

ARTICLE

Returning the *tataayiyam honuuka'* (Ancestors) to the Correct Home: The Importance of Background Investigations for NAGPRA Claims

DESIREÉ R. MARTINEZ, WENDY G. TEETER, AND KARIMAH KENNEDY-RICHARDSON

Abstract The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) claims process can be frustrating for Native American communities due to hindrances such as the lack of provenience and provenance of collections. Through historic research on and preliminary analysis of Santa Catalina Island archaeological collections assembled by Ralph Glidden and held by museums across the United States, the authors have discovered that much of the documented provenience and provenance information is missing, wrong, or at best more complicated than previously thought. The authors assert that background research of collections is imperative to ensure that ancestral remains are returned to the appropriate lineal descendants or Native American descendant community. Further, the Glidden collections show that disputed provenience and provenance information has massive implications for NAGPRA claims made by non-federally recognized tribes, such as the Gabrielino/Tongva, the Indigenous inhabitants of Santa Catalina and the Los Angeles Basin.

“It’s gross what you are doing, keeping our ancestors on the shelf. Why can’t you just give them back to us so we can rebury them?”¹

For those who work with Native American artifacts and human remains, the above statement is not unusual. Since the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)² in 1990, many Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native community members thought NAGPRA would finally remove their ancestors from museum shelves and send them back to their communities for reburial. However, after 24 years, many Native American community members still have not seen their ancestors returned, and in some instances have not been allowed to participate, until very recently, in

the process.³ The NAGPRA claims process has been frustrating to some Native American communities due to a number of hindrances, such as incomplete museum inventories and lack of physical location information, lack of financial resources to conduct consultation visits, museum and/or federal agency staff ill-equipped to lead successful consultations, the daunting task of gathering cultural and scholarly information to prove claims, as well as having repatriations blocked due to personal and/or political agendas (Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010; Alvitre 2005; Martinez 2006).

NAGPRA mandates that prior to repatriation, human remains and objects must have documentation that summarizes “the existing museum or Federal agency records including

Desireé R. Martinez (drmartin@fas.harvard.edu), Gabrielino (Tongva), Cogstone Research Management, 1518 W. Taft Ave., Orange, California. Wendy G. Teeter (wteeter@arts.ucla.edu) Fowler Museum at University of California, Los Angeles, Box 951549, Los Angeles, California. Karimah Kennedy-Richardson (krichardson@theautry.org), Autry National Center, Southwest Museum, 234 Museum Dr., Los Angeles; Ph.D. Student, University of California, Riverside.

inventories or catalogues, relevant studies, or other pertinent data for the limited purpose of determining the geographic origin, cultural affiliation, and basic facts surrounding the acquisition and accession of human remains and associated funerary objects.”⁴

As Native American communities started to make NAGPRA claims and visited museums to view archaeological and ethnographic collections, they were surprised and flabbergasted to discover that many objects did not have provenience and provenance information associated with them.⁵ Reno Keoni Franklin, Tribal Chairman of the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, who has visited many museums and federal agency repositories for NAGPRA consultation, states:

Collections always seem to be missing “objects” and in the case when a federal agency has transferred a collection, there is little to no documentation with both sides pointing the finger at each other. The lackadaisical attitude of museum staff (not always but frequently) frustrates tribal people. I find myself embarrassed to bring traditional leaders with me because of the culture vulture attitude many of the museum staffers have shown.⁶

If there was provenience and provenance information, it was scanty at best, because the collections were assembled early in the twentieth century, prior to the development of standardized anthropological excavation and recording methods. This is especially true for collections that were the result of looting or amateur collecting prevalent in the late 1800s and early 1900s where the only recorded location information describes a large geographical area (such as California or Los Angeles). Further, early museums exchanged objects with each other in order to gain depth and breadth in areas where

their collections were lacking. A particular artifact could be exchanged a number of times with provenience information being lost along the way.⁷

Through historic research on and preliminary analysis of Santa Catalina Island archaeological collections held by a number of museums across the United States, the authors have discovered that much of the documented provenience and provenance information is missing, wrong, or at best more complicated than previously thought. Using the collections assembled by Ralph Glidden, a well-known collector of Channel Island material, as an example, the authors assert that background research of collections is especially imperative during the NAGPRA claim process in order to ensure that the ancestral remains are returned to the appropriate lineal descendants or Native American descendant community. Further, the Glidden collections show that disputed provenience and provenance information has massive implications for NAGPRA claims made by non-federally recognized tribes, such as the Tongva (Gabrielino), the Indigenous inhabitants of Santa Catalina and the Los Angeles Basin

The theories and interpretations drawn from these collections should be scrutinized, even if they are considered infallible and indisputable by practicing California archaeologists. Detailed investigation and acknowledgment of the complicated provenience and provenance issues respects the deceased, who have already been harmed by disinterment, as well as provides the opportunity for the correct cultural protocols and ceremonies to be conducted by their kin. NAGPRA should not be simply considered a matter of reburial. Instead, as others have argued, NAGPRA provides a way for Native American communities to recover their ancestors’ inherent human right to be treated

with dignity after death and to assert their sovereign right to their past.

