in the form of both the Mountain Spirits and the Supreme Creator. Dzil Nchaa Si An was also repeatedly termed ‘a holy place.’ The mountain was characterized as a ‘church’; a place of pilgrimage, a gathering place, and a place that must be preserved from harm. Much of the rhetoric utilized comparisons with Western religions.

_The university claims we have no religion here. They say they don’t have any proof that this mountain is sacred, but we can ask the same question about anything in the bible. This is the same to us as Mount Sinai. What kind of proof do you need? (Victor 1991b)

_We don’t have churches. We meet our Supreme Being on open ground because it’s all his anyway. (Victor 1992c)

_If they were to try to put telescopes on Mount Sinai, the world would be outraged. Just because we have no written Bible, and we don’t build shrines
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at our sacred places, some German astronomers think they can ignore our religious freedom. (Davis 1995a)

Mt. Graham, long known to the Apache as Dzil Nchaa Si An, is a primary location for Apache religious practices and ceremonies, much like Mt. Sinai is to Christians and Jews, and Mt. Arafat in Saudi Arabia is to Moslems. (Mount Graham Coalition 1998)

Many Western Apaches engage in traditional ritual practice as well as being members of a Christian religion. This made understanding this religious language difficult. At times conceptual slippage seemed apparent, especially when elders expressed frustration in attempting to convey their concerns in English. I use the term conceptual slippage to convey Western Apache attempts to explain cultural practice through the use of Western terms, which they acknowledge as being incomplete or less than accurate. Utilizing non-Apache concepts leaves the audience (telescope proponents, the public, and us as scholars) with the impression, often inaccurate, that Apache cultural practices and understandings fit within the Western paradigm. Hybridity was also apparent however, in discussion of the Creator, in comparisons with saints and churches, and in the vocabulary used while retaining many key historical Western Apache concepts.

Sacrality was increasingly asserted, usually in association with social – religious practice rather than belief. Apache discourse remained rooted in the ethical tone noted previously. Actions by observatory partners were specifically characterized as ‘desecration’, assaults upon religious freedom, and causing harm and suffering to the mountain and the Apache people. These terms were confusing at best as religious terminology emphasized belief but harm and
suffering emphasized Western Apache social practice. An examination of the discourse demonstrates the difficulty the Apaches had in attempting to convey their concerns to the opposition. What is interesting is that though word choice shifted through time, the underlying structure, style, and orientation remained much the same. Apache individuals and tribal organizations continued to emphasize practice over belief, ethical behavior with regard to the mountain and others, and verbal restraint.

_The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us...Mt. Graham is the chief, the most important sacred mountain._ (Stanley 1992a)

_The telescopes there must be removed so they will no longer cause harm to our traditional culture and religious beliefs. Those terrible wounds must be healed so our prayers will no longer be interfered with._ (O. Davis 2001b)

_You have shown no respect for our religious practices, our way of praying, and you have set aside what we stand for._ (Stanley 1992d)

Sacrality is mentioned in conjunction with more traditional understandings and prayer is associated with traditional practices, even though Apaches have previously asserted the inaccuracy of these terms (Goodwin Papers; Stanley 1992b).

The strategies and themes explicated in this chapter shed light on how place is understood and experienced by the Western Apache, but complicate our understanding of Apache practices termed religious. Linguistic choices support the notion of place as participatory partner or event in Western Apache lives. This
explication is continued in the following chapter through analysis of the metaphors utilized rhetorically by the Western Apache throughout this controversy.
Chapter 8

METAPHOR ANALYSIS

Western Apaches who opposed the observatory continued a narrative of explanatory discourse in an attempt to create understanding among telescope proponents and ultimately press their case against construction. Explanatory discourse often utilizes metaphor to provide access to difficult or abstract concepts. Basso proposed that the Western Apache utilized metaphors as a response to accidental lexical gaps, that is, a response to the incompleteness of vocabulary to convey meaning, and in category creation (1990:69-71). Western Apache discourse revealed a number of conceptual metaphors that are consistent with the ontological and epistemological understandings suggested in thematic and discourse analysis. These metaphors link past and present understandings and reveal cultural knowledge, cultural continuity, and viability.

There is a dialectic relationship between conceptual systems and perceived reality. If metaphor is understanding one concept or event in terms of another, then metaphors reveal how we structure, perform and discuss those understandings. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:1) assert “Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature”. Conceptual metaphors reveal ontological and epistemological systems and are “grounded in experience” (Todoli 2008:4). Which experiences are used in mapping one concept onto another offer us clues to how individuals and groups

44 The metaphorical expressions in this section are not directly cited as this makes the text unwieldy. See Appendix B for specific citations.
understand, experience, or conceive of their world. This mapping highlights certain meanings and obscures others. Critical analysis of which metaphors are presented in rhetoric offers insights into the speakers’ purposes and cognitive understandings (Musolff 2008: 2). Basso has previously noted (1990: 63-65), Western Apache metaphors reveal ‘kinds of attributes.’ I contend that these attributes are defined relationally through metaphor. Analysis of Western Apache metaphorical expressions revealed a tendency to understand and conceive of reality in personal and ethical terms, especially when concerned with places.

**Ethical Connections and Ties**

For many of the Western Apache, the struggle to preserve Dzil Nchaa Si An was presented as a war, one in which injury, death, and destruction of the mountain and the Apache people was imminent. Even more telling, actual building of the telescope was interpreted as war, with all its attendant consequences. Listed below is the conceptual metaphor Construction is War and the subcategories and entailments found in Western Apache rhetoric.

**CONSTRUCTION IS WAR**

Construction is physical injury to the mountain
- *Building the telescopes on Mount Graham is like ripping off the arms of the singers.*
- *The University of Arizona wishes that their death marks will be successful by completion of building all of the seven proposed telescopes.*

Construction is a battle (attacking, fighting, killing…)
- *If we don’t stand and fight for our Apache culture, who will?*
- *We have put our bows and arrows down, now our weapon is our minds, our intellect, what we learn and how we apply it. We need allies not enemies.*
The dedication of the Vatican telescope on Mount Graham is not the end of the battle. Jesuit Father Reverend George V. Coyne, Vatican Observatory Director, has again attacked the religious beliefs and human rights of the traditional Apache.”

Construction is destruction

- To destroy our sacred places is to destroy us.

Construction is taking sides in struggle

- I can no longer sit back and let you take sides with those who do not honor our cultural identity.

This conceptual metaphor is similar to the ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Analyzing the subcategories provides some subtle distinctions. Not only does this metaphor re-present the historic past of the Western Apache and link it to the present, it also suggests personal causation and the personhood of the mountain. Rather than metaphorical expressions that emphasize strategy, tactics, or the mechanisms of battle, Western Apache expressions focus on the interpersonal results of war. Physical injury is stressed and the subsequent death of the mountain, the Apache people, and their cultural identity. Marks upon the land and the ripping of appendages reinforce the concept of land as living entity. These metaphorical expressions make telescope proponents aware of the consequences of their acts. Moreover, this conceptual metaphor is linked or perhaps subsumed under the metaphor, INSTITUTIONS ARE ENTITIES. War is undoubtedly an act of persons against persons. Here we see organizations and institutions understood as being subject to the same constraints as ethical persons.
INSTITUTIONS ARE ENTITIES OR PERSONS
Institutions have agency
❖ It is unbelievable that an institution of higher learning would set such a bad example for its students
❖ b. Why does the Vatican not respect the religious beliefs of others?

Institutions have feelings, awareness, and consciousness
❖ You may not have noted that our San Carlos Tribal Council is courageous...
❖ The University... Is like a tin man. No heart. They don't have no feeling. They wanted recognition for that large telescope. They want to be known all over the world.

Institutions as human bodies/having corporeality
❖ ...the Court of Appeals overlooked the unclean hands of the University of Arizona and the U.S. Forest Service and their attorneys in their fraudulent avoidance of the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.
❖ ...we're trying to wake people up, wake up the non-Indian society as to what they are doing, how they're hurting the earth

It is interesting to note is that these institutions are never discussed abstractly, as containers or objects, as many Western metaphorical mappings suggest.

Metonymy is used as in the statement that refers to the ‘unclean hands’ of the university. We see an emphasis on ethical interpersonal relationships and behavior through discourse that references parts of the body and social awareness.

These expressions reinforce the notion of personal accountability and the relational quality of life.

This emphasis on personal accountability continues in discourse where Apache individuals link themselves to the tribe as a whole. Here we see the person linked to a larger whole that sustains the community. As discussed before, this is often suggested through grammatical structure and word choice. However,
metaphorical expression and metonymy are also utilized. In the statements below, we see traditional dress or parts of the body used to represent the tribe as a whole. Traditional clothing and age suggest wisdom, cultural knowledge, and community viability through the continuance of customs. Metonymy is used in the second statement; one individual’s face stands for the entire community.

**APACHE PERSON IS THE TRIBE**

Traditional dress as the body of the tribe

- *The campdress she wore was colorful and descriptive as the lines of age in her face.*

Vision/voice as tribal vision/voice/awareness

- *As Wendsler took the stand, one could see in his face all of us that have ever prayed.*

Bird-David’s (1999) notion of the ‘dividual’ appears to be operable here; persons whose identity is created and sustained through inter-relationships within their community and the world. The Western Apache tribe is understood as a relational partner, whose agency sustains members in a very real way. The metaphor **INSTITUTIONS ARE ENTITIES** must be understood in context of this relational epistemology. Western Apaches often demonstrate a strong communal identity; they are not separate from their tribal group. We need to understand that even if discussed metaphorically, this understanding may transcend linguistic explanation. This notion of dividuated person interacting in the world is linked to personal agency and the normative assumptions of the community.

Throughout the controversy, Western Apaches consistently spoke of ethical behavior or the lack thereof. This discourse often took the form of metaphorical expression. The overriding conceptual metaphor was of
MORALITY IS A LANDSCAPE. Several subcategories were also present, entailments that characterized bodily movement within or on the landscape. Thus, ethics resides in the residence within, and movement upon the landscape, in patterns that reveal normative assumptions. This notion of place and placement within the landscape reiterates the primacy of place over time and the significance of embedded knowledge in particular places. “We learn from our sacred land, which give us information about ourselves. Some sites are like libraries, there is sacred knowledge embedded in the landscape” (O. Davis n. d.)

MORALITY OR ETHICS IS A LANDSCAPE
Standing on is moral action (surface)
  ❖ They also see the Native American Indians standing on the ground of truth, of hope, and faith. The ground on which our grandfather, our great leader stood.
  ❖ That is why we need to come together and make a stand for our God-given right to pray.

Standing up for is moral action (surface)
  ❖ This is an urgent call to stand up for traditional Apache culture and our sacred dzil nchaa si an
  ❖ The new San Carlos Apache Tribal Council stands united with the tribal people opposing this desecration...

Standing side by side on the land is moral action
  ❖ He thanked the Indians and non-Indians who were standing side-by-side to help protect the Apache traditions under attack by the University of Arizona.
  ❖ I stood by the Apache people and it hurts.

Traveling a path is moral action
  ❖ They have charted the path we must follow.
  ❖ The mountain is like a road that leads our prayers to the Almighty Being.
  ❖ We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.
  ❖ I say that somewhere our Apache people are being misled.
  ❖ One path should not block another.
This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.

Obstacles on the path are impede moral action

She felt fortunate to have friends...who had helped her immensely and helped carry what seemed like a burden at times when the University of Arizona would not listen to her requests.

...obstructions of their religious practice.”

Moral action is embedded in the landscape

We Apache people are proud that our council has not sold our cultural legacy to the highest bidder.

It does so, not only because it destroys sacred ground, but also because it changes the sacred landscape of the mountain

How would he like it if I built a wickiup and beat my drum on top of his church, on his sacred ground, not just for a little while but for a lifetime?

Morality, for many Native American peoples, is understood as directive, embedded and activated within places (Basso 1996; Martinez et al 2008: 100). Encoded knowledge is therefore always in the present, a living epistemology. To walk the land is to gain in knowledge and wisdom. We see this in the journey schema of source – path – goal. Loss of place is lost knowledge and negatively affects cultural viability.

Prayer is a facet of ethical behavior. Western Apache expressions concerning prayer are complicated. This is in part due to the concept of breath in the traditional Western Apache cosmological system. Traditional Western Apaches understand language as generative. Language is sound and breath; generative in capacity due to the dependence of all life upon breath. Thus
language is an act which can create, destroy, or sustain others and the world. Prayer is dedicated language, and as such holds even more power. While prayer is certainly understood as ethical behavior, one of mutuality, respect, and gratitude, conceptual metaphors concerning prayer appeared to be two-fold: (1) PRAYER IS A PERSON having agency in the world, and (2) PRAYER IS A JOURNEY OR PATH within the world.

