NPS Form 10-900-b
(March 1992)

OMB No. 1024-0018

RECEIVED 2280
FEB - 6 1998
NAT. REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

cover

United States Department of the Interior
Nationa Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES MULTIPLE PROPERTY DOCUMENTATION FORM

This form is used for documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items.

☒ New Submission ☐ Amended Submission

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Warfare Between Indians and Americans in Arizona, 1846 - 1886

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

1. Organization of U.S. Military and Indian Warfare in Arizona, 1846 - 1886.

2. Military Engagements and Peace Talks Between Americans and Indians in Arizona, 1846 - 1886.

3. Transportation and Warfare in Arizona, 1846 - 1886.

4. Communication and Warfare in Arizona, 1846 - 1886.

5. Impact of Warfare on American Settlers and Indians in Arizona, 1846 - 1886.

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Don W. Ryden, AIA - Historical Architect/ Doug Kupel - Historian of Ryden Architects
street & number 902 W. McDowell Road **telephone** 602/253-5381
city or town Phoenix **state** AZ **zip code** 85007

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

☐ See continuation sheet for additional comments.

James W Garrison AZ SHPO 27 JAN 1998
Signature and title of certifying official Date

ARIZONA STATE PARKS
State or Federal agency and bureau

I hereby certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

3/6/98
Signature of the Keeper Date

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and the title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in How to Complete the Mul;tiple Property Documentation Form (National Register Bulletin 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

E. Statement of Historic Contexts (pages 1 - 65)

F. Associated Property Types (pages 66 - 76)

G. Geographical Data (page 77)

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods (pages 78 - 81)

I. Major Bibliographical References (pages 82 - 88)

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

(Document historic contexts on one or more continuation sheets. If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)

F. Associated Property Types

(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements on one or more continuation sheets.)

G. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ....

UTM References (Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
1	12			3	12		
2	12			4	12		

☒ See continuation sheet.

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing on one or more continuation sheets.)

I. Major Bibliographical References

(List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)

Bilbliography

Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS)

☐ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
☐ previously listed in the National Register
☐ previously determined eligible by the National Register
☐ designated a National Historic Landmark
☐ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # ________
☐ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # ________

Primary Location of Additional Data:

☐ State Historic Preservation Office
☐ Other State agency
☐ Federal agency
☐ Local government
☐ University
☐ Other

Name of repository:

SUMMARY

This multiple property group is organized around the theme of the extended period of warfare between Indians and Americans which occurred within the present confines of the State of Arizona from 1846 to 1886. The forty-year time period starts with the beginning of the War with Mexico which resulted in the acquisition of the Southwest by the United States, and ends in 1886 with the cessation of hostilities between Indians and Americans following negotiations involving Apache leader Geronimo and General Nelson C. Miles. This thematic multiple property group is based on the historic context study The United States Military in Arizona, 1846-1945: A Component of the Arizona Historic Preservation Plan prepared for the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office in 1993.

The thematic presentation is limited to conflicts between Indians and Americans. Conflicts between US and Mexican citizens are excluded, as are conflicts between American groups which occurred during the US Civil War. These events are mentioned only as they relate to the theme of military incidents between Indians and Americans. Inter-ethnic conflicts which occurred between native groups are also excluded, with the exception of those that are associated with the main theme - conflict between Indians and Americans.

While this multiple property format nomination has a specific forty-year period of significance, it is important to an understanding of the historic contexts presented here to note that there was a considerable amount of enmity between Indian groups before the arrival of Americans in large numbers starting from the beginning of the War with Mexico in 1846. Warfare between Apaches and Tohono O'odham and Pima set the stage for later conflicts. Likewise, Indians had a series of violent encounters with both Spanish and Mexican groups in the years prior to the arrival of Americans in Arizona. For example, hostility between the Tohono O'odham and Hispanic community with Apaches pre-dates the founding of the Tucson presidio in 1775. These encounters have evidence in sites that could be identified today. However, since the focus of this study is property types associated with conflicts between Americans and Indians, those properties are beyond the purview of this nomination. The experiences between Indian groups, and between Indians and non-American groups, significantly influenced relations between Indians and Americans during the period of significance, and for that reason are examined when they relate to the main theme and are within the period of significance (1846-1886).

The significance of the US military presence in Arizona, starting in this period and continuing to the present, goes far beyond specific engagements and events. Civilians in Arizona benefitted from military activities in many ways. The protection afforded from the military installations allowed ranching and agricultural enterprises to develop. The military provided a market for civilian goods and services. Some Indian groups benefitted as well, such as the Pima and Maricopa, for example, who found a ready market for their agricultural goods among the many military travelers who passed through their lands. Recognition of the strong connection between the military presence in Arizona and economic development is an important step toward understanding the period of warfare.

Because this project is an outgrowth of a SHPO historic context study that focused on the military history of Arizona, much of the material contained in the nomination consists of a comprehensive discussion of U.S. military establishments, transportation, and communication. That previous historic context study continues the evaluation of military sites beyond the period of significance for this nomination. This interest in military activities is reflected in the large amount of published sources regarding military history. However, much of the previous literature contains a distinctive pro-American bias. Comparatively little material is available from the native point of view, with the one exception of anthropological literature. In compiling the history of warfare between Indians and Americans in Arizona, one must rely on the existing sources for much of the information. The resulting product is a reflection of the sources, which in many instances may reflect what some might consider a heavy emphasis on American military activities. As this project has as its goal the identification of additional properties associated with the period of warfare, an attempt has been made to include all available sources and viewpoints.

Civilians set policy during the period of warfare. It is a fallacy to portray the conflict between native groups and Americans in terms of a military / Indian dichotomy. Civilians in Washington set policy by creating the reservation system and sending troops where settlers demanded protection. The civilian government in Washington had a great concern for containing the cost of the reservation system, as well as the size of military expenditures. The desire to minimize cost helped to drive policy and strategy. This desire also contributed to the length of the conflict. The result was tragic for native groups, including those that had little or no military contact. The reservation system caused suffering for the Hopi, Pima, Maricopa, and Tohono O'odham against whom no military action was taken. The conflict must be viewed in the broader context of overwhelming pressure brought by an expanding American population. Military action was just one part of that expansion. In many ways, the military was reacting to demands placed upon it by civilians for "protection" in order to open lands for development.

This multiple property submission is organized around five historic contexts and their associated property types. The first historic context examines the military infrastructure of warfare between Indians and Americans. This context focuses on the forts, camps, and military command structure of the wars. A second context examines military engagements and peace talks between the two groups. This context examines the "battle" aspects of the period. A third and fourth context examine the role that transportation and communication played respectively in the period of warfare. The final context examines the impact of warfare on the lives of Indians and Americans. This final context steps back from the immediate results of warfare and evaluates the indirect impacts of the conflict.

Before these five contexts are examined, two background sections are included. The first is a preface to the nomination which describes the point of view used in the document. It also includes a description of terms used in the nomination. The second background section is a brief introduction to the geography of Arizona, and an overview description of the Indian groups present in the state. This second background section serves as an orientation to the multiple property submission.

PREFACEAND DEFINITIONS

The main goal of this multiple property format nomination is to assist historic preservation planning efforts in Arizona by establishing appropriate contexts which will assist in the nomination of additional properties to the National Register of Historic Places. The historic context study prepared for the Arizona SHPO in 1993 noted properties associated with the period of warfare recognized by listing on the National Register did not adequately represent the conflict. Many sites associated with American military actions are recognized, but very few properties associated with Indians have been listed. There are several reasons for this situation.

For Americans, the period of warfare is often portrayed as one of struggle and heroism. For this reason the properties linked to military activities are well-represented on the National Register of Historic Places. Because much of the history of the warfare period is written from the American point of view, many of the officially recognized properties from this period are those associated with Americans.

Indians viewed military conflict as absolutely necessary for their own survival. Their homeland was being invaded and occupied by a foreign nation. Indians were fighting to preserve their land. While Indians have many sites that are considered sacred or the locations of traditional activities, those properties have not generally been perceived by Americans as being significant. Instead, those locations were coveted by Americans for many uses - mining, agricultural development, and other extractive industries. Because of this very different conception of the conflict from the Indian viewpoint, few sites associated primarily with the Indian side of the conflict have received recognition by listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The goal of the multiple property submission is not to present a balanced treatment of the warfare period. To do so would only further the conflict inherent in any discussion of warfare. We can never forget that this was a period of horror and terror for both groups. It is perhaps best understood as an inter-ethnic conflict of tremendous proportions. Because of the strong feelings on both sides, events occurred which today are perceived as barbaric and inhumane. Both groups engaged in acts of retaliation and terror. We must recognize the nature of the conflict and accept it for what it was: warfare. This recognition is a basic step toward understanding the depth of feeling on both sides of the conflict. Rather than achieving balance between two opposing viewpoints, the purpose of the nomination is to delineate common ground with regard to properties that are significantly associated with the conflict.

The conflict in Arizona was over land - between those who had it and those that wanted it. Despite the differences between Indians and Americans, both believed that land could be acquired by conquest or discovery. Indians in Arizona, possessed of resources from conquest and discovery in ancient times, viewed Americans as trespassers on their land. Americans, who viewed Arizona as theirs by right of conquest over Mexico, perceived the actions taken by Indian groups to defend their territory as acts of war. Both groups felt that they were correct in what they were doing, sanctioned by divine right - Indians in defending their land, and Americans in defending what they thought was theirs. While both sides performed wrongful acts, as judged by their own contemporary standards, the nomination describes the events of the warfare period without attempting to lay blame or assess guilt for the descendants of the victorious or defeated nations.

While time has passed, it has not healed all wounds. Some of the wounds will never heal, no matter how the reasons for the conflict may be explained. The nomination is essentially a descriptive document. It presents descriptions of events which took place and can be significantly associated with identifiable properties. By providing recognition and association, the current residents of Arizona will have a greater understanding of the incidents of the past. With that understanding, they may be better prepared to be a bit more forgiving in their acceptance of different cultures.

A note on definitions and terminology is necessary in order achieve a common language. Definition of terms is needed to determine mutual understanding for the contextual history, and to provide consistency throughout the nomination. Nomenclature of groups is a complex issue. In many instances, Americans used simplified terms for native groups in order to have a convenient label for those who might be attacked or invaded. This deliberate simplification often gave political form to native groups that they themselves did not have. Over time, those outside definitions of native groups have become entrenched through continued use. In most instances, the approach used in this nomination is to use "time-appropriate" terminology - meaning that the terms used are those that were used during the period of warfare. There are instances, detailed below, where the use of time-appropriate terminology is offensive or incorrect.

There were, in fact, no "Indians" living in Arizona during the period of warfare. Indian is a term Christopher Columbus used to describe the native peoples of the new world when he, incorrectly as it turns out, thought he had arrived in the West Indies. Nonetheless, it is a term which has been in use since 1492 to describe native peoples living in the Americas. For the period under study, 1846 to 1886, native people in Arizona were commonly referred to as Indians. Because this nomination considers that period, the word Indian is used as a time-appropriate term to refer to native peoples in this document. These individuals did not achieve status as American citizens until 1924, thus the term "American Indians" will only be used when referring to events after that time. When not referring to a specific time period, the terms "native groups" or "native peoples" will be used to refer to those individuals or groups of individuals living in Arizona that do not derive their culture from an original European or American heritage.

In similar fashion, there were no "Apache" or "Chiricahua Apache." This are names given to some Athapaskan speaking tribes and used by Spaniards, Mexicans, and Americans to refer to those groups. They themselves preferred to be referred to by their own tribal identification, such as Bedonkohe, Chihenne, Chokonen, and Nednai, for example. For the period under study, these groups were referred to as Apache. Today, this is a name that is, for many, acceptable.

In historic times, the Tohono O'odham were referred to as the Papago. In recent years, the Tohono O'odham tribe has gone to great lengths to change their name from Papago. Because of the tribe's strong desire to be known using a specific term, the word Tohono O'odham will be used in this nomination.

The word "Americans" will be used to refer to the citizens of the United States, who first arrived in Arizona some three centuries after the Spanish moved north from Mexico in the mid-sixteenth century. The terms "Anglo American" or "Euro-American" are not used because these terms imply English or Spanish characteristics that Americans did not share with these European groups.

The word "Mexicans" is used to refer to former citizens of the Republic of Mexico living in Arizona during the period of warfare. By virtue of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo these individuals were citizens of the United States, yet they maintained a separate culture distinct from that of Americans. Because this difference is significant, and because the term was in common use during the period of warfare, the word Mexican will be used to refer to the former citizens of the Mexican Republic.

The term "warfare" is used to describe a violent conflict between two or more nations. Reasons for warfare included conquest of territory, to redress grievances, and to pursue punitive attacks. Warfare could be either offensive or defensive in nature. It is important to note that many native groups viewed warfare and raiding differently. Preparations for a war party were often complex, including planning meetings and dances. In contrast, preparations for a simple raid in search of food, supplies, ammunition or on social / ceremonial occasions, were much less elaborate. A raid by native groups was generally pursued outside their traditional area, into the territory of another group. Warfare was practiced within their area as a punitive attack. Americans in the historic period did not understand this difference between raids and warfare, and treated all Indian attacks as war. This perception contributed to the violence of the era.

The term "settler" is used in this nomination to refer to non-Indians who arrived in Arizona for the purpose of engaging in some type of economic activity over an extended period of time. Such individuals could not "settle" the area, since it had already been occupied by native groups for thousands of years. However, since the word was in common use during the historic period under study and is not normally considered offensive, the term settler will be used to refer to individuals who moved to Arizona with the desire to make it the location of their home and economic activity.

The terms "resisters" and "accommodators" are used in this nomination to describe actions without placing judgment. Native peoples had only two actions (in varying degrees) when faced with the arrival of American military representatives: they could resist or accommodate that force. Resisters fought (went to war), refused to accept reservation life, or left (escaped) from reservations. Accommodators accepted or tolerated the restrictions placed on them by American force. Many native groups and individuals changed their stance from either resistance or accommodation according to the pressures applied by American military force.

The term "massacre" is used only when referring to a largely successful attack on men, women, and children with the full intent to kill all with surrender being unacceptable. This style of attack was practiced by

Americans, Indians, and Mexicans during the period of warfare between 1846 and 1886.

This delineation of terminology is not an exercise in political correctness. Rather, it is a careful attempt to be considerate and respectful of the concerns of native peoples, both in the past and present. While it is not the task of historians to sanitize the terminology of the past by obliterating words in common use then but now considered offensive, neither should we reiterate past practices without comment.

GEOGRAPHY OF ARIZONA

Arizona is divided into two main physical areas: The Colorado Plateau in the northeastern half of the state and the Basin and Range Province in its southern half. A mountainous Transition Zone exists between the Colorado Plateau and the Basin and Range province. The Colorado Plateau is a generally level area cut by deep canyons carved by rivers such as the Colorado and Little Colorado. High volcanic peaks rise from the general level of the plateau. The Basin and Range Province is also a generally level area, but is at a much lower elevation. It is divided from the Colorado Plateau by the sharp escarpment of the Mogollon Rim where the Plateau drops quickly down to the Basin and Range Province within this Transition Zone. Although generally level, the Basin and Range Province is broken by numerous mountain ranges that lie between broad alluvial valleys. In these valleys the desert rivers of Arizona flow: the Bill Williams, San Pedro, Salt, and Santa Cruz. The Gila River crosses the entire state, rising in the mountains of New Mexico and flowing through the Basin and Range Province to its confluence with the Colorado River at Yuma.

The geography of Arizona influenced the nature of the conflict between native and American groups. Water is scarce in all areas of the state, so river drainages became natural routes of travel. Springs and seeps became stops for travelers who measured their progress by the distance to the next water hole. The high mountains became natural refuges for the pursued, and provided good visibility into the valleys below. The rugged nature of the terrain in the state favored those native groups that adapted to the challenge, and made travel and communication difficult for their military pursuers.

NATIVE GROUPS IN ARIZONA

Arizona is home to a wide variety of native groups, each of which has a separate history and each of which interacted differently with the U.S. military. The names applied to these groups by Spanish, Mexican, and American settlers differed through the years which has made the task of identification confusing. The various groups moved their locations as well. A brief summary of the Indian groups in Arizona is a necessary introduction to an understanding of the conflict between the first residents of Arizona and later arrivals.

Starting with the western portion of the state along the Colorado River, Arizona is home primarily to Yuman speaking groups which practiced agriculture in the rich lands along the river. The southern portion of the Colorado is home to the Yuma (Quechan) and Cocopah Tribes located near the confluence of the Gila River.

North along the Colorado River, the Mohave Indians occupied the location near the confluence of the Bill Williams River with the Colorado. Located between the Yuma and Mohave were the Yuman-speaking Maricopa, and Uto-Aztecan speaking Chemehuevi Tribe. The Maricopa were forced eastward by the Quechan and Mohave in the 1850s to join the Pima Tribe along the Gila River, which opened the former Maricopa lands on the Colorado to the Chemehuevi Tribe from California.

The central portion of Arizona was dominated by the Pima Indians, an agricultural group. The Pima, later joined by the Maricopa, farmed the bottom lands of the Gila River in central Arizona. South and west of the Pima, in the desert areas of southern Arizona, the Tohono O'odham lived in the desert area of Arizona where they practiced a pattern of seasonal migration between villages. Further west, the Hia'Ced O'odham were more "nomadic" in that they traveled between several locations. Although closely related to the Pima in that both groups were agriculturalists, the O'odham preferred a mobile lifestyle of migration to take advantage of summer rains to plant crops.

North-central Arizona is home to the Yavapai, who occupied lands along the Verde, Agua Fria, and Hassayampa Rivers. The Yavapai speak a Yuman language. The Yavapai practiced limited agriculture, but relied on a collecting lifestyle including hunting and gathering. The Apache had a similar subsistence pattern. The Apache homeland is located in east-central Arizona and southeastern Arizona, in the headwaters of the Gila and Salt Rivers. The Apache were fragmented into as many as twenty different bands. The Apache were collectors, hunters, and gatherers who practiced limited forms of agriculture.

Northern Arizona is home to several tribal groups. The most numerous are the Athabaskan-speaking Navajo, who occupy the northeast corner of the state. Today, the large Navajo Reservation surrounds the smaller Hopi Reservation. To the west along the Colorado River, the Grand Canyon area is home to the Havasupai Tribe. Further west are the Hualapai. North of the Grand Canyon the Southern Paiute Tribe call a portion of Arizona home. The original extent of tribal homelands was much larger than the size of current reservations. In addition, the modern distribution of Indian reservations does not exactly match the historic distribution in terms of location.

Not all of these native groups participated in warfare with Americans. Of the tribes that did participate, some did so with greater strength and for longer periods than others. The Pima, Maricopa, Tohono O'odham, Havasupai, and Hopi primarily based their lifestyle on agriculture which brought them into relatively little conflict with Americans. In particular, the Pima and Maricopa tribes provided American military and civilians with feed and forage. The Tohono O'odham, Havasupai, and Hopi occupied territory and practiced a way of life that enabled them to avoid conflict with American settlers. The Mohave, Navajo, Hualapai, and Yuman tribes (Quechan) settled their conflicts fairly early with Americans. The Apache and Yavapai, who controlled lands and resources coveted by Americans, were faced with continual conflict for extended periods of time as more and more Americans entered Arizona.

Because the Apache were forced into an extended conflict with Americans after 1866, much of the history contained in the nomination after that date concerns warfare between Apaches and Americans. Fertile agricultural land and valuable mining properties in southern Arizona, and travel routes across the southern portion of the territory, brought many Americans into conflict with Apaches who had traditionally made the area their home. American land use practices and settlement patterns in the Apache homeland contributed to the extended period of warfare in this portion of Arizona. The nomination focuses on the conflict between Apaches and Americans in the years after 1866 simply because that conflict constituted the vast majority of incidents in the years following the Civil War.

Through the process of warfare between Indians and Americans, the Indian tribes in Arizona were gradually confined onto reservations which comprised only a small portion of their native territory. Today Arizona has twenty-one Indian reservations which cover some 14.8 million acres of the state. Indian reservations comprise nearly 27 per cent of the state's land surface. Table 1 lists Arizona's Indian Reservations.

Table 1

Establishment of Arizona Indian Reservations by Date

1859	Gila River
1865	Colorado River
1868	Navajo
1871	White Mountain
1871-1875	Camp Verde
1872-1876	Chiricahua
1874	San Xavier
1879	Salt River
1880	Havasupai
1880	Fort Mohave
1882	Hopi
1882	Gila Bend
1883	Hualapai
1884	Fort Yuma
1896	White Mountain divided into Fort Apache & San Carlos
1902	Fort McDowell
1907	Kaibab - Paiute
1912	Ak-Chin
1914	Camp Verde Yavapai-Apache
1916	Tohono O'odham
1917	Cocopah
1935	Prescott Yavapai
1972	Payson Tonto Apache
1978	Pasqua Yaqui

Historic Context 1: Organization of American and Indian Warfare in Arizona, 1846-1886.

This historic context documents the military infrastructure of warfare between Indians and Americans, with the exception of transportation and communication which are accorded their own separate context. Although specific battles and peace talks are mentioned, these events are discussed in a separate context as well. This context focuses on the forts, camps, and military structure of the wars. The approach will be chronological and geographical within each time period. Chronological periods include the Mexican War (1846-1848), pre-Civil War (to 1860), Civil War (1861-1865), early years of conflict (to 1875) and later years of conflict (1875-1886).

For Americans, this context describes the initiation, build up, and eventual decline of a series military campaigns against native groups. The focus is on the infrastructure, such as command patterns and history of fort construction. For native groups, the physical organization of military activities is less well known. Their activities are less closely associated with constructed buildings or structures. Native groups used what might best be termed "refuges" as locations to plan attacks from or as places to retreat into for a greater degree of safety. Americans in the historic period commonly called these locations "bastions" or "strongholds," but these words convey a greater degree of military importance to these sites than is perhaps necessary. Since the locations of only a few of the native refuges are documented, this context will document the types of warfare practiced by Indian groups. Properties identified as associated with this context are listed in Table 2.

The designation of an installation as a "fort" or "camp" leads to some confusion, as a single location might have been known by both names. Prior to 1866 most posts in Arizona were designated as forts, although only Fort Whipple at Prescott was fortified with a log palisade. After 1866, all Arizona posts except for Whipple and Yuma (in California) were designated as camps. In 1879, the military command switched designations again and after that time most permanent installations were identified as forts. Identification of particular installations is also confused by situations where a post might have changed location but retained its name. These instances are identified in the text.