PIMU CATALINA ISLAND ARCHAEOLOGY PROJECT

The arguments presented here are based on the authors' first hand experiences as museum professionals, working with Native American communities and their objects, both now and in the past. The authors have witnessed the emotional reactions of Native American community members as they have viewed museum collections. Furthermore, each author has had extensive experience researching the provenience and provenance of collections in preparation for Native American consultations under NAGPRA. Wendy Teeter has been the NAGPRA coordinator for the University of California, Los Angeles since 1998 and has overseen dozens of repatriation requests and returns. Desiree Martinez is a Gabrielino (Tongva) community member and has participated in the NAGPRA claim process both as a claimant and as a liaison for other Native American communities. Karimah Kennedy Richardson is the staff archaeologist for the Southwest Museum of the American Indian, Autry National Center and is charged with performing the osteological inventories and organizing and assisting research for NAGPRA inventories and notices. The authors are also practicing archaeologists, co-directing the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project (PCIAP), which investigates over 8,000 years of cultural history on Santa Catalina Island.

Located 22 miles off the coast of Southern California, Santa Catalina (*Pimu* or *Pimungna*) is one of three southern Channel Islands including San Clemente (*Kiinkepar*) and San Nicolas (*Xaraashnga*) that were inhabited by the Gabrielino (Tongva) based on linguistic,

ethnographic, and archaeological cultural affiliation (McCawley 1996). At the time of European contact by Juan Cabrillo in 1542, the Tongva lived in autonomous villages comprised of related lineages with populations numbering 50 to 100 people and larger villages containing 300 people. The Tongva used a wooden plank canoe called a *ti'at* to travel to and from the Channel Islands, allowing for intra-island and island-mainland trade, exchange, and communication. Santa Catalina Island items such as soapstone artifacts, dried fish, and marine mammal pelts and meat were traded for mainland resources including furs, skins, grass seeds, worked deer bone, chert, and obsidian (Bean and Vane 1978; Meighan 1959; Schumacher 1879, 11). These are the *tataayiyam honuuka'*—the “ancestors” of our title.⁸

In addition to the three southern Channel Islands, Gabrielino (Tongva) traditional territory included portions of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. The term Gabrielino was used by the Spanish to identify Native Americans who were baptized at the Mission San Gabriel during the Spanish colonial period. Prior to European contact, there was no collective overarching label that identified people who lived in the Los Angeles Basin. Instead, people would identify themselves as belonging to a particular village. Most of these names have since been lost. As an alternative to Gabrielino, which only reminds the community of their painful past, a number of descendant community members are using the term Tongva. This term will be used throughout the rest of the article.

Since 2007, PCIAP has investigated how the connections between various communities of Tongva—both physical and social—were constructed and maintained. The primary method of this investigation is compiling and re-analyzing previous research; re-mapping,

re-assessing and re-documenting previously recorded sites using GPS and GIS technology; as well as identifying and documenting new sites while working with members of the Tongva community and living multi-generational Catalina Island residents. The project also explores the span of time and location of human occupation through geomorphological analysis and landscape studies (Teeter et al. 2013). Taken together, PCIAP's research goals aim to dispel the imagined history of Santa Catalina Island and to educate the public about who the Tongva were and are—an objective considered essential by the Tongva community.

PCIAP is unique within the southern California archaeological research community due to its use of an Indigenous Archaeology approach. Indigenous Archaeology was first defined by George Nicholas in 1990 as “archaeology done with, for and by Indigenous people” (Nicholas and Andrews 1997, 3). Nicholas expanded his definition to include at least eight principles that further the deconstruction of the colonial enterprise inherent within archaeological research. They are:

- (1) The proactive participation or consultation of Indigenous peoples in archaeology;
- (2) A political statement concerned with issues of Aboriginal self-government, sovereignty, land rights, identity, and heritage;
- (3) A postcolonial enterprise designed to decolonize the discipline;
- (4) A manifestation of Indigenous epistemologies;
- (5) The basis for alternative models of cultural heritage management or stewardship;
- (6) The product of choices and actions made by individual archaeologists;
- (7) A means of empowerment and cultural revitalization or political resistance; and
- (8) An extension, evaluation, critique, of current archaeological theory (2008, 1660).