**PRAYER AS A PATH OR JOURNEY**
- *Prayers travel to the Creator*
- *When we go up the mountain we pray as we go. We take every step with prayer.*
- *The construction would be very detrimental because our prayers would not travel their road to God.*

**PRAYER AS A PERSON HAVING CORPOREALITY AND AGENCY**
- *...she realized that prayers become stronger, step by step.*
- *No one can fight the power of a prayer.*

**PRAYER AS SMOKE**
- *The prayers are like smoke going into the air, rising.*
- *... the brisk feeling of fresh air rising as she danced with her arms and shoulders in position to the beat and rhythm of the drum beat.*

These metaphorical expressions suggest the multi-dimensionality of prayer; spoken word, breath, smoke, person. Prayer is an intentional, ethical act. Prayer also is mapped onto the concept of person; as a living being who grows, holds power and agency, travels, and grows stronger. Moreover, prayer (breath) is movement (along paths). Agency is a characteristic of persons who have movement (along with intent, perception, desire, etc), an important concept for Southern Athapaskan peoples (Schwartz 1997). The concept of prayer is thus mapped as a person moving upward along a path.
The act of prayer also demonstrates directionality; prayer rose upward and was understood either as smoke or as traveling upon air. This coincides with the conceptual metaphor of GOOD IS UP. Unlike Western notions of upward movement, this metaphor was usually emplaced within the mountain, rather than utilized abstractly; placement and movement within the landscape anchoring ethical behavior.

GOOD IS UP

- *This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God.* “They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.
- *… come from far and wide to keep aloft our heritage, customs and pride.*
- *We had a holy ground up there too, we would start praying up there whenever we needed some help, we needed some strong prayers. We’d go up there and we’d pray there.*

**Personhood**

The inter-personal and relational nature of Western Apache life is suggested through conceptual metaphors that map institutions, objects, plants and animals as persons possessing corporeality, intent, and sentience. Some of these metaphors appeared consistent with modern Western metaphorical mappings while others were distinctly different.

MONEY IS A PERSON

Having a body/voice and agency

- *Money seems to talk more with these bureaucrats...*
Western metaphorical expressions often attribute agency to monetary objects. Utilizing this expression exemplifies Western Apache attempts to meet telescope proponents on their own discursive field but could also be an example of congruence of thought. This statement also mocks telescope proponents and hold the partners up as examples of negative behavior, mirroring Western Apache narratives and place-names; terse statements that evoke multiple meanings and understandings.

The personal nature of Apache relationships was also evoked in expressions that characterized particular plants, animals, bodies of water and planetary bodies as persons. It is not clear that these statements are completely metaphorical. Metaphor in this case may reside in the attribution of a human body and bodily functions to these beings rather than the ‘beingness’ itself.

**STARS AND PLANETS ARE PERSONS**

Having feelings/emotions
- *I remember how sullen the sun looked.*
- *Those telescopes will bother them*

Having awareness/concerns
- *We're not supposed to interfere with the sky or the stars--we're supposed to let them be, just enjoy them, not bother them*
- *It's not right to look at anything that is female [the birth of stars] and to disrespect it.*
- *Who are we to look at this womb of the universe? “*

As teachers, providing guidance
- *They and the stars guide us.*

**PLANTS, ANIMALS ARE PERSONS**

- *And the eagle, which is a person itself, is the example of that integrity of what we once followed, still following, and will always follow…*(MORALITY IS A PATH also)
I can hear trees rumbling sometimes and yet there's nobody there. I see yelling and screaming sometimes when I walk the forests, horses, gunfire. And I think somebody's trying to remind me that get your warriors together, start fighting again... The sounds of the drums, the bells that you hear, yet there's no one around. Some seemed to have touched you. The wind seemed to have moved you.

The metaphors above speak to a broad understanding of personal responsibility and agency within the world. The overarching ontological understanding here is personal agency and its action within the world. This understanding is particularly apparent in statements concerning Dzil Nchaa Si An. The mountain is a living entity with entailments detailing the mountain as body, protector, provider and teacher.

**Dzil Nchaa Si An as Person**

**MOUNTAIN IS A PERSON (LIVING ENTITY)**

Mountain possessing human corporeality

- *If you desecrate Mount Graham it is like cutting off an arm or a leg of the Apache people.*
- *It is like you're going to tear off a person's arm, or a part of their body, it hurts. That's the way they are hurting today, us Apache and those mountains.*
- *[telescope construction] is a blemish on what is supposed to be the work of our great spirit.*
- *Dzil Nchaa Si An is presently being desecrated and harmed by the cutting of ancient forest, digging, and road construction...*  
- *On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.*
- *When you harm the mountain, desecrate its summit, you are doing violence to a spiritual person who is alive.*
- *When Indian people look at the mountain, it is beautiful, but we don't see just the mountain. What we see is what is inside, the beautiful spirit, a living being which is inside that mountain which was placed for us by the creator.*
the mountain can take a deep breath and savor the victory...  

Mountain as Protector (possessing power)
- When we survived this holocaust, because of the mountain...
- The mountain is rumbling. The spirit is moving”
- Since time immemorial, Mt. Graham has been sacred to the Apache. It is the spring of our life and the protector of our existence.
- You are not just interfering with our belief or our practices, but you are disturbing a powerful Apache spiritual messenger gaan who can destroy you or make you crazy. This supernatural being confers spiritual power on those chosen to become medicine men or women.
- The Apache believe that you can’t lie about that mountain or it will turn back on you.
- Just wait and see. This is a very bad place. There are a lot of things going on that they never tell anybody. Bad things are coming to them. It is not coming today or tomorrow. Mount Graham, he works for himself.

Mountain as Provider
- Mt. Graham is a unique mountain, which cares for special animals and continues to replenish the medicine herbs used for different ailments.
- This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.
- The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us.
- On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.
- The rain that comes sprinkles everyone even in the Valley and blesses everyone.

Mountain as Teacher
- My mother told me that Mount Graham is one of the sacred mountains, one of the four chief mountains... They and the stars guide us.

Athanaskan speaking peoples’ ontological distinctions encompass the notion of inner and outer forms. The outer forms of persons frequently do not fit into a Western categorization of personhood or agentive entity (i.e.: they do not match the inner form). Moreover, these other-than-human persons transform their outer forms or manifest in multiple or various outer forms. Transformation is a key concept for the Western Apache, referencing power and knowledge.
Mount Graham holds many religious ceremonial secrets central to our spiritual and religious way of life.

The telescopes also interfere with the guidance the mountain gives us.

If they are built traditional Apache who learn from the mountain won’t be able to see what to do, we won’t know what to do or learn what we need to learn...

A homeland to our Gan, our Mountain Spirit Dancers, Dzil Nchaa Si An has given guidance, strength, knowledge and direction to our Apache people for centuries and shall continue to do so until the end of time.

Mountain as Mediator

- We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.
- The mountain leads the prayers into God’s presence.
- We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain.
- Dzil nchaa si’an is the home of our mountain spirit, our spiritual messenger who came to the Apaches.

Mountain as Community Member

- Mount Graham has been a part of the part and a center for the Apache People.
- Mount Graham is made for our sacred prayer is the place for ceremonies because we know that our Gan dancers went there to live and they left from us human beings. Whatever you need you can pray to Mount Graham.
- This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.

This characterization of the mountain doesn’t fit neatly into the Great Chain of Being hierarchy (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Musolff 2008:3).

Verticality is suggested but not necessarily a hierarchy. The mountain has power to aid and guide Western Apaches but is not an agent of control over humanity; he (or his power) may be harmed or destroyed by human actions (construction). The mountain is both Mountain Spirit and home to Mountain Spirits. While this implies a greater degree of power and agency (not to mention a closeness to the
Supreme Being, God, or *Usen*), this power is nevertheless fragile and dependent upon Apache ‘prayer’ and relationship. Mutuality is more consistent with horizontal or shifting vertical relationships. The mountain as (human) body situates Dzil Nchaa Si An on the same ontological ‘level’ as the Western Apache and within the same social and physical constraints as humans. The mountain can be harmed and suffers from these injuries. Ethical behavior is propelled to the fore as this suffering is delineated.

The mountain is also presented as provider, protector, and teacher; roles which are strongly ethical and inter-relational in nature. Many of the statements do not suggest a metaphorical mapping but rather an actual quality or characteristic. This is reinforced in the conceptual metaphors: MOUNTAIN AS HOME and MOUNTAIN AS CHURCH. A close examination of these metaphors reveals that HOME is understood as a protector and provider, while CHURCH is viewed as a mediator and teacher, relational roles of ethical persons.

**MOUNTAIN AS HOME**

Mountain as a Hiding Place
- *That mountain sustained our ancestors’ lives, by providing food, water, medicine, herbs, shelter, for many generations.*
- *Our hidden secret ceremonial sites’ sleep will be revealed.*

Mountain as fertile, providing sustenance
- *The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us.*

Mountain as home to others
- *It is home to 18 endemic plants, mammals and insects including the Mt. Graham red squirrel, a federally listed endangered species, whose habitat is the 615 acres of*
remaining old-growth spruce-fir habitat where the telescopes are being built.

- This is home to our Apache Mountain Spirit Dancers and it is a place that is sacred to my people.
- Mount Graham is also the home of our Gaan people, and that's where the Gaan people, spirit to our medicine people call on them.
- ....the Apache Mountain Spirit Dancers, or Gaahn, which dwell in most sacred mountains such as Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mt. Graham)...

Mountain as home to Apache Ancestors

- When you go deep in thought, you hear your forefathers, you feel the spirit.
- Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.
- Our ancestors are up there, looking down on us.

Mountain as a source of water and life

- On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.
- When our prayers are answered we see the water come. There is life giving waters on the mountain. The rain that comes sprinkles everyone even in the Valley and blesses everyone.

MOUNTAIN AS CHURCH

Mountain as Home to Spirits

- We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain. We worship on the mountain. The mountain is part of spiritual knowledge that is revealed to us.
- Mt. Graham is the home of our Angels, the Gahn.
- It is the home of the gaan, our Crown Dancers.
- If the spirits leave, we don't know where they'll go"

Mountain as Ceremonial Site

- Our lands, which include our sacred places are no less important than a church is to others.
- ‘This is like a State Highway Department notifying the City government of a new road and not telling the members of a Church that the church is about to be destroyed! And then talking to church members too late for them to suggest changes in the location of the road!'
- We had a holy ground up there too, we would start praying up there whenever we needed some help, we needed some strong prayers. We'd go up there and we'd pray there.
- These sacred mountains are like our church to us and we respect them as whitemen respect their churches and we do not destroy our churches, they should respect our churches and not destroy them.
- How would the Vatican like us to say the altar of St. Peter’s in Rome is not sacred so we can set up a handicrafts concession in it?

Mountain as Conduit for Prayer
- The "Almighty" is the Ruler of Life. To reach the Almighty the prayers go up through the mountain and passes through the top... The telescopes will be holding back all of our prayers. The telescopes block the gateway into the next realm.
- This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.
- The construction would be very detrimental because our prayers would not travel their road to God.
- We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.
- It is closer to the sky, so you can reach up to God.

Mountain as Spiritual River
- ... the mountain is like a gateway or river and putting the telescopes on top of the mountain is like putting dam on the river.

Mountain as Container (Repository of Sacred Objects)
- On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.
- If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain. This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.
- ...Tribe will take such legal action as is necessary to protect the graves of its ancestors and our irreplaceable religious sites.
Mountain as Host (to events/people)

- Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.
- Because there’s a lot of prayers that have been done up there in our ancestors' time. They lived up there. There is that a lot of ceremonial dance, prayers, upholding a lot of our cultural ways and things that are up there.

Again, the question is raised as to whether this is figurative speech, an act of personification, or ontological categorization. Is conceptual metaphor at use here or are there deeper worldview issues being presented? Understanding Western Apache social practice, cosmological understandings, and discursive acts is necessary to tease this out. Goodwin’s work was rich in explanatory detail on Western Apache social and ‘religious’ practice. He uncovered social and kin relationships, how these operated, and the relational quality of Western Apache life. Historically, the Western Apache appeared to have a broad, differentiated, and generally horizontal ontological system. Persons were those beings who possessed sentience, intent, desire, breath, and movement (even if that movement was over centuries). Western Apache epistemological systems were rooted within this view of life—persons possessing agency acted within the world, sharing knowledge, and power (Goodwin Papers; Goodwin 1969). Goodwin also detailed the generative power of speech and the necessity to use care and restraint in discourse, “I think there must be something you have put in your words” (Anna Price in Goodwin 1969:331). Basso enlarged our knowledge of Western Apache sociality, detailing the strong discursive components of Western Apache social practice.
Metonymy was utilized often in such a way as to reinforce the notion of discourse as both generative and relational. To speak is to engage with others in the world and thus to be in that world.