The main purpose of this context is to identify the major military installations of Arizona and to provide some background for an understanding of their significance. For this reason the emphasis is on those installations that are more permanent in nature and played an important role in the period of warfare. There are nearly one hundred military installations in Arizona that were designated as camps or forts. This number does not include temporary camps that might have been used sporadically during campaigns or travel across the territory.

Mexican War (1846-1848)

The acquisition of Arizona by the United States is rooted in a military action with Mexico. What is now Arizona had been a province of New Spain prior to Mexican independence in 1821, and from 1821 to 1848 Arizona was part of Mexico. The War with Mexico began on April 25, 1846, as a result of a boundary dispute between the two nations over territory between the Nueces and Rio

Grande rivers following the American annexation of Texas. The scene of the conflict soon extended over the entire Southwest, from Texas to California. The War with Mexico ended when the United States agreed to sign the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848. According to the terms of the agreement, on July 4, 1848, all of Arizona north of the Gila River became part of the United States.

The first military incursions into Arizona took place within the context of the War with Mexico. Although no conflicts between Indians and the U.S. military occurred during the period from 1846 to 1848, the War with Mexico had a significant impact on the later military organization of the territory. On August 18, 1846, Colonel (later General) Stephen W. Kearny occupied Santa Fe peacefully. Kearny accomplished this without firing a shot. Kearny established a set of laws and government for New Mexico. Most of what is now Arizona was included in the Territory of New Mexico.

On October 21, 1846, Kearny and his "Army of the West" began a journey to California down the Gila River. This marked the first official U.S. military expedition in Arizona. Kearny's contacts with Indians were amiable. Lt. Col. William H. Emory - the expedition's diarist - was particularly impressed with the peaceful nature and agricultural enterprises of the Pima Indians on the Gila River. Kearny reached the Colorado River on November 22, 1846, and was surprised to hear that the U.S. flag was already flying over California. Kearny's experiences in the Southwest are significant because he pioneered a travel route across the territory and established the first U.S. military authority in the area.

A second military expedition crossed Arizona during the War with Mexico. Captain (later Lt. Col.) Phillip St. George Cooke blazed the first practical wagon trail across Arizona in 1846 with his "Mormon Battalion," a group of Latter Day Saints who had been organized in Council Bluffs, Iowa, in July of 1846. A portion of this group numbering 397 men left Santa Fe to blaze a trail to California on October 19, 1846. The Mormons took a southern route across Arizona, traveling down the San Pedro River, over to the Mexican village of Tucson, then followed the Santa Cruz River to the Pima villages. The group reached Warner's Ranch near San Diego on January 21, 1847. Cooke's Battalion is significant for the route it pioneered across southern Arizona. Cooke demonstrated that wagons could traverse the territory, albeit with some difficulty.

A third military expedition during the War with Mexico was less significant for its military contribution, but resulted in an agreement with the Navajo Tribe. While in New Mexico Kearny sent a group of Missouri Volunteers under the command of Col. Alexander W. Doniphan to reach an agreement with the Navajo Tribe regarding conflicts over cattle herds that belonged to Mexican citizens. Doniphan signed a treaty with the Navajo on November 22, 1846, near the present town of Gallup, New Mexico. Although the peace that resulted was short-lived, this treaty represents the first agreement with an Arizona tribe signed by the U.S. military.

A final expedition into Arizona came late in 1848, after the peace treaty had been signed. Major Lawrence P. Graham led a column of troops from Monterrey in Mexico through Arizona. These military expeditions had relatively little effect on the outcome of the War with Mexico, but they are significant as the first military presence in

Arizona. The rudimentary military organization in the area was centered in Santa Fe, New Mexico, with Arizona a part of New Mexico. The expeditions opened up Arizona as an important travel route.

Pre-Civil War (to 1860)

Following the War with Mexico, and the discovery of gold in California, the southern route across Arizona became a significant avenue of travel to the Golden State. This led to the establishment of Camp Calhoun on the California side of the Colorado River near the present location of Yuma by Lt. Cave J. Couts in September of 1849. While not within the boundary of Arizona, this temporary military establishment served the important purposes of securing the ford across the Colorado River and facilitating travel to California until it was abandoned in February of 1851. In that month, Brevet Major S.T. Heintzelman moved the garrison to the top of a nearby bluff. Facing supply difficulties in June of 1851, Heintzelman moved most of the garrison closer to San Diego. He left Lieutenant Thomas W. Sweeny in command of the remaining troops at the Colorado River. Sweeny moved off the bluff and closer to the confluence of the Colorado and Gila Rivers where he established Camp Independence, a successor to Camp Calhoun and a tongue-in-cheek reference to his own independence from Heintzelman. This post was abandoned in December of 1851. On February 29, 1852, Heintzelman returned to the bluff to establish a permanent garrison. Named Fort Yuma, it was located on the California side of the river on a bluff overlooking the ford.

Although it was importantly associated with travel across Arizona, since Fort Yuma is located in California recognition for the first Arizona post goes to Fort Defiance in the northern part of the state. On September 18, 1851, Col. Edwin V. Sumner established a post in the heart of the Navajo territory in Canyon Bonito. During the spring of 1852 Sumner constructed buildings at the location and named the post Fort Defiance. Fort Defiance has the distinction of being the first permanent U.S. military post in Arizona.

Fort Defiance was located near a Navajo refuge location. Canyon de Chelly, a Spanish corruption of the Navajo word "Tsegi" which means "rock canyon," was a deep defile located in the heart of the Colorado Plateau. Native groups such as the Navajo used these deep canyons in the Plateau country as places of refuge that could be easily defended. The Indians withdrew into shelters built into the rugged walls of the canyon which gave them protection and offered a good position from which to strike at the enemy below.

Native groups also made use of short-term camps. These locations were used repeatedly as places for rendezvous before and after conflicts. While very few of these locations were known to the American military and are thus rarely mentioned in the historical record, the short-term camps may have archaeological remains.

In addition to protecting travelers journeying across Arizona, Fort Yuma and Fort Defiance served as a base of military operations in the area. During the 1850s Arizona was crossed repeatedly by military and private surveyors seeking to determine the southern portion of the land acquired from Mexico and the location of possible railroad routes through the territory. As a result of these surveys, the United States soon determined that it needed land south of the Gila River for a railroad right-of-way. The United States began negotiations with the government of Mexico for the acquisition of this territory. This additional land, known today as the Gadsden Purchase after James Gadsden who negotiated the treaty which acquired it, was purchased by a treaty signed on December 20, 1853 and ratified on April 25, 1854.

The first post established in the Gadsden Purchase area was Camp Moore, located about forty-five miles southeast of Tucson. It was created on November 17, 1856. On May 29, 1857, the name of this post was changed to Fort Buchanan in honor of President James Buchanan and its location was shifted further east. A second post was located in the Gadsden Purchase area on May 8, 1860. Known as Fort Aravaypa (sic), it was situated sixty miles from Tucson at the junction of the San Pedro River and Arivaipa Creek. It was re-named Fort Breckenridge on August 6, 1860. Breckenridge was abandoned on July 10, 181, when troops were drawn east during the civil War. Later, during the Civil War, this post was known briefly as Fort Stanford until its final abandonment in 1862.

The final post located in Arizona prior to the Civil War was Camp Colorado on the Colorado River along the 35th parallel travel route. It was established on April 19, 1859 by Maj. L.A. Armistead. On April 28, 1859, Armistead changed the name of the post to Fort Mojave. This post served to protect travelers on the immigrant trail to California. After the Civil War this post was known as Camp Mohave, but the name was changed to Fort Mohave in 1879 (a second Camp Colorado was established in a different location in 1868; north of La Paz on the Colorado River).

Prior to the Civil War, the Department of New Mexico headquartered in Santa Fe, under the command of General John Garland, governed military operations in Arizona. Although the boundary between the Department of the Pacific and the Department of New Mexico was the 110 degree line of west longitude (about 55 miles west of the current Arizona-New Mexico boundary), given the rudimentary transportation facilities of the time the posts in the Gadsden Purchase area were governed from New Mexico. The posts on the Colorado River reported to the Department of the Pacific headquartered in California.

Civil War (1861-1865)

The outbreak of the War Between the States deprived settlers in Arizona of military protection. Fort Breckenridge was abandoned on July 10, 1861 and Fort Buchanan was abandoned on July 23, 1861. From July of 1861 until April of 1862 Arizona was devoid of a U.S. military presence. The regular troops were withdrawn east to fight the Confederacy. In December of 1861 Brigadier General George Wright suggested sending volunteers from California to Arizona to guard the mail routes. During March and April of 1862 the California Volunteers began assembling at Fort Yuma under the command of Colonel James H. Carleton to advance against Confederate sympathizers operating in Arizona. At the same time, Brigadier General Henry H. Sibley brought a Confederate force from Texas up the Rio Grande. The two sides met in a brief skirmish at Picacho Pass on April 15, 1862. Carleton's forces continued on to Tucson and occupied the city on June 7. The Confederate threat to Arizona vanished.

During the next few years the California Volunteers established several new posts in Arizona and re-established those that had been abandoned at the outbreak of the Civil War. The first military post established in 1862 was the "Post at Tucson" created by the California Volunteers on May 21, 1862 when they occupied the town. The Post lay west of Main Avenue and south of Congress Streets. It was abandoned on September 15, 1864. In June of 1865 the Post at Tucson was re-occupied and troops were quartered in rented buildings. This second Post at Tucson was abandoned on May 27, 1865. During this time period, the US military created the Tucson Depot in June of 1865 to supply posts south of the Gila River. It was located near what is now the corner of Scott and 14th Streets and abandoned in 1874. In July of 1866 a Camp was again established in Tucson. On August 29, 1866, the post was designated permanent and named Camp Lowell in honor of Brigadier General Charles R. Lowell. In March of 1873 Camp Lowell was moved to a location on Rillito Creek seven miles from Tucson.

A second camp established in 1862 by the volunteers was named Fort Barrett in honor of the officer killed at Picacho Pass. It was located at the Pima Villages on May 31, 1862. It was abandoned on July 23, 1862. Another temporary post established in 1862 was Camp Tubac, which functioned as a supply depot on the Tucson to Guaymas wagon road. A temporary post was also established at La Paz on the Colorado River. This post saw sporadic use over the years as troops were stationed there to protect supply lines from this important river port.

The most important post established by the California Volunteers was Fort Bowie. It is located in Apache Pass in the Chiricahua Mountains, along side the wagon road from Tucson to Mesilla and near an important springs. It was first constructed in July of 1862 on a small hill overlooking the road and springs. In 1863 the Fort was moved a short distance to an adjoining hill which offered a better site. The post was designated Camp Bowie after 1866, and Fort Bowie after 1879. Fort Bowie served a strategic role during warfare with the Apache in the 1870s and 1880s.

In the midst of the Civil War, Congress created Arizona as a separate Territory from New Mexico. Because of increasing concerns about the Confederate military threat and in recognition of mineral discoveries in central Arizona, the Union decided to carve the Territory of Arizona from the western portion of New Mexico. Arizona officially became a separate Territory on February 24, 1863.

On October 23, 1863, Colonel Carleton authorized the establishment of a post near the gold fields of central Arizona. This post was named Camp Clark and was the location of the first territorial government offices in Arizona. The post was located about twenty-four miles northeast of the present location of Prescott in the Chino Valley area and was under the command of the Major Edward B. Willis of the California Volunteers. On May 18, 1864, Carleton designated the post Fort Whipple in honor of Brigadier General Amiel W. Whipple. The location of Fort Whipple was also moved at this time to the banks of Granite Creek near the town of Prescott, the territorial capitol of Arizona. Fort Whipple has the distinction of being the only palisaded fort in Arizona. It was enclosed with a rectangular stockade of rough-hewn logs twelve feet high.

Troops from Fort Whipple established a second post in central Arizona, located near the confluence of Beaver Creek with the Verde River. Called Fort Lincoln in honor of the assassinated President, it was established in January of 1866. It was manned by volunteer troops. The name of this post was changed to Camp Verde in 1868 to avoid confusion with other posts named after the fallen President. In 1871 this post was moved one-half mile south. It was designated Fort Verde in 1879.

California Volunteers established Fort Goodwin thirty miles from Safford and south of the Gila River in May of 1864. It was named for the first Territorial Governor of Arizona. This post served to protect agricultural settlements in the Safford Valley of the Gila River. Designated Camp Goodwin after 1866, its location along the Gila River in a swampy area made it an unhealthy post. It was abandoned in 1871.

California Volunteers also established Camp McDowell on the Verde River. It was first occupied on September 7, 1865 by five companies under the command of Lt. Col. Edward Bennett. Farmers harvested hay in the bottom land of the Salt River west of its confluence with the Verde River and transported it to Camp McDowell for sale. This activity gave rise to the small community of Phoenix, some thirty-five miles distant from Camp McDowell, in 1868.

During the Civil War, the California Volunteers also re-occupied Fort Defiance. It had been abandoned on April 25, 1861. In 1863 Colonel Carleton ordered Colonel Kit Carson to organize an expedition to stop Navajo raiding. Carleton gave the Navajo until July 20, 1863, to surrender to the Bosque Redondo Reservation in New Mexico. On July 20, Carson arrived at Fort Defiance. He was soon joined by a group of Ute Indian scouts, traditional enemies of the Navajo. Carson took on the Navajo in a major war, but could not penetrate into the refuge of Canyon de Chelly during the summer and fall. He waited until winter, then entered the Canyon. During this campaign, Carson established Camp Canby about twenty miles from Fort Defiance. Carson's winter campaign broke the resistance of the Navajo. Carson then organized the infamous "long walk" to the Bosque Redondo Reservation. Many Navajo died during this arduous trip.

Other posts established by volunteers during the Civil War included El Reventon, a supply camp on the Tucson to Guaymas road occupied in 1862 and again in 1864; the Bonneville Depot, a temporary camp on the Gila River near Yuma; Camp Mansfield, used in the Navajo campaign in 1863; Camp Supply, used by Kit Carson in the Navajo campaign; Camp Rigg used in 1864 in a campaign against the Apache; Camp Estray, used in 1864 and associated with Fort Breckenridge; and Camp Tonto, a temporary camp in the Verde River Valley.

In March of 1865 Arizona became a separate military district, under the command of General John S. Mason of the Department of the Pacific. For the first time the military responsibility for Arizona was severed from that of New Mexico. With the Civil War nearing an end, the enlistments of the California Volunteers began to expire. These troops were gradually replaced with regular troops from the Department of the Pacific.

Early Years of Conflict (1866 to 1875)

Although the Union forces were demobilized in the aftermath of the Civil War, the United States soon continued its march west in search of lands. During this time period, many Americans turned their attention to the interior sections of the country. In the Southwest, the conclusion of the War presented the opportunity for Americans to develop mining properties discovered before and during the War. A steady influx of miners and settlers into Arizona after the War demanded military protection as the Territory was integrated more closely into the national economy. The period up to 1875 saw a continuing expansion of the military presence in Arizona.

One of General Mason's first actions upon taking command of the District of Arizona was to establish a post at Date Creek to guard the Wickenburg-Prescott road junction. This post was first Called Camp Mason in honor of the new commander. It was established in June of 1865. It was abandoned in December that same year. It was replaced on May 11, 1867 with Camp McPherson. On November 23, 1868 the name of this post was changed to Camp Date Creek.

Mason formally authorized a supply depot on the Arizona side of the Colorado River across from Fort Yuma first created by California Volunteers in 1864, the Yuma Quartermaster Depot. The Yuma Depot grew to serve as the supply point for all of Arizona south of the Gila River. Mason also established a post near Calabasas on the Tucson to Guaymas road. He placed Colonel Charles W. Lewis in charge. Lewis named the post Fort Mason in honor of his commander. In June of 1865 Mason located a temporary camp at Maricopa Wells to protect the mails and in August of 1865 he established a post in the town of Wickenburg to protect the mines in the vicinity.

In November of 1865 Camp Grant was established 400 yards north of the confluence of the San Pedro River and Arivaipa Creek, near the old location of Camp Stanford (formerly Breckenridge). Camp Grant was a important facility on the along the heavily traveled San Pedro River trail along Leach's Wagon Road. Camp Grant was the last major military post established in the immediate post war period.

These major posts gave the U.S. military a commanding presence in Arizona. On the Colorado, Fort Yuma and the Yuma Supply Depot guarded the southern immigrant road to California and served as a transfer point for supplies entering the territory. Further north on the Colorado, Fort Mohave guarded the 35th parallel crossing of the river. Fort Whipple served as the military headquarters of the District of Arizona, centrally located near the mining district and the territorial capitol of Prescott. Nearby, Camp Lincoln guarded the upper Verde River while Fort McDowell protected the confluence of the Verde and Salt Rivers. Fort Defiance continued to serve as the only outpost in the northeastern part of the territory. In the southern part of the territory, Camp Grant protected the San Pedro River valley while troops at Fort Lowell stood watch over the town of Tucson and the Santa Cruz River. Fort Bowie protected the southern immigrant trail and stage route from New Mexico. Fort Mason guarded the Upper Santa Cruz River valley and the road from Guaymas.

These larger posts served as centralized locations from which smaller posts were established. As more and more settlers traveled to Arizona in the wake of the Civil War, and as post-War regulars replaced volunteer troops, a number of smaller camps were established subsidiary to the main outposts. These smaller posts served to bring the troops closer to the locations of Indian settlements.

One such post was Camp Reno, established subsidiary to Fort McDowell on Tonto Creek. Camp Reno was established in 1867 as a point of departure for troops fighting the Tonto and Pinal bands of Apache Indians. Fort Wallen was constructed on Babocomari Creek near its confluence with the San Pedro. Fort Wallen was created on May 9, 1866 to pursue bands of Chiricahua Apaches under the leadership of Cochise. Camp Lewis was established near the head of the Verde River. It served as a base of operations against the Yavapai from 1865 to 1870.

Other smaller posts in central Arizona were Camp Hualapai and Camp Tollgate, established as operational bases against the Hualapai and Yavapai Indians. Other small camps established between 1867 and 1870 included Camp Alexander, a temporary camp along the Beale Wagon Road; Camp Carroll, Camp O'Connell and Camp Miller, temporary camps on the road to Camp Reno from Fort McDowell; Camp Ilges, a temporary camp in Yavapai County, Camp Willow Grove, an infantry and cavalry outpost between Prescott and Kingman; Camp Rawlins, on the Prescott-Fort Mohave road; Camp Skull Valley north of Prescott; a temporary camp at the Santa Rita Mines; Camp Corner Rock near the Colorado River Indian Reservation; Camp Colorado on the river north of La Paz; and Camp Pinal in Pinal County to protect mining interests at the headwaters of Mineral Creek.

Larger facilities erected prior to 1870 but after the initial build up of troops included Camp Crittenden. This post was located in what is today Santa Cruz County. It replaced Fort Buchanan which was located about one-half mile east. Camp Crittenden was the largest post in Santa Cruz and Sonoita valleys south of Tucson.

One facility that started in 1870 but did not achieve prominence until later was Fort Apache. This post started as Camp Ord on May 15, 1870. It was located on the south bank of the east fork of the White River. The name of this post was changed to Camp Mogollon on August 1, 1870. This name lasted a little over a month. On September 12, 1870, the name of the post was changed to Camp Thomas. It became Camp Apache on February 2, 1871 and was known as Fort Apache after 1879. Fort Apache is significant as the headquarters for General George Crook's military campaigns. It served as a major staging point for the 1872 campaign of General Cook to force the remaining resisters onto reservations.

Native groups did not have facilities that resembled forts. They preferred to retreat into the rugged mountains for protection. Americans who perceived the raiding activities of native groups as militaristic described such locations as "strongholds." A more accurate term for these locations would be "refuge" which conveys a feeling for the sense of protection that native groups felt there. One such location for the Apache is today called Cochise Stronghold. It is located in the Dragoon Mountains of southeast Arizona. Rising above the Sulphur Springs Valley on its western flank, the Dragoon Mountains are a convoluted outcropping of granite rocks broken and tumbled together. Deep canyons penetrate the Dragoons, making pursuit difficult as resisters hid in the rocks above the canyons ready to fire. Cochise Stronghold was the primary place of refuge for the Apache leader after which it is named. When he died in 1874 the refuge was his final resting place as well.

In contrast to an organized system of forts which the Americans utilized, native groups practiced what might best be described as guerrilla warfare. Americans who had entered native territory were considered trespassers and so were considered as "fair game" for native groups. Attacks by native groups were typically very fast, quiet, and effective. These attacks were designed to redress grievances and to serve justice for crimes committed against native groups. Attacks for purposes of war were well-planned as well as executed. Planning consisted of ceremonies, speeches, dances, and physical preparations. Because the native concept of war was based on an entirely different physical premise than the methods used by Americans, there are few sites associated with native preparations for war that have been identified. Canyon de Chelly, mentioned earlier, and Cochise Stronghold, mentioned above, are perhaps the best examples, but these two sites give a false impression of native warfare strategy. That strategy was not based on offensive thrusts from a fixed point, nor on strategic defense of a particular locale.

Relations between Indians and Americans were in a very poor condition by 1870, particularly for the Apache and Yavapai. The quick increase of American population following the Civil War led to numerous incidents of trespass on traditional Indian lands and property. Indian retaliatory raids on American property were frequent. American settlers often fueled the conflict by unprovoked attacks on Indians, turning the conflict into an endless cycle of blood retaliation. Arizona Territory was in a state of war.

To combat the situation, the U.S. Army designated Arizona as a separate military department on April 15, 1870. This unification of command was an important gain for the military. However, the commanding general of the Department of Arizona, Major General George Stoneman, established his headquarters at Drum Barracks in California. This eliminated much of the advantage of the department command structure. To resolve this problem, on May 2, 1871, the Army placed General George Crook in charge of the Department of Arizona.