As a result of adhering to these principles, PCIAP's research has been shaped through continued discussions, during all research phases, with Tongva community members who have special interests and familial ties to Santa Catalina Island.

For decades, Tongva community members have actively fought against the notion that the Tongva are extinct or are latecomers to the southern California area, as well as the distorted stereotype that they are a group of delusional Mexicans who are lying about their heritage for personal gain (Alvitre 2006; Jurmain and McCawley 2009; Martinez 2010b; Teeter and Martinez 2009). These perceptions are based on studies completed by early ethnologists and anthropologists who had a limited definition of who was Tongva and who wasn't.

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, many scholars engaged in “salvage ethnography,” the recording of California Native American lifeways before they “vanished.” However, the scholars focused solely on gathering pre-Columbian lifeways practiced prior to “corruption” by outside (European) influences. This strategy was based on the idea that one could lose his or her culture by incorporating “foreign” ideas and objects into “traditional” lifeways. In reality, lifeways were an accumulation of hundreds of changes, sometimes spurred by outside influences, over thousands of years. As a result, anyone who did not participate in the “pure”—and basically fictional—culture was not considered a California Native American. Alfred L. Kroeber used this benchmark when he searched for Tongva in 1910. When he didn't find anyone who fit his strict definition, he declared the Gabrielino extinct. “Since Kroeber is considered the father, the authority, of Native California ethnography, his perspective is given precedence over

other perspectives,” one of us wrote (Martinez 2010a, 216). “Later studies followed his lead; if Kroeber said it, it must be true.”

As will be discussed later, these misinformed ideas and studies have hindered the Tongva community’s ability to assert sovereign rights over the treatment and care of their cultural items and ancestors.

Tongva community members have developed public educational programs (Kuruvungna Springs, for instance⁹) to dispel these myths, and are working with scholars, such as the authors, to create research agendas that show they have continued to be a vibrant community in spite of historic and modern colonial pressures. Further, they will no longer allow their histories and contributions to be silenced or solely conveyed by non-community members.

PCIAP also addresses the concerns of the Tongva community by exposing archaeology students to an Indigenous perspective during the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Field School (Martinez 2012). Students are introduced to the cultural beliefs and deep history of the Tongva as they are taught rigorous archaeological methods reviewed by the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA). Students learn that sites and objects are not valued solely based on their research potential, but are seen by the Tongva community as being infused with power and symbolism. By learning directly from Tongva community members about the importance of the island’s cultural resources to the Tongva community, students—it’s hoped—will recognize that various communities have a different sense of place and space and will take this realization to their future archaeological endeavors.

EARLY RESEARCH AND COLLECTIONS

In order to understand cultural materials that have been removed from Catalina,

PCIAP’s first task was to identify where Catalina archaeological collections are physically located and to become familiar with the amount and types of artifacts that have been previously collected. A number of research expeditions to Catalina occurred during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. (For a complete list see Wlodarski 1982.) For example, from 1873-1874, naturalist William Dall, best known for his documentation of Native Alaskan cultural practices and material, journeyed with the United States Coast Survey to collect natural resource specimens along the Pacific Coast (Smithsonian 2011). Dall returned with a number of Santa Catalina Island artifacts and presented them to the United States National Museum, now the Smithsonian’s National Museum of Natural History (House of Representatives 1877, 533).

Under contract with the United States National Museum and the Harvard Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Paul Schumacher joined the Expedition for Explorations West of the One Hundredth Meridian to collect additional artifacts from California’s Channel Islands and from sites on the southern California mainland. Schumacher’s investigations from 1875 to 1879 included documenting Catalina’s soapstone quarries, gathering samples of native plants, as well as assembling examples of mainland basketry.¹⁰ Schumacher’s collections were divided between the Harvard Peabody Museum and United States National Museum.

Although these early expeditions were scientific and scholarly explorations with published results, detailed descriptions of context were non-existent. Generally only vaguely descriptive terms were used—Johnson’s Landing, Whitney’s Place, and Potts Valley, for instance—which identified large swaths of land that included a number of activity and habitation areas.

It wasn't until the UCLA Archaeological Survey, running from the late 1950s until the 1970s, that a systematic and research-oriented approach was applied to Santa Catalina Island (see Meighan 1959; Finnerty et al. 1970). Environmental-compliance-driven archaeological work as well as smaller research and field school projects were completed from the 1970s to the present, through the University of California, Riverside; California State University, Los Angeles; and California State University, Long Beach.¹¹ Although these later projects identified and recorded many sites, the haste with which they were conducted, often by students, resulted in often imprecise location data and incomplete site characterizations not useful today.