*Who is the Pope anyway? The pope’s medicine is his mouth* (Stanley 1992b)

*I put out my voice.* (O. Davis 2006)

*We are hopeful that our voice is finally being heard. We have been pushed aside to build these telescopes. It is time that our religion was respected.* (O. Davis)

*...we need to assert ourselves and really start defending our ancestral homelands and making our voice be heard.* (W. Nosie 2010:63)

*We need to ensure that the Apache voice is finally heard in this process.* (O. Davis 1995)

**Discussion**

Discourse for the Apache is succinct and productive; it produces experience (Basso 1996: 32). If speech is both figurative and generative then these discursive expressions may be both metaphorical and actual; to speak is to bring into being. In the selections above, Dzil Nchaa Si An is consistently presented as a multi-dimensional living being. The mountain possesses power, knowledge, and agency. It also cares for and nurtures others while receiving gifts from these others; a mutual relationship. Metaphors appear to be used to convey these understandings. For example, the mountain as a human body appears to be metaphor but not that the mountain is corporeal in some sense. Metaphor is used to express ontological similarity; persons have bodies and these are similar to our human bodies.
This connects back to the linguistic analysis. Cognitive linguists generally assert that the categories of noun and verb reflect the structuring of reality (Kovecses 2002: 123). Things, objects and persons are linguistically coded in English as nouns while relationships and events are coded as verbs. This doesn’t appear to always be the case for the Western Apache individuals analyzed here. Classification is often inverted; things, objects and persons are verbs (in Western Apache) and are metaphorically represented as events and relationships in English. I find this concurrence, in Western Apache names linguistically coded as verbs, and metaphorical expressions which reference relationship between these same ‘things’ to indicate consistency in ontological conceptualization.

The same process appears in MOUNTAIN AS HOME. The entailments suggest that home is the metaphor used to express the nurturing, caring and sustaining qualities of the mountain who-is-person. HOME AS CHURCH (SACRED PLACE) is repeated over and over. Here we find a demonstration of the multi-dimensionality of place; at once home and person, physical site and relational being. The metaphorical expressions within these larger entailments reveal that MOUNTAIN AS HOME and MOUNTAIN AS CHURCH are facets of the ethical, relational behavior of the mountain; holding, sustaining, nurturing, and gifting others. We understand from these expressions that persons are those living beings who participate in a mutual relationship with others.

The traditional elders in the community who spoke publicly against the observatory consistently discuss Dzil Nchaa Si An as a person possessing these qualities, both with metaphor and more directly. Many of these elders were
practitioners of other religions also. Other Western Apache advocates expressed a more muted or mixed understanding of the mountain; less personal in character or more distanced and ‘Western’, though they often still expressed the notion that the mountain possessed power and agency.

The notion of power became subsumed under sacrality as the controversy progressed. How is sacrality understood? Is it another metaphorical mapping in an attempt to convey understanding? Many of the conceptual metaphors are similar to recognized Western metaphorical understandings. These mappings are not entirely coherent with Western understandings as Western Apache experience and culture incorporates multiple cultural understandings through time and place. As I have discussed earlier, Apache history is rife with imposed cultural and religious practices in an attempt to ‘civilize’ and render impotent Apache lifeways. (colonization, missionization, pacification). This experience continues today. Therefore, while metaphorical expressions may ‘fit’ into a Western conceptual schematic, many Western Apache understandings may vary considerably in practice, not only from Western conceptual understandings but also within the community.  

Metaphor analysis of Western Apache rhetoric reveals a complex set of understandings. While conceptual metaphors are apparent, often metaphorical expressions appear to be utilized to convey ontological and epistemological categories. These expressions do not imply abstract ideas rather they suggest

---

46 This research only analyzed those statements made publically and documented. Many Western Apaches did not speak and so their understandings were not accessible in the project.
categories of Apache reality. Too often this is characterized as personification or myth. Significant places are consistently described as multi-dimensional and an integral partners in Apache sociality. Dzil Nchaa Si An was consistently referred to as a community member, protector, provider, and teacher but also as a place of interaction with others. It is the relational field (Ingold 2000) that is so often referred to metaphorically while the ‘personhood’ of the mountain appears to be more directly conveyed.
Chapter 9

CONCLUSION

When Indian people look at the mountain, it is beautiful, but we don't see just the mountain. What we see is what is inside, the beautiful spirit, a living being which is inside that mountain which was placed for us by the Creator. Dzil nchaa si’ an is the home of our mountain spirit, our spiritual messengers who came to the Apaches. The mountain spirits appear at our most important ceremonies, the Na’I’ees, which makes women of our daughters and it (sic) healing ceremonies. When you harm the mountain, desecrate its summit, you are doing violence to a spiritual person who is alive. You're not just interfering with our beliefs or practices, but you are disturbing a powerful Apache spiritual messenger gaan who can destroy you or make you crazy. This supernatural being confers spiritual power on those chosen to become medicine men or women. To attack the gaan is the same as destroying Lourdes, or Fatima and the Virgin Mary when she appears as a messenger to those on earth. They are disturbing the spirits of our ancestors who are buried there in the mountain. We deeply respect the mountain and its life-giving force. The spring, the waters, the animals, the plants, the trees, the medicine plants, are all things we depend upon. We depend on the land as a part of our learning. All of these things are part of our values and we do not make the same separation between nature and the people which is found in the western traditions. To destroy our sacred places is to destroy us. My mother used to tell us that when the cloud hangs over the mountain halfway that it is trying to tell us that it will rain for long time. Rain is precious and life-giving in our desert land. Our religion is not like western religion. [Davis 1998]

This project focused on how Western Apache peoples understand their special places by examining the discourse during the Mount Graham International Observatory controversy. Discourse and metaphor analysis were analytical tools that allowed me to understand how many Western Apaches talk about their special places. The central question underlying this discursive examination was: Whether ontological and epistemological differences with regard to significant places are present or revealed in the public discourse between Western Apaches
and non-Apaches in the Mount Graham International Observatory controversy? Additional questions included (1) How do Western Apaches understand and operationalize their concepts of place? (2) What ontological and epistemological conceptualizations framed these understandings? and (3) Do differences in discourse patterns, if present, reveal fundamental cross-cultural misunderstandings in public discourse? To put it more simply, how do Western Apaches talk about their places and were their understandings of place adequately or convincingly expressed in the public discourse? This study found ontological and epistemological differences were present in many Western Apache statements that revealed that places, especially Dzil Nchaa Si An, are understood and experienced differently than most Western understandings. In particular the Western Apache statements understood to place to be multi-dimensional and participatory in interactions with the Apache. These differences were presented frequently in Western Apache discourse but observatory proponents did not appear to understand these as fundamentally distinct from their own conceptualizations. These findings will be discussed more fully in this chapter.

**Review**

Apache discourse cannot be removed from the social context in which it is embedded. It is “a social activity…and part of the equipment for living rather than merely a set of meanings embedded within texts and waiting to be
discovered. Bourdieu (1991) put forth the notion of social and discursive practices as neither homogenous nor bound; they do not occur within a vacuum but rather within particular social, historical, and political contexts. Bakhtin (1996:293) noted, “As a result of the work done by all these stratifying forces in language, there are no ‘neutral words or forms’ – words and forms that can belong to ‘no one’ language has been completely taken over, shot through with intensions and accents. For any individual consciousness living in it, language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world.” We know that place-making can be, in part, an intentional social act. For the Western Apache, discourse is an important part of this process. Basso has emphasized how social practices are tied to specific places and time is embedded in places through experience, history, and memory. While Western Apache peoples share many of the same experiences and understandings (historical and contemporary), difference is still present. In part this is because many Western Apache groups were removed from their homelands and confined to the San Carlos Reservation and to some extent the White Mountain Reservation as well. Individual differences coupled with distinct social and ‘religious’ practice also contribute to discursive and conceptual difference. This was present in the Mount Graham controversy, though published Western Apache discourse was dominated by those who opposed the observatory.

47 Cruikshank (1998) provides a sophisticated and complex discussion of the significance of narrative and discourse in northern Athapaskan peoples, linguistic cousins of the southern Athapaskan tribes.
Bourdieu (1991) has asserted that language wields symbolic power. Language imposition by colonizers is its own power play, one that dismisses authenticity and removes agency from the colonized. Forced conversion to another’s language imposes new ways of thinking, talking, and ultimately acting.\textsuperscript{48} As discussed previously, this imposition results in many of the inherent difficulties in cross-cultural translation of fundamental concepts. While many scholars have acknowledged this difficulty, we as Westerners often fail to fully appreciate the depth, variability, and complexity of Western Apache discourses regarding their places.

Theoretical approaches that remain within dualistic parameters are problematic. Utilizing approaches in place, language, and discourse that allow for multiplicity (extending beyond binary categories) allowed me to better understand how some Western Apaches talk about their special places. Avoiding boundedness in categorization and allowing for the possibility of sliding between and through multiple ontological ‘categories’ opened up clearer understandings. Additionally, discourse that proceeds from the notion of semantic potency presents meaning and conceptual assumptions differently than representative languages. Taking this into account made metaphor analysis more nuanced and allowed me to understand whether a statement might be metaphorical or an actual ontological category. This is difficult to do if we retain both our Western

\textsuperscript{48} For an excellent discussion on the subtle effects of reducción in the transformation of social practice, see William F. Hanks’ *Converting Words: Maya in the Age of the Cross*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010. Hanks argues that the indigenous peoples fuse and transform forced changes (via missionization and pacification) in practice and language in a myriad of ways, intentional and involuntary, which are too deep and subtle to attribute to current models of syncretism.
ontological categories and a strict conception of language as only representative of an external reality.

Basso (1996) had discussed both the descriptive nature of Southern Athapaskan naming and its social connectedness in his work with the Western Apache as discussed in previous chapters. Placenames describe a particular place (from a specific vantage point) while at the same time connecting Western Apache individuals to that place through stories (oral traditions and histories). These names reveal not only the emplaced and embodied character of Western Apache sociality; they reveal important conceptual assumptions and categories. This can be seen in the name of Dzil Nchaa Si An (one of four names for the mountain). Translated as Big Seated Mountain, it refers to the broad saddle-like morphology of the mountain. The name is also used to refer to historical narratives and Western Apache emplacement in the landscape. Naming the mountain also brings to the fore, personhood, relational qualities, and connection to Apache society (the remaining names may reference different qualities, narratives, and persons). Both Kari (2001) and Basso (1996) reinforce Witherspoon’s (1977) assertions concerning the generative power of language. Speech is movement and event; it is the performance of thought and ‘brings into being’ the nature of reality (Witherspoon 1977: 47-51). The intentionality of thought manifested through speech creates, connects, and transforms.

Paskvan (2011) has also noted the linguistic links between places and language. In particular she has found that for Northern Athapaskan peoples, places and their associated narratives provided a ‘cognitive map’ of tribal history.
This appears to hold true for most Athapaskan speaking peoples. Basso (1996) has previously noted that for the Western Apache places maintain and transmit both Apache history and ethics. While Athapaskan language forms rarely overtly referred to cosmography, cosmology is embedded within the landscape and customs. This fits with the succinct and restrained verbal style of Athapaskan speakers. Indeed, both Kari (2001) and Gary Holton’s (2011) discussions of Athapaskan language structures point to the significance of places within communal life. Placenames are both directly and indirectly referred to, intertwined to the extent that naming is not necessary to convey meaning. Stories and events immediately evoke the place and vice versa (Paskvan 2011: 269; Basso 1996). This connection does not disappear with a change in language. English speaking Western Apaches remain Western Apache. The question is if some conceptualizations are modified in this language shift.

There is a spatial disconnect between indigenous and Western linguistic representations and ontologies. English uses spatiality in its metaphors as mapping. This predisposes Anglo-Americans to understand any spatial reference as metaphorical in nature rather than actual. This impacts the perceived validity of Apache statements concerning Dzil Nehaa Si An (as well as underlying meanings). Western Apache statements that the mountain is a person and participatory partner in Apache identity and culture are often seen as either semantic attempts to convey importance (but not actual reality) or evidence of superstition and paganism. Western Apaches speaking in English aggravates this problem. English language structure tends to be abstract, impersonal and object-
oriented. Metaphors are seen as always representative and often reinforce this by mapping onto objects. In addition, the Western view of places as territory is a juridico-political concept, as well as a geographic one. Geography is central to colonialism and both geography and history are intimately tied to hegemonic processes and nationalistic discourses (see Foucault 1980: 68).