Before General Crook could start his campaign, the U.S. government first pursued a policy of peace with Indians in Arizona. In the aftermath of the Camp Grant massacre on April 30, 1871, when a group comprised of ninety-eight Tohono O'odham Indians, supported by forty-eight Mexican and six American settlers, killed a group of Apache in Arivaipa Canyon who were under the protection of the U.S. military, President Ulysess S. Grant sent a peace commissioner to Arizona. Vincent Colyer held views that many Arizonans believed were out of touch with local conditions. Colyer felt that the Apache and other native groups were innocent victims of oppression. He held whites to blame for many of the outrages, despite the fact that the majority of the perpetrators of the Camp Grant massacre were Tohono O'Odham Indians. The Camp Grant incident was one of many attacks and counter attacks involving a Indians, Mexicans, and Americans.

Colyer established several reservations for Indians in Arizona. He designated the land surrounding Camp

Apache as a reservation for the Coyotero Apache, lands surrounding Camp Grant for the Arivaipa and Pinal bands of Apache, lands near Camp McDowell for the Tonto Apache, lands at Camp Verde and Date Creek for the Mohave and Yavapai, and land at Beale's Springs for the Hualapai. Colyer left late in 1871, considering his mission complete.

With Colyer departed from the scene, Crook resumed preparations for his military campaign. Crook placed an Army officer in charge of the reservations and ordered the Indians to report to the internment areas by February 15, 1872. Those that did not report would be considered hostile and campaigned against in a state of war.

In northern Arizona, Camp Beale's Springs was established by General George Stoneman as a temporary camp in February of 1871. With the military preparations underway in central Arizona, this camp was declared permanent on May 11, 1871. It is located near the present Arizona town of Kingman.

In the midst of these preparations, the government pendulum in Washington swung back to peace efforts. President Grant appointed a second peace emissary. He selected General Oliver Otis Howard, a decorated Civil War veteran and former head of the Freedman's Bureau, to renew peace efforts. Howard arrived in Yuma in March of 1872 and traveled quickly to central Arizona. Howard abolished the Camp Grant reservation at the request of the Apache, and designated additional lands south of the Gila River as part of the White Mountain Reservation. Howard negotiated a peace treaty with the Arivaipa band of Apache. Howard's most dramatic achievement was a peace treaty with Cochise and the Chiricahua Apache. At a conference held in October of 1872, Howard and Cochise agreed to terms. Howard created the Chiricahua Indian Reservation in southeastern Arizona for Cochise's band of Apache. Howard also closed some of the smaller reservations established by Colyer - McDowell, Date Creek, and Beale's Springs - and directed a reduction in the size of the White Mountain Indian Reservation.

Howard's policy was essentially one of concentration. When he left for Washington in October of 1872, only two reservations remained of those designated by Colyer: The White Mountain Indian Reservation with its San Carlos sub-agency, and the Camp Verde Indian Reservation. With the Chiricahua reserve dedicated for Cochise's and his people, only the Camp Verde and White Mountain reservations remained open for resettlement. Howard directed that all Indians remaining in the abandoned reservations be brought to San Carlos by January 1, 1873.

With the departure of Howard, Crook resumed his military preparations. One important logistical change Crook made was to abandon the old location of Camp Grant at the junction of the San Pedro River and Arivaipa Creek. In December of 1872 Major William B. Royal established a new location for Camp Grant at the base of Mount Graham and at the head of the Sulphur Springs Valley. This post was designated Fort Grant in 1879.

Crook waited until winter to begin his campaign. Using the aid of Apache scouts who knew the territory, Crook took the fight to the mountains. In December of 1872 Crook's forces surprised a group of Yavapai who had established a camp and taken refuge in a cave above the

Salt River. This battle of Skull Cave, so described from the remains of the many Indian dead, was followed by a second significant engagement. In March of 1873 Crook's forces routed and killed an Apache force that had taken refuge at Turret Peak.

These military victories demonstrated the value of Crook's use of Indian scouts. These individuals knew the terrain and the style of fighting used by their kinsmen. The locations of refuges such as Skull Cave and Turret Peak were passed to the pursuers. The use of the Apache scouts also gave Crook a psychological advantage, as the Apache combatants in the field found it demoralizing to be pursued by their own kind.

These engagements reveal something of the strategy of native resisters during the period of warfare. They preferred to retreat into refuges such as caves and high mountains which afforded them protection during the winter. During the summer, resisters brought the fight to the enemy through the means of small war parties. This cyclical round was a centuries old pattern, used first between native groups and later between native groups and Spanish or Mexican settlers. Over the years, native groups had developed an intimate knowledge of the geography of Arizona, something the American military lacked. The rugged terrain of Arizona was their homeland, and they had mastered its harsh conditions.

Crook's daring winter campaign in 1872-73 broke this cycle and established a brief period of peace in Arizona. By the spring of 1873 many Apache and Yavapai began to assemble at Camp Verde. Their will to fight had been temporarily broken. Indians agreed to remain on the reservations and accept the rule of civilian agents who had replaced the military supervisors in December of 1872. The military continued its presence, however. In May of 1873 Crook established Camp San Carlos to oversee activities on the San Carlos Reservation.

The peace achieved through extended warfare lasted through the tenure of General Crook as commander of the Department of Arizona. It came at quite a price, with many dead on both sides of the conflict. The peaceful interlude ended shortly after Crook's departure in March of 1875.

Later Years of Conflict (1876-1886)

During this time period responsibility for relations between Indians and Americans in Arizona expanded to include the Department of the Interior. This Federal agency struggled to meet the strenuous demands of running the Indian reservations in Arizona. It relied on the use of civilian agents. Some of these were capable men; others were not. The Federal government created a system for protecting Indians in Arizona from American settlers by confining native groups on small reservations. Indians were forced to accept deprivation of their traditional lands and a tremendous disruption in their lifeway by increasing numbers of American settlements in Arizona. The forced relocation of Indians on reservations during this time period resulted in just over ten years of war.

In 1875 the Department of the Interior announced a policy of concentration for Indians in Arizona. It closed the Camp Verde Indian Reservation and transferred the

Apache and Yavapai from the Verde River valley to the San Carlos sub-agency. The population at San Carlos swelled to more than 4,200 Apache and other tribes. In March of 1876 the Interior Department ordered the Chiricahua Indian Reservation closed, further concentrating native groups at San Carlos. Of the more than 500 Chiricahua on the reservation, about 350 accommodated the desires of Interior Department officials; about 150 resisted the effort and refused.

This policy of concentration resulted in serious discontent among the native population of Arizona. The mingling of diverse groups in close proximity at San Carlos led to disorder and unrest. The mixing of various groups caused a disruption of group identity. By 1877 discontented groups began to gather up their people and go home. Americans called this behavior a "break out" and believed that resisting native groups were returning to a state of war. The ill-conceived policy of concentration threw Arizona into another cycle of violence and warfare.

The renewal of war led to a renewal of military construction in Arizona. In the summer of 1876, the Army established Camp Thomas on the Gila River. Later designated Fort Thomas, this post served to block the movements of Apache Indians who might desire to flee from the San Carlos Reservation and return home. A second major post was established on the flanks of the Huachuca Mountains overlooking the San Pedro River Valley in southern Arizona. Fort Huachuca was founded on March 3, 1877. It served an important role in the final campaign against those Apache who had fled the San Carlos Reservation. One other post was established after 1875, a minor one. Located near the border with Mexico in the Chiricahua Mountains, Camp Supply was established on April 29, 1878. Its name was changed to Camp Rucker in April of 1879, in honor of Lt. John A. Rucker. One small post, Camp Hentig, was established in 1882 between Forts Apache and Thomas. Hentig was a temporary post.

The establishment of these final three major posts set the stage for the ultimate campaign against the remaining resisters. The next ten years saw repeated incidents of groups leaving the reservations and returning home. One by one the resisters were tracked down, killed or confined. The military campaign culminated with the search for the individual Americans perceived as the last Apache leader still at large, Geronimo. Although Geronimo was only one of several Apache leaders, the final period of war ended with his agreement to cease hostilities in 1886. The Geronimo campaign witnessed the establishment of posts at Bowie Station and in the Chiricahua Mountains (Camp Emmett Crawford).

After the cessation of hostilities in 1886, the Army kept up the major posts for a few years. By 1890 it became apparent that the period of warfare was truly over. Some conflicts continued, but these are classed as individual acts of violence rather than organized warfare. The Army closed several of the major posts during the 1890s. These included Fort Bowie, Fort McDowell, Fort Lowell, Fort Mohave, Fort Verde, Camp San Carlos, and Whipple Barracks. Installations at Fort Whipple, Fort Apache, Fort Grant, and Fort Huachuca continued until the twentieth century.

Table 2

List of Forts and Camps to 1886

Name	Dates	Status*
Alexander	1867	
Apache	2/3/1870-5/3/1922	NR, 10/14/76; SI, #009-11
Arivaipa	see Breckenridge	
Barrett	5/31/1862-7/23/1862	SI, #021-119
Beale's Springs	2/1871-5/30/1874	NR, 7/18/74; SI, #015-2c
Bonita	late 1880s	
Bonneville	February, 1863	
Bowie	7/27/1862-10/17/1894	NHS, 8/30/64; SI, #003-20
Bowie Station	January-July, 1886	
Breckenridge	5/8/1860-3/7/1867	
Buchanan	1857-7/21/1861	
Calhoun	see Yuma	
Canby	1863-1864	SI, #001-40
Carroll	12/13/1867-2/4/1868	
Clark	1863-1864	SI, #025-29a
Colorado (not Fort Mohave)	11/25/1868-3/1871	
Corner Rock	3/14/1868-6/24/1868	
Emmett Crawford	1886	
Crittenden	3/4/1868-6/1/1873	SI, #023-31
Date Creek I	1865-10/12/1866	
Date Creek II	5/11/1867-9/1873	SR, #025-9
Defiance	9/18/1851-4/25/1861	SI, #001-9
Devin	see Hualapai	
El Reventon	Jul-Aug, 1862; 4/14/1864-6/22/1864	
Estray	May 31, 1864	
Goodwin	6/21/1864-3/14/1871	SI, #009-35

Grant I	10/31/1865-3/29/1873	SI, #021-11
Grant II	12/1872-1912	SI, #009-103, #4a & #4b
Hentig	5/18/1882-9/29/1882	
Huachuca	3/3/1877-present	NHL, 11/20/74; SI, #003-21a
Hualapai	1870-8/27/1873	SI, #025-12
Ilges	2/16/1867-6/13/1867	SI, #025-95
Independence	see Yuma	
La Paz	1864; 1865; 1867; 1874-75	SI, #027-171
Lewis	1865	
Lincoln	See Verde	SI, #025-10
Lowell I	5/21/1862-3/31/1873	
Lowell II	3/8/1873-1/8/1891	NR, 12/13/78; SI, #019-9
McDowell	9/7/1865-12/1890	NR, 8/27/92; SI, #013-3109 & #013-53
McKee	see Mason	
McPherson	see Date Creek	SI, #025-9
Maricopa Wells	1865-1867	
Mason, Camp	June-Dec. 1865	
Mason, Fort	Aug. 1865 - Sep. 1866	SI, #023-8
Mescal Springs	1885-86	
Miller	Oct. 1867-12/13/1867	
Mogollon	see Apache	
Mojave	4/29/1859-1890	SI, #015-11a
Moore	11/1856-6/1857	
O'Connell	2/8/1868-5/15/1868	
Ord	see Apache	
Pinal	11/22/1870-8/4/1871	SI, #021-12
Prescott Barracks	see Whipple	
Price	Spring 1882-10/10/1882	SI, #003-71
Rawlins	2/1870-8/11/1870	SI, #025-93
Reno	10/5/1867-6/25/1870	SI, #007-1851 & #007-6
Rigg	1864	SI, #009-36
Rucker	4/29/1878-11/5/1880	NR, 3/3/95; SI, #003-250 & #003-6
San Carlos	5/29/1873-1900	SI, #007-90
Santa Rita Mines	3/2/1867-5/27/1867	

Saw Mill	June-July, 1872	
Skull Valley	4/10/1866-5/1867	
Stanford	5/29/1862-6/29/1862	
Supply I	1863	SI, #017-102
Supply II	see Rucker	
Thomas	8/12/1876-4/10/1891	SI, #009-34 & #009-5
Toll Gate	see Hualapai	
Tonto	12/17/1864	
Tubac	6/1862-3/4/1868	NR, 12/2/70; SI, #027-9e & #027-38
Tucson Depot	6/19/1865-1874	
Verde	8/27/1865-6/1890	NR, 10/7/71; SI, #025-13e
Wallen	5/10/1866-10/31/1869	
Walnut Creek	1881	
Whipple	12/23/1863-1922	DOE, 6/25/81; SI, #025-294 & #025-30
Wickenburg	8/1865-6/1866	
Willow Grove	8/1867-6/30/1869	SI, #015-149
Yuma	11/27/1850-1884	NHL, 11/13/66; SI, #027-2

Status:
NR - National Register
DOE - Determination of Eligibility
NHL - National Historic Landmark
NHS - National Historic Site
SR - State Register
SI - State Inventory

NOTE - State register and state inventory numbers are not unique; they are sequential within counties - thus there could be more than one site with the same number. To clarify this situation, in this table and all other tables in this nomination the state register or state inventory number is preceded by the NPS county designation number, as follows:

001 - Apache
013 - Maricopa
027 - Yuma
003 - Cochise
015 - Mohave
005 - Coconino
017 - Navajo
007 - Gila
019 - Pima
009 - Graham
021 - Pinal
011 - Greenlee
023 - Santa Cruz
012 - La Paz
025 - Yavapai

Historic Context #2: Military Engagements and Peace Talks Between Americans and Indians in Arizona, 1846-1886.

This context describes the actual engagements and peace talks between Indians and Americans. This context emphasizes the "battle" aspects of the warfare period. This context follows the chronological and geographical format established in Context #1. Properties identified as associated with this context are listed in Table 3.

Mexican War (1846-1848)

Relations between the U.S. military and native groups during the War with Mexico were generally amiable. Col. Alexander W. Doniphan of Kearny's Army of the West met in council with a group of Navajo at Ojo de Oso (Bear Springs) near Gallup, New Mexico, and reached a treaty. A subsequent treaty was signed between the Navajo and the U.S. military in 1851. Most conflicts occurred between Indians and Mexican settlers. Mexicans, who had already settled Arizona, had villages, farms, and trade goods that were attractive to native groups. American settlers, who had yet to take up permanent residence in Arizona, had little that attracted the attention of native groups. Conflict between Mexican settlers native groups continued during this period, as it had since the first Spanish and Mexican interest in Arizona The transition to U.S. rule from 1846 to 1848 contributed toward escalating violence, as the War with Mexico left Arizona with reduced military protection. The California gold rush starting in 1849 contributed to the situation, as many settlers left the area to pursue opportunities further west.

The War with Mexico provided U.S. military men with their first encounters with Native groups in Arizona. These first contacts were peaceful. Observers traveling with Kearny's Army of the West and with the Mormon Battalion of Phillip St. George Cook were favorably impressed with the settled nature of the Pima Indians they encountered along the Gila River in central Arizona. Kearny himself visited with the Apache leader Mangas Coloradas near the Santa Rita copper mines in New Mexico before the U.S. soldier embarked on his journey across Arizona.

Pre-Civil War (to 1860)

In the aftermath of the War with Mexico and during the tumultuous years leading to the Civil War, large numbers of military and civilian explorers entered Arizona. The military surveyors had the task of charting the new boundary with Mexico, and the private surveyors were looking for a possible railroad route across Arizona. In addition to these Americans who had business in Arizona, the area also witnessed large numbers of immigrants who crossed the territory on their way to the gold fields in California. Some of these wealth seekers stopped in Arizona and began to develop the mineral resources of the area. This new influx of population led to conflicts with the native residents of Arizona who viewed the Americans as trespassers.

Since the United States by virtue of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the War with Mexico, assumed the protection of Mexican as well as American residents, the U.S. Army took up the defense of the territory. Boundary surveyor John Russell Bartlett was one of the first Americans to face the dangers of Arizona. In 1850 he assisted in the return of a Mexican girl who had been kidnapped by the Apache. Americans, Mexicans, and Indians captured the children of their enemy on occasion during the period of warfare. This practice led to repeated conflicts as the aggrieved party attempted reunite children with families.

The ford at the confluence of the Colorado and Gila rivers was likely place for conflict as more and more travelers crossed Arizona. The Yuma (Quechan) Indians seized the opportunity afforded by the stream of travelers to make a living by ferrying passengers across the Colorado. The Quechan forged an association with Dr. Abel B. Lincoln in their operation. When American John Glanton moved into to establish his own ferry operation, tensions rose. Glanton and his crew antagonized the Indians, and on April 21, 1850, the Quechan retaliated by attacking their rivals and killing eleven ferrymen.

The second incident which underscored the danger that accompanied the heat of the Arizona desert occurred in 1851. An immigrant party en route to the California gold fields had the misfortune to press forward across the southern immigrant trail to Yuma in spite of dwindling supplies and signs that Indian raiding parties were in the area. On February 18, 1851, while encamped near the Gila River, Royse Oatman, his wife, and children were attacked by Yavapai raiders. Six members of the family were murdered, with the eldest son Lorenzo left for dead. The two Oatman sisters, Olive and Mary Ann, were taken into captivity. Lorenzo escaped to tell the tale. The two sisters were later sold to the Mohave tribe. Mary Ann died within a year. Olive Oatman was recovered from the Mojave in 1856. The Oatman Massacre, as it came to be known, illustrated the dangerous conditions for travelers in Arizona.

Although the "Glanton Massacre" was almost universally recognized as justified at the time, incidents such as it and the Oatman Massacre led to demands by civilians for military protection of travelers crossing Arizona. On February 29, 1852, Brevet Major S.T. Heintzelman established a permanent garrison above the important ford of the Colorado River at its confluence with the Gila. Named Fort Yuma, it was located on the California side of the river on a bluff overlooking the ford.

As a result of surveys after the War with Mexico, the United States determined that it needed land south of the Gila River for a railroad right-of-way. The United States began negotiations with the government of Mexico for the acquisition of the territory. This additional land, known today as the Gadsden Purchase after James Gadsden who negotiated it, was acquired by a treaty signed on December 20, 1853 and ratified on April 25, 1854.

The construction of the Butterfield Overland Mail stage route across southern Arizona created additional points of conflict between Indians and Americans. The Butterfield Overland Mail began operation on September 16, 1858, entering Arizona through Apache Pass from the San Simon Valley in New Mexico and following the southern trail through Tucson, Maricopa Wells and on to Fort Yuma. The isolated stage stations of the Overland Mail were an easy target for native raids. Parties seeking supplies to capture could easily keep the few guards occupied while their compatriots drove off the stock.

The Overland Mail served as one of the first points of contact between Americans and Indians in Arizona. In many ways, native groups followed the same pattern with Americans that they had developed for their relationship with previous Mexican settlers. This consisted of a mix of friendly trading relationships on one side, accompanied by raiding forays on the other. Mexican settlers in one community might be considered by native groups as a source for goods, which, when acquired, were in turn sold or traded to other Mexican settlers in a separate community. This strategy had been employed between native groups before the arrival of the Spanish, and was an understandable later adaptation to the Mexican frontier. However, the Americans, and the Mexicans and Spanish before them, failed to understand the raiding and trading patterns. To Americans, Mexicans, and Spaniards, raiding of any sort by anyone not on their side was intolerable.

The establishment of Fort Buchanan in 1857 brought a military force in close proximity to the Apache raiders. Captain Richard S. Ewell took to the field in June of 1857 to exert some measure of control over raiding activity. On June 27, 1857, Ewell and his troops engaged an Apache band north of Mt. Graham. At least twenty resisters were killed and a large number of women and children were captured.

The presence of U.S. military troops and American settlers in the area pushed raiding into prominence by disabling preferred methods of subsistence. The raids were one part of a native lifeway that was centuries old. Other portions of the lifeway included agriculture, hunting, gathering, and collecting. As native groups came under pressure from more and more settlers, the raiding portion of the lifeway increased. This increase is evidence of a society under stress.

The Apache distinguished two types of raids. The first was for subsistence, to obtain supplies such as food, weapons, ammunition, and for kidnapping. Killing was not a goal of these subsistence raids because it added to the risk of failure. The apache also practiced raiding for revenge, as a punitive action to redress previous losses. In this second instance, the acquisition of goods was a secondary element. Few Americans understood the difference between these two types of raids. Those that did managed to arrange an understanding with the Apache. Some settlers paid money or provided goods to the Apache on the condition that they were left alone, so the Apache attacked somewhere else. Sylvester Mowry of the Patagonia Mine and the operators of the Butterfield stage took this precaution. The Apache needed partners to trade with. They also needed to leave something in the fields and farms of the settlers to grow and develop.

The introduction of U.S. troops into the Gadsden Purchase escalated the Apache cycle of raiding by preventing the Apache from utilizing their other sources of subsistence. The removal of traditional farmlands, and the danger of being shot on sight while hunting or harvesting made these other activities too dangerous to pursue. While some settlers may have reached an accommodation or understanding with some Apache groups, most new settlers felt that the raiding must come to an end. This belief by Americans, shared by Mexicans and Tohono O'Odham groups, resulted in an escalation of tension between Apache groups and American settlers.

This tension broke into the open in February of 1861 near what is today called Apache Pass. Lt. George N. Bascom accused Apache leader Cochise of being responsible for a raid which occurred in January of 1861 in the Sonoita Valley. A child, Feliz Martinez, had been kidnapped and Bascom was seeking his return. Bascom and Cochise conducted negotiations in a tent in Sulphur Canyon under a flag of truce. Bascom accused Cochise of conducting the raid and kidnapping the boy. Cochise disavowed any responsibility, and stated that the raid had been conducted other Apaches. After tensions escalated and Bascom attempted to capture Cochise, the Apache leader escaped from the tent. Bascom retaliated by taking the remaining Apache, family members of Cochise, hostage.

On February 5, Cochise retaliated, taking three prisoners from the stage station and a passing wagon train. Cochise offered to trade the captives for those held by Bascom. Bascom refused, unless Cochise would also turn over the kidnapped boy. Cochise later killed the captives after the two sides failed to come to terms. Bascom's supervisors later retaliated by killing the Apache captives.