PCIAP has found that some of the most unique items were in assemblages amassed by individuals who lived and/or vacationed on Catalina Island, such as Ralph Glidden, Frederick Holder, George Schaffer, Louella Blanche Trask, William Henry Holms, and Arthur Sanger. Some of these individuals eventually donated their collections to various museums nationwide, such as the National Museum of American Indian and others. Glidden, whose collections are described here, was the most prolific and well known.

RALPH GLIDDEN AND HIS COLLECTIONS

Born in 1881 in Lowell, Massachusetts, Ralph Glidden moved with his parents to Avalon, Santa Catalina Island, when he was 15. Although Glidden learned to be a carpenter like his father and helped with the family business, he joined the crew of Captain A. B. Chappell (another early relic hunter) to explore San Nicolas Island in search of abalone pearls in 1915 (Wlodarski 1978). Instead of pearls, he became more interested in digging for treasures

of the past. His big “break” came when George Heye, director of the Museum of the American Indian located in New York City, hired Glidden over Chappell—Heye had described Chappell as a horrible looter—to assemble a collection of Channel Islands artifacts for his museum (Wlodarski 1982, 8).

Glidden excavated mainly on Santa Catalina, San Nicolas, and San Miguel Islands between 1919 and 1923. Photographs and journals, now held by the Santa Catalina Island Museum, record the hundreds of burials and thousands of objects removed under the sponsorship of the Heye Foundation. The patronage ended by 1923 when Heye realized that Glidden was selling objects to other collectors and publicizing his findings at the expense of his benefactor.

In 1924, Glidden built his own Museum of the American Indian of the Channel Islands in Avalon with the remains and cultural materials not sent to the Heye Foundation or to Chicago's Field Museum (at the request of board member William Wrigley). Glidden decided on a very particular way of displaying his finds. This included using various skeletal elements nailed to walls and structures to create shelving brackets and wall decorations. As one newspaper article described it:

But—the little museum itself is lined with human bones. The window frames are finger bones, the sills, toe bones, great rosettes grace the ceilings, these are human shoulder blades, shank bones form the braces of shelves upon which rest grinning skulls of noble chieftains. . . bones, bones, everywhere bones (Anonymous 1926).

Glidden hoped that his collections would bring him fame and glory. Alma Overholt, his publicist and greatest champion, wrote a number of sensationalist newspaper articles for

the *Los Angeles Times* detailing Glidden's "discoveries," including "White Indian Giants" and Indian Princesses, one said to have been found buried and clutching the side of a large urn surrounded by 65 children (1930; 1932). Although he tried desperately to find credible museums to purchase his collections and sponsor his research, he was unsuccessful and the museum closed by 1950. Glidden sold the museum collection to the Catalina Museum Society¹² for \$5,000 in 1962; it became the foundation for the Catalina Island Museum's archaeological collections (Sahagun 2012).

GLIDDEN'S COLLECTION AND DISPLAY PRACTICES

The history of Glidden's collection and display practices highlights a number of important issues that affect NAGPRA claims made to museums that hold remains and items acquired by Glidden. First and foremost is the problem of provenience. In order to accurately culturally affiliate human remains and cultural objects, one must know the exact location of the burial or object and be able to demonstrate that they are Native American. Although Glidden briefly documented his finds in journals and took pictures, linking the human remains and burial objects back to those notes is almost impossible. Glidden used a basic sequential numbering system in his journal to keep track of his finds, but did not write those numbers on the remains or on his photographs. This problem extends also to the Glidden collections sent to other museums, such as the Field Museum and the Heye Foundation's Museum of the American Indian.¹³ It appears that only brief catalogue cards were sent with the cultural items, providing a generalized description and little if any context beyond the basic geographic loca-

tion information of "Santa Catalina Island" (National Museum of the American Indian 2009).

Further complicating collection provenience, a recent inventory and preliminary physical documentation of the human remains within the Glidden collection shows numerous ethnicities being represented, including non-Native Americans and partial remains such as an Egyptian mummy hand and foot. Previous researchers have always assumed that the human remains collected by Glidden were either Chumash or Tongva, based on Glidden's documented Channel Island expeditions. However, we now know that this is not the case.