**Discussion of the Historical Record**

The examination of the historic record demonstrates a sustained and documented connection with the mountain. The historic presence is specific to two local groups (Eastern White Mountain and Aravaipa Apache) and a more general intermittent presence by other bands. Even within the confines of a Western documentary perspective we find multiple, repeated, specific citations detailing Apache residence and use of the Pinaleños, and Mount Graham in particular, through a time depth of several centuries. The documents also consistently characterize Apaches as mountain peoples in terms of residence, retreat from hostile encounters, and in cultural ties to mountains.

The archaeological record, though incomplete, also suggests a significant presence in the region that would bring into question our previously held assumptions regarding both the time of Apache arrival into the area and Apache residence. The issues of how residential sites are defined and how migration is understood and interpreted within the landscape complicate our understanding of the archaeological evidence. Site choice is often restricted to the dominant culture’s residential site definition and archaeological efforts are constrained to
those areas consistent with definitional parameters. As noted before, a village orientation skews data by not acknowledging temporary sites as valid residential sites. Additionally, if population markers are employed then small foraging groups are not considered to have a presence and their cultural ties to an area are overlooked. Structures with low archaeological visibility are either missed or discounted as non-significant. Seymour’s dating of Apache residential sites in the area from 1220 C. E., combined with other archaeological evidence suggesting Apache revisitation of high altitude shrines and the cotton cache site, support an earlier residential pattern in the region than previously documented. Given the predominant migration pattern attributed to the Apache (from the north and east), these sites in the southern and central portion of Arizona would suggest an earlier arrival date than the 1450 C. E. usually attributed to the Apache.

The more recent site studies conducted upon Mount Graham have been problematic. Brandt (1992) remarked on the inadequacy of cultural resource and archaeological surveys on the mountain and procedural missteps. More specifically with regard to the Mount Graham survey, Brandt (1992c) noted

1) missing sites which exist; 2) inadequate width of the survey areas; 3) impossible surveys or falsification of reports; 4) failure to follow Forest Service Cultural Resource Survey Guidelines; 5) inability to see the ground surface due to forest duff and litter, making survey[ing] inappropriate; 6) failure to do clearing, shovel testing, or other testing measures; 7) no archeological reports once ground disturbing activities commenced as required by the Arizona SHPO; 8) lack of any independent monitoring of the project once ground disturbing activities began.

Conclusions reached upon the basis of this data would be inherently suspect as the lack of data itself is not definitive. Understanding the documentary
evidence also requires that we recognize the power dynamics occurring at the
time and continuing today. Spanish and Anglo explorers and settlers employed
multiple methods of conquest and appropriation. The dearth of data validating
Western Apache residence can also be understood as political appropriation
through cultural contestation. In this case, Apache lands designated as ‘empty’
allowed for conquest through ‘re-naming’ and the taking of significant parts of
mineral rich Apache territory through Anglo settlement and executive orders.

Setha Low (2011) has discussed the significance of examining the
‘spatialization of culture’ for evidence of cultural conflict, contestation and
resistance encoded in places. The documentary record surrounding Western
Apache residence and homeland suggests as a process of exclusion in which
discursive practices reinforce power and reapportion space or places (Low
2011:391). Apache places were hidden under new designations that allowed
Spanish explorers to lay claim to the land and the people. What we do see in the
more recent data is use by multiple groups including the Western Apache, shrines
used by ancient peoples and reused by Apaches through time on the highest peaks
of Mount Graham, and evidence of Apache residence in mountains previously
thought uninhabited. The data and conclusions reached by Seymour (2008,
2009a, b) and others supports the written documentary history regarding Western
Apache residence in the area and corroborates the oral histories of the Western
Apaches.
Discussion of the Analysis

Ontological and epistemological differences concerning how places were understood were present in much of the Western Apache rhetoric concerning telescope construction. Because Western Apaches have experienced colonialization, missionization, and forced inculcation as a result of hegemonic processes and the American doctrine of Manifest Destiny, individuals presented a range of ontological understandings, though almost all the protestors centered upon the mountain as a cultural participant. The Western Apaches who publicly spoke in favor of the observatory did not present this view. This is not conceptual sliding per se but rather the individual differences present in all cultural groups based upon their own particular experience. Also, it was apparent that knowledge is differentially present within Apache communities. However there were remarkable similarities among individuals and through time. The analysis of Western Apache public statements during the controversy suggests several conclusions: (1) many Western Apaches experience their significant places as multi-dimensional participatory agents, (2) underlying this experience is a broadly differentiated ontology and a relational epistemology, (3) religion and sociality are not distinct spheres of behavior, and (4) communication of Western Apache concepts and concerns to Mount Graham International Observatory proponents was less than optimal.

49 The low numbers of Western Apache pro-observatory statements does not necessarily indicate that few individuals were in favor. As discussed previously, Western Apache individuals demonstrate restraint in voicing their opinions and often refrain from direct confrontation.
Mountain as Multidimensional Agent or Person

Ontological and epistemological differences were most prevalent when Western Apaches discussed the mountain specifically. Discourse, metaphor, and text analysis revealed that Dzil Nchaa Si An was consistently understood as a multi-dimensional agent, a living being, and a community member as well as a ‘place.’ Scripted and extemporaneous statements spoke of the mountain as a person of power, who mediated, protected, and provided for the Western Apache. Additionally, other significant places were discussed in much the same manner, suggesting that places interact with Apaches to guide sociality and maintain community viability and identity. The results of this analysis are displayed below. These understandings (of mountain and place) carried across multiple discursive contexts and speakers.

**Place as Person**
- as teacher
- as guardian – protector
- as interlocator – mediator
- as community participant

**Place as morally significant**
- as home to spiritual beings
- as conduit to powerful persons
- as providing spiritual health
- as ethical narrative/way of being
- as teaching ethical behavior
- as sacred
- as knowledge
- as providing sustenance

**Place as physical locality**
- as ritual site
- as scenic
- as habitat for animals, plants,
- as recreational site

**Place as community**
- as home
- as ritual center
- as preserving Apache identity
- as emotionally supportive
- as shared experience,
- as Apache sociality
- as encoded memory, events

**Place as knowledge**
- as cognitive map
- as encoded memory
- as encoded events
As shared experience
As narrative
As journey

The mountain was revealed to be culturally understood and experienced as sustaining. This sustenance was expressed in the mountain as a provider, protector, community member, physical entity, memoryscape, and in pilgrimage.

The mountain as a provider was discussed through the fertile and reproductive qualities the mountain possessed, a home to flora and fauna, and a hiding place that the Western Apache need to survive (physically and culturally). Dzil Nchaa Si An is revealed as a bringer of life. This concept is linked to the mountain as a source of water, via rainfall, streams and rivers, and clouds. There is also an implicit understanding, indirectly conveyed in several statements, that the mountain is cosmologically linked to menstruation in the Sunrise Ceremony. (see Goodwin Papers, Goodwin 1969). The notion of sustenance is also apparent in the mountain as home to ancestral persons and other beings. This sustains clan identities, reinforces historical land tenure, and provides social links, both ceremonial and narrative. These social links are both within and between Apache communities and persons, and also revealed in repeated statements emphasizing the mountain as an intercedent for prayer and communication with others.

Ontologically, we see that person and home are not diametrically opposed or rooted in subject – object binaries. The relational act of providing implies agency, sentience, and dialogue or communication, which are ontologically understood to be components of personhood.
The mountain was also understood as a protector, a guardian of both deceased and living beings. Multiple statements referred Dzil Nchaa Si An as a resting place of Western Apache ancestors. Western Apache ancestors both guide and protect community members. As we have seen in both the ethnohistorical chapters and in Western Apache statements, the mountain also provided hiding places historically for Apachean peoples, effectively guarding them from harm. Dzil Nchaa Si An is home to other guardians as well. Diyi and other powerful persons reside within and upon the mountain protecting life in general and Western Apache peoples in particular. While the roles of protector and provider appear closely related, Western Apaches distinguish between them in speech and text. This reinforces the notion of multi-dimensionality but also expresses the relational and ethical quality of Apache life; interactions with persons who support and sustain each other through relational acts.

Overlaying these two roles is that of the mountain as a community member. Involvement with the Western Apache enfolds persons into the community. Dzil Nchaa Si An is referred to as an ancestor to the Apache people, an elder with great power who serves as a mediator for the community. Again we see the notion of communal sustenance through ethical relationships with the mountain. A deeper examination reveals those characteristics that comprise communal identity: mutuality and sharing, service, interpersonal relationship, embodied and narrative knowledge, belonging, and respect. Ontological boundaries, vis à vis Western ontologies, do not appear to apply.
The mountain was occasionally discussed as a physical entity or natural force. This conceptualization fits more closely with a Western concept of place. More often than not however, Dzil Nchaa Si An as a physical place was discussed as a sacred site or ceremonial ground. It is difficult to tell what is meant by this as Apaches opposed to the telescopes repeatedly affirmed that religious behavior and sacrality were not separate (as Durkheim contended) from daily sociality. The statements suggests that place is more than objective physicality; place is event with all that is implied within an event—interaction, sociality, meaning, and occurrence.

Physicality appears to be a less strictly defined category, implying corporeality in some aspects. This corporeality is not mere flesh but rather the physical presence of persons or beings who interact with others. The Western Apache word for body, \textit{kits'í} or \textit{bits'í}, is always a possessive; \textit{his} or \textit{her} body rather than \textit{a} body (Bray 1998:229). The same prefix is used in the Western Apache word for descendent. While ambiguity is present, corporeality implies some measure of beingness or personhood. Not all places are understood as agentive beings or persons. This coincides with the notion of transformation, mutuality and engagement as components of personhood (Hallowell 1975; Black 1977; Ingold 2000) and the Western Apache conceptualization of inner and outer forms (Brandt 1996). Corporeality suggests individuality and ‘responsive relatedness’ (Bird-David 1999) in that these special places respond, perceive, and experience. Again this dovetails with the ontological understanding that persons relate to each other in sustaining or ethical ways. Cosmogonic and historical
narratives discuss beings who fail to behave in ethical or moral ways, incurring disaster or harm through their actions. Thus, while the mountain may be referred to as a physical site, it would be erroneous to assume that this fits with the Western notion of a physical substrate upon which humans overlay meaning.

The mountain is powerful, as a person, a force, and as a dwelling place for others, and these designations do not appear to be mutually exclusive. Power may be manifest in multiple ways that do not necessarily preclude ‘aliveness.’ The wind is a powerful force but also a being who moves through the world, bestowing gifts and danger (Goddard 1918; Goodwin Papers, Goodwin 1969; Basso 1996; Schwarz 1997; Clark 2001). Clouds, Wind, and Lightning are part of the mountain and beings in their own right (Brandt 1996). This ontological multiplicity is a function of possibility and emergence within the relationship. We manifest within our interactions, moving between roles depending on the context of our situation. This is not solely a function of humanity for many of the Western Apache.

The mountain as a memoryscape also embodies multiplicity. Place for the Western Apaches can be an event, a life journey, and embodied knowledge in this dimension. Basso (1996:71-104) has discussed this aspect of some Western Apache placenames and the discourse examined in this project suggests that this aspect of places still remains a vital component of Apache sociality. For the Western Apache life is a journey through time and within places or, more accurately, time is a journey through places. Historical change is experienced as movement within the landscape (Basso 1996; Ingold 2000, 2011). Time is
embodied and emplaced through experience and narrative. This is a collective form of knowledge that underpins much of Western Apache identity.

Memoryscapes ‘sediment’ history; history is embedded in places and discursive performance. This may be understood by the Western Apache as an example of intentionality on the part of the mountain and the Apache people. This sedimentation implies relationship between the mountain and the Apache through time. We must be careful not to subsume our understanding of memoryscape within the Western paradigm. There appears to be the willful memorialization of events in some instances but there also is the discursive and performative experience of Western Apache history within and through places. Samuels (2004:39) discusses this circularity of discursive performance (as opposed to our linear recounting of history) as transformative.

This notion of movement within and among places is also understood in discussions of Dzil Nchaa Si An as a place of pilgrimage. Not only is the mountain a ceremonial place but pilgrimage implies travel to ritually engage in a place; movement and experience within the Apache landscape. Our binary notions of physical – mental and physical – spiritual complicate the notion of pilgrimage. Pilgrimage in Western traditions implies spiritual enlightenment or engagement, distinct from secular issues (Astor-Aguilera 2008). Elders discussed pilgrimages to Dzil Nchaa Si An for ‘spiritual’ knowledge but also for training themselves and the young in matters which would transcend our notion of ‘spiritual.’ The Mount Graham Sacred Run is an example of this. The Run reinforces ‘religious’ behavior but also identity and history. Western Apaches were acclaimed runners.
historically; they journeyed through their homeland, and cemented ties with places through their presence, narrative, and movement. Additionally, pilgrimage is not always a physical movement or journey (in the Western sense) to the mountain but may include dreaming, vision quests, and evoking or engaging the mountain through rituals performed at the reservation.