Many historians trace deteriorating relations between Apache groups and Americans to this incident, called the "Bascom Affair." Cochise himself seemed to take this view, tracing his campaign for vengeance to this incident. Several of the Apache captives killed were his relatives. Although it is easy to trace the conflict to a single incident, a broader view is that the increasing American population in Arizona, accompanied by conquest of traditional Apache lands by Americans, made conflict inevitable. Within this larger view of conflict over territory, incidents such as the Bascom affair only served to harden attitudes on both sides. Each group felt that cruel murders had to be avenged.

The influx of travelers across Arizona prior to the Civil War led to demands for military protection in the northern part of the area as well. During the summer of 1858, a group of immigrants traveling along the 35th parallel route were attacked. On August 30, 1858, a group of Mohave Indians, angered at the invasion of their homeland and perhaps provoked by events now lost to history, attacked an immigrant party preparing to cross the Colorado River. Nine were killed. This incident, known as the Rose Massacre after the name of the immigrant's leader, led to demands for the construction of a military post on the Colorado.

Early in 1859, Lt. Col. William Hoffman led four companies of the Sixth Infantry to the area with the intent of establishing a post. Hoffman encountered a large group of Mohave and Paiute warriors and engaged them in a pitched battle. This experience led to renewed demands for a post on the Colorado. Hoffman returned in February with a larger force. The post was first called Camp Colorado. It was established on April 19, 1859 by Maj. L.A. Armistead. On April 28, 1859, Armistead changed the name of the post to Fort Mojave.

The construction of Fort Mohave led to relative peace with the Mohave. Impressed with the size of the U.S. contingent, the Mohave under leaders Iritaba, Kariook, and others agreed to terms. They pledged that they would not disturb the immigrants. The U.S. government then established the Camp Colorado Indian Reservation in 1859. The purpose of the reservation was to allow the Mohave to continue their agricultural pursuits and to afford them some protection from American settlers.

The era just prior to the Civil War era witnessed one of the largest attacks ever by Indians in Arizona. On April 30, 1860, more than 1,000 Navajo attacked Fort Defiance. They were successful in seizing some of the buildings at the fort. This attack is unusual since Arizona Indian leaders generally preferred to avoid direct confrontations at fortified American military posts. The attack at Fort Apache in 1881 (described later) is the only other such incident in Arizona.

Civil War (1861-1865)

The outbreak of the Civil War led to a withdrawal of U.S. military protection in Arizona. The immediate result of the withdrawal was an increase in conflicts between native groups and American settlers. With U.S. troops occupied in the east, American settlers in Arizona felt they needed protection.

In December of 1861 Brigadier General George Wright suggested sending volunteers from California to Arizona to guard the mail routes. During March and April of 1862 the California Volunteers began assembling at Fort Yuma under the command of Colonel James H. Carleton to advance against Confederate sympathizers operating in Arizona. At the same time, Brigadier General Henry H. Sibley brought a Confederate force from Texas up the Rio Grande. The two sides met in a brief battle at Picacho Pass on April 15, 1862. More accurately described as a brief skirmish between pickets, this conflict has generally been called a victory for Union forces. Recent research by Boyd Finch supports the view that the Confederate forces actually carried the engagement. In its aftermath, Carleton's forces continued on to Tucson and occupied the city on June 7. The Confederate threat to Arizona vanished.

The California Volunteers made a significant military presence in Arizona. During the Civil War the California Volunteers re-occupied many of the posts that had been abandoned at the start of the war. The volunteers also established several new posts. A column of troops from the volunteers engaged the Apache in one of the largest battles ever fought between U.S. troops and Indians.

In July of 1862, a column of troops left Tucson en route to Mesilla. At Apache Pass on July 15, Apache warriors under the leadership of Mangas Coloradas and Cochise attacked. Known as the "Battle of Apache Pass," the battle began with a sharp skirmish at Apache Springs. Thinking the battle was over, the troops advanced toward water in the springs at Apache Pass. Here, the Apache began firing from hidden positions. They kept the troops under fire. Only by using shells from howitzers directed at the hidden positions did Captain Thomas S. Roberts manage to dislodge the Apache.

This battle demonstrated the importance of Apache Pass as a military location. On July 27, 1862, Colonel James H. Carleton ordered the establishment of a military camp at the location. Carleton designated it Fort Bowie in honor of General George W. Bowie of the Fifth California (Federal) Cavalry.

Native groups during the Civil War viewed the withdrawal of regular troops from Arizona as an opportunity for re-asserting control over the area. Col. John R. Baylor, the military governor of Confederate Arizona, ordered a policy of extermination to combat the threat. Colonel Carleton of the Union forces followed a similar policy of genocide.

Native groups felt that their homeland was being invaded by the numerous prospecting parties which had entered Arizona. Gold deposits were discovered in central Arizona in 1863. The rush of miners led to conflicts between Indians and Americans. The California Volunteers established Fort Whipple in the Little Chino Valley to protect the miners. After the designation of Arizona as a separate Territory from New Mexico in 1863, Fort Whipple was relocated to the territorial capitol of Prescott.

Indiscriminate attacks by miners on Yavapai Indians and the Tonto Apache in central Arizona caused these groups to respond in kind. Miners and settlers in central Arizona considered themselves in a constant state of war. Native groups felt that they were simply responding to an armed invasion of their traditional lands.

In January of 1864 these conditions led to an incident known today as the "Massacre at Bloody Tanks." Frontiersman King S. Woolsey organized an expedition of settlers and friendly Maricopa Indians to pursue a party of Apache accused of stealing cattle in the Peeples Valley. Near the present site of Miami, Arizona, King and his group encountered a large band of Apache. The two groups settled down to a conference. At a sign from Woolsey, his men attacked the Apache leaders. The fight soon became general. Later estimates placed the number of Indian dead at twenty-four.

Settlers in the southern portion of Arizona followed the extermination policy as well. In May of 1863, Captain T. T. Tidball of the California Volunteers tracked a band of Apache to Arivaipa Canyon. The volunteers reported killing fifty Apache. In April of 1864, Captain James H. Whitlock led a detachment of sixty California Volunteers in pursuit of a Chiricahua Apache band. Whitlock reported killing at least twenty-one Apache during an engagement near Grey's Peak in today's Greenlee County.

In northern Arizona, Union leaders felt the need to establish a military presence in the area. Fort Defiance had been abandoned on April 25, 1861. In 1863 Colonel Carleton ordered Colonel Kit Carson to organize an expedition to stop Navajo raiding. Carleton gave the Navajo until July 20, 1863, to surrender to the Bosque Redondo Reservation in New Mexico. On July 20, Carson arrived at Fort Defiance. He was soon joined by a group of Ute Indian scouts, traditional enemies of the Navajo. Carson took on the Navajo in several battles, but could not penetrate into the stronghold of Canyon de Chelly. He waited until winter, then entered the Canyon. During this campaign, Carson established Camp Canby about twenty miles from Fort Defiance. Carson's winter campaign broke the resistance of the Navajo. Carson then organized the infamous "long walk" to the Bosque Redondo Reservation. Many Navajo died during this arduous trip.

In March of 1865 Arizona became a separate military district, under the command of General John S. Mason of the Department of the Pacific. For the first time the military responsibility for Arizona was severed from that of New Mexico. With the Civil War nearing an end, the enlistments of the California Volunteers began to expire. These troops were gradually replaced with regular troops from the Department of the Pacific.

Early Years of Conflict (1866 to 1875)

Although the Union forces were demobilized in the aftermath of the Civil War, the United States began to re-assert its political and military authority in the Southwest. The conclusion of the War presented the opportunity for Americans to develop the mining properties in the Southwest. A steady influx of miners and settlers into Arizona after the War demanded military protection. The period up to 1875 saw a continuing expansion of the military presence in Arizona.

Brigadier general John S. Mason assumed command of the District of Arizona during the summer of 1865. He inherited a basic system of defense from Colonel Carleton's California Volunteers. It consisted of Forts Lowell, Bowie, Breckenridge, and Camp Wallen south of the Gila River. North of the Gila Fort Whipple and Camps Goodwin and Lincoln (renamed Camp Verde in 1868) protected the miners of central Arizona. On the Colorado Forts Yuma and Mohave guarded the important river crossings. In 1865 Mason added Fort McDowell near the confluence of the Salt and Verde rivers.

The election of General Ulysses S. Grant as President of the United States in November of 1868 brought military leadership to the White House. Those who advocated a strong policy of force against Indians were pleased. However, as President, General Grant pursued a policy of peace and conciliation with Indian groups that disappointed settlers in areas such as Arizona who demanded military action.

The immediate post-war years were ones of conflict and violence in Arizona. Tribes such as the Apache and Yavapai were emboldened by the lack of an organized military command during the Civil War. The post-War influx of settlers caused many points of friction between these native residents and the new arrivals. The violence which occurred hardened settler's attitudes towards Indians and made Grant's peace policy difficult to enforce. In November of 1866, military commanders divided Arizona into five separate districts of the Department of the Pacific, making coordination of military activities difficult. These districts included Tucson (Camp Lowell, headquarters), Prescott (Fort Whipple, headquarters), Verde (Camp McDowell, headquarters), Upper Colorado (Camp Mohave, headquarters), and Lower Colorado (Fort Yuma, headquarters). The lack of a strong central U.S. military command contributed to the violent conditions in Arizona.

On April 15, 1870, War Department orders created a separate Department of Arizona. This unification of command was an important gain for the military. However, the commanding general of the department, Major General George Stoneman, established his headquarters at Drum Barracks in California. This eliminated much of the advantage of the department command structure.

In northern Arizona the period from 1866 to 1869 is known as the "Hualapai War" because of its extended nature. This conflict began shortly after the completion of the Beale Wagon Road across the 35th parallel of Northern Arizona in 1858. The influx of travelers across Hualapai lands generated some battles and skirmishes starting in 1859, but the withdrawal of troops east during the Civil War eased tensions. With the establishment of the Territory of Arizona in 1863 after the discovery of mineral wealth in the mountains near Prescott, and the end of the Civil War, conflict between the United States and the Hualapai people resumed as large numbers of prospectors and miners entered the area. Three Hualapai leaders played important roles in the conflict: Wauba-Yuba, Cherum, and Hualapai Charley. In 1866 Wauba-Yuba was murdered by a prospector near present-day Kingman. This act set off an extended period of warfare. Miners in the area became subject to attack. A series of engagements between the Hualapai, the military, and civilians occurred in 1867 and 1868.

The pivotal engagement in the Hualapai War took place in January of 1868. Known as the Battle of Cherum Peak, it began when Captain S.B.M. Young and Lt. Jonathan D. Stevenson heard that Cherum's band was encamped in the Cerbat Range of northwest Arizona. Traveling at night, Captain Young encircled Cherum's campsite. Young attacked at dawn on January 14, 1868, meeting a force of more than one hundred native warriors. Stevenson had executed a flanking maneuver and awaited the results of the initial engagement. Hearing the noise of battle, Stevenson and his troops quickly joined in. Stevenson fell in the first volley. The fight continued all day and into the night. By sunrise the next day, Cherum and his band had escaped, but the battle had taken a toll on the Hualapai. Twenty-one warriors had died and many others were wounded.

The Battle of Cherum Peak broke the back of the Hualapai resistance. Soon, Cherum and Hualapai Charley began peace negotiations. The Hualapai War ended on August 20, 1868, when Hualapai Mountain Band Chief Levi-Levi (half brother to Cherum and Hualapai Charley) sued for peace. For the next few years the Hualapai people lived in peace with the United States, but in 1874 the Office of Indian Affairs decided to remove the Hualapai to the Colorado Indian Reservation. The Army was dispatched to carry out the orders and on April 4, 1874, started the Hualapai on a forced march to the Colorado River at La Paz. Many died along the way. Many more died in the hot climate of the Lower Colorado River Valley. Even the US Government recognized the injustice of the situation, and a year later in 1875 allowed the Hualapai to return to their homeland on the Colorado Plateau.

North of the Colorado River, in what is known as the Arizona Strip, the years following the Civil War saw an increase in population by Mormons. Because of their unique religious views, Mormons advocated a more humane treatment of native groups. To the Mormons, Indians were descended from one of the original tribes of Israel. The Mormon felt an obligation to bring these people back to what they felt was the true church. For this reason, most Mormons were less antagonistic towards Indians than other Americans.

However, for all their good intentions, Mormons were frontiersmen who carried with them all the prejudices and passions of the frontier. The Paiute and Navajo Indians of the Arizona Strip, perhaps treated better by Mormons than by others, still felt their lands were being trespassed upon as good lands an watering places were fenced off and wild game began to disappear. Relations between Americans and Indians in the Arizona Strip reached a low point in 1866 during what has become known as the Whitmore-McIntyre Incident. Dr. James Whitmore was a rancher who ran a herd of sheep near Pipe Spring with the assistance of an employee, Rover McIntyre. On January 8, 1866, Whitmore and McIntyre were killed, presumably by Paiutes. A party of Mormon settlers tracked down those they believed to be the perpetrators. Seven Paiutes were killed. Years later, the attack on the ranch was attributed the Navajo.

In the years that followed, several other conflicts took place between Paiute and Navajo Indians and Mormon settlers. This led to the designation of Pipe Spring Fort, a Mormon settlement in the Arizona Strip, as a means of protection for settlers in 1869. In 1870, Jacob Hamblin and navajo Indians reached an agreement at Fort Defiance which ended further conflicts in the Arizona Strip.

In southern Arizona, General Stoneman followed Grant's peace policy by establishing "feeding stations" where native groups would receive rations in exchange for laying down arms. One such location was at Camp Grant at the junction of the San Pedro River with Arivaipa Creek. A group of Apache under the leadership of Eskiminzin settled near Fort Grant during the winter and spring of 1870-1871.

The feeding station at Camp Grant was the location of one of the worst episodes of violence during the period of warfare. Known today as the Camp Grant Massacre, it occurred at dawn on April 30, 1871. A group of ninety-eight Tohono O'odham Indians, forty-seven Mexicans, and six Americans from Tucson attacked a group of Arivaipa and Pinal Apaches under the military protection of Camp Grant. At the time of the attack, the warriors in the group were away from camp. This left elderly men, women, and children as targets. Between 86 and 150 were killed and at least twenty-eight children were carried away as slaves.

This attack by civilian settlers and an enemy Indian tribe on the Apache shocked the eastern establishment in the United States, although most American residents of Arizona expressed little dismay at the outcome. This incident was actually a continuation of hostilities between the Apache and Tohono O'Odham going back at least for a century. The involvement of Mexican and American settlers in an attack on an Indian group under the presumed protection of the US military places this incident firmly within the conflict between Indians and Americans. In the aftermath of the incident, President Grant threatened to place Arizona under martial law until the perpetrators were captured. More than 100 defendants were indicted (mostly Tohono O'Odham), but a Tucson jury took only nineteen minutes to return a not guilty verdict.

In the wake of the Camp Grant Massacre, President Grant relieved George Stoneman of his command and sent General George Crook to take over the leadership of the Department of Arizona. Crook arrived in June of 1871. President Grant also sent Vincent Colyer to Arizona as a peace commissioner. Colyer was charged with finding a peaceful solution to the violence. Colyer arrived in September of 1871 and quickly created a series of reservations for native groups. At those locations, the government provided food and clothing, as well as protection from settlers. Colyer designated the land surrounding Camp Apache as a reservation for the Coyotero Apache, lands surrounding Camp Grant for the Arivaipa Apache and Pinal Apache, lands near Camp McDowell for the Tonto Apache, lands at Camp Verde and Date Creek for the Yavapai, and land at Beale's Springs for the Hualapai.

The establishment of these reservations did not stop the centuries-old pattern of raiding by native groups. On November 5, 1871, a group of Apache attacked a stage near Wickenburg. This attack was soon called the Loring Massacre because it resulted in the death of Frederick W. Loring, a prominent eastern writer. This attack modified eastern perceptions of the conflict in Arizona. Perhaps, easterners now grudgingly agreed, Arizonans were right: the only way to combat violence was with more violence. Peace Commissioner Colyer returned east late in 1871.

With Colyer departed from the scene, General Crook resumed preparations for his military solution to the situation. Crook placed an Army officer in charge of the reservations and ordered the Indians to report to the internment areas by February 15, 1872. Those that did not report would be considered hostile and hunted down. Crook scouted the rugged Arizona territory and prepared to take his campaign to the Apache combatants.

In the midst of these preparations, the government pendulum in Washington swung back to peace efforts. President Grant appointed a second peace emissary. He selected General Oliver Otis Howard, a decorated Civil War veteran and former head of the Freedman's Bureau, to renew peace efforts. Howard arrived in Yuma in March of 1872 and traveled quickly to central Arizona. Howard abolished the Camp Grant reservation at the request of the Apache, and designated additional lands south of the Gila River as part of the White Mountain Indian Reservation.

One of Howard's more significant accomplishments during this trip was to negotiate a peace treaty with the Arivaipa Apache. This was a very difficult task. Howard had to bring the grieving band of Arivaipa Apaches together with Americans, Hispanics, and Tohono O'odhams in the wake of the Camp Grant Massacre. The talks began on Friday, April 26, 1872. Howard practiced a type of "shuttle diplomacy," speaking with many bands of Apache and consulting with military and civilian authorities. On May 21, 1872, the representatives of Apache, American, Tohono O'Odham and Hispanic groups gathered in a shady grove near Camp Grant. Apache leader Eskiminzin pointed to a rock at the conference site and stated: "as long as that stone lasts the treaty will be kept." The 1872 conference achieved a lasting peace with the Arivaipa Apache.

As exceptional as the Camp Grant conference was, Howard's most dramatic achievement was a peace treaty with Cochise and the Chiricahua Apache. At a conference held in October of 1872, Howard and Cochise agreed to terms. Howard created the Chiricahua Indian Reservation in southeastern Arizona for Cochise's band of Apache. Howard also closed some of the smaller reservations established by Colyer - McDowell, Date Creek, and Beale's

Springs - and directed a reduction in the size of the White Mountain Reservation.

Howard's policy was essentially one of concentration. When he left for Washington in October of 1872, only two reservations remained of those designated by Colyer: The White Mountain with its San Carlos division, and Camp Verde. With the Chiricahua reserve dedicated for Cochise's tribe, only the Camp Verde and White Mountain reservations remained open for resettlement. Howard directed that all Indians remaining in the abandoned reservations be brought to the San Carlos sub-agency by January 1, 1873.

With the departure of Howard, Crook resumed his military preparations. The policy of peace resulted in more than 5,000 Apache and Yavapai settling on reservations, but between September of 1871 and September of 1872 more than fifty-four violent conflicts resulting in the loss of forty-four lives had occurred. While some native groups wanted peace, others continued resistance. Settlers demanded action from Crook. He waited until winter to begin his campaign. Using the aid of Apache scouts who knew the territory, Crook took the fight to the mountains starting on November 15, 1872.

Crook's winter campaign included two decisive engagements. The first of these occurred in December of 1872 when Crook's forces surprised a group of Yavapai who had established a camp in a cave above the Salt River. On December 28, 1872, Captains William H. Brown and James Burns trapped about 100 Yavapai and placed the cave under siege. They directed their aim at the roof of the cave. The bullets bounced off the roof of the cave, and dropped into the warriors, women, and children below. The official death toll was seventy-six. This Battle of Skull Cave, so described from the remains of the many Indian dead, was a decisive blow to the Yavapai in the heart of their territory.

A second pivotal engagement occurred in March of 1873 when Crook's forces routed and killed an Apache force that had taken refuge at Turret Peak. On March 27, 1873, a column led by Capt. George M. Randall of the 23rd Infantry located a band of Tonto Apache encamped atop Turret Peak south of Camp Verde. Randall's troops quietly ascended the mountain during the night. When dawn broke, they charged the summit. Twenty-three Apache died in the surprise attack. The battle at Turret Peak broke the strength of the Tonto Apache who were still resisting.

Although the battles at Skull Cave and Turret Peak marked the end of resistance for groups of Yavapai and Tonto Apache, they were only two battles of an extended campaign. Over the winter of 1872-1873, Crook's troops engaged Indians in more than twenty separate battle actions, resulting in the death of more than 200 Indians. The Skull Cave and Turret Peak engagements accounted for nearly half of the Indian dead.

On April 6, 1873, Crook met with Apache leader Chalipun at Camp Verde. More than 300 Apache accompanied Chalipun, as representatives of a total band population of 2,300. As Chalipun surrendered, he remarked that General Crook had "demasiadas cartuchos de cobre" - too many copper cartridges - for the Tonto Apache to continue the fight.

By the autumn of 1873, the Indian Bureau registered more than 6,000 Apache and Yavapai enrolled on the reservation lists at Camp Verde, Fort Apache, Fort Bowie, and San Carlos. The combination of Crook's impressive campaign of warfare and Grant's peace policy had resulted in an uneasy calm in Arizona. The peace lasted through the tenure of General Crook as commander of the Department of Arizona. It ended shortly after his departure in March of 1875.

Later Years of Conflict (1876-1886)

The later years of conflict between Indians and Americans in Arizona are characterized as ones of adjustment for both groups. The Apache, who had suffered a series of dramatic military defeats, were confined to small portions of their former wide range of territory. This transition was a difficult one, as it represented a drastic change in their way of life. For Americans, the reservations covered areas that might otherwise be available for settlement or mineral exploitation. Conflict came when Americans continued to press for additional lands. Indians, confined to reservations, resisted the attempts by Americans to take more of their land. Indians also resisted the cruel conditions on the reservations.

The policy pursued by the Federal government in Arizona was one of concentration. Agents of the Interior Department sought to confine Indians on smaller and smaller reservations. Officials defended the policy on the basis of control and economy, arguing that it would be easier to manage the native groups if they were all located in close proximity. For Indians, who had used distance from one another to maintain peaceful relations, the concentration policy generated discomfort. The practice of pitting one group against another through the use of an Indian police force formed by Americans induced conflicts.

The extension of the concentration policy in 1875 triggered another wave of violence in Arizona. As early as 1873, the Interior Department's Indian Bureau had moved 1,500 Arivaipa and Pinal Apache to the San Carlos sub-agency. In March of 1875 the Indian Department closed the Camp Verde reservation and transferred more than 1,400 Yavapai and Tonto Apache to San Carlos. In July, nearly 1,800 Coyotero Apache were moved from Fort Apache to San Carlos.

The last group designated to move were the Chiricahua Apache. This native group was divided over the wisdom of the move. On June 12, 1876, Indian Agent John P. Clum convinced 325 Chiricahua to make the journey to San Carlos. However, more than 400 resisted the move and broke free toward New Mexico and the Sierra Madre range in Mexico.