After reviewing some of Glidden's documents, Martinez found that Glidden purchased many display pieces that were generically Native American, such as model canoes, teepees, and dolls from dealers across the country. He was especially fond of one business in particular, Smith's Coin and Curio Company located in Sacramento. Glidden bought a number of artifacts from this company, including shell beads, spear points, soapstone pendants, as well as skeletal material. In his letters to Glidden, proprietor Carl Smith states that the human remains and other items came from a number of shell mounds located within the Sacramento Valley. It is not known if any of these items ever made it into the collections assembled by Glidden and passed off as being from the Channel Islands. However—according to Ernest Windle, one of many who accompanied Glidden into the Santa Catalina Interior to dig—Glidden thought that the Shoshonean Indians, such as the Tongva, came from South America, while the Chumash came "from the north, of Mongolian extraction, and are the same type of Indian as those found in and around Sacramento" (Windle 1931, 23-25). If this is true, it may explain why Glidden thought buying skeletal material from the

Sacramento area would be a good substitute for Chumash remains. Further, in the account book documenting his expenditures on behalf of the Heye Foundation collection, Glidden includes charges for items purchased from Smith's Coin and Curio, indicating the possibility that some of the Sacramento material made it into the Heye collections.

The treatment of the Santa Catalina Island Museum's Glidden collection after its excavation by Glidden also demonstrates how the provenance has implications for NAG-PRA claims. After the purchase of the Glidden Museum collection by the Catalina Museum Society, UCLA graduate students Keith Johnson and Fred Reinman were asked to dismantle and inventory the collections. As they removed the bones that were nailed to the walls and shelves, many elements crumbled into small pieces. Additionally, due to the sheer number of the skeletal elements, only those that offered the most information to researchers at the time (cranium, pelvis, and femur bones) were kept; the rest were discarded into the ocean (personal communication, Keith Johnson 2014). Further, because Glidden disarticulated and separated his finds in order to "decorate" his museum, and he had no numbering system in place, it is impossible to reunite separated elements together. These issues make it impossible to know the actual number of people Glidden really unearthed, which may have ranged from 800 to over 3,000 by his count, nor where they came from. Preliminary analysis shows that there are minimally 200 people currently represented in the Glidden collection. Most egregious in this situation is the fact that it is impossible to put people back together, something that according to Tongva tradition hinders the spiritual journey of the deceased.

IMPLICATIONS FOR REGIONAL HISTORY AND ITS INTERPRETATION

Based on what has been discussed here, one must question the regional histories and chronologies developed using data gathered from collections such as Glidden's. Some have argued that the Tongva are relative newcomers to the Los Angeles Basin and Southern Channel Islands. Supporters of what is called the Shoshonean Wedge or Shoshonean "intrusion" theory contend that the Tongva and other Takic speakers moved toward the Southern California coast around 4,000 Before Present (BP) from the Great Basin area and "wedged" themselves between the Hokan-speaking Chumash, now located to the north, and the Hokan-speaking Kumeyaay, now located to the south (Sutton 2009). The Shoshonean Wedge theory was first proposed by Alexander S. Taylor in "The Indianology of California," his column published in the *California Farmer* from 1860 to 1863. Originally just an observation placed as a footnote to his larger commentary of California Native American lifeways, his idea gained legitimacy through its support by Alfred Kroeber (1925) and is now accepted as fact by most California archaeologists (such as Sutton 2009). Using the Glidden collections, scholars have provided data to support this theory by measuring the physical differences between Tongva and Chumash skeletal material and using their documented provenience (see Kroeber 1925; Kerr 2004; Sholts et al. 2010; Legler 1977). However, based on the previous discussions, it can no longer be assumed that Glidden collections contain only people from the Channel Islands. Thus, any conclusions drawn from Glidden's problematic skeletal collection should be considered suspect.

NON-FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES' NAGPRA CLAIMS

NAGPRA has been described as a way to remedy the differential treatment Native American remains and objects have received in the past. However, even with NAGPRA in place, Native American remains continue to be treated unequally within the law. Until the recent changes made in 2010, NAGPRA only pertained to “any tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community of Indians that is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians” (NAGPRA 1990, as amended). Human remains and funerary objects that could not be culturally affiliated with a federally recognized tribe were labeled culturally unidentifiable, even if a non-federally recognized community was available. The human remains and objects often stayed on the shelves until a federally recognized tribe could be affiliated with them or until a process was developed in order to deal with them as culturally unidentifiable. In order to circumvent this obstacle, some federally recognized tribes made claims to human remains and funerary objects and, once these were repatriated, returned them to the non-federally recognized tribe for reburial. The Tongva have worked with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians in this manner (Department of the Interior, National Parks Service 2002; 2004). Many non-federally recognized tribes have not taken this route because they want to show their sovereignty by claiming their ancestors outright without having to rely on another related tribe.