**Relational Epistemology**

Analysis in this project suggests that many Western Apaches understand and experience the world through a broadly differentiated ontological field which may at times display verticality but is not necessarily hierarchical in structure. Persons are ‘discovered,’ or more specifically, they emerge through interactions with beings who enter into mutual relationship with the Apache. These persons may have more power than Apache individuals or merely different power. Statements concerning Mount Graham repeatedly stressed the agency of the mountain and other beings who exist within these relationships. What is apparent is that persons exist in a state of mutuality; the mountain needs Apache ceremonies, ‘prayers,’ songs, relationships, and protection to survive. Several Western Apaches specifically mention that the loss of this relationship will spell doom for the mountain and the Apache. This broad inclusive ontology is intertwined with a relational epistemology; without ethical mutual relationships, persons cannot survive and prosper. The give and take of knowledge, as mutual relationship, is a complex social contract that sustains the Western Apache world. If knowledge is emplaced and embodied then loss of place is both the erasure of
memory and knowledge, and the death of a relationship; loss of kin and cultural
death. Ingold (2011) has asserted that knowledge is not so much emplaced as
emerging within these relationships and the act of engagement and the inability to
relate then results in loss. Many Western Apaches attempted to convey this loss in
the rhetoric quoted within this thesis as pertaining to the Mount Graham
controversy.

Western paradigms often conceive of place as enclosed spaces upon which
culture, memory, and emotion are overlaid. Ingold describes this enterprise as
occupying place rather than inhabiting it (2011: 147). Places, in these
perspectives, are still surfaces upon which human beings inscribe meaning.
Previous ethnographic research demonstrates that places may be more than
territory or specific landforms for some peoples. Places may have agency and
power; they are at once creative and created. For Native Americans, place and
persons have their own powers, which can be perceived by humans. Rather than a
physical objective constant, place emerges relationally though interaction with
others; meaningful modes of dwelling in which relations with living beings are
maintained and nurtured. This concept of place does not subscribe to the notion of
nature as separate from culture, which is often prevalent in Western theoretical
models.50

50 There is an extensive literature on the various traditions and theoretical models used by scholars
to understand other peoples’ diverse concepts and constructions of place. In many local models,
nature and culture do not adhere to a strict dichotomy as evidenced in Western industrialized
worldviews. Political ecologists, humanist geographers, and ecological anthropologists have
argued that for many Third World peoples, local knowledge and local models of ‘nature’ and
‘place’ are constructed within a worldview encompassing flow and continuity between
biophysical, human, and supernatural ontological categories. See, Edward Casey, “Body, Self,
and Landscape,” Textures of Place: Exploring Humanist Geographies, P.C. Adams, ed.
This difference was apparent in many of the statements made by Western Apache elders and tribal officials. The Western Apache discourse surrounding the issue of the Mount Graham International Observatory installation was based within a larger social framework—one rooted in basic normative assumptions that rest upon the notion that all social behavior is based upon relatedness and ethical behavior. Dzil Nchaa Si An, one of four mountain chiefs, is a central source of knowledge, protection, and cultural integrity for the Western Apache people and is understood as an embodied, intentional participant who exists through space and time. Moreover, despite a pronounced legalistic and distanced rhetoric from observatory partners in the public forum, Western Apache discourse remained centered within an ethical, relational format. Despite the use of English, a traditional cultural stance was retained on the part of the most of the Apaches opposed to the observatory throughout the myriad of public venues. Deviations from this discursive form and content were found primarily when non-Apache consultants or partners were responsible for public statements.

**Religion and Sociality**

Analysis also demonstrated that religion and social behavior were not recognized as distinct and separate spheres of behavior. This fits conceptually with an inclusive ontology and relational epistemology that leads us to

---

acknowledge that we do not completely understand the nature of Western Apache ‘religious’ behavior. Discourse and metaphor analysis of Apache statements consistently found discursive connections made between everyday Western Apache sociality and culture and ‘religious’ or ‘spiritual’ practice and the mountain. Medicine people and elders were specific and insistent on the lack of separation between these spheres of behavior (Stanley 1992b). Western Apache conceptualizations of ‘sacred’ and ‘holy’ were particularly problematic. These concepts were incompletely drawn out in the rhetoric. In part, this was due to the restricted nature of the knowledge. However many individuals, particularly those who were involved in both Christian and traditional Apache practices, displayed at least some hybridity or perhaps conceptual slippage in their statements. An example of this taken from Goodwin’s papers highlights some of the problems. Diy'i was translated by one consultant as ancestor, while a different consultant (at a later date) translated the word as devil. This may have been an example of hybridity but might also indicate individual differences in knowledge, a masking of important knowledge, or the difficulty in translating a complex concept. Devil may have been used synonymously with ancestor at the time, in part due to Christian concerns with Apache notions of embodied power who, when treated with disrespect, "may retaliate by causing the offender to become sick.” (Basso 1970: 224, 1992). The current word for evil spirit in Western Apache, ch'iin, is also translated as ghost (Bray 1998:61).

During the controversy, the use of English appeared to frustrate many of the elders who complained that the English language was too broad and imprecise
to convey understanding. This was coupled with statements that emphasized traditional Western Apache as practice-centered rather than belief-centered, making understanding in another cultural frame difficult (Stanley 1992b, d). This wasn’t unexpected but made the analysis process difficult and more necessary. Interestingly, in 2010, the Native American tribes of the Southwest held a Sacred Lands Summit and these concepts were discussed. The statement below by Vincent Randall, a Yavapai Apache, offers some illumination.

“Holy is a place where there’s an interaction with the Almighty...It is a holy place. Sacred place is something like Gettysburg where people have died. I don’t dishonor that, but there is a difference between sacred and holy...We’re talking about holy places, we’re not talking about sacred. Sacred can also be the place where the airplanes knocked down the two buildings in New York. We all know that place. It’s a sacred place but it’s not something that is spiritual above all things, all things happen.”

[Randall 2010:66-7]

This differentiation between sacred and holy emphasizes the behavioral aspect of Western Apache sociality and ‘religious’ acts. We see connection with significant places and relationship with those places as intentional agents. Holy is characterized as intentionality and engagement while sacred appears to be those places which do not interact with others—where events have occurred (without input from the place). This interconnectedness is precisely the reason land loss is so devastating to the Western Apache (and many other indigenous peoples), loss of places directly leads to loss of relationship, knowledge, and identity.
Communicative Disjuncture

The discourse surrounding the Mount Graham controversy provides a mechanism to understand how Apache discourse links past and present practices and identity. Using discourse and text analysis, this dissertation examined the manner in which Western Apaches opposed to the observatory conveyed their understandings of their places to non-Apache individuals and groups. In so doing, cultural differences were found to impact the basic conversational structure of that dialogue and reveal intriguing glimpses into the maintenance and continuity of Apache sociality and place.

Analysis revealed that basic content and thematics remained remarkably steady throughout the controversy: Dzil Nchaa Si An is a mountain of immense importance to the community viability and identity of many of the Western Apache. Despite the large number and variety of speakers, varied discursive types, and situational contexts, Western Apache speakers expressed themselves in similar ways. Contextual differences were most apparent when elders were deposed in a closed session. In this setting, elders were somewhat more forthcoming regarding knowledge of the mountain, though specific knowledge remained restricted. The other situational context that changed the style, if not the content, of the rhetoric was the clearing and construction event on the summit by the observatory partners that was later ruled as illegal. After this event, certain Western Apache speakers became increasingly strident in tone and more direct in their confrontation of telescope proponents. Religious language increased though content and theme remained the same.
This discursive consistency suggests both continuity and agency on the part of the Western Apache. Past and present were repeatedly brought into co-presence through narrative, sentence structure, and the performative aspects of speech and rhetoric. As previously discussed, narratives (in many forms) were historically an important form of both communication and community identity and maintenance for the Western Apache (Goodwin 1969; Basso 1990, 1996). Throughout the controversy, Western Apache individuals and groups continued to utilize narratives and narrative structure to convey information and to form and maintain community bonds. Grammatical structure and choice, while in the English idiom, retained much of the Western Apache grammatical structure; an emphasis on verbs and hence action, open-ended statements, and a succinct style. This suggests a way of thinking about and being in the world that does not fit neatly into the Western perspective or the English language (with its underlying assumptions). Elders continued to retain both authority and important knowledge. These patterns suggest that Western Apaches are intentional agents rather than passive victims who maintain deep connections with their historical past, places, and cultural lifeways. These lifeways are by no means static but rather evolving as Western Apaches attempt to meet and overcome the many devastating effects of American power and culture.

While cultural continuity was suggested through Western Apache discourse and rhetoric, so also was communicative disjuncture. This disjuncture, however, was perhaps as much a function of hegemonic processes as it was differing worldviews. The disconnect between Apache statements and meanings
and the telescope proponents’ understanding appears to be both political and paradigmatic. Observatory partners consistently dismissed the validity of Western Apache claims. There were obvious legal and political advantages in this strategy, based within the larger frame of expansion, development, and hegemony. Proponents consistently attempted to control the tone, content, and meaning of the rhetoric in an attempt to push forward their agenda. When elders attempted to speak of their concerns, these were either refuted directly or were sidestepped through legislation and statements which promised continued access to the mountain, while retaining control. In this sense, telescope proponents adhered to a policy that treated the mountain as property within the government purview and Western Apache practice as a belief-based religion. Communicative disjunctures were manifested through redirection, lack of understanding, lack of access to observatory officials, direct refutation of Apache claims by University of Arizona scholars, and minimal direct interaction with Western Apache individuals and groups.

However, a subtler communicative disjuncture was evident which appeared rooted in the underlying paradigmatic differences. Western Apache individuals complained that observatory partners appeared indifferent, ignored or mocked important elders’ statements, especially in the rare joint public forums which did occur. There is a marked difference in Western understandings of public information sessions and Western Apache communal gatherings. While mocking is not considered appropriate in either forum, non-Apache observatory proponents probably did not appreciate the serious nature or the authority of
elders in an Apache gathering. Another example of this disjuncture can be seen in the frequent attempts made to re-form, compare, and translate Apache understandings of the mountain into a form that was more consistent with major world religions. Western Apaches often expressed frustration both with the difficulty of conveying their meanings or concerns and with the inability of proponents to understand those concerns. Perhaps the most significant communicative disjuncture is the difficulty of conveying the difference between a practice-based worldview and a belief-centered religion. It is obvious that proponents did not appreciate or acknowledge this difference and that Western Apaches speaking in opposition to the telescopes felt frustrated in their attempts.

**Concluding Remarks**

A dynamic theory of place is critical in understanding non-Western conceptualizations of place. Theories of place that remain rooted in either social constructionism or phenomenology fall short of Western Apache reality. I contend that a dynamic theory allows for the possibility of multiplicity (in agents, interactions, perceptions, relationships) but does not presuppose the character of those interactions in the apprehension of place. Understanding the complex connections which language and discourse present as both social action and in presenting ontological and epistemological assumptions was a key component in this project. How we conceptualize place and then convey our understanding must be critically examined with an eye toward our own preconceptions. A Western perspective may truncate understanding by unintentionally re-categorizing key
assumptions within the Western frame. Yet most of the discourse regarding places occurs in languages rooted in this frame.

Western Apache discourse within the controversy revealed the mountain as a participatory partner in Western Apache sociality, identity, and cultural continuity. The notion of mutuality and agency appears to fit best with a dynamic framework of places and landscape, emphasizing the relational aspects of moving and dwelling with(in) places. Places are relationally experienced in an ongoing process of emergence or unfolding within a relational field. This is similar to what Ingold terms ‘wayfaring’ (2011: 143). Landscape is an articulated field of social relations, a place of epistemic activity. Essentially landscapes and places encompass practices within and with places and result in knowledge-making. Knowledge is not preexisting (even within the mountain) but unfolds along relational paths of occurrence (rather than existence). This implies an active process with and through places as co-occurring entities rather than the Western emphasis on containers and closed environments that hold knowledge until extracted.  

In this way knowledge transforms rather than transfers (Ingold 2011:143). This complicates the mind – body dichotomy. There is a reciprocal relationship or a tacking back and forth between ontology and epistemology in which perception makes the world real. Discourse maintains the relational reality. This fits with metaphors that emphasize personal connection and qualities rather than container or object-focused entailments.