Those Apache that escaped the government's concentration policy in 1876 included three of the tribe's most able leaders: Juh, Noglee, and Geronimo. Geronimo gradually assumed a position of leadership for the resisters. Often described as more of a medicine man and spiritual leader than a military chief, Geronimo struggled between resistance and accommodation. Geronimo and other Apache leaders continued the battle with U.S. troops for the next ten years, alternating periods of accommodation with the repression of the reservation system with periods of violent resistance to it.

San Carlos Indian agent John P. Clum is associated with the end of one of Geronimo's periods of resistance in 1877 at the Hot Springs Reservation in New Mexico. In a tense confrontation on April 20, 1877, Clum contended that he and his Indian allies surrounded Geronimo and compelled his surrender. An alternative view would be that Geronimo and his allies decided that accommodation was the best course of action at the moment. In the aftermath, Clum rounded up 343 Warm Springs Apache and 110 Chiricahua Apache and transferred them to the San Carlos reservation. The accommodation was short-lived. On September 2, 1877, Apache leader Victorio engineered an outbreak from San Carlos. He led more than 310 Apache, mostly Warm Springs with some Chiricahua, on a two year hiatus from the reservation. Although Geronimo remained on the reservation, Victorio's escape demonstrated that the control of the U.S. military and the Indian Bureau over the Apache was tenuous at best.

Conditions at San Carlos contributed to the discontent of the Apache. Confined on the reservation in close proximity to other native groups, many of whom had enmity for each other, the Apache suffered from a complete breakdown of their traditional social fabric. With their historic lifeway replaced by a ration system for sustenance, the Apache suffered from hunger and deprivation. Crook called the Apache "these tigers of the human race." Those tigers took to the regimentation and control which accompanied reservation life stoically. They tried to make their conditions bearable by using their sense of humor, joking and laughing at the predicaments of the American reservation agents.

Despite their attempts at accommodation, the abuse and deprivation of the reservation system contributed to the resistance of Warm Springs and Chiricahua Apache, triggered in part by the Cibecue Creek Massacre of August 30, 1881. A medicine man named of Noch-ay-del-klinne began to circulate stories of how the Apache could raise the dead and induce the white invaders to go away. The process included a special dance, and in many ways was similar to the Ghost Dance movement which originated among the Paiutes of Nevada in about 1870 and spread later through the Great Plains. The visions espoused by Noch-ay-del-klinne inspired many White Mountain Apache. However, they greatly troubled San Carlos agent J.C. Tiffany. The agent wanted the prophet arrested, and even killed if he did not cooperate. This situation contributed to a feeling by the Apache that military authorities would arrest and kill Apaches on the slightest pretense.

Col. Eugene A. Carr of the 6th Cavalry received the orders to arrest Noch-ay-del-klinne. Carr viewed the assignment with distrust, because he felt that it was ripe for violence. On August 30 he marched into the prophet's camp on Cibecue Creek about 28 miles northwest of Fort Apache. The confrontation with Noch-ay-del-klinne was intense, but he finally submitted. As Carr marched back to Fort Apache with two troops of cavalry, eighty five men, twenty-three White Mountain Apache scouts, and his captives, his column was dogged by followers of Noch-ay-del-klinne. After the troops had camped for the night, the followers attacked. During the violence which ensued, several Apache scouts turned on their commanders for the first and only time in the period of warfare. Several were killed on both sides, including Noch-ay-del-klinne and Captain Edmund C. Hentig. Carr managed to retreat during the night to Fort Apache.

The Cibecue Creek Massacre, as the event became known, rekindled fears on the San Carlos reservation and resulted in renewed outbreaks. In the aftermath of the battle troops swarmed over the reservation. Many Apache felt that retribution would be forthcoming after the conflict. On September 15, 1881, a group of 74 Chiricahua under the leadership of Juh, Naiche, Geronimo, and Chato escaped during the night. They quickly fled for the Sierra Madre mountains of Mexico. A second Apache leader, Natiotish, also escaped in the aftermath of Cibecue and led a group of Apache into the mountains of Arizona.

The outbreak of Natiotish precipitated the last major battle of the period of warfare. Known as the Battle of Big Dry Wash, it started when Natiotish and his group of White Mountain Apache spotted a group of the 6th Cavalry in pursuit and decided to set an ambush. The Apache occupied two sides of a narrow canyon and waited. Unbeknownst to them, veteran guide Al Sieber detected the trap. The 6th Cavalry was reinforced with units from the Third Cavalry. On July 17, 1882, as one group mustered a feint down the canyon, two cavalry troops executed a flanking maneuver on the plateau. Between sixteen and twenty-seven Apache died. Those that remained were quickly returned to the reservation.

In the wake of the Cibecue Creek Massacre and the Battle of Big Dry Wash, the military command re-organized the military Department of Arizona. War Department brass in Washington, D.C. turned to a proven and effective commander: General George Crook. Although conditions seemed poor, only one Apache group was still considered hostile by the U.S. military. Geronimo's band of Chiricahua Apache, operating out of its strongholds in Mexico's Sierra Madre mountains, was the last remaining group still in a state of war. The Battle of Big Dry Wash marked the end of hostilities by all other Apache groups.

Crook faced three tasks as he assumed command at Whipple Barracks on September 4, 1882. He needed to bring the Indians confined on reservations under control, he needed to protect lives and property in Arizona, and he needed to subjugate the Apache resisters operating out of the Sierra Madre. Crook first appointed officers to improve conditions at San Carlos and Fort Apache. To combat the Apache in Mexico, Crook forged a reciprocal border crossing agreement with Mexican President Porfirio Diaz.

Resistance by Apache leader Chato in March of 1883 allowed Crook to put his system into operation. Chato blasted through southeastern Arizona, raiding day and night, and managed to escape back into Mexico without being engaged by military authorities. Crook mounted an expedition. On May 1, 1883, Cook crossed the border and made his way to the Sierra Madre range. Crook engaged bands under the leadership of Chato and Benito on May 15, attacked their camp. After several hours of fighting Crook crushed their resistance and brought them back to the reservation.

The presence of Crook within the heart of their refuge cause many Apache to reconsider continued warfare, as opposed to seeking accommodation with the American general. Crook conducted extensive negotiations with Apache leaders Geronimo, Chihuahua, Chato, Benito, Loco, Naiche, and Nana. Crook managed to convince them to stop fighting and accompany him back to the reservation in Arizona. On June 10, 1883, Crook crossed the border with over 300 members of the Warm Springs Apache band. It took some time for the remaining Chiricahua and Warm Springs groups to arrive. Between December of 1883 and February of 1884, groups under Naiche, Chato, and Mangas trailed in. Geronimo was the last to arrive.

The surrender of the remaining Chiricahua Apache bands in the spring of 1884 shifted the scene of action back to the Fort Apache Indian Reservation. Conditions there had changed little. The recent arrivals chaffed under the control of military authorities. While those who had been confined for some time had become accustomed to the routine, those who had only recently given up the taste of freedom found the regulations offensive. On May 17, 1885, forty-two men and ninety-two women and children fled the reservation to seek their traditional homeland. The group included Geronimo, Naiche, Chihuahua, Nana, and Mangas. Geronimo headed directly for Mexico, while Chihuahua used diversions as tactics and strategy to resist the superior force. These actions took him through New Mexico before crossing the international border.

The 1885 outbreak of Chiricahua Apache led to another campaign by Crook in the mountains of Mexico. A summer expedition in 1885 proved futile. Another expedition in the fall of 1885 also failed to encounter the Apache resisters. Finally, a third expedition led by Capt. Emmett Crawford located the group near the Aros River in Mexico. A chance encounter with Mexican troops resulted in the death of Crawford, claimed by Mexican troops as an error during the confusion of the fight.

Despite Crawford's unfortunate end, Crook's campaign soon bore fruit in the form of negotiations to end hostilities. On January 13, 1886, Lt. Marion P. Maus discussed the possibility of ending hostilities with Geronimo, Naiche, Chihuahua, and Nana. Geronimo, dictating the terms of the negotiations, stressed that he needed to discuss the matter with Crook personally. Geronimo promised to meet with Crook in two months near the border. On March 25, 1886, Crook sat down with Geronimo and other Apache leaders to discuss the surrender at Canyon de los Embudos in Mexico. At first, Crook demanded an unconditional surrender. After negotiation, Crook offered terms of confinement in the east for two years followed by a return to the reservation.

The Chiricahua spent some time discussing the proposition. By March 27, they had agreed with terms. They agreed to exchange hostilities for peace and return to the reservation in Arizona. Crook returned to Arizona with the good news, leaving Lt. Maus to escort the group. It turned out that Crook's relief was premature. During the night of March 28, both groups celebrated with mescal purchased from an itinerant trader. During the night the Apache reconsidered their situation. Geronimo and Naiche, along with twenty men and thirteen women, fled into the mountains of Mexico. Chihuahua and Nana, with about seventy-five others, returned to Arizona.

The failure to capture Geronimo angered officials at the War Department in Washington, D.C. General Phillip H. Sheridan ridiculed the performance of Crook and his Apache scouts, expressing a common belief that the combined forces should have been able to bring Geronimo and his small band to Arizona. Crook, anticipating the inevitable, asked to be relieved of command on April 1, 1886. Sheridan responded quickly. The next day Sheridan assigned Brig. Gen. Nelson A. Miles to command the Department of Arizona.

Miles abandoned Crook's reliance on Apache scouts, trusting that American troops would eventually wear down and conquer the Apache combatants. Miles also adopted a reliance on technology. He brought a system of communications based on the heliograph to Arizona. This system used mirrors and sunlight to flash messages quickly from peak to peak across the vast terrain of Arizona and New Mexico. In addition, Miles planned to remove all of the Chiricahua and Warm Springs Apache on reservations in Arizona to Florida. Miles hoped that the removal would stop the threat of continuing resistance.

With these plans in place, Miles then unleashed a full campaign to kill or capture the small band of Apaches still resisting. He dispatched Captain Henry W. Lawton and Lt. Charles B. Gatewood to Mexico to locate Geronimo and his people. Apache scouts Martine and Kayihtah led the Americans to the location of the camp. On August 24, 1886, Geronimo and Gatewood met along the Bavispe river in Mexico. There, Gatewood delivered the news that the families of the Apache combatants would be sent to Florida in five days. This depressing bit of news - a choice of family over freedom - convinced Geronimo to end his resistance. However, he would only surrender to General Miles himself. As Gatewood and Lawton hurriedly tried to convince Miles to meet with Geronimo, the two groups - Apache and U.S. military - began the trip northward to the border.

On September 4, 1886, Geronimo and Miles met in Skeleton Canyon, Arizona Territory. Located just north of the border and sixty-five miles south of Fort Bowie, Skeleton Canyon was a rugged and isolated spot where the Apache felt secure that they could escape back into Mexico should negotiations take a turn for the worse. Here, Miles promised that Geronimo and his band would soon be re-united with their families that had been sent to Florida on August 29. Gladdened by this assurance, Geronimo agreed to cease hostilities. He and his group traveled to Fort Bowie as prisoners of the U.S. government, where they awaited arrangements for a train to take them to Florida. Four days later, as the military band played "Auld Lang Syne," the prisoners were escorted to Bowie Station and boarded a train for Florida.

This final agreement to cease hostilities reached between Geronimo and Miles at Skeleton Canyon is accepted as the end of the period of hostilities between Indians and Americans in Arizona. The exile of the Warm Springs and Chiricahua Apache to Florida ended any real threat of continued violence. Some additional episodes did take place between Indians and Americans following 1886, but these are seen as isolated incidents of violence and not as part of any organized resistance by native groups. The U.S. military soon began to abandon and dismantle its elaborate apparatus of defense in Arizona.

Warfare did not end with the cessation of hostilities in 1886. For those who were transported from Arizona as prisoners of war, the struggle continued for twenty-six years of deportation and imprisonment. In 1986, 100 years following the negotiations between Geronimo and Miles, there were thirteen surviving prisoners of war. Today, there are only five survivors left. In 1912, Congress released the final Apache prisoners and gave them the choice of going to the Mescalero Reservation in

New Mexico or staying in Oklahoma. Of the 261 remaining prisoners in 1912, 183 choose to go to Mescalero and seventy-eight decided to remain in Oklahoma.

Pages E42 - E49 and pages E59 - E60 contain restricted information and are not included in this document.

Historic Context #3: Transportation and Warfare in Arizona, 1846-1886.

This context examines the transportation routes established during the warfare period. Since Arizona was a rugged and isolated area for much of this era, the development of travel routes in the state has had lasting impact. Care is exercised in this context to differentiate military transportation routes and exploration from non-military transportation, such as boundary surveyors and railroad surveyors. These aspects are mentioned but not emphasized. The emphasis here is on the military transportation routes, such as those pioneered by Kearny, Cooke, Beale, and Crook. As such, this context is more narrow than the previous two contexts. Properties identified as associated with this context are listed in Table 4.

At the start of the War with Mexico Arizona was a little-traveled area for Americans. A few mountain men had traversed the region searching for beaver to trap, but had gained little knowledge beyond that of the basic geography of the Gila River. The Gila River served as a convenient path for early travel across Arizona, as did other river valleys. Spanish and Mexican travel in Arizona was essentially oriented north and south, with the San Pedro and Santa Cruz river valleys serving as conduits for transportation north from Mexico. The Spanish had pioneered a major east / west route. Called "El Camino del Diablo," it linked missions at San Xavier with those near today's location of Yuma via a route which originated near Sonoyta, Mexico. This route crossed the dry and desolate Sonoran Desert.

The Mexican War resulted in the first penetration of Arizona by forces of the U.S. military. On October 21, 1846, Colonel Stephen Watts Kearny and his "Army of the West" began a journey to California down the Gila River. This marked the first official U.S. military expedition in Arizona. The Army consisted of three hundred regulars of the First Regiment of Dragoons, the First Missouri Mounted Rifles (volunteers), three independent companies of volunteers, one company of Indian scouts, and one battalion plus two batteries of volunteer artillery. This amounted to a force of 1,650 men with sixteen artillery pieces. Kearny reached the Colorado River on November 22, 1846. Kearny's experiences in the Southwest are significant because he pioneered a travel route across the territory and established the first U.S. government in the area. Kearny's route became known as the Gila Trail. In a few years it would carry thousands of gold seekers across Arizona to California in search of wealth.

A second military expedition crossed Arizona during the War with Mexico. Captain (later Lt. Col.) Phillip St. George Cooke blazed the first practical wagon trail across Arizona in 1846 with his "Mormon Battalion," a group of Latter Day Saints who had been organized in Council Bluffs, Iowa, in July of 1846. A portion of this group numbering 397 men left Santa Fe to blaze a trail to California on October 19, 1846. The Mormons took a southern route across Arizona, traveling down the San Pedro River, over to the Mexican village of Tucson, then following the Santa Cruz River to the Pima villages. The group reached Warner's Ranch near San Diego on January 21, 1847. Cooke's Battalion is significant for the route it pioneered across southern Arizona. Cooke demonstrated that wagons could traverse the territory, although with some difficulty.

A third military expedition into Arizona came late in 1848, after the peace treaty had been signed. Major Lawrence P. Graham led a column of troops from Monterrey in Mexico through Arizona. Graham's expedition is significant because it established a military supply link with old Mexico down the Santa Cruz River.

Following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which ended the War with Mexico in 1848, a number of American explorers and surveyors traveled across Arizona in order to chart the topography of the new territory. These explorers had different goals. Some were concerned with charting the new boundary with Mexico, others were interested in possible railroad routes across Arizona, and still others wanted to establish military routes of travel. Although the explorers had several varied goals, all had U.S. government support in their endeavors.

One of the first military explorers after the War with Mexico was Lt. James H. Simpson. In 1849 Simpson explored the northeast corner of Arizona. He encountered mountain man Francois S. Aubrey, and the two charted possible paths across Arizona. Simpson reported that he thought a wagon route could be constructed across the region. Captain Lorenzo Sitgreaves of the Army Corps of Topographical Engineers took up where Simpson left off. In 1851 Sitgreaves explored northern Arizona in the vicinity of the 35th parallel. Sitgreaves produced the first accurate maps of the area. He reported that northern Arizona would make a good location for a wagon road across the territory and might support the construction of a transcontinental railroad.

Lt. Amiel W. Whipple followed in Sitgreaves' path a few years later. Whipple left Zuni on November 29, 1853, and reached the Colorado River on February 28, 1854. Whipple concluded that a railroad could be constructed across northern Arizona. He recommended that the 35th parallel route receive consideration as a potential location for a transcontinental railroad.

In 1854, a private surveyor explored southern Arizona for possible railroad routes. Former boundary commission surveyor Andrew B. Gray ran a preliminary survey across southern Arizona in 1854. The Texas Western Railroad sponsored Gray's work. Gray determined that southern Arizona also had possibilities as a railroad route. Based on the favorable recommendation of Gray, the U.S. government sent Lt. John G. Parke to re-survey portions of the southern route late in 1854. Parke returned in 1855 and discovered a pass between the base of Mt. Graham and the Chiricahua Mountains that would make an excellent location for the railroad route.

As a result of the surveys in southern Arizona, the United States soon determined that it needed additional land south of the Gila River for a railroad right-of-way. The United States began negotiations with the government of Mexico for the acquisition of additional territory. This additional land, known today as the Gadsden Purchase after James Gadsden who negotiated the treaty which acquired it, was purchased by a treaty signed on December 20, 1853 and ratified on April 25, 1854.

A final expedition before the start of the Civil War took place along the Colorado River. In 1858 the Army sent Lt. Joseph C. Ives up the Colorado River north from Yuma to determine how far from the mouth of the river it could be navigated. Ives took his vessel Explorer north from Yuma, reaching the mouth of Black Canyon (today's location of

Hoover Dam). There, Ives divided his party. Half returned south on the Colorado to Yuma while the other half crossed northern Arizona to reach Fort Defiance.

These expeditions generated enough information that the U.S. government felt comfortable in making expenditures for roads across Arizona. The first government road was known as the El Paso - Fort Yuma Wagon Road. It was constructed by contractor James B. Leach and is often referred to as Leach's Wagon Road. Its construction resulted from an 1857 Congressional appropriation of $600,000 for four roads to the Pacific Ocean to facilitate immigrant transportation. Leach's Wagon Road followed the line of Parke's railroad survey, with the one exception of turning north from the San Pedro River to strike the Gila River about fifteen miles below its junction with the San Pedro. This route reduced travel time and reduced construction cost, but it also bypassed the town of Tucson. The Department of the Interior sponsored the project.

The construction of the El Paso - Fort Yuma wagon road opened southern Arizona as a major travel route. It also offered the immigrants a choice. They could follow the wagon road along the San Pedro, reducing the length of their journey by about fifty miles, or they could make the detour to Tucson. Once both routes converged at the Pima Villages in central Arizona, the road cut across the desert to Gila Bend, where it once again joined the Gila River. This route became known as the Gila Trail or the Southern Overland Trail. It was an important military and civilian travel corridor in southern Arizona.

A second wagon road was constructed across Arizona prior to the Civil War. In contrast to Leach's Wagon Road, this road across northern Arizona was a military project from start to finish. In 1857 Secretary of War John B. Floyd selected Edward Fitzgerald Beale to build a wagon road along the 35th parallel of northern Arizona. Beale was a former Navy officer. One unusual aspect of this project was that it also entailed the use of camels as an experiment into the worthiness of these animals as beasts of burden in the American Southwest.

Beale left San Antonio with a wagon train and a caravan of camels on June 25, 1857. This first trip was one of reconnaissance. From August of 1857 to January of 1858 Beale followed Whipple's route along the 35th parallel, marking locations and charting distances. This initial trek demonstrated both the utility of the route, although the camels proved a bit difficult to handle.

In 1858 The Army persuaded Congress to appropriate $100,000 to construct the wagon road. Construction began west of Albuquerque in the spring of 1859. Beale and his troops cleared and smoothed the road, cleaned and marked springs, and provided watering places not more than thirty miles apart. The road was completed by the end of the summer in 1859. Beale's Wagon Road received heavy use in the following years, from wagon freighters, immigrant trains, and stagecoaches carrying the mail. It also received heavy military use as a means to link facilities across northern Arizona.

Civilian stage operators took advantage of the routes pioneered by the military across Arizona prior to the Civil War. In 1857 James E. Birch established what became known as the "Jackass Mail" route from Fort Yuma to San Diego. It received its derisive name from the mules which pulled the coaches. The route was later expanded across

Arizona to San Antonio. The Jackass Mail soon developed a reputation for late schedules and infrequent service. It was replaced in 1858 by the Butterfield Overland mail, which was a well-funded and prosperous franchise. These civilian stage operations were often focal points for military activity as well. Soldiers had to defend the routes and keep them open for the passage of the US mail, freight, and passengers.

The Civil War curtailed military construction activities in Arizona. The War era did result in the construction of a civilian trail in Arizona. Constructed by James R. Walker and a party of prospectors in 1863, the Walker Trail struck north from the Pima villages to enter the new mining area in the Bradshaw Mountains. The discovery of gold in the north central Arizona was a significant factor in the designation of Arizona as a separate territory from New Mexico in 1863. Union military leaders believed that precious metals from Arizona could aid their war effort. Prescott, the new territorial capitol, was the terminus of the Walker Trail. This route also saw military use.

By the end of the Civil War a matrix of supply routes had been established across Arizona. Along the western portion of the state, the navigable Colorado River served as a major military supply line. Steamships entered the Colorado River from the Gulf of California at Port Isabel, and traveled north to Fort Yuma, La Paz, Ehrenburg, and Hardyville. La Paz was the port for central Arizona, later served by Ehrenburg after a shift in the river left the port at La Paz dry. Hardyville, some three hundred miles north of Yuma, was the distribution point for northern Arizona. The supply route along the Colorado also served many mining properties discovered along this border with California.

Yuma was the chief port of supply for Arizona south of the Gila River. During the Civil War Union military authorities recognized the importance of Fort Yuma as a supply depot and in 1864 designated lands on the Arizona side of the Colorado as the Yuma Quartermaster Depot under the command of Major William B. Hooper. This decision recognized the significance of Arizona, designated a Territory in 1863, as the Yuma Quartermaster Depot was one of only three such depots in the Southwest - the other two being Drum Barracks in California and Fort Union in New Mexico.