Being federally non-recognized and unable to make NAGPRA claims, tribes run into the insinuation that they are not “real” Native Americans and are trying gain access to money,

resources, services, human remains, and objects that they do not have the right to. However, this is not always the case. Instead many tribes and communities remain unrecognized due to their unique history. For the Tongva, their rights and recognition as a Native American tribe was supposed to be acknowledged by the United States with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico. However, through the lobby efforts of Southern California ranch owners on whose land many Tongva worked at the time, their identity as a vibrant Native American community was purposely obscured so that they would not be relocated to distant reservations, as other troublesome Native American communities were (Shipek 1987). The removal of the workforce from the ranchos would have caused great financial hardship for the owners. This cession of acknowledgment by the federal and local governments has created a number of obstacles for the Tongva to have control over their livelihood as well as the ability to give voice to their history the way they want to.

On top of this failure of the U.S. Government, scholarly theories such as the Shoshonean Wedge argue against the Tongva’s claims of affiliation to human remains and to items older than 4,000 BP. In order to have human remains and items affiliated, under NAGPRA, “the preponderance of the evidence—based on geographical, kinship, biological, archeological, anthropological, linguistic, folklore, oral tradition, historical evidence, or other information or expert opinion” must reasonably lead to that conclusion.¹⁴ During the NAGPRA claim process, tribes present evidence supporting affiliation; many hire expert consultants to assist and participate in their own research. Federally recognized tribes have access to resources, either through government programs geared toward Native Americans or their tribe’s own financial resources, to pay for this gathering of

information. In contrast, non-federally recognized tribal members do additional research after their “day jobs” or rely on scholars to volunteer their time to help their case. Too many previously conducted reports contain incomplete tribal information or make inaccurate interpretations about the tribe’s history and culture to be useful.

Even with the addition of culturally unidentifiable (CUI) regulations in NAGPRA, however, non-federally recognized tribes still face obstacles in the NAGPRA process. For example, it must be first determined whether a federally recognized tribe has *any* cultural tie to an area; the tribe must then refuse affiliation before a non-federally recognized tribe’s right to a claim may be acknowledged.

Another major hurdle for non-federally recognized tribes is that even if human remains are repatriated back to them, they often do not have land on which to rebury them. Although it is preferable to bury repatriated human remains and objects as close to the original location of removal as possible, this is sometimes not feasible. With federal recognition, tribes have trust lands, or the ability to put land into trust,¹⁵ that can be used for reburial if necessary. Since trust land is not available for non-federally recognized tribes, repatriated human remains have to continue to sit on shelves in the physical possession of the museum or agency until land can be found within which to rebury.

Even with all of these complications, however, non-federally recognized tribes are working hard to find solutions. Through capacity building and working with projects such as the PCIAP, the Tongva community is attempting to obtain the tools necessary to bring their ancestors home and to see them treated with the respect they deserve.

GETTING THE ANCESTORS BACK TO THEIR HOMES AND COMMUNITY

As lengthy as the NAGPRA claim process can be, each step is imperative to ensure that the ancestors and other cultural items are carefully identified, properly cared for, and sent to the right relatives. The exhumation of the ancestors, without their consent, has been a tragic and painful experience that Native American communities have had to struggle with since colonization. Some argue that the best way to ease this pain is to just return all of the remains and funerary objects without further research as quickly as possible. However, returning the ancestors without extensive research could actually cause more anguish, especially if the ancestors are returned to the wrong community. Not taking the time to do intensive background research can be just as disrespectful as the original disinterment. Although each Native American community holds its own beliefs on the appropriate treatment of the dead, it is all of our responsibilities to get the ancestors back to their communities, so they can continue to be honored and cherished by their relatives. **END**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for their continued support of the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Research Project: the Gabrielino (Tongva) Community; Santa Catalina Island Conservancy; California State University, Northridge; Santa Catalina Island Museum; University of Southern California; Cotsen Institute of Archaeology and the Director’s Council; UCLA Tribal Learning Community and Educational Exchange Program; Nakwatsvewat Institute; Fowler Museum at UCLA; and Catalina island residents.