51 We see this object-centered approach in practice throughout the Americas. Places are inanimate and therefore mitigation or even destruction of a site (place) is acceptable once information or resources have been extracted.
How you gain knowledge is as important as what that knowledge is. This is evidenced by an understanding that the world and changes within the world are due to human interaction not human action (Basso 1996; Cruikshank 2005:4; Fienup-Riordan 2011). Restoration and maintenance of right relationships is necessary for the continuation of the Western Apache world. Knowledge is contingent, expansive, and open-ended—individualistic action informed by collective knowledge. As Basso (1996) has pointed out, Western Apache places and identity are maintained discursively. This same mechanism is apparent within the public rhetoric of this controversy. Western Apache identity and places are reforged and maintained through the public discourse of Apache participants. Moreover, this discourse exhibited both inclusive and divisive elements; bringing distinct Western Apache groups into a more coherent whole and fracturing other social bonds. Western Apaches are active agents in their own cultural systems. They decide, select, and promote which ideas, behaviors, and relationships should be pursued, modified or discarded. Cultural continuity is maintained through discursive acts that bring the past into the present, through the establishment of relationships and the bestowing of knowledge.

The rhetorical framing of the controversy by observatory partners, news reports, and Federal agencies remained embedded in the descriptive notion of place as a physical substrate upon which human action and meaning were overlaid. Sacrality, holiness, and belief were framed as products of Apache social behavior that could be easily transferred to other locations. According to some Western Apache, the emplacement of the Mount Graham International
Observatory is essentially a re-colonization; a claiming of land at the expense of a people who have long held cultural ties to the landscape. This occurred in several ways. First, Native American claims to the land were disputed and invalidated. This was asserted through both scholarly testimonials and through a legal system based upon the hegemonic concept of Manifest Destiny that limited Apache claims both temporally and spatially. Claims could be made only within a particular time frame (laches) and those claims were circumscribed within an area designated by non-Apaches and essentially confined to the reservation. Secondly, telescope proponents set about naming the development using Western designations, thus claiming the area on the topmost peak as telescope property. At one point, in a move that was consistent with re-colonization, the large binocular scope was touted as the Columbus Telescope, sparking criticism that resulted in observatory officials quickly renaming the telescope. Thirdly, access to the mountain was restricted for non-observatory personnel. The observatory grounds (now property of the Mount Graham International Observatory and named accordingly) were off-limits and other parts of the mountain severely restricted. Apaches were required to apply for a permit to conduct ceremonies, gather plants, pray, etc. Wendsler Nosie was arrested on the mountain after attempting to prepare for his daughter’s Sunrise Ceremony. Finally, United States law did not recognize or support Western Apache religious practice, essentially denigrating their cultural practices as less than valid. Though religious freedom, sacrality, and practice were highlighted throughout the controversy, United States government policies effectively made this a moot point. Indeed, as Western
Apache individuals began to utilize religious language and the frame of constitutional rights to religious freedom in their objections to the telescopes, telescope proponents ceased to argue on religious grounds, emphasizing property rights and economic issues. Legally and politically, land remains the property of only one sovereign government, the United States. Secular authority holds priority and religious practice may not interfere with that function.

Spatial orientation is a form of power when used to define and regulate others. Place and placial orientations are relational engagements. By defining the rhetorical spaces and Western Apache places within a Western frame, telescope proponents effectively destroyed much of the Western Apache relationship and connection to the mountain. If we realize that the Western Apache people are their relations (with places, persons, narratives, etc), then we understand that in essence this is a type of cultural death for the Western Apache (Basso 1996; Ingold 2011:70).

‘Writing research’ requires an endpoint though the actual project or research may be ongoing. Such is the case in this instance. Many Western Apaches continue to struggle in their efforts to protect their mountain and to maintain their cultural integrity. Though much of the public rhetoric concerning the Mount Graham International Observatory project has died down, Western Apaches and other Native American peoples continue to struggle to be heard, both behind the ‘scenes’ and in smaller public forums.

Comprehending the significance of place-based discourse is essential to understanding many of the contemporary difficulties facing Native American
peoples, especially with respect to contested places and lands. Culture is enacted and embodied through discursive and social practices. This remains true whether the language is Western Apache or English. Language loss for many Native American peoples is a on-going problem which has significant impact on cultural practice and continuity (Kroskrity and Field 2009:3). As more Native Americans’ primary language becomes English, we need to be cognisant of how we understand key conceptualizations. This project is a key step in the ongoing process of cross-cultural understanding. While the legal and economic realities have been examined in multiple ‘sacred site’ controversies, how culture-specific meanings are represented and recast into a multi-cultural arena is as important. The current approach to explain Native American understandings still tends to reflect Western cultures as the normative cultures of reference.