On January 16, 1865, military commanders ordered the construction of two storehouses on the Depot grounds. Construction materials for the storehouses arrived on September 18, 1865, and construction began on October 1. On November 15, 1866, Fort Yuma was designated the headquarters for the Lower Colorado military district. On January 22, 1867, President Andrew Johnson officially designated the Fort Yuma Military Reservation by executive order.

In 1867 the Depot was the principle location for receiving and forwarding supplies to the country north of the Gila River in Arizona and the location of the reserve supply for the whole territory. It had seventy civilian employees, including such trades as blacksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers, wagon masters, expressmen, corral masters, herders, and laborers. The monthly payroll of the Depot totaled $4,000. Military stores arrived by steamship up the Colorado River to the Depot and were redistributed by contractor mule teams to the posts of Arizona, such as Camp Lowell, Fort Bowie, Fort Goodwin, and Fort Grant to name a few.

A second supply route from the Gulf of California led north from the port of Guaymas to Tucson. The natural topography formed an easy transportation route from the Mexican port to the largest town in the Territory of Arizona. Here goods were dispatched to Fort Lowell which served as the focal point for quartermaster functions in southeastern Arizona.

Within Arizona, the two major supply routes were the 35th parallel route along Beale's Wagon Road and the Gila Trail along the Gila River. The northern route linked military facilities from Santa Fe, to Prescott, to Hardyville, and then to Los Angeles. The southern route linked Santa Fe, Tucson, Yuma, and San Diego. This infrastructure of supply routes created a network of military and civilian transportation in Arizona.

These wagon roads, military supply routes, and trails allowed for the basic transportation needs of the U.S. soldiers during the period of warfare. However, the military need for transportation often went beyond linking the major towns, mining districts, and agricultural areas. To speed communications between forts, the military also constructed transportation routes that were initially limited to military traffic. These routes later became important travel corridors across Arizona.

One of the most important military transportation routes was constructed by General Crook in 1874. Crook took advantage of a lull in the period of warfare between 1873 and 1875 to use his troops to construct a rough wagon road from Fort Verde to Fort Apache. The construction of Crook's Trail reduced travel distance between the two posts by fifty per cent. It was used mainly as a warm weather supply route, as it extended along the Mogollon Rim which suffers from poor weather in the winter. Crook's Trail later served as an important communication link along the Mogollon Rim for settlers, resulting in its continued use.

Other smaller roads linked the military outposts of Arizona, although these are less well-known because they served for a limited period of time or involved little construction activity. An example of the former is the Reno Road, named for Camp Reno. This wagon road was constructed in 1867 to link Fort McDowell with Camp Reno in the Tonto Valley. Troops carved a road to the new post, constructed in 1867. Camp Reno was abandoned in 1870, and the Reno Road fell into disrepair.

Other military roads existed, but those that involved little construction activity are less well known. An example of this type of military transportation route is the road from Maricopa Wells to Fort McDowell. Crossing the desert of central Arizona, this route did not need much development. It became marked from use and portions are visible today.

Table 4

Military Travel Routes, 1846-1886

Date	Name	Status*
1846	Kearny	NR, 10/9/74 (campsite only)
1846	Emory	
1846-47	Cooke (Mormon Battalion)	
1848	Graham	
1851	Simpson	
1853-54	Whipple	
1857-1859	Leach's Wagon Road	
1859	Beale's Wagon Road	NR, 12/6/77 (section through Petrified Forest); SI, #015-203, #015-339, #015-5157, #015-451, #015-4229, #015-4230, #015-4931, #015-123, #015-2
1867	Reno Road	
1868	Maricopa Wells / Ft. McDowell	SI, #013-2974
1874	Crook's Trail	SI, #025-187, #025-326, #025-166, #025-4145, #025-212, #025-14

NR - National Register
SI - State Inventory

Historic Context #4: Communication and Warfare in Arizona, 1846-1886.

This context examines the important aspect of communication during the warfare period and in particular two aspects of communication: the telegraph and heliograph. Although this context is also narrow in relation to contexts one and two, it touches on a significant aspect of the warfare period. The introduction of the telegraph, while not unique, had a profound impact on the course of the conflict. The use of the heliograph is unique to Arizona and New Mexico and is thus accorded extended and separate treatment in this context. Properties identified as associated with this context are listed in Table 5.

The telegraph uses electrical signals transmitted through metal wires. Messages can be transmitted by operators using Morse code, a series of dots and dashes (varied by the length of the electrical contact) that are relayed by wire to the receiving station. The first transcontinental telegraph line connecting San Francisco with the east was completed in 1861. Previously, a line linking San Francisco and Los Angeles was in use by 1860. The use of the telegraph in Arizona came later than its neighbor to the west.

General George Crook initially advocated the construction of a military telegraph for Arizona in his first annual report in 1871. Crook felt that Arizona could be easily connected with the telegraph system of California. Crook repeated this request in his 1872 report, noting that the nearest telegraph office to Arizona was in Los Angeles. In 1873 Congress appropriated $120,000 for the construction of a military telegraph in Arizona.

The first order of business was to link Yuma with San Diego. The line would then run from Yuma through Maricopa Wells to the territorial capitol at Prescott. Construction on the Yuma - San Diego line began in August of 1873 and from Prescott to Yuma in September. The line from Prescott to Yuma was finished first, on November 11, 1873, followed quickly by the link to San Diego on November 18. Details of soldiers set the posts and strung the wires. Crook then constructed a second branch of the telegraph in Arizona late in 1873, this one extending from Maricopa Wells to Tucson. Fort Grant was linked to Tucson via telegraph in 1876. Telegraph service extended between Fort Grant to Fort Apache and Fort Bowie in 1877. From Fort Bowie the line extended to Fort Bayard in New Mexico.

The military telegraph greatly increased the speed of communication across Arizona. Although individual forts were not linked at first, the telegraph enabled commanders in Arizona to communicate with officials in major towns in the territory and with California. Communication with the east could then be made through the California system. In following years, during the late 1870s, telegraph links were forged between the major forts in Arizona. This enabled commanders at individual forts to respond more quickly when outbreaks of violence occurred.

Native groups used signalling techniques as well. These were not as technologically intensive as those used by the US military. They included smoke signals, marks on rocks or other landmarks, and trail-side cairns. Some remnants of this activity may be encountered as archaeological features, particularly rock markings and trail-side cairns.

With their own experience at signalling, Native groups in Arizona quickly grasped the military significance of the telegraph. They also understood that it could be disrupted. The lines were easily severed, thus cutting off communications for the military. These breaks were detected and repaired, but the disruption reduced the effectiveness of the troops. The Apache soon discovered that if they replaced the wire with a strip of wet rawhide they could hide the break. When the rawhide dried it resembled the wire and made it difficult for the troops to detect the break.

Apache disruption of the telegraph during the Cibecue Massacre in 1881 contributed to the confusion regarding the situation. Col. Eugene A. Carr of the 6th Cavalry received orders to arrest Apache spiritual leader Noch-ay-del-klinne. On August 30 he marched into the leaders's camp on Cibecue Creek about 28 miles northwest of Fort Apache. The confrontation with Noch-ay-del-klinne was intense, but he finally submitted. As Carr marched back to Fort Apache with two troops of cavalry, eighty five men, and twenty-three White Mountain Apache scouts, his column was dogged by followers of Noch-ay-del-klinne. After the troops had camped for the night, the followers attacked. During the melee which ensued, several Apache scouts turned on their commanders for the first and only time in the period of warfare. Several were killed on both sides, including Apache spiritual leader Noch-ay-del-klinne and Captain Edmund C. Hentig of the 6th Cavalry. Carr managed to retreat during the night to Fort Apache. Fort Apache was then surrounded by Apache and the telegraph line cut.

As garbled reports reached San Carlos that told of the massacre at Cibecue, word leaked to eastern newspapers. The press responded with sensational stories that were reminiscent of those that pronounced the disaster of Custer at the Little Big Horn. With the telegraph line cut, it took four days for the news of the battle and the attack on Fort Apache to reach headquarters.

When the Southern Pacific railroad reached Yuma in 1877 and with it the commercial Western Union telegraph system, more than 1,000 miles of military telegraph lines were in place in Arizona. As the commercial lines became available with the march of the railroad across Arizona, the use of the military telegraph declined. By 1882, only 532 miles of military telegraph were still in use.

In contrast to the telegraph, which used wires to communicate with electrical signals, the heliograph used a system of mirrors that reflected signals using sunlight. A beam of light from the sun, reflected off the mirror and interrupted with a shutter, formed the familiar dots and dashes of Morse code. The uses of mirrors for signals, known for centuries, was advanced through the mechanism of the heliograph.

The U.S. Army began experimenting with the heliograph in 1877. It conducted experiments at Fort Myer in Virginia, and later used the system in the field in Montana, Oregon, and Arizona. The advantage of the heliograph over the telegraph was that it did not require the fixed installation of poles and wires. Those installations were expensive to construct and maintain. The fixed system was also subject to disruption by Indian combatants and by weather. In contrast to the fixed system of the telegraph, the heliograph was mobile and required little equipment. The heliograph was not subject to disruption by combatants. However, the heliograph had disadvantages as well. The heliograph could not be used at night or during storms, nor could it be used at distances over forty miles between stations. It also had no effect south of the border with Mexico, as no stations were established there.

General Miles brought the heliograph to Arizona when he took over command from General Crook in 1886. Miles felt that immediate communication would be a key to forcing Geronimo and the last few Apache holdouts to end hostilities. A series of heliograph stations located on the high peaks of southern Arizona would act as sentinels to monitor the movements of combatants in the valleys below. Signals sent reporting the movements of the Apache could be quickly transmitted to the forts, allowing for the mobilization of troops in pursuit.

Miles arrived in Arizona on April 12, 1886, taking over command at Fort Bowie from General Crook. Soon after, on April 20, Miles issued orders for the establishment of detachments of signal officers at the high peaks and lookouts of Arizona. The first heliograph station became operational on April 26. The last station came on line on July 14. Miles located fourteen stations within the Territory of Arizona, and thirteen within the Territory of New Mexico.

Much of the course of the final campaign to capture Geronimo took place south of the border in Mexico. Since no stations were established in Mexico, the heliograph had little direct impact on the events leading to the negotiations between Geronimo and Gatewood on the Bavispe River and the final cessation of hostilities in Skeleton Canyon. However, the US military felt that the heliograph served as an effective line of defense for Arizona. On June 5, 1886, the station at Antelope Springs observed a party of Indians headed south. The operators were able to alert their superiors, who managed to capture the resisters.

The elaborate and effective communications network that the heliograph system provided maximized the use of scarce personnel in the border area. The observation teams at the high peaks and lookouts successfully tracked all movements below, with the goal of preventing useless sorties in pursuit of false leads. More than 2,200 messages were generated in Arizona alone in 1886.

Historic Context #5: Impact of Warfare on American Settlers and Indians in Arizona, 1846-1886.

This context attempts to step back a bit from the immediate results of the warfare period and examine the indirect impact the events had on the American settlers and Indian residents of Arizona. For Americans, the presence of the military in the area provided an economic stimulus to farming and ranching. It also offered a stimulus to mercantile commercial enterprises. Perhaps the best example of this context is the Schwertner House in Willcox, listed on the National Register as being significant for its association with the military. Properties identified as associated with this context are listed in Table 6.

For native groups, the associated impacts of warfare were certainly less beneficial, but no less significant. The development of the reservation system, often at locations of former military posts, is a direct outcome of the warfare period. Although the development of the reservation system is outside the scope of this project, the later use and adaptation of military-era facilities is an important change in terms of evaluating the integrity of these properties. Later changes which may have altered the original appearance of a military property may have had their roots in impacts caused by the military. Those changes would thus be significant in and of themselves. The Prescott Yavapai Indian Reservation is a good example of a military reservation subdivided during the modern era for multiple uses. A portion of it is now used for the Indian Reservation, the Fort Whipple Veteran's Administration Hospital, and Yavapai College. The boundary of the old military reservation is still visible from the air.

The military presence in Arizona brought prosperity to many civilian businesses that were established to trade with the soldiers or to provide items needed by Indians under the control of the civilian reservation agents. Located close to each fort or camp was a "sutler's store," a commissary where the enlisted men and officers could buy items not issued by the army. Canned foods, household items, and personal accoutrements were available from the sutler. These helped to make the duty more amenable.

Located further afield from the fort and outside the boundary of the military reservations, were other commercial establishments that catered to the military trade. These included rooming houses, stores, bars, and brothels. On payday scores of enlisted men and officers descended on these establishments to spend their hard earned cash.

Perhaps the best example of a civilian property significant for its association with the military is the Schwertner House in Willcox. The building was constructed in 1880 by Delos Hutchins Smith, who had a military background as a former quartermaster agent. 1880 was also the year that the Southern Pacific railroad passed through the southeast portion of the Arizona Territory, making Willcox an important transportation and commercial center. Smith was a partner in the Norton-Stewart Commercial Co., a mercantile firm which supplied goods to the military posts in southeast Arizona. Smith's house served as the base of his commercial operations. It also served as an overnight rooming facility for Army personnel en route from the Willcox depot to Fort Grant, which was located 35 miles north of Willcox. For this early and close association with the military, the property was listed on the

National Register on August 25, 1983. It is known as the Schwertner House after Josef Schwertner who purchased the property in 1897.

Beyond retail and wholesale mercantile companies, the military presence in Arizona also stimulated the ranching industry. The soldiers of the US Army needed beef, as did Indians confined to reservation life. The period of warfare was also the heyday of the Arizona cattle industry. Ranches such as the San Bernardino, Sierra Bonita, and Faraway contributed to the sustenance of the soldiers and native by providing produce and cattle.

The Faraway Ranch is typical of a smaller civilian operation that depended on the military for its economic survival. The ranch was homesteaded around 1880 by J.H. Stafford. Located in Bonita Canyon in what is now the Chiricahua National Monument, Stafford erected a cabin and established a small garden, orchard, and farm. Stafford sold the produce from his operation to the soldiers at Fort Bowie and, later, to the "Camp at Bonita Canyon." The fresh produce was particularly welcome to the soldiers who subsisted on a bland diet of hardtack and beef while on field rations.

On the other end of the scale from the small Faraway Ranch are the massive ranching enterprises such as the Sierra Bonita Ranch and the San Bernardino Ranch. The Sierra Bonita Ranch, now a National Historic Landmark, was the property of Henry C. Hooker. The Sierra Bonita Ranch is located in the Sulphur Springs Valley as well. Hooker was a pioneer Arizona cattleman who made a fortune supplying beef to the Army and to Indian Reservations. John Slaughter's San Bernardino Ranch served a similar function. Located in Cochise County along the border with Mexico, this National Historic Landmark was the home of John Slaughter. A lawman and pioneer cattleman, Slaughter amassed large ranch holdings. He also became wealthy by supplying beef to the military.

Military activities in Arizona also stimulated the freighting industry. The military contracted with civilian freighters who transported goods on wagons into Arizona and to the individual forts. One of the most prominent firms was that of Tulley and Ochoa in Tucson. Founded by Pinckney Randolph Tulley and Esteban Ochoa, this freighting firm prospered on government contracts. The Tully and Ochoa firm received fame for an attack by Apache in Canada del Oro near Tucson in May of 1869. Even though the Tully and Ochoa wagon train was supposed to be guarded by soldiers from Fort Grant, The soldiers showed up late. The wagon train was attacked by Apache. Nine wagons, eighty mules, and fourteen men en route to Fort Grant put up a spirited fight, but three were killed and two were wounded. The Tully and Ochoa firm lost $12,000 in merchandise, along with $8,000 worth of government stores.

Other early military freight contractors included Soloman Warner, Charles D. Poston, and Charles Trumbell Hayden. All of these men amassed great personal wealth in the business. They were accompanied by many others, less prominent, who also entered the business. Freighting took little capital to start, only a large amount of courage to brave the desolate territory of Arizona.

Beyond the larger entrepreneurs and businessmen of the territory, a large number of everyday working people earned a living from the military presence in Arizona. Commanders preferred to restrict the soldiers to military activities. This opened up a large number of other jobs at the military posts for civilian employees. For example, the Yuma Quartermaster Depot had seventy civilian employees, including such trades as blacksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers, wagon masters, expressmen, corral masters, herders, and laborers. The monthly civilian payroll of the Depot totaled $4,000. Jobs at the posts were not restricted to men. A few women labored as laundresses at each post.

The close association between the business community of territorial Arizona and the military presented opportunities for corruption. Although business owners complained of losses caused by Indian attacks, they also stood to gain from the continued violence in the form of increased sales to their military customers. During the early 1870s a group of Tucson businessmen earned the title of the "Tucson Ring" as a way of describing their shady business dealings with the military. The ring was considered instrumental in the concentration policy of placing Indians on smaller reservations during the 1870s. The reasoning of the ring was that if the Indians were self supporting on larger, dispersed reservations, the contractors could not make as much money providing the reservation agents with supplies. By continuing to sell low-quality merchandise and feeding the Indians poorly, the ring actually encouraged more resistance by the confined inhabitants of the reservations.

This corruption caused friction between the military and the civilians. The civilians accused the military of not doing the job of protecting the territory properly. Many military men felt that the civilians contributed to the problem by picturing all Indians as hostile and by committing acts of violence against the native population. A common opinion among the military was that the civilians kept up the hostilities because they prospered from it.

Further evidence of the important relation between military facilities and civilians comes from the period after the end of warfare. Civilians applied political pressure to keep facilities from closing during the 1890s when the military presence in Arizona began to fade. When the posts were closed, civilians often took or purchased at auction building materials salvaged from the facilities for their own use.

The American approach to the non-military aspects of relations with native groups focused on three areas: individual landholding, compulsory education, and replacement of native religions. The concept of individual landholding was central to the Dawes Act of 1887, which attempted to divide reservations into many separate individual "allotments" where Indians could practice agriculture in the American pattern. The development of off-reservation boarding schools and on-reservation schools was another method used by Americans to expose Indian youth to American concepts. The opening of reservations to missionaries was a way to bring American religious ideas to native peoples.

The same forces which brought prosperity to American settlers also bought prosperity to some native groups. For the Pima and Tohono O'odham, the increase in population provided a market for their agricultural goods.

The Navajo in northern Arizona developed extensive herds of sheep that provided a mainstay of the ranching economy in that portion of the state.

Despite these few positive examples, the outcome of the intercultural interaction between Americans and Indians is usually judged in negative terms. The tremendous changes brought on by the conquest of native groups by Americans have had lasting effects. In terms of sites that are associated with this change, there are few properties associated with native groups that are representative of this change within a military context. There are many properties that are associated with the growth and development of the reservation system, and they are more properly evaluated within that context.

It is important to remember that for some, such as the Apache, warfare did not end with the cessation of hostilities in 1886. For those who were transported from Arizona as prisoners of war, the struggle continued for twenty-six years of deportation and imprisonment. In 1986, 100 years following the negotiations between Geronimo and Miles, there were thirteen surviving prisoners of war. Today, there are only five survivors left. In 1912, Congress released the final Apache prisoners and gave them the choice of going to the Mescalero Reservation in New Mexico or staying in Oklahoma. Of the 261 remaining prisoners in 1912, 183 choose to go to Mescalero and seventy-eight decided to remain in Oklahoma.

Table 6

Associated Sites

San Bernardino Ranch, National Historic Landmark designated 8/7/64
Sierra Bonita Ranch, National Historic Landmark designated 8/27/64
Pete Kitchen Ranch, National Register listed 2/20/75
Stafford Cabin, National Register listed 3/31/75
Faraway Ranch Historic District, National Register listed 8/27/80
Schwertner House, National Register listed 8/25/83

General Springs Cabins, State Inventory #211
Army Scout Residence, State Inventory #115

Outline of Property Types:

1. Camps, Forts, and Refuges, both permanent and temporary
2. Battle Sites and Treaty or Peace Talk Sites
3. Roads and Trails
4. Communications: Telegraph and Heliograph Sites
5. Non-Military properties with significant military association
6. Cemeteries and burial sites
7. Military districts

1. Camps, Forts, and Refuges, both permanent and temporary

Description:

These properties are described as being of a permanent or semipermanent nature that were occupied for a period of time longer than one day, and that served as a base for American or Indian military activities. They include a range of size from small temporary camps to large installations that lasted for many years. A common element to all of these sites is the notion of time, a location that was occupied at least overnight. There is a great degree of variation in the architectural styles and design of these properties. This property type would fit the National Register functional category of defense, with the subcategory of military facility. National Register significance category areas would include military and, for archaeological properties, archaeology. Refuges may be significant under the significance category of ethnic heritage.

Subtype: Permanent Camps

Permanent camps in Arizona were not fortified, with the exception of Fort Whipple. Many were laid out in a regular manner with a central parade ground. Others were not, with buildings being placed haphazardly according to the topography of the site. The location of permanent camps in Arizona was often related to the presence of available water. In the arid environment of Arizona, the year-round presence of a good water supply was often a key to the construction of a permanent post. Permanent camps were also closely associated with travel routes. The permanent camps served to protect important travel routes, and their close location to roads and trails facilitated the dispatching of troops. Construction materials for permanent U.S. military posts in the nineteenth century ranged from wood and brush, to adobe, stone, and dimensioned lumber. Most buildings had glass windows and wooden floors. The more permanent a post, the more substantial its construction. Close beside some posts such as Fort Apache were the camps used by Indian scouts. The quarters for the scouts were usually tents or wickiups.

Subtype: Temporary Camps

Temporary camps might not have any buildings at all. They may have used tents erected on wooden platforms or set over depressions dug into the ground. Most temporary camps that were occupied for an extended period of time did have some type of rudimentary buildings constructed. Temporary camps were often associated with a spring or other water source. The dependable presence of water, a commodity precious in arid Arizona, meant that locations with this resource were used repeatedly on a short-term, temporary basis. In addition, temporary camps are often associated with roads and trails. Travel by foot, horse, or wagon was slow and tedious. Travel routes across the state dating from the warfare time period are dotted with camps where travelers rested for the night. Examples of this include Laws Spring and Register Rock, both located along the Beale Wagon Road. Roads and trails themselves are accorded a separate section; see property type 3 below.