NOTES

1. A UCLA graduate student speaking to the first author, Martinez, in 2006.
2. NAGPRA: 104 STAT. 3048 Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.
3. With the Cultural Unidentifiable (CUI) rule that was passed in 2010, non-federally recognized Native American communities can now make claims for human remains as long as the federally recognized tribes do not object to that affiliation.
4. NAGPRA: 104 STAT. 3048 Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 § 10.9 (e)(5)(i).
5. Personal communication, Joyce Perry (Acjachemen) 2014; personal communication, Cindi Alvitre (Tongva) 2014; personal communication, and Rosie Clayburn (Yurok) 2014.
6. Reno Keoni Franklin's quote was a response to a question about tribal experiences regarding NAGPRA posted on Facebook by one of the authors (Martinez) on January 8, 2014. It is used here with his permission.
7. See Kaplan and Barsness (1986) in regard to this situation with Alaskan and other objects held by the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.
8. The phrase *tayiy honuuka'* means ancestor in the Gabrielino (Tongva) language. Although the word for "ancestors," *tataayiyam honuuka'*, was not previously recorded, Pam Munro, a UCLA linguist who is working with members of the Gabrielino (Tongva) on language revitalization, proposes the above spelling for the plural, based on other Native American languages within the same family. (Personal communication, Pam Munro, 2014).
9. For more information about Kuruvungna Springs see <http://www.gabrielinosprings.com/mainmenu.html>.
10. For instance, see Harvard Peabody Museum Number 78-40-10/14757-59; Schumacher 1877; 1878; 1879; Wheeler, et al. 1879.
11. See Wlodarski 1982; Strudwick et al. 2007. For university research projects, see Leonard 1976; Reinman and Eberhart 1980; Rosenthal et al. 1988.
12. Founded in 1953, the Catalina Museum Society, Inc. was the precursor and is now the non-profit that supports the Santa Catalina Island Museum. The society was started by William Wrigley and residents who wanted to ensure that the history of Avalon and Catalina was preserved and accessible to future generations.
13. After the closure of the Heye Foundation's Museum of the American Indian, the United States Congress appropriated money to buy the collections and created the foundation of the National Museum of the American Indian.
14. NAGPRA: 104 STAT. 3048 Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 § 10.2 4 (e)(1).
15. Trust land is land that is managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for the benefit of a federally recognized tribe.

REFERENCES

- Alvitre, Cindi. 2005. Moving into the mainstream. *Convergence* (Winter): 6–10.
- Anonymous. 1926. Catalina's museum walls lined with Indian bones, relics of long-lost. *Los Angeles Times* Jan. 10, page B3.
- Bean, L.J., and S. Brakke Vane, eds. 1978. *Persistence and Power: A Study of Native American Peoples in the Sonoran Desert and the Devers-Palo Verde High Voltage Transmission Line*. Submitted to Southern California Edison by Cultural Systems Research, Menlo Park, California.
- Department of the Interior, National Park Service. 2002. Notice of inventory completion for Native American human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of California State University, Long Beach, Long Beach, CA. *Federal Register* 67(176): 57621.
- Department of the Interior, National Parks Service. 2004. Notice of inventory completion: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest, Arcadia, CA. *Federal Register* 69(225): 68159–68160.
- Finnerty, W.P., D.A. Decker, N.N. Leonard III, T.F. King, C.D. King, and L.B. King. 1970.

- Community structure and trade at Isthmus Cove: A salvage excavation on Catalina Island. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Occasional Papers* No. 1.
- House of Representatives of the United States. 1877. Appendices of the report of the chief of engineers. In *Report of the Secretary of War. Volume II Part III*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Jurmain, C.K., and W. McCawley. 2009. *Oh My Ancestor: Recognition and Renewal for the Gabrielino-Tongva People of the Los Angeles Area*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.
- Kaplan, Susan, and Kristin Barsness, eds. 1986. *Raven's Journey: The World of Alaska's Native People*. Philadelphia: University Museum Publications.
- Kerr, S., and G.M. Hawley. 2002. Population replacement in the southern Channel Islands: New evidence from San Nicholas Island. *Proceedings of the Fifth California Island Symposium*: 546–554. Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History.
- Kroeber, A.L. 1925. *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Washington, DC: Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Legler, W.C. 1977. *Description, Analysis and Origin of Crania from the Catalina Island Museum Society Collection*. Unpublished masters thesis. Department of Anthropology, California State University, Long Beach.
- Leonard III, N.N. 1976. Archaeological Element for the Conservation and Recreation Plan for Santa Catalina Island. Phase I: The Data Base. Submitted to the Center of Natural Areas. Copies available at the California South Central Coastal Information Center.
- Martinez, D.R. 2006. Overcoming hindrances to our enduring responsibility to the ancestors: Protecting traditional cultural places. (Special Issue: Decolonizing Archaeology.) *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3): 486–503.
- . 2010a (Re)searching for ancestors through archaeology. In *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*, George Nicolas, ed., 210–221. Maryland: AltaMira Press.
- . 2010b. The Shoshonean Wedge should only be the name of a shoe: The Wedge theory and its effects on Tongva history and identity. Paper presented at the Society for American Archaeology, April 17, 2010.
- . 2012. A land of archaeologists: Archaeology with native Californians. In *California: Contemporary Issues in Archaeology*, T. Jones and J. Perry, eds., 355–367. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- McCawley, W. 1996. *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press.
- Meighan, C.W. 1959. The little harbor site, Catalina Island: An example of ecological interpretations in archaeology. *American Antiquity* 24(4): 383–405.
- Nash, Stephen E., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. 2010. Editorial: NAGPRA after two decades. *Museum Anthropology* 33(2): 99–104.
- National Museum of the American Indian. 2009. Catalina inventory sent to D. Martinez, January 15, 2009. In the possession of the authors.
- Nicholas, G. 2008. Native peoples and archaeology. In *Encyclopedia of Archaeology*, D. Pearsall, ed., volume 3: 1660–1669. New York: Academic Press.
- Nicholas, G., and T. Andrews. 1997. Indigenous archaeology in a post-modern world. In *At A Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*, G. Nicholas and T. Andrews, eds., 1–18. Burnaby: SFU Archaeology Press.
- Overholt, A. 1930. Giant white Indian race stirs scientific research. *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 26, page F6.
- . 1932. The mysterious children's graves on Catalina isle. *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 6, page J5.
- Public Law 101-601. 1990. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, as amended. 104 STAT. 3048 Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.
- Reinman, F., and H. Eberhart. 1980. Test excavations at the Ripper's Cove site, SCaI-26. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 16(1 and 2): 6: 1–105.