The impacts of this extend beyond the Mt. Graham controversy. The discourse surrounding these issues is framed within the national debate regarding cultural significance and bears directly upon the success of other preservation efforts. A clearer understanding of the underlying ontological and epistemological components involved in place construction, and how these understandings are publicly conveyed will have real world effects for other Native American, or non-Western peoples. Traditional cultural places are intimately tied to social practice, traditional knowledge systems, identity, and cultural viability. Communicative disjunctures impact the effective responses of Native American and other diverse groups. Understanding the manner in which Apache discourse links to past practices and identity can be helpful in demonstrating cultural continuity and
authenticity. This project is an attempt to examine the role of discourse in conveying basic, crucial cultural understandings of Apache places as well as how discourse reveals Apache cultural norms and practices, sustains cultural integrity, and creates and maintains participatory relations with Apache places.
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Zolbrod, Paul
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apache culture</strong></td>
<td>and heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and land as tied together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the U.S. government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apaches as experts on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assault upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preservation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cultural other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and differentiation from-using 'we, us, our'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cultural relationship and values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extending beyond death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>burial grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>centrality of mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destruction of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional way of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveys of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as generative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contradictory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique-restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>displayed in text</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sarcasm, irony</td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong language</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>critical habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ecological significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethical considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allegiance for sale</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and consequences of unethical behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrogance and contempt as unethical acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avoidance of confrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>behavior displayed</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bravery</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equivocation, by-passing rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fighting for cultural values,</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>customs, honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forgiveness for unethical acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genocide as unethical act or</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gifting</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gratitude &amp; thanks</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modesty, humility</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral behavior as a path</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overt accusations concerning</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>power used unethically</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the Creator</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the government, court</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the Vatican, Pope</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>respectful behavior as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service to others</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and selfishness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm or injury</td>
<td>desecration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>harming</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imposition of will upon another</td>
<td></td>
<td>395</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protection from</td>
<td></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to public image</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeland</td>
<td>Apache’s original homeland</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cherished feature</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spirit dancers, gaan</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>ancestral</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and dreams</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as an ethical relationship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extending beyond death</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>death</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>embedded in landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>memory</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of truth of Apache relationship to mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by proponents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a road or path</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as gateway to another realm, connected to</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as sacred</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gan living in or on mountain, mountain as outer form</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain as church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature-culture-supernatural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oral traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orality vs. written text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal relationship-communal connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personhood</td>
<td>and animacy of plants, rocks, animals</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apache as tied to land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a living being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as community member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as nurturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as protecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as providing knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mountain as a whole, body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of extra-terrestrial aliens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suffering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested through grammatical structure-choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>reality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as experiential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as verifiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Western paradigm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as physical and objective</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relationship with the</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mountain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as source of Apache way of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mountain spirits-Gaan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the first amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ceremony and prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as generative</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>destruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EuroAmerican perceptions &amp; framing of other religions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fear and ridicule of Apache practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power</td>
<td>tampering with God's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious intolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual leaders as</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theological aspects of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visions, revelations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion and culture as</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inseparable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrality</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with Western acts</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as expressed externally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>created through human action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with reference to Western ideas, concerns, opinions</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having a universal nature</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imbedded in the mountain</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>sacred sites</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cultural &amp; historical significance</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>destruction of</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foundation of community, cultural, spiritual relationships, identity</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>physical &amp; spiritual integrity of</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sources of health</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>science</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and human values</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>self-referential</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Subtheme</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sovereignty</td>
<td></td>
<td>tribal interests</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual relationship with the mountain</td>
<td>profoundly sacred places</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spiritual relationship with the mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>without boundaries-nonlinear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth</td>
<td></td>
<td>scholarly endeavors as ultimate truth</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suppress the truth about us Apaches and our sacred mountain.</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universe</td>
<td></td>
<td>as sacred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
METAPHOR ANALYSIS TABLE\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{52} This is an abbreviated version of the analysis sheets done in this dissertation. The entire analysis is too large and unwieldy to present.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Speaker/Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT. AS PERSON</td>
<td>corporeal body</td>
<td>Mt as arm, leg</td>
<td>If you desecrate Mount Graham it is like cutting off an arm or a leg of the Apache people.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So what we believe is that the mountain spirit are still in there, the spirit are still around yet, and when the mountain is disturbed they are disturbed too. They really need our help to stop the telescope because they really are disturbed. It is like you're going to tear off a person's arm, or a part of their body, it hurts. That's the way they are hurting today, us Apache and those mountains.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us...</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[telescope construction] is a blemish on what is supposed to be the work of our great spirit</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is the chief, the most important sacred mountain. Mount Graham must be treated with the greatest respect.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nowhere else in this world stands another mountain like the mountain that you are trying to disturb. On this mountain is great life giving force.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.</td>
<td>H. Kenton 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dzil Nchaa Si An is presently being desecrated and harmed by the cutting of ancient forest, digging, and road construction…</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we Apache would respectfully urge this body of the United Nations to recognize and acknowledge that the disrespect and suffering caused by the nations and governments…</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To destroy our sacred places is to destroy us.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…this mountain should not be disturbed for research or commercial purposes.</td>
<td>D. Massey 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“….we have to continue our prayers so the mountain can heal.”</td>
<td>M. Nosie 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Those terrible wounds must be healed so our prayers will no longer be interfered with.”</td>
<td>O. Davis 2001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“They cause real pain to our mountain with their telescopes and powerline.”</td>
<td>O. Davis 2001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, we have a sacred mountain in four directions. We make sure--they're listening--that your voices will be heard in the proper place.</td>
<td>R. Lupe 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provider</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Graham is a unique mountain, which cares for special animals and continues to replenish the medicine herbs used for different ailments.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain. This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain gives us life giving plants and healing.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They go there to receive all the gifts so that the culture can continue.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1991b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain itself protects the Apache from illness as well as enemies. It is the source of power to medicine men and women and defines as well as defends the lands of the Apache.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1994b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Graham is a unique mountain, which cares for special animals and continues to replenish the medicine herbs used for different ailments.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They are disturbing the spirits of our ancestors who are buried there in the mountain. We deeply respect the mountain and its life-giving force. The springs, the waters, the animals, the plants, the trees, the medicine plants, are all things we depend upon. We depend on the land as a part of our learning. All of these things are part of our values and we do not make the same separation between nature and the people which is found in the western traditions.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My mother used to tell us that when the cloud hangs over the mountain halfway that it is trying to tell us that it will rain for a long time. Rain is precious and life-giving in our desert land.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When we survived this holocaust, because of the</td>
<td>M. Davis 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain is rumbling. The spirit is moving.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since time immemorial, Mt. Graham has been sacred to the Apache. It is the spring of our life and the protector of our existence.”</td>
<td>H. Talgo 1994 &amp; SCAT 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guardian</td>
<td></td>
<td>My mother told me that Mount Graham is one of the sacred mountains, one of the four chief mountains… Because of Springs… Herbs… Crown Dancers, and other power… They and the stars guide us.</td>
<td>R. Riley 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mediator</td>
<td></td>
<td>We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.</td>
<td>R. Riley 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My grandparents used to call down the Mountain Spirits for traditional healing ceremonies. That mountain is our identity.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain leads the prayers into God's presence.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community member</td>
<td>Mt. as Apache people</td>
<td>Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The White Mountain Apache Tribal Council has insisted upon full and unbiased recognition of the central importance that Dzil Nchaa Si An has in Apache Culture and History. If you are willing to understand the lessons from our culture and history then the University of Virginia (Minnesota) will avoid any and all association with the telescope project, thus avoiding additional damage to Apache people, and Apache culture, and our sacred mountain.</td>
<td>D. Massey 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Apaches and Dzil Nchaa Si An are waiting.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metonymy</td>
<td>Mount Graham has been a part of the part, and a center of the Apache people.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>our mountain, our Sacred Mountain, our Mountain</td>
<td>multiple statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elder</td>
<td></td>
<td>She was on a venture to save what was left of Mount Graham, the sacredness and holiness of the prayers, dances and ceremonies which were once held since time began for the Apaches until now.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ancestor</td>
<td></td>
<td>The telescopes disrupt the spiritual life of the mountain for the mountain and for the traditional Apache.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our ancestors are up there, looking down on us.</td>
<td>R. Lupe 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can hear trees rumbling sometimes and yet there's nobody there. I see yelling and screaming sometimes when I walk the forests, horses, gunfire. And I think somebody's trying to remind me that get your warriors together, start fighting again…The sounds of the drums, the bells that you hear, yet there's no one around. Some seemed to have touched you. The wind seemed to have moved you.</td>
<td>R. Lupe 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So when we say it’s our mound, we mean it’s everybody’s mound, it’s everybody’s spirit.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1997a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Their spirit is inside of that mountain. These are the things that we know through the medicine men such as Franklin Stanley Sr., who is a spiritual leader for us. They said it is there, still alive as it was before, so these are very true things that we believe in, us Apache, and this is why we don't want the telescopes up there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The &quot;gaan&quot; live on Mount Graham. Mount Graham is one of the most sacred mountains. The mountain is holy. It was holy people before any people came, and in the mountain lives a greater spirit.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gan was created and they were holy medicine men that lived on this earth to teach sacred things to Apaches and then they left to of these mountains and live there today.</td>
<td>H. Kenton 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When Indian people look at the mountain, it is beautiful, but we don’t see just the mountain. What we see is what is inside, the beautiful spirit, a living being which is inside that mountain which was placed for us by the creator. Dzil nchaa si’an is the home of our mountain spirit, our spiritual messenger who came to the Apaches.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having power</td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain spirits appear at our most important ceremonies, the Na’i’ees, which makes women of our daughters and at healing ceremonies. When you harm the mountain, desecrate its summit, you are doing violence to a spiritual person who is alive. You are not just interfering with our belief or our practices, but you are disturbing a powerful Apache spiritual messenger gaan who can destroy you or make you crazy. This supernatural being confers spiritual power on those chosen to become medicine men or women.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To attack the gaan is the same as destroying Lourdes, or Fatima and the Virgin Mary when she appears as a messenger to those on earth.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham holds many religious ceremonial secrets central to our spiritual and religious way of life.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The telescopes also interfere with the guidance the mountain gives us.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they are built traditional Apache who learn from the mountain won't be able to see what to do, we won't know what to do or learn what we need to learn through revelations and our prophecies. It will destroy our spiritual way of life.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Dzil nchaa si an is the central source of spiritual guidance, sacred geography for the Apache people, and a path by which prayers travel to the heavens.</td>
<td>1999 Tribal Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mount Graham) in Arizona is a central source and means of sacred spiritual guidance</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT. AS HOME</td>
<td>hiding place</td>
<td>A homeland to our Gan, our Mountain Spirit Dancers, Dzil Nchaa Si An has given guidance, strength, knowledge and direction to our Apache people for centuries and shall continue to do so until the end of time.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provider, teacher</td>
<td>If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain. This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>providing sustenance</td>
<td>On Mount Graham, there is also sacred waters that feed the life of these holy mountains.</td>
<td>H. Kenton 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>home to flora/fauna</td>
<td>The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fertile</td>
<td>It is home to 18 endemic plants, mammals and insects including the Mt. Graham red squirrel, a federally listed endangered species, whose habitat is the 615 acres of remaining old-growth spruce-fir habitat where the telescopes are being built.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1994b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ancestors</td>
<td>Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Mount Graham, when you go deep in thought, you hear your forefathers, you feel the spirit.</td>
<td>J. Hoffman 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source of water, life</td>
<td></td>
<td>among us lives a person who knows about the healing plants and heals people who live in the Valley using the healing herbs that have been gathered on Mount Graham, plants that exists there and are found nowhere else.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When our prayers are answered we see the water come. There is life giving waters on the mountain. The rain that comes sprinkles everyone even in the Valley and blesses everyone.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gan, Mountain Spirits</td>
<td>Mount Graham is home to our spiritual messengers, gaan, known as Crown Dancers. These mountains spirits provide the very essence of Apaches spiritual life-past, present and future.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Graham is also home to the Ga’an, Apache mountain spirits, who give their power to the Apache crown dancers in ceremonies on Mt. Graham.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1994b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is home to our Apache Mountain Spirit Dancers and it is a place that is sacred to my people.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1997b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A homeland to our Gan, our Mountain Spirit Dancers, Dzil Nchaa Si An has given guidance, strength, knowledge and direction to our Apache people for centuries and shall continue to do so until the end of time.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is also the home of our Gaan people, and that's where the Gaan people, spirit to our medicine people call on them.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Graham is the home of our Angels, the Gahn, which are the same as those angels in other religions.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT. AS CHURCH</td>
<td>home to spirits</td>
<td></td>
<td>....the Apache Mountain Spirit Dancers, or Gaahn, which dwell in most sacred mountains such as Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mt. Graham), are present at this ceremony. The Gaahn bring the gift, power and blessings of our Apache way to Apache womanhood.</td>
<td>San Carlos Tribal Resolution 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Graham</td>
<td>Mt. Graham is the home of our Angels, the Gahn</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is the home of the gaan, our Crown Dancers. It is closer to the sky, so you can reach up to God.</td>
<td>M. Nosie 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the crowndancers considered Mount Graham as one of their havens,</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The &quot;gaan&quot; live on Mount Graham. Mount Graham is one of the most sacred mountains. The mountain is holy. It was holy people before any people came, and in the mountain lives a greater spirit.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ceremonial site</td>
<td></td>
<td>We had a holyground up there too, we would start praying up there whenever we needed some help, we needed some strong prayers. We'd go up there and we'd pray there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why do you come and try to take my church away and treat the mountain as if it was about money instead of respect?</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These sacred mountains are like our church to us and we respect them as whitemen respect their churches and we do not destroy our churches, they should respect our churches and not destroy them.</td>
<td>H. Kenton 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Dzil nchaa si an is the central source of spiritual guidance, sacred geography for the Apache people, and a path by which prayers travel to the heavens,</td>
<td>1999 Tribal Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is like a State Highway Department notifying the City government of a new road and not telling the members of a Church that the church is about to be destroyed! And then talking to church members too late for them to suggest changes in the location of the road!</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1994a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our lands, which include our sacred places are no less important than a church is to others.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduit for prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td>We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.</td>
<td>R. Riley 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For the traditional spiritual Apache who live in the Valley the mountain is the road the Almighty. It is a gateway.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We pray to the mountain. The gods speak to us from the mountain. We worship on the mountain. The mountain is part of spiritual knowledge that is revealed to us.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Dzil nchaa si an is the central source of spiritual guidance, sacred geography for the Apache people, and a path by which prayers travel to the heavens,</td>
<td>1999 Tribal Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our prayers go through the mountain, to and through the top of the mountain.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The construction would be very detrimental because our prayers would not travel their road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The &quot;Almighty&quot; is the Ruler of Life. To reach the Almighty the prayers go up through the mountain and passes through the top. If you build the telescopes on the top it would be like damning a river, a spiritual river. The telescopes will be holding back all of our prayers. The telescopes block the gateway into the next realm.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain. This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They are destroying our religious ground on the mountain. Visitors will trample on the mountain top and the construction will make it impossible to pray in the right way. If we cannot use Mount Graham for our religious ceremony, we will lose our knowledge teaching the traditional belief.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My grandparents used to call down the Mountain Spirits for traditional healing ceremonies. That mountain is our identity.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain is like a road that leads our prayers to the Almighty Being.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...a unique place on earth through which Apache people's prayers travel to the Creator…</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repository of sacred objects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tribe will take such legal action as is necessary to protect the graves of its ancestors and our irreplaceable religious sites.</td>