Subtype: Indian Refuges
Indian refuges utilized natural caves and rock shelters sometimes modified with stone and adobe construction. These locations were often distant physically from American settlements. Refuges possess some degree of geographic isolation as well, by rugged terrain or elevation. A refuge is not directly comparable to a fort or camp, it that it was not intended as a location at which to make a defensive struggle. It was, instead, a location to retreat to and escape from attacks by others. If a refuge itself came under attack the response may have been to abandon it if possible. In cases where this was not an option, e.g., the American soldiers completely surrounded the refuge as at Turret Peak, or where the Indians believed their refuge to be invulnerable as at Skeleton Cave, the results could be disastrous for the Indians.

Significance:
These properties are associated with the context of military organization and must relate in a significant way. Most of these properties would be considered eligible under Criterion A for their association with the broad pattern of military history in Arizona. Some properties might be considered eligible under Criterion B, for association with a specific person, for example, Cochise Stronghold is significant for its association with one of the most important Apache leaders. Properties with standing architecture could be considered eligible under Criterion C as typical, representative, or outstanding examples of military architecture or design. The standing buildings at Fort Verde or the Yuma Quartermaster Depot, for example, are significant representations of military architecture in Arizona. The plan of the property itself, either typical or outstanding, may also qualify it for nomination under Criterion C. Most of the military camps in Arizona would be considered eligible under Criterion D for their potential to yield information important in history. Since many of the camps are in a ruined condition, archaeological deposits are often all that remain. Since much has been lost, archaeological investigation offers a great potential to discover information about daily lives of those involved in the military campaigns. Since several U.S. Army camps also had associated encampments of Indian scouts, these sites can potentially provide information about both nineteenth century American military life and Indian lifeways.

Registration Requirements:
Registration requirements depend on the criterion under which the property is nominated; most would be considered eligible under Criterion D. For Criterion D, the archaeological remains would have to be reasonably intact. Extensive surface or subsurface disturbance might compromise the integrity of a site and weaken its data potential. Properties with standing remains considered eligible under Criterion C must contain the original aspects of design, materials, and workmanship. Extensive modifications or alterations to a property significant under Criterion C may compromise its integrity. Even in the process of saving a building, important issues of integrity come up because almost anything that is done to a property will degrade its integrity so some degree. For example, in 1996, Arizona State Parks, which manages Fort Verde, had to shore up a sinking wall on an officer's quarters. The original foundation of stone had crumbled.

State Parks decided to dismantle the wall, put in a new concrete foundation then replace the wall with the original material. Though the building has been saved, to a small degree it is no longer the same building constructed by the soldiers. Integrity of materials and workmanship has declined, though not to a degree that could cause the building to be delisted from the National Register.

For properties nominated under Criteria A or B, integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association are more important. The location of Fort Bowie, where the buildings have deteriorated into mounds of melted adobe, still evokes strong feelings of association and feeling for those who visit it.

2. Battle sites and treaty or peace talk sites

These properties are described as the location of armed or unarmed conflict between Indians and Americans, and the location of negotiations to end conflicts. There may be no visible remains at these locations and in some instances no archaeological remains as well. The site may simply be the place where small groups met, discussed the issues between them, and perhaps concluded an agreement. In some instances, though not all, there may be some evidence of landscape modifications such as breastworks in the case of battle sites or monuments in the case of treaty sites. This property type meets the National Register functional category of defense, with the subcategory of battlefield. There is no applicable National Register functional category for locations of treaty or peace talks. National Register significance categories would include military, and for sites with archaeological resources, archaeology. This property type may also be significant under the National Register significance category of ethnic history as well.

Subtype: Battle Sites

Most battle sites in Arizona were small skirmishes between, or lopsided attacks involving Indians, Americans, and Mexican-Americans. Locations of major battles or massacre sites may contain greater amounts of physical remains. Skeleton Cave, for example, took its name from the remains of the many Indian dead that were left at the site. The bodies were removed by Yavapai descendants in the 1920s and interred at the Fort McDowell Reservation Cemetery. The site of the Camp Grant Massacre has a great deal of surface archaeological material representing the frequent use of the area by Indian peoples. It also has a number of visible grave sites where victims were buried where they fell. The site of K-H Butte, which has been studied archaeologically, may be thought of as a more "typical" Arizona battle site. It contained breastworks and a small amount of weapons-related artifacts such as bullets, cartridge cases, and military hardware.

Subtype: Treaty Sites

Treaty sites are likely to contain very few artifacts. These sites may be difficult to locate precisely unless there is some type of physical landmark which allows the researcher to identify the spot of the treaty. Most negotiations took place in natural surroundings, as opposed to a building which might remain today. These natural locations may be identifiable if the contemporary description of the event is specific enough. In some instances a marker may have been erected at the location of the negotiations. An example of the former is the location of the 1872 peace talks between Apache leader Eskiminzin and General O.O. Howard. This took place in a "shade grove" in the vicinity of old Camp Grant. The exact location would be difficult to identify today. An example of the latter is the 1886 peace talk sites associated with Geronimo. The negotiation site in Cañon del los Embudos in Mexico where Geronimo indicated his intention to surrender to General Crook is theoretically identifiable because frontier photographer C.F. Fly took photographs there. The site of Geronimo's final agreement with General Miles, located in Arizona's Skeleton Canyon, is identifiable because soldiers at the time built a large monument of stones there that enabled modern researchers to precisely locate the spot.

Significance:
These properties must be associated in a significant way with the context of military engagements and peace treaties. With respect to battle sites, one measure of that significance is if humans were killed, captured, or wounded at that location. Minor conflicts without bloodshed, would be considered less significant while those where large numbers of individuals were killed or captured would be more significant. In many attacks by Indians, capturing or killing livestock, horses, or other supplies was the primary goal and such engagements were planned so as to avoid fighting where someone might be killed or wounded. Such an engagement served to provide sustenance and arms and ammunition for further resistance. On the American side, the loss of supplies or mounts might force a retreat or delay an advance. Such fights rarely proved decisive and their significance is problematic. A historically significant battle is more likely to be one leading to immediate strategic advantage for one side or effectively deciding the outcome of a war. The course of events implies that by using this definition, most significant battle sites will necessarily be ones in which Americans defeated Indians. A significant Indian victory site will be one, not where ultimate victory was won, but where the conflict was substantially extended. Such a battle site might be where a large quantity of supplies was taken, where American soldiers were driven back and forced to restart their campaign, or where Indians made good their retreat so they could fight again. A battle or massacre site that initiated a major conflict between the Army and a particular tribe is also likely to be significant.

For treaty sites, those locations of long-lasting and permanent cessation of hostilities would be considered more significant than locations of indecisive talks or short-term agreements.

Most battle or treaty sites would be considered eligible under National Register Criterion A for their association with the broad patterns of military history in Arizona. Some of these properties might be significantly associated with a particular individual, making them eligible for the National Register under Criterion B. For Criterion B properties, these must be associated with the individual in a significant way when compared with other sites that are historically identified with the individual. A battle or treaty site could be nominated under Criterion C as an example of a type of military fortification architecture, but these examples are expected to be rare in Arizona. Most battle sites in this state have little in the way of architecture or landscape modification. Many of the battle sites will be eligible under Criterion D for their potential to yield information on military strategy and techniques, information that, in some instances, would only be available from archaeological analysis.

Registration Requirements:
Integrity considerations of location, feeling, setting, and association would be more important than materials and

workmanship at these locations. Integrity of location would be paramount. The nominated location must be the place the event occurred. Closely related is the concept of association. There must be some evidence associating those involved with the event that links them to the location. Setting is less critical, but this factor of integrity must be present to some degree. In Arizona, where many battle and treaty sites are located in isolated areas, integrity of setting is not likely to be compromised. Integrity of feeling is difficult to ascertain, but for many properties is very evident. The site of the Camp Grant massacre is one of very strong feelings for the Apache people, who have continued to hold ceremonies there to honor those who died in the attack. The lonely isolation of Skeleton Canyon is reminiscent of the tragedy and ethos associated with the last days of freedom for Geronimo's people.

3. Roads and trails

Description:

These properties are described as the physical remains of transportation routes usually related to the period of nineteenth century warfare. Roads and trails accommodated travel by horse, wagon, and foot. Some routes were the result of concentrated construction efforts and others resulted from continual use over time. Although temporary or permanent camps were sometimes located along these travel routes, those occupation resources are discussed in the property type section covering camps, forts, and refuges (property type 1 above). This property type only covers the roads or trails themselves. These properties fit the National Register's functional category of transportation, with the subcategory of road or pedestrian related. National Register significance categories include military and transportation.

Subtype: Specifically-Constructed Roads and Trails

The Mormon Battalion trail, the Beale Wagon Road, and Crook's Trail are examples of military-constructed roads and trails that involved a large construction effort. These roads are marked by ruts caused by wagon traffic, rock berms along the edge of roads, trees slashed as markers, and rock outcrops marked as mile posts.

Subtype: Roads and Trails Created by Use

Other properties, particularly those located in the low desert portions of the state, are marked by continual use rather than concentrated construction efforts. The southern overland route first pioneered by the Mormon Battalion became marked and altered by years of use by travelers.

Subtype: Roads and Trails of Unique Use

The smallest category of significant roads and trails are those neither constructed nor marked by continued use. These are routes of unique usage where soldiers passed a single time. An example is the route of Kearny's Army of the West during the Mexican-American war. This route is significant as the first passage of American soldiers through Arizona and is important for the history of the war because of Kearny's role in the conquest of the Southwest from Mexico. Although this passage way had been used earlier by Spanish and Mexican explorers and American mountain men, the route was not marked by a road but rather simply by the Gila River from western New Mexico to its confluence with the Colorado River at Yuma. One site in Arizona—a camp site—associated with Kearny's passage is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. This site was located using the description provided in soldiers' journals.

Significance:

Eligible properties have to be related to the military transportation context in a significant way in order to be considered under Criterion A. Transportation routes used by those with nonmilitary purposes, such as boundary or railroad surveyors, would not be considered eligible under a military context, even though soldiers typically escorted the survey parties or the surveyors themselves were military men. Those properties significantly associated with the military, such as Reno Road or Crook's Trail, would be considered eligible. These properties may be eligible under Criterion A for their association with the broad patterns of military conflict.

Some routes may be importantly associated with individuals, such as George Crook, and thus may be eligible under Criterion B. Crook's Trail has an important association with the general because it was constructed at his command and constituted an important part of his program for subjugation of the Apaches. Criterion B does not apply merely because of the ability to name its builder. For example, Leach's Road, built under the direction of James B. Leach, is not eligible under Criterion B although it is eligible under criterion A. The reasoning is this: Leach is known to history only because he constructed this road. It is he who gains significance because of his association with the road, not the road that gains its significance because of its association with him. The road is independently significant as an important route of travel.

Some properties may be significant as outstanding or typical examples of construction, or for the unusual use of technology and thus may be eligible under Criterion C. Many roads and trails are likely to have an archaeological component, and may be eligible for the information they contain. Such information may relate to soldiers who actually built or travelled on them or may relate to identifying methods of construction.

Registration Requirements

In order to be considered eligible, these properties must possess some elements of design, workmanship, location, setting, and feeling. The mere location of a route, based on maps and plotted on the ground, would not be considered sufficient in most circumstances. Some physical remains must be present. Integrity of setting and feeling are important because the routes may have continued, modern usage. Later modifications such as paving for automobile traffic can degrade integrity. Specifically-constructed roads and trails must have elements of design and workmanship present. Those roads and trails created by use would not necessarily have design or workmanship elements, present, but must retain the ability to visually convey their significance.

The preservation of linear properties like roads and trails is complicated by the loss of integrity of specific segments. Parts of trails may have been integrated into modern highways and it is not unusual to see historic roads break off of modern ones, cross over at points, then rejoin at still another. Critical to evaluating integrity is the ability of the property to visually convey its significance. A segment of a road that has been modernized can no longer visually convey the significance of the early military road, even though they are physically in the same place. If the historic road retains large portions with integrity, the road as a whole is considered eligible though the specific segments lacking integrity are considered noncontributing elements.

Visibility is also problematic in the case of historic road segments that appear to have reverted back to nature. A person on a road may have difficulty in identifying they are on a road because of vegetation growth and erosion that has occurred in the last century. If the road is only identifiable by maps, and the person is left to presume that the trail passed through a particular spot, than that segment should not be considered eligible. However, it is quite possible that a trail that a person on the ground misses is visible either from the air or from a mountain top or promontory. In such a case, the segment should be considered eligible.

In the case of routes uniquely used, eligibility depends on first establishing that though used only once, the route contributed significantly to the broad pattern of events in military history. The route of Kearny's Army of the West has such significance. The route of the Mormon Battalion was also unique in segments. It may be arguable that the primary significance of the Mormon Battalion was not in their contribution to the outcome of the Mexican-American War, but rather to the social history of the Mormons and the highly significant event of their westward emigration as well as to the overall settlement of the American Far West. Once the significance of a unique route is established, the next step is in determining eligibility is to precisely locate the route on the ground. Approximate locations are not eligible. In the case of the Mormon Battalion, the location of the famous "Battle of the Bulls" is identifiable because several members of the battalion kept detailed journals and described the location. Modern researchers have pinpointed the site with acceptable accuracy.

4. Communications: telegraphs and heliograph sites

These property types are the location of communication facilities. Because of the ephemeral design, materials, and workmanship of these facilities, little in the way of physical remains are likely to be encountered. These properties are likely to be located in remote areas. There are no direct National Register functional categories which apply to these properties; the closest category is defense with military facility as a subcategory. The National Register significance categories includes communication and military.

Subtype: Telegraph Sites

Telegraph lines were often strung along roads, making for easy maintenance and repair. In some locations, such as along Crook's Trail, the lines were strung to trees. In the desert areas of Arizona, poles had to be installed because of the sparse natural vegetation afforded few opportunities for using trees. In the eastern part of the state the poles were placed twenty-five to the mile, and tended to be made of cedar, redwood, or other hardwood. These poles were twenty feet long and were buried from 3 1/2 to 4 feet in the ground. On the west side of the state poles were placed seventeen to the mile, were eighteen feet long, and were usually made of pine. Given their construction materials, little remains of the poles or lines today. Some are still present at Maricopa Wells. Telegraph Canyon in Phoenix's South Mountain Park took its name from the military telegraph that passed through it.

Subtype: Heliograph Sites

Heliograph stations required less construction work than telegraph sites because the heliograph stations were not physically connected. The heliograph used signals of reflected sunlight flashed by mirrors. Heliograph stations were located on high mountain summits, most often with a forested background as a means to enhance the signal with a dark backdrop. The equipment itself was limited, and included a tripod, a sun mirror, a station mirror, a sighting rod with a movable disk, a screen, a key for the screen, and a screen spring. This equipment was often mounted on a wooden base, with two wooden stools on either side. The stations included some type of shelter for the soldiers assigned to it, often a ramada-type shelter made of brush or tents set on the ground. These facilities housed from five to eight men, with enough supplies to last thirty days.

Significance:

These properties would be considered significant under Criterion A for their association with the military communication system. Few sites could be identifiable with a particular individual so it is doubtful that they would qualify under Criterion B. Single sites or whole systems may be significant under National Register Criterion C as evidence of the design and workmanship of military communication facilities. Those sites that contain physical remains take on added significance because they would be considered a very rare property type. Properties with archaeological remains may be significant under Criterion D.

Registration Requirements:

For telegraph sites, integrity of location, association, and materials would be important. Setting and feeling would be less important as these aspects have little impact on the significance of the property. For heliograph sites, integrity of location, association, and setting would be integral. Although individual sites may not have any design elements that remain, the system as a whole may be taken as evidence of the design of the heliograph system. With this in mind the sites of heliograph stations, where they can be precisely identified, are considered eligible properties whether they contain any physical remains of the equipment or not.

5. Non-military properties with significant military associations

Description:

These properties are associated with the context of the military's impact on civilian and native residents of Arizona. They could be located apart or adjacent to military installations. This is a functional category which would include such properties as a sutler's store. Even though the civilian enterprise may be located on or quite near the fort or installation, it would be considered a separate property type. There is a wide variety of building types and properties that would be included in this property type. What the properties share is their connection to military history. Because of the varied nature of these properties, they might fall into many different National Register functional categories. These might include domestic, commerce/trade, agriculture/subsistence, and transportation. These properties might pertain to many different significance categories as well, but each must possess some type of significance to the military.

Significance:

These properties must be associated in a significant way with the military. A commercial enterprise that traded in a small way with the military or native groups would not be considered eligible under this context, but an enterprise for which military business comprises a large portion of its trade—enough that the business probably would not have existed without it—would be eligible. For example, the Hubbel Trading Post, which is a significant property for trade between Indians and Americans, would not be considered eligible under this context because that trade was not associated with military activities. The types of interaction that civilians or Indians might have with the military are detailed in the context statement. These include trade, transportation, and the provision of agricultural commodities. These properties would be significant under National Register Criterion A. Some properties might be considered under Criterion B if the individual involved had no other significant property associated with him/her. It is doubtful that properties identified as significant under the identified context would meet Criterion C for their military association, but they could be eligible under Criterion C for nonmilitary significance. Properties with archaeological remains of the civilian-military interaction would be eligible under Criterion D provided they can be expected to yield significant information.

Registration Requirements:

The registration requirements of association is paramount for this property type. These properties must have some identifiable military association. Location would also be important, to establish the link with the military. Integrity of setting would be of less importance, as the setting may be removed from the military locale. Integrity of workmanship, design, and materials may have little relation to the military significance of these properties, but if they are buildings or structures they must contain enough of these integrity considerations to convey a sense of the historic period of which they are a part. Integrity of feeling may not need to be present. These properties may not feel at all like a military property, yet they may have a documented military association.

6. Cemeteries and burial sites

Description:

Certain types of properties, such as cemeteries and graves, do not normally qualify for the National Register unless they meet certain special conditions. Cemeteries and graves may qualify under Criteria A, B, or C if they are integral parts of larger properties that do meet the criteria or if they meet conditions called "Criteria Considerations." Cemeteries and burial sites that may be eligible under Criterion D for the potential to yield significant information important to history do not have to meet the criteria considerations. In Arizona, most burials of military personnel at military posts were removed after the posts were abandoned. The remains were then reburied in national military cemeteries. Civilian or Indian dead were often left in place. These properties meet the National Register functional category of funerary, and the subcategories of cemetery or grave/burial. Significance categories would include military, and in the case of native groups, ethnic heritage.

Subtype: Cemetery

A cemetery is a complex burial site that is developed after some deliberate selection of location and involving the arrangement of the landscape. A cemetery is used over a period of time and contains the remains of persons who died at different points in time.

Subtype: Burial site

A burial site is broadly defined as a location where the dead are prepared for burial or cremation and where the remains of the dead are placed. In this instance a burial site is more informal than a cemetery, which is a planned and organized burial site used over a span of time. A burial site as described here is the location of an expeditiously prepared location such as at a battle site, along a military travel route, or at a temporary camp site. For many native groups, the subject of death was avoided in conversation. Native burial sites were placed in expeditious locations, such as a natural depression, a small cave, or rock outcropping.

Significance:

Cemeteries or burial sites are not normally considered eligible for the National Register, unless 1) they are a part of a larger property that is eligible; 2) they are associated with a person of outstanding importance and there is no other appropriate site related to that person that is eligible; or, 3) if the cemetery has significant design features or derives its primary significance from its association with historic events, i.e., Criterion A. Cemeteries or burial sites significant for the archaeological information they contain do not need exceptional justification in order to be nominated under Criterion D.

An example of the first situation is present at Fort McDowell where civilian and Indian dead are buried. The remains of military personnel were removed when the post was abandoned. The cemetery at Fort McDowell would be eligible because it is part of the larger post complex.

An example of the second situation might be the burial site of an important Indian leader or military figure for which no other property is considered eligible. The grave of Beale's camel caravan teamster, Hadji Ali (better known as "Hi Jolly") in Quartzite might fit this situation.

It is doubtful that any cemeteries or burial sites in Arizona would meet the parameters of the third situation with regard to design features since most were built quickly with little regard for ornamentation. However, there may be burial locations that would be eligible under situation three for their association with historic events. The burial location of those killed at the Rose Massacre Site or other such conflict, if the primary location was not considered eligible, would be eligible for its association with this historic event.

Most cemeteries and burial sites could be considered eligible under Criterion D for their potential to yield information important to history. In this instance, that information would have to be significant. A nomination for a burial location under Criterion D must state how the research at the property would contribute in a significant way to the study of history through archaeology. Careful thought should be taken to nominating a historic cemetery or burial site under Criterion D alone. Because this implies that the importance of the site is only the information it can provide. This ignores any emotional or cultural values people may attach to the site. Retrieval of that information, perhaps through excavation, is considered an appropriate treatment under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 should the property be threatened by federal undertakings. Such a situation might be taken as desecration by those wanting to preserve the site as it is.

Registration Requirements:

Evaluation of the seven integrity considerations for burial sites focuses on those of location, association, and setting. Since few Arizona properties would be nominated under Criterion C, the factors of design, materials, and workmanship would be less important. For location, the burial must be located at its historic location. The remains of soldiers once buried in Arizona and now removed elsewhere would not be considered eligible. The remains must be associated with the event. There must be a clear determination that the burial is linked in a significant way with the historic events or person. Setting is also important. However, in Arizona most of the burial locations are somewhat removed form modern improvements so this should not be much of a factor in precluding the nomination of a property.

7. Military districts

Description:

Military properties in Arizona are often large and complex. They cover extensive areas of land. For this reason, these properties are often nominated as a historic or archaeological district. The difference between the two is whether or not the properties are predominantly historical or archaeological. The Fort McDowell Archaeological and Historic District encompasses both types of resources at a series of locations that are closely connected spatially and adjacent to one another. The district forms a cohesive group. In contrast, the Fort Lowell Multiple Resource Area contains a number of properties that are separated spatially—although all the properties share an association with the old fort. In this instance, intervening properties that were not considered eligible precluded the nomination of the area as a district. The National Register no longer accepts Multiple Resource Area nominations. National Register functional categories for districts would most likely be defense, with the subcategory of military facility. Significance categories would include military, and, in the case of archaeological properties, archaeology.