- Rosenthal, E.J., S.L. Williams, M. Roeder, W. Bonner, and I. Strudwick. 1988. The Bulrush Canyon project: Excavations at Bulrush Canyon site (ScaI-137) and Camp Cactus Road site, Santa Catalina Island. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 24(2 and 3).
- Sahagun, L. 2012. Bones flesh out an island's history: Files of man who dug up Indian skeletons could change views of early Catalina life. *Los Angeles Times* April 02, Column 1.
- Schumacher, P. 1877. Method and manufacture of several articles by the former inhabitants of Southern California. In *Peabody Museum 11th Annual Report*, VII: 258–268. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum Press.
- Schumacher, P. 1878. Ancient olla manufactory of Santa Catalina Island, California. *American Naturalist* 12(9): 629.
- Schumacher, P. 1879. The method and manufacture of soapstone pots. In *Report Upon United States Geographical Surveys West of the One Hundredth Meridian: Archaeology*, G. Wheeler, A.A. Humphreys and H. Wright, eds., 117–121. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Shipek, F. 1987. *Pushed into the Rocks: Southern California Indian Land Tenure, 1769–1986*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Sholts, Sabrina B., Anna F. Clement, and Margaret Clegg. 2010. An investigation of European skeletal remains buried on San Nicolas Island, California: New insights into early European contact with native Californian populations. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*.
- Smithsonian Institution. 2011. *Smithsonian Scrapbook: Letters, Diaries, and Photographs from the Smithsonian Archives*. Accessed Oct. 5, 2011 at <http://siarchives.si.edu/history/exhibits/documents/dall.htm>.
- Strudwick, I.H., R. McLean, J. Michalsky, B. Smith, and J.E. Baumann. 2007. *A Glimpse of the Past on Pimu: Cultural Resource Survey, Santa Catalina Island, Los Angeles County, California*. LSA Associates. Submitted to Southern California Edison. Copy available at the South Central Coastal Information Center.
- Sutton, M.Q. 2009. People and language, defining the Takic expansion into Southern California. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 41(2 and 3): 31–93.
- Teeter, W.G., and D.R. Martinez. 2009. Native American perspectives of California archaeology. In *Archaeology in America Encyclopedia*, L.S. Cordell, K. Lightfoot, F. McManamon and G. Milner, eds., 20–26. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Teeter, W.G., D.R. Martinez, and K. Kennedy-Richardson. 2013. Cultural landscapes of Catalina Island. In *California's Channel Islands: The Archaeology of Human-Environment Interactions*, C.S. Jazwa and J.E. Perry, eds. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Wheeler, G.M., A.A. Humphreys, and H.G. Wright. 1879. *Report Upon United States Geographical Surveys West of the One Hundredth Meridian: Archaeology*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Windle, Ernest. 1931. *History of Santa Catalina*. Avalon, CA: Catalina Islander.
- Wlodarski, R.J. 1978. Ralph Glidden: His museum and collection. *The Masterkey* 52(1): 4–10. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum.
- . 1979. Ralph Glidden's Catalina investigations. *The Masterkey* 53(2): 55–61. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum.
- . 1982. *A Bibliography of Catalina Island Investigations and Excavations (1850–1980)*. Occasional Paper 9. Los Angeles: Institute of Archaeology, University of California, Los Angeles.