<td>B. Kitcheyan 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sacred place</td>
<td>Also what I know is that every Spring, the water there on Mount Graham is the holy water. That's the way our ancestors made it. Because there's a lot of prayers that have been done up there in our ancestors' time. They lived up there. There is that a lot of ceremonial dance, prayers, upholding a lot of our cultural ways and things that are up there. These things I have heard from the medicine men and medicine woman.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge revealed</td>
<td>She was on a venture to save what was left of Mount Graham, the sacredness and holiness of the prayers, dances and ceremonies which were once held since time began for the Apaches until now.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge revealed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is the place where things are revealed to you by the Almighty. The telescopes will destroy that communication.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have no building, we pray outside on a mountain. This is the way we are. We have not one door--we have open doors all around us.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT. AS SITE</td>
<td>home to flora/fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Apache relationship with the mountain includes showing respect to the natural things found on the mountain, the things we have discovered in revelations, or that the mountain has given us.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>host to past events</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also what I know is that every Spring, the water there on Mount Graham is the holy water. That's the way our ancestors made it. Because there's a lot of prayers that have been done up there in our ancestors' time. They lived up there. There is that a lot of ceremonial dance, prayers, upholding a lot of our cultural ways and things that are up there. These things I have heard from the medicine men and medicine woman.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She was on a venture to save what was left of Mount Graham, the sacredness and holiness of the prayers, dances and ceremonies which were once held since time began for the Apaches until now.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apache homeland</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think we’ve shown a lot of people that we have sacrificed ourselves for a sacred mountain.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physically sustaining</td>
<td></td>
<td>the mountain is like a gateway or river and putting the telescopes on top of the mountain is like putting dam on the river.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If they build that telescope up there it is going to harm us Apache. Our prayers are not going to be answered when we pray to that mountain. This is how that mountain is important to us because it holds a lot of things for us up there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION IS WAR</td>
<td>physical injury to Mt as the body</td>
<td></td>
<td>When you harm the mountain, desecrate its summit, you are doing violence to a spiritual person who is alive.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building the telescopes on mount Graham is like ripping off the arms of the singers.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite our cultural desecration, we native people must fight on if we are to survive and maintain our culture for future generation.</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>killing of Mt as Apache people</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to bring your attention to the grievous harm which your University's proposed joining in the Mt. Graham telescope project inflicts upon the Apache people</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 2001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To destroy our sacred places is to destroy us.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The San Carlos Apaches have been in battle opposing the telescopes on top of Mt. Graham</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Arizona wishes that their death marks will be successful by completion of building all of the seven proposed telescopes.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed construction of an astronomical observatory on Mt. Graham threatens to destroy apache ancestral burial grounds, medicine plants used in sacred Apache ceremonies, and other religious sites.</td>
<td>B. Kitcheyan 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The dedication of the Vatican telescope on Mount Graham is not the end of the battle.</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking sides in struggle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If we don't stand and fight for our Apache culture, who will?</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One hundred years later, the Apache are again being attacked by “respected, upstanding” Tucson business leaders.</td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Moccasin 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We went and fought for the Sacred Mount Graham.</td>
<td>W. Velarde 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With Indian Nation leaders like Pres. Albert Hale coming to our side and with honorable veterans like the late Janie Ferriera giving us her wisdom in support is a great relief to those of us who are struggling to help conquer this war with the White Man.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have put our bows and arrows down, now our weapon is our minds, our intellect, what we learn and how we apply it. We need allies not enemies.</td>
<td>V. Foster 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jesuit Father Reverend George V. Coyne, Vatican Observatory Director, has again attacked the religious beliefs and human rights of the traditional Apache.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To this day, they have worked hard against us traditional Apaches.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we appreciate to keep all these documents together and retaining them and speaking with the elders and the medicine people to fight for Mount Graham.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I can no longer sit back and let you take sides with those who do not honor our cultural identity.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mt. Graham squirrel] driven to extinction</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A moment of silence had been offered for one of our late warriors, tribal elder Perry Harney, Sr.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The continuing construction and existence of telescopes on Dzil Nchaa Si An (Mt. Graham) is interfering with the practice of our religion.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think we’ve shown a lot of people that we have sacrificed ourselves for a sacred mountain.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The metal they’re putting up there. It is going to spoil our religion.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAYER AS A JOURNEY OR PATH</td>
<td>prayer is good; good is up</td>
<td>Prayers travel to the Creator</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We had a holyground up there too, we would start praying up there whenever we needed some help, we needed some strong prayers. We’d go up there and we’d pray there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Saturday afternoon everybody received the sand painting blessing, 190 people walking through the four sacred hoops, taking off our shoes and one great human circle, the largest group, in recent memory, to participate in this Holy Ground ceremony.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When we go up the mountain we pray as we go. We take every step with prayer.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The construction would be very detrimental because our prayers would not travel their road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Her name was Ola Cassadore Davis, a San Carlos Apache who had returned for a visit from Tucson. There had been many visits, but this particular one was to visit some friends and relatives. One of the other visits she had had, which was a long one, was to become a godmother and it was through this experience that she realized that prayers become stronger, step by step.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAYER AS PERSON</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>messages</td>
<td>The mountain is like a road that leads our prayers to the Almighty Being.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My grandparents used to call down the Mountain Spirits for traditional healing ceremonies. That mountain is our identity.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not one can fight the power of a prayer.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She prayed that through their strength of prayers that the telescoped would not be built on top of such a sacred mountain to the Apache people, it was her people and she wanted to protect what was left.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAYER AS SMOKE</td>
<td>rising</td>
<td></td>
<td>The prayers are like smoke going in to the air, rising. (You need revelation to understand what I'm saying here.)</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It was a beautiful morning, with the sun shining brightly, the brisk feeling of fresh air rising as she danced with her arms and shoulders in position to the beat and rhythm of the drum beat.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She seemed to be listening intensely to the word of the Medicine Man as he sang and looked straight as if she was praying silently and determined to accomplish a goal she had set before arriving to participate in the Apache sunrise ceremony.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They have joined the brave men who have come from far and wide to keep aloft our heritage, customs and pride.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONS ARE PERSONS</td>
<td>responsible for actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why does the Vatican not respect the religious beliefs of others?</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The University… Is like a tin man. No heart. They don't have no feeling. They wanted recognition for that large telescope. They want to be known all over the world.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can the Pope's left hand not know what his right hand is doing?</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is unbelievable that an institution of higher learning would set such a bad example for its students</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She felt fortunate to have friends on the tribal council like Wendsler Nosie and Ernest Victor, Jr., who had helped her immensely and helped carry what seemed like a burden at times when the University of Arizona would not listen to her requests</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To this day, they have worked hard against us traditional Apaches</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…object to the project's continued avoidance of the laws...</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE AS APACHE PERSON</td>
<td>having corporeality</td>
<td></td>
<td>You may not have noted that our San Carlos Tribal Council is courageous…</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Court of Appeals overlooked the unclean hands of the</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Arizona and the U.S. Forest Service and their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attorneys in their fraudulent avoidance of the requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the National Historic Preservation Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE AS APACHE PERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once we lose these things we will lose our identity and</td>
<td>H. Francis 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cease to be a people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…the observatory project has already damaged our culture</td>
<td>S. Rambler 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in a profound and almost unforgivable way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despite our cultural desecration, we native people must</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fight on if we are to survive and maintain our culture for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If we don't stand and fight for our Apache culture, who</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Wendsler took the stand, one could see in his face all of</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>us that have ever prayed.</td>
<td>Preservation 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APACHE TRIBE AS PERSON</td>
<td>having emotions, sensory</td>
<td></td>
<td>We Apache people most earnestly seek the protection</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perception, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>We Apache were greatly encouraged….</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we Apache would respectfully urge this body of the United Nations to recognize and acknowledge that the disrespect and suffering caused by the nations and governments...</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APACHE INDIVIDUAL AS TRIBE</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>metonymy</td>
<td>I put out my voice</td>
<td>O. Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are hopeful that our voice is finally being heard. We have been pushed aside to build these those who. It is time that our religion was respected.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need to ensure that the Apache voice is finally heard in this process.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She felt fortunate to have friends on the tribal council like Wendsler Nosie and Ernest Victor, Jr., who had helped her immensely and helped carry what seemed like a burden at times when the University of Arizona would not listen to her requests</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we need to assert ourselves and really start defending our ancestral homelands and making our voice be heard</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I listened to the old lady. She was trying, and she was begging the people that this is sacred.</td>
<td>W. Velarde 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>face,</td>
<td></td>
<td>As Wendsler took the stand, one could see in his face all of us that have ever prayed.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>corporeality</td>
<td></td>
<td>The campdress she wore was colorful and descriptive as the lines of age in her face.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional dress as body of tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She was proud that morning to be a member of the San Carlos Apache Tribe as she held the megaphone with her hair tied back and the rick-rack sewed on to her campdress was dignified in white colors.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision, seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She said, “We can see, we have visions, the telescopes mean absolutely nothing to us.”</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARS, PLANTS AS PERSONS</td>
<td>having concerns, feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>We're not supposed to interfere with the sky or the stars--we're supposed to let them be, just enjoy them, not bother them.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having concerns, feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>And the eagle, which is a person itself, is the example of that integrity of what we once followed, still following, and will always follow…</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having concerns, feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Those telescopes will bother them</td>
<td>O. Davis 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That's one thing you fail to understand about this [the Apaches refusal to look at pictures of stars taken from the telescopes]. It's not right to look at anything that is female [the birth of stars] and to disrespect it. There's no way we will do that. That's what your pictures represent. The telescopes are opening the doors to see the womb and that desecrates Mount Graham because the mountain will be used as an instrument to look at the womb.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who are we to look at this womb of the universe?</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1991a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as teachers, providing guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>My mother told me that Mount Graham is one of the sacred mountains, one of the four chief mountains… Because of Springs… Herbs… Crown Dancers, and other power… They and the stars guide us.</td>
<td>R. Riley 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALITY/ETHICS AS LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>standing on</td>
<td>They also see the Native American Indians standing on the ground of truth, of hope, and faith. The ground on which our grandfather, our great leader stood.</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That is why we need to come together and make a stand for our God-given right to pray.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>having had the courage to stand up for our Apache customs and traditions.</td>
<td>O. Gilbert 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They are destroying our religious ground on the mountain. Visitors will trample on the mountain top and the construction will make it impossible to pray in the right way. If we cannot use Mount Graham for our religious ceremony, we will lose our knowledge teaching the traditional belief.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She was angry and upset that the natives who first took claim of what is now the State of Arizona were not given their right to preserve their religious sites, particularly at Mount Graham.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a precedent which must not stand.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“When we walk upon Mother Earth we always plant our feet carefully, because we know the faces of our future generations are looking up at us from beneath the ground. We never forget them.”</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we must stand firm, stand strong</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stand up for</td>
<td>This is an urgent call to stand up for traditional Apache culture and our sacred dzil nchaa si an</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of us are tired of being used and manipulated by outside forces, and this is a big chance to show the world that we stand together for our Apache beliefs and traditions and will not allow ourselves to be divided.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The new San Carlos Apache Tribal Council stands united with the tribal people opposing this desecration, and reaffirming the resolutions passed by the former Tribal leaders. This is the fourth time the Council has executed a resolution or document opposing the telescopes.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>side by side on…</td>
<td>He thanked the Indians and non-Indians who were standing side-by-side to help protect the Apache traditions under attack by the University of Arizona.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I stood by the Apache people and it hurts</td>
<td>W. Velarde 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paths within/on</td>
<td>They have charted the path we must follow.</td>
<td>O. Davis N.d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The mountain is like a road that leads our prayers to the Almighty Being.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We go to the mountains because they bring us closer to God.</td>
<td>R. Riley 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janie had definitely paved the road for many of us. I smiled as I recall the times we sat together and she always advised me on my efforts to help people.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I say that somewhere our Apache people are being misled.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One path should not block another.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We had a holyground up there too, we would start praying up there whenever we needed some help, we needed some strong prayers. We'd go up there and we’d pray there.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Saturday afternoon everybody received the sand painting blessing, 190 people walking through the four sacred hoops, taking off our shoes and one great human circle, the largest group, in recent memory, to participate in this Holy Ground ceremony.</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is how the mountain works: our prayers travel to and up through the mountain to God. They must travel the right road to God through the top of the mountain. But the telescopes interfere with this. If they are built, our prayers will not travel the right road to God.</td>
<td>F. Stanley 1992d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wendsler Nosie Sr, went to Mt. Graham to prepare for his daughter’s upcoming Sunrise ceremony. As he was walking down the mountain he was cited by a U of A police officer for Criminal Trespass.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Carlos Apache tribal runners, protesting the University of Arizona, Vatican and German telescope complex being built on their sacred Mt. Graham, completed a four day, 238 mile run from the heights of Mt. Graham to Tucson. There the Apache met up with Peace and Dignity runners from other Arizona and California tribes. From Tucson designated runners will continue on to Mexico City to meet with other North, Central and South American runners in October. The run marks the 500th anniversary of European arrival and celebrates not 500 years of glory but 500 years of survival for indigenous peoples.</td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Moccasin 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This petition was carried to Europe and presented to all the people mentioned above who had interest in the Mt. Graham project.</td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Moccasin May 26, 1992a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Apache delegation met with the astronomers from Italy’s Arceti Observatory but the astronomers refused to allow the Apache to speak. The Apache then got up and walked out.</td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Moccasin May 26, 1992a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Sacred run concluded with a prayer and blessing, thanking the creator for his guidance and for all the obstacles which brought teaching to all participants.</td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Moccasin 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopefully, after this meeting, the Forest Service officials will now better realize that the Apache people will not go away despite the many efforts which have been made to ignore and downplay the Apache peoples’ concerns in preserving their traditions and beliefs regarding this sacred mountain.”</td>
<td>O. Davis 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Her name was Ola Cassadore Davis, a San Carlos Apache who had returned for a visit from Tucson. There had been many visits, but this particular one was to visit some friends and relatives. One of the other visits she had had, which was a long one, was to become a godmother and it was through this experience that she realized that prayers become stronger, step by step.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She was on her way to Bylas to talk with the elders about Mount Graham and how much it was a part of their community.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She had come from a family with medicine men. Her father was one and her late brother, Philip Cassadore, was also one. She had been taught the ways and customs of the Apaches and she was a traditionalist.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She was on a venture to save what was left of Mount Graham, the sacredness and holiness of the prayers, dances and ceremonies which were once held since time began for the Apaches until now.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She lived the Apache ways, she was truly one of the most respected women on the reservation and she had returned to offer prayers for her family and her people.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She had spent many nights worrying about the loss of Mount Graham and spent many hours talking with Indians and non-Indians in her quest to save Dzil’Nchaa’Sian.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She realized she was getting somewhere with her venture and that she was gaining support</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The eyes of our elders filled with tears as they stood near the finish line atop Mount Graham this past summer. These San Carlos Apache elders knew this mountain as Dzil Nchaa Si An and the Apache youth had helped to organize a sacred run in protest of the construction of seven telescopes which had been planned for decades.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“These white people came to American and took away our land. And now they are trying to take our mountain away! Why don’t they just go back where they came from?” cries Irene Upshaw, a tribal elder from the Bylas community of the San Carlos Apache Reservation.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He said that by building the telescopes on the mountain, they were destroying the people’s beliefs who are on spiritual journeys.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is like the state highway department notifying the city government of a new road and not telling the members of a church that the church is about to be destroyed, then talking to church members too late for them to suggest changes in the location of the road...</td>
<td>Apache Survival Coalition 1994a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In using the line-item veto in late 1997 to strike ten million dollars largely destined for the observatory, the President took a major step forward.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1998a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…this is going to lead us to tomorrow, and our tomorrow is our children, and we don't want to go on a path that has led nowhere…now it is our turn to build that new road that is going to send us somewhere.</td>
<td>W. Nosie 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burdened upon the journey</td>
<td></td>
<td>She felt fortunate to have friends on the tribal council like Wendsler Nosie and Ernest Victor, Jr., who had helped her immensely and helped carry what seemed like a burden at times when the University of Arizona would not listen to her requests.</td>
<td>S. Rambler 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be bought and sold</td>
<td></td>
<td>We Apache people are proud that our council has not sold our cultural legacy to the highest bidder. Perhaps this is because we are among the last Indian people that held out against the attempts of the Europeans.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstructions in the path/journey</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are hopeful that our voice is finally being heard. We have been pushed aside to build these those who. It is time that our religion was respected.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1999b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrality embedded within</td>
<td></td>
<td>if Native American religious beliefs and cultural survival, or US environmental laws get in the way, just buy your way around them.</td>
<td>P. Nosie 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALITY AS HAVING A CORPOREAL BODY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now is an opportunity for the tribal council to exercise their role as a moral force in preserving our Apache cultural heritage.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Graham is also where my Apache ancestors suffered. If the telescope this built up there, everything will be taken away from us. It will cause us suffering again.</td>
<td>O. Davis 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Elements</td>
<td>Quote</td>
<td>Speaker/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As Wendsler took the stand, one could see in his face all of us that have ever prayed.</td>
<td>Apaches for Cultural Preservation 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having awareness,</td>
<td>we're trying to wake people up, wake up the non-Indian society as to what they are doing, how they're hurting the earth</td>
<td>W. Nosie 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONEY AS A BAD PERSON</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>Money seems to talk more with these bureaucrats and our congressional representatives and exemption laws are passed to satisfy these interests.</td>
<td>V. Randall 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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