Significance:

These groups would have to be importantly related to one of the contexts identified in this study. For example, the property could be eligible under Criterion A for its association with the context regarding military infrastructure. Several properties in Arizona are already on the National Register for this reason, such as the Fort Verde District, the Fort Apache District, and the Fort Lowell MRA to name a few. Others might be considered eligible under Criterion B, but it is doubtful that, given the inclusion of multiple properties in this property type, all of the properties nominated would be importantly associated with a single individual. Districts might be eligible under Criterion C, as representative of typical example of design. The standing military architecture at the Fort Huachuca National Historic Landmark is an example of properties significant under Criterion C. The Fort McDowell Archaeological and Historic District contains no standing architecture; all its resources are archaeological in nature.

Registration Requirements:

For districts, integrity of location is of prime importance. The location must be determined precisely. For those nominated under Criterion C, integrity of design, materials, and workmanship must be present. For properties that are primarily archaeological in nature, integrity of association and materials is paramount. The property must be associated with the military in a significant way as evidenced by the presence of diagnostic military-type artifacts. Setting and feeling are also important, but less so for this property type. The setting may have changed considerably from the military era, yet these properties can still convey a sense of history.

GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

This multiple property nomination contains, those resources that are located within the present boundaries of the State of Arizona. What we now know as the State of Arizona was once a province of New Spain, and then part of Mexico from 1821 to 1848. After the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the War with Mexico in 1848, that portion of Arizona north of the Gila River was contained within the Territory of New Mexico established in 1850 by the United States government. The western boundary of the Territory of New Mexico was the Colorado River, west of which the state of California was created in 1849. The Gadsden Purchase, ratified in 1854, added the area south of the Gila River in Arizona to the United States as part of the Territory of New Mexico. In 1863, Arizona achieved separate territorial status when the Federal government created the Territory of Arizona during the Civil War. In 1866, the Territory of Arizona lost part of its area when portions of Pah-Ute and Mohave counties were ceded to Nevada. Arizona achieved statehood on February 14, 1912.

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

This Multiple Property Documentation Form project is an outgrowth of a state historic preservation plan component. It is not based on community survey. It includes limited field research. The MPDF builds on established scholarly studies of the period and links those properties identified in the studies with specific locations. The MPDF serves to combine academic and avocational interest in the warfare period with historic preservation. The MPDF is designed to provide some balance in the types of properties recognized. Many US military forts or camps are recognized by listing on the National Register, but few locations associated with Native American groups have received recognition. The MPDF has as its goal to recognize a greater range of property types.

It must be stressed that this multiple property submission is only an overview of the Indian warfare period. The emphasis here is to note the more significant aspects of the era with regard to historic and archaeological properties. Entire books have been written on the Apache wars, individual commanders and Indian leaders, and on aspects of technology. The goal of this project was to identify several significant contexts that will facilitate the nomination of additional properties to the National Register of Historic Places. It is not intended as an exhaustive treatment of the subject.

The state historic preservation plan component that the MPDF is based on is the historic context study prepared in May of 1993 and titled The United States Military in Arizona, 1846-1945. That context study was an outgrowth of a class project of the Public History Program at Arizona State University. It was prepared by William S. Collins, Melanie Sturgeon, and Robert M. Carriker. The context study addressed a unique irony of Arizona: Military history is a very popular subject for both amateur and professional historians, yet little has been done to protect the remaining resources. To meet the need of protecting a deteriorating resource base, the context study identified six goals:

1. Increase efforts to identify military properties and sites.
2. Assist public agencies and private land owners identify, evaluate, and preserve sites and associated properties.
3. Develop preservation treatments consistent with the values that the particular sites possess.
4. Increase public awareness of the dangers that threaten our historic military sites.
5. Encourage public involvement in site preservation.
6. Work with officials at active military bases to identify, nominate, and actively preserve significant properties.

Because the National Register of Historic Places is the centerpiece of historic preservation programs in the United States, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office determined that one immediate step it could take in its program of meeting the preservation goals identified above would be to facilitate the nomination of military properties to the National Register. The criteria for evaluating the eligibility of properties are carefully delineated by the National Register. The qualifications necessary to include a property on the National Register are the standards generally used to judge which properties deserve recognition. Once a property is considered eligible for the National Register, it achieves some measure of protection from destructive state and Federal undertakings. Such properties also become eligible for funding from state and Federal granting agencies. By facilitating the nomination of military properties to the National Register, Arizona has taken a long step toward achieving its preservation goals.

One of the easier ways to facilitate the nomination of multiple properties to the National Register is the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF). The MPDF is a cover document, and not a nomination in its own right. It serves as the basis for evaluating the National Register eligibility of related properties. The MPDF streamlines methods of organizing information collected for registration and preservation planning purposes. It is considered an essential management tool.

In August of 1995 the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office contracted with Ryden Architects to prepare the MPDF and to nominate three properties associated with contexts developed in the MPDF to the National Register. Ryden Architects assigned three individuals to work on the project: Douglas E. Kupel, Ph.D., served as the principle investigator. Dr. Kupel is a historian and certified professional archaeologist with an extensive background in the preparation of National Register nominations. Don W. Ryden, AIA, served as the project's architect, bringing to the effort a lengthy history of involvement with historic preservation projects and an intimate knowledge of the state's military history. Col. Lloyd Clark, Ret., served as the military historian for the project. Col. Clark has a distinguished military career and a lifetime interest in military history which he has shared with others through teaching and lecturing since his retirement.

Historical research into the history of the period of warfare between Native Americans and Anglos began with a check of repositories in Phoenix and Tucson. The initial investigation developed leads which were then followed in detail. Because the State Historic Preservation Office has already developed a statewide historic preservation plan component for the impact of military history in Arizona, the methodology for the project concentrated on identifying and describing specific contexts that would facilitate the nomination of additional properties to the National Register. Specific locations of resources utilized in the historical research are as follows:

Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records

This state agency has an excellent research collection, starting with publications of a general nature regarding Arizona and the military theme. Of particular importance are its collection of newspapers on microfilm which helped to detail the chronological history of sites.

State Historic Preservation Office

Provided copies of previous historic site inventories and National Register nominations of properties associated with the military theme.

Arizona Room, Hayden Library, Arizona State University

This special collections library has specific inventories of military properties in Arizona and photographs.

Map Collection, Noble Library, Arizona State University

Contains historic military maps of Arizona.

Arizona Historical Foundation, Tempe

Contains a good collection of photographs and some manuscript material. This collection also contains a good selection of historic military maps.

Arizona Historical Society, Tucson

The manuscript and photo collections of this state agency are kept at the Arizona Historical Society Museum in Tucson. This agency has an extensive collection of photographs, maps, and manuscript material relating to the military theme.

Interviews

Several individuals provided additional information that could not be obtained from primary or secondary source materials. Arizona has a wealth of individuals who are experts in the field of military history and many were generous with their time and expertise. Although these individuals offered support and guidance, the final nomination should not be considered as representative of the views of any specific individual or group. The authors alone are responsible for the final tone and content of the nomination. Specific individuals consulted for this study included:

Jay Van Orden, Arizona Historical Society historian
Mark Santiago, Arizona Historical Society historian
Peter Booth, Arizona Historical Society historian
Dale Curtis Miles, San Carlos Apache tribe historian
Chad Smith, San Carlos Apache tribe archaeologist
Leland Michael Darrow, Fort Sill Apache tribal historian
Bill Collins, Arizona SHPO historian
Reba Grandrud, Arizona SHPO historian
Gene Rogge, Arizona HSRC archaeologist
Dave Faust, Fort Lowell Museum historian
Bill Hoy, retired NPS Fort Bowie superintendent
Larry L. Ludwig, current NPS Fort Bowie superintendent
Jim DuBois, Bonita Store owner (near Ft. Grant)
Ben Snure, Geronimo cessation of hostilities site owner
Jim McDonald, Coronado National Forest archaeologist
Bill Doelle, Center for Desert Research archaeologist

The project team worked closely with William S. Collins of the Arizona SHPO to determine the historic contexts, property types, and properties selected for nomination. The historic contexts are based on the statewide historic preservation plan component co-authored by Mr. Collins, as modified to facilitate National Register nominations. Each context identified stresses a different aspect of military history. These include military installations, battles and peace talks, transportation, communication, and civilian impacts. Because the contexts are designed to assist in the nomination of particular property types, there may be some duplication of information between each context. Each context is designed to stand alone, rather than having a single context which covers many separate events and themes. The property types were based on an analysis of properties already listed on the Arizona historic property inventory, and on National Register properties listed in Arizona.

The project was funded with state funds from the Arizona Heritage Fund. The funding source and the amount of funds available guided the selection of individual properties designated for nomination. Heritage Fund money can be used only on private property, state owned land, or land governed by Arizona Indian tribes. It cannot be used for properties owned by Federal agencies. Using these parameters, the project team in consultation with SHPO selected several properties that appeared to be likely candidates for nomination to the National Register.

The identified sites were examined in the field to determine integrity, to locate the properties accurately, and to take photographs. The three selected properties are attached to this cover document as individual nominations. The properties were selected with a view toward recognizing properties that were not well represented on the National Register for Arizona. These included properties associated with the Native American side of military history and civilian sites with important military associations. The nominated properties should be viewed as a small selection of the potential sites. Time and budget considerations precluded the preparation of additional nominations. However, it is hoped that the development of the context statements and property types will facilitate the nomination and protection of additional properties. These would include those owned and administered by Federal agencies.

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Agnew, S.C.
Garrisons of the Regular U.S. Army, Arizona, 1851-1899. Arlington, Virginia: Council on Abandoned Military Posts, 1974.

Altshuler, Constance Wynn
Chains of Command: Arizona and the Army, 1856-1875. Tucson: Arizona Historical Society, 1981.

———
Starting With Defiance: Nineteenth Century Arizona Military Posts. Tucson: Arizona Historical Society, 1983.

Bahre, Stephen
Arizona Frontier Military Camps and Posts. Tucson: Pueblo Cartographic, 1970.

Bailey, Paul D.
"The Navajo Wars," Arizoniana 2: 2 (Summer, 1961): 3-12.

Bailey, L.R.
The Long Walk: A History of the Navajo Wars, 1846-1868. Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1964.

Barnes, Will Croft
"The Battle of Cibecue," Arizona Highways 7 (March, 1936): 18-20.

Bender, Averam B.
"Military Posts in the Southwest, 1848-1860," New Mexico Historical Review 16 (April, 1941): 125-147.

———
"Military Transportation in the Southwest, 1846-1860," New Mexico Historical Review 32 (April, 1957): 123-150.

Blount, Bertha
"The Apaches in the Southwest, 1846-1886," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 23 (July, 1919): 20-38.

Brandes, Ray
Frontier Military Posts of Arizona. Globe, Arizona: Dale Stuart King, 1960.

———
Troopers West: Military and Indian Affairs on the American Frontier. San Diego: Frontier Heritage Press, 1970.

Brinckerhoff, Sidney B.
"Camp Date Creek, Arizona Territory: Infantry Outpost in the Yavapai Wars, 1867-1873," Smoke Signal 10 (Fall, 1964).

Bourke, John G.
An Apache Campaign in the Sierra Madre. New York, 1886; reprint New York: Scribners', 1951.

________ On the Border with Crook. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1891; reprint Chicago: Rio Grande Press, 1962.

Brooks, Drex and Patricia Nelson Limerick
Sweet Medicine. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Cargill, Andrew Hays
"The Camp Grant Massacre," Arizona Historical Review 7: 3 (1936): 73-79.

Casebier, Dennis g.
Camp El Dorado, Arizona Territory. Tempe: Arizona Historical Foundation, 1970.

________ Camp Beale's Springs and the Hualapai Indians. Norco, California: Tales of the Mohave Road Publishing Co., 1980.

Chidester, Otis H., ed.
Military Forts and Campaigns in the Southwest: A Collection of Smoke Signals. Tucson: Tucson Corral of the Westerners, 1983.

Clum, Woodworth
Apache Agent: The Story of John P. Clum. New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1936.

Collins, William S., ed.
The United States Military in Arizona, 1846-1945. Phoenix: State Historic Preservation Office, 1993.

Colyer, Vincent
Peace with the Apaches of New Mexico and Arizona. Washington, D.C.: 1872.

Connelley, William B.
Doniphan's Expedition. Kansas City, Missouri: 1907.

Cremony, John C.
Life Among the Apaches. San Francisco, 1868; reprint Tucson: Arizona Silhouettes, 1951.

Crook, George
Resume of Operations Against Apache Indians from 1882 to 1886. Washington, D.C.: 1886.

Cunningham, Bob
"The Calamitous Career of Lt. Royal E. Whitman," Journal of Arizona History 29: 2 (Summer, 1988): 149-162.

Davis, Britton
The Truth About Geronimo. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Davisson, Lori
"Fifty Years at Fort Apache," Journal of Arizona History 17: 3 (Autumn, 1976): 301-320.

Debo, Angie
Geronimo. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976.

Dobyns, Henry F.
"Inter-Ethnic Fighting in Arizona: Counting the Cost of Conquest." Journal of Arizona History 35: 2 (Summer, 1994): 163-182.

Frazer, Robert W.
Forts of the West. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986.

Gardner, Hamilton
"Phillip St. George Cooke and the Apache, 1854," New Mexico Historical Review 28 (1953): 115-132.

Gatewood, Lt. Charles B.
"Lieut. Charles B. Gatewood, 6th U.S. Cavalry, and the Surrender of Geronimo," Arizona Historical Review 4: 1 (1931-1932): 29-44.

Goetzman, William H.
Army Exploration in the American West, 1803-1863. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Goff, John
"John Titus, Chief Justice of Arizona: 1870-1974," Arizona and the West 14: 1 (Spring, 1972): 25-44.

Hastings, James R.
"The Tragedy at Camp Grant in 1871," Arizona and the West 1: 2 (Summer, 1959): 146-160.

Hayes, Alden C.
"Sierra Madre Revisited," Journal of Arizona History 32: 2 (Summer, 1991): 125-152.

Hayes, Jess C.
Apache Vengeance: The True Story of the Apache Kid. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1954.

Hazen-Hammond, Susan
"The Battle at Bloody Tanks," Arizona Highways (July, 1995): 32-35.

Hoffman, Velma Rudd
"Lt. Beale and the Camel Caravans Through Arizona," Arizona Highways (October, 1957): 81-106.

Hopkins, Richard C.
"Kit Carson and the Navajo Expedition," Montana 18: 2 (1968): 52-61.

Howard, O.O.
My Life and Experiences Among Our Hostile Indians. Hartford: 1907.

____
Famous Indian Chiefs I Have Known. New York: Century, 1908.

Hunt, Aurora
Major-General James Henry Carleton, Western Frontier Dragoon. Glendale: Arthur H. Clark, 1958.

Irwin, Bernard J.D.
"The Chiricahua Apache Indians: A Thrilling Incident in the Early History of Arizona Territory (The Bascom Affair)," Infantry Journal (April, 1928): 368-375.

Jeffrey, Charles Frederick
"A Historical Geography of the Heliograph in the Department of Arizona." Master's thesis, Arizona State University, 1980.

Johnston, Virginia, W.
The Unregimented General: A Biography of Nelson A. Miles. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Jones, Okah L., Jr.
"The Origins of the Navajo Indian Police," Arizona and the West 8: 3 (1966): 225-238.

Kane, Adam
"Army Politics and Indian Wars: Charles B. Gatewood and the Geronimo Campaign of 1886," Military History of the West 26 (Fall, 1996): 109-28.

Lindgren, Raymond E.
"A Diary of Kit Carson's Navajo Campaign, 1863-1864." New Mexico Historical Review 21 (1946): 226-247.

Lockwood, Frank C.
"Early Military Posts in Arizona," Arizona Historical Review 2 (January, 1930): 91-97.

McKenna, Clare V., Jr.
"Life Hangs in the Balance: The U.S. Supreme Court's Review of Ex Parte Gon-Shay-ee," Western Legal History 3: 2 (Summer-Fall, 1990): 197-211.

McKown, James
"Pipe Spring National Monument Historical Handbook." Manuscript on file Arizona SHPO, 1960.

Malach, Roman
Military Posts in Mohave County. Kingman: Helt Printers, 1986.

Marion, Jeanie
"As Long as the Stone Lasts: General O.O. Howard's 1872 Peace Conference," Journal of Arizona History 35: 2 (Summer, 1994): 109-140.

Mooney, James
The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Morgan, George H.
"The Fight at the Big Dry Wash in the Mogollon Mountains, Arizona, July 17, 1882, With Renegade Apache Scouts from the San Carlos Reservation," Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Order of Indian Wars of the U.S. held February 24, 1940, pp. 21-28.

Opler, Morris E.
"A Chiricahua Apache's Account of the Geronimo Campaign of 1886," New Mexico Historical Review 13 (1938): 360-386.

________ An Apache Life-Way: The Economic, Social, and Religious Institutions of the Chiricahua Indians. New York: Cooper Square, 1965.

Prucha, Francis Paul
A Guide to the Military Posts of the United States, 1789-1895. Milwaukee: North American Press, 1964.

Reed, Bill
The Last Bugle Call: A History of Fort McDowell, Arizona Territory, 1865-1890. Parsons, West Virginia: McClain Printing, 1977.

Richardson, Harold Charles
"United States Military Posts in Arizona, 1849 through 1900." Master's thesis, Arizona State University, 1954.

Robinson, Dorothy Fulwiler
"A Brief History of the Apaches from 1848-1864." Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1928.

Rolak, Bruno J., ed.
Military History of the Spanish American Southwest: A Seminar. Fort Huachuca: Privately printed, 1976.

________ "The Heliograph in the Geronimo Campaign of 1886," in Military History of the Spanish American Southwest: A Seminar, Bruno J. Rolak, ed. Fort Huachuca: Privately printed, 1976.

Ryden Architects
Preservation Master Plan Concepts for Fort McDowell Yavapai Heritage Park. Phoenix: Ryden Architects, 1991.

________ A Historic Building Analysis of Eight Buildings at Fort Yuma. Phoenix: Ryden Architects, 1993.

Rue, Norman L.
"Words by Iron Wire: Construction of the Military Telegraph in Arizona Territory." Master's thesis, University of Arizona, 1967.

Sacks, Benjamin
"New Evidence on the Bascom Affair," Arizona and the West 4 (1962): 261-278.

Salzman, M., Jr.
"Geronimo: The Napoleon of Indians," Journal of Arizona History 8: 4 (Winter, 1967): 215-247.

Schmitt, Martin F., ed.
General George Crook: His Autobiography. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946.

Schreir, Jim
Camp Reno: Outpost in Apacheria, 1867-1870. Tucson: Arizona Historical Society, 1992.

Smith, C.C.
"Fight at Cibecue," Arizona Highways 32 (May, 1956): 2-5.

Sonnichsen, C.L.
"The Remodeling of Geronimo," Arizona Highways 62: 9 (September, 1986): 2-11.

Spicer, Edward H.
Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533-1960. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962.

Talbot, Dan
A Historical Guide to the Mormon Battalion and Butterfield Trail. Tucson: Westernlore Press, 1992.

Thompson, Gerald
Edward F. Beale and the American West. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1983

Thrapp, Dan L.
Al Sieber, Chief of Scouts. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.

________ The Conquest of Apacheria. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.

________ General Crook and the Sierra Madre Adventure. Norman. University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.

Toulouse, Joseph
"Military Forts in 1869," Arizona Historical Review 6 (July, 1935): 81-85.

Tyler, Barbara Ann
"Cochise: Apache War Leader, 1858-1861," Journal of Arizona History 6: 1 (Spring, 1965): 1-10.

Utley, Robert M.
"The Bascom Affair: A Reconstruction," Arizona and the West 3: 1 (1961): 59-68.

____
"The Surrender of Geronimo," Arizoniana 4: 1 (Spring, 1963): 1-9.

____
Frontiersman in Blue: The United States Army and the Indian, 1848-1865. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

____
Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indian, 1866-1891. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

____
A Clash of Cultures: Fort Bowie and the Chiricahua Apaches. Washington: National Park Service, 1977.

Van Orden, Jay
"C.S. Fly at Canon de los Embudos," Journal of Arizona History 30: 3 (Autumn, 1989): 319-346.

Walker, Henry P.
"Wagon Freighting in Arizona," Smoke Signal 28 (Fall, 1973).

Wagoner, Jay J.
Arizona Territory, 1863-1912. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980.

____
"Geronimo," Arizona Highways 62: 9 (September, 1986): 12-23.

Webb, George
Chronological List of Engagements Between the Regular Army of the United States and the Various Tribes of Hostile Indians Which Occurred During the Years 1790 to 1898, Inclusive. St. Joseph, Missouri: Wing Printing and Publishing, 1939.

Worcester, Donald E.
"The Beginnings of the Apache Menace of the Southwest," New Mexico Historical Review 16 (1941): 1-14.

Toulouse, Joseph
"Military Forts in 1869," Arizona Historical Review 6 (July, 1935): 81-85.

Tyler, Barbara Ann
"Cochise: Apache War Leader, 1858-1861," Journal of Arizona History 6: 1 (Spring, 1965): 1-10.

Utley, Robert M.
"The Bascom Affair: A Reconstruction," Arizona and the West 3: 1 (1961): 59-68.

_______ "The Surrender of Geronimo," Arizoniana 4: 1 (Spring, 1963): 1-9.

_______ Frontiersman in Blue: The United States Army and the Indian, 1848-1865. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

_______ Frontier Regulars: The United States Army and the Indian, 1866-1891. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

_______ A Clash of Cultures: Fort Bowie and the Chiricahua Apaches. Washington: National Park Service, 1977.

Van Orden, Jay
"C.S. Fly at Canon de los Embudos," Journal of Arizona History 30: 3 (Autumn, 1989): 319-346.

Walker, Henry P.
"Wagon Freighting in Arizona," Smoke Signal 28 (Fall, 1973).

Wagoner, Jay J.
Arizona Territory, 1863-1912. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980.

_______ "Geronimo," Arizona Highways 62: 9 (September, 1986): 12-23.

Webb, George
Chronological List of Engagements Between the Regular Army of the United States and the Various Tribes of Hostile Indians Which Occurred During the Years 1790 to 1898, inclusive. St. Joseph, Missouri: Wing Printing and Publishing, 1939.

Worcester, Donald E.
"The Beginnings of the Apache Menace of the Southwest," New Mexico Historical Review 16 (1941): 1-14.