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EDITOR’S CORNER
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We are kicking off 2015 with a special issue of The SAA Archaeological Record, titled “NAGPRA and the Next Generation of Collaboration,” guest edited by Sara L. Gonzalez and Ora Marek-Martinez. As pointed out by Gonzalez and Marek-Martinez, the SAA convened a retreat at the Amerind Foundation in Dragoon, Arizona, during 2010 to provide an opportunity for discussions between the SAA Executive Board and Committees on Native American Relations and Repatriation. While the specific focus of the 2010 retreat concerned implementation of 43 CFR 10.11, the Regulations for the Disposition of Culturally Unidentified Human Remains, outcomes of those discussions were much wider-reaching and included development of special issues of The SAA Archaeological Record. This issue is the second in this series, emphasizing NAGPRA and the collaborative process.

Contributions to this issue are diverse, spanning consultation under 43 CFR 10.11 to a range of other kinds of collaborations. Colwell and Nash address, among other things, challenges of consultation concerning unclaimed Native American and non-Native American human remains in the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. They offer some creative approaches that will surely generate further discussion. Noble reviews the collaborative process by which the Burke Museum and the University of Washington Anthropology Department developed solutions regarding repatriation of human remains with statuses ranging from “with” to “lacking” provenience. Similarly, Kretzler discusses repatriation and the collaborative process at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Martinez and Teeter introduce the Pima Catalina Island Project and its emphasis on indigenous archaeology, Tongva perspectives on their past, and training of tribal cultural resource practitioners. Gonzalez discusses two projects involving indigenous archaeology and collaboration. Her article contributes to a wider discussion concerning indigenous research methods, interpretive frameworks, and practical outcomes. Neelwand also emphasizes practical outcomes of collaborative archaeological research with an emphasis on climate change and California coastal sites. Lippert reflects from personal and professional standpoints on disciplinary changes, particularly associated with repatriation, since the publication (1997) of her now classic article, “In Front of the Mirror.” Thoms ties together personal growth, tribal consultation, and the myriad of positive outcomes of collaborations with indigenous people. All in all, I think this is an incredibly important special issue of The SAA Archaeological Record that deserves significant attention from our readership.

I close with two additional notes. Considerations of Open Access (OA) publishing are ongoing within the SAA. Be sure to read incoming SAA President Diane Gifford-Gonzalez’s column for insight into the latest discussions. Finally, preservation of the archaeological record itself remains a series global concern. White, Shopov, and Casson introduce the crisis and challenges of saving the ancient gardens of Istanbul, Turkey. Action is needed!
FROM THE PRESIDENT

Jeffrey H. Altschul, RPA

My term as president ends in April at our annual meeting in San Francisco. It’s hard for me to realize that two years has passed. After all, I’m still learning how to be president. Yet, I’m relieved that the end, while not quite in sight, is close by.

A lot was accomplished in the last few years. Some highlights include:

- Advances in Archaeological Practices
- Online Seminar Series
- The multilateral financial institutions and Latin American archaeologists meeting, Improving Standards and Practices in Cultural Heritage Compliance in Latin America
- Task forces on landscape-scale management of cultural resource
- Discovering the Archaeologists of the Americas pilot study
- Opening dialogue on open access of SAA publications and associated data

While I look back with a sense of satisfaction, I’m also reminded of the fact that my term is not yet complete. There are still many things to do. In this column, I want to highlight two projects. The first is the repatriation survey, which is set to open on January 9, 2015, and close on February 9. This survey is years in the making. Five committees worked on the survey design and questions. A separate task force was convened to organize the results into a coherent questionnaire. The Board then appointed a subcommittee of the Board to revise the survey questionnaire, with the entire Board openly debating and refining the survey instrument prior to voting to approve it and proceed with the survey. Why such a long process? The answer is simple: repatriation is a complex, contentious, and potentially divisive issue among archaeologists. Some have counseled that it is so contentious that the survey will do more harm than good and should be abandoned. But in my two terms on the Board—first as treasurer (1997-1999) and now as president—I have witnessed repatriation issues move from “difficult, but generally solvable” (in the sense that the Board ultimately took a position) to “paralytic” (the Board unable to reach a position and hence taking no action).

Repatriation issues are not going away. If anything, we can anticipate more repatriation cases as SAA broadens its interest in the subject beyond the United States. The Board needs your help. We need to take the pulse of the membership on repatriation issues. Please take the survey and I promise, we will let you know where the members of our Society stand.

The second project, the joint European Association of Archaeologists (EAA)-SAA thematic conference in Curacao, November 5-7, 2015, also has a long history. I have been attending the EAA annual meeting since the early 2000s. I was always struck by the difference in style between the EAA and SAA annual meetings. The SAA meeting is large, well organized, and, as is the case with many U.S. conferences, very business-like. European meetings, in contrast, are much more social. They have an opening and a closing that most participants attend and numerous social events, including excursions to nearby sites that are at least as important as the papers themselves. What if we combined the two?

For the inaugural meeting, we chose a European setting on the American side of the ocean: Curacao. We also chose a topic of interest to both sides of the Atlantic—slavery, trade, and colonialism. Willem Willems agreed to be chair of the scientific committee. Four leading scholars—Kathleen Deagan, Tom Gilbert, Corinne Hofman, and Roberto Valcárcel Rojas—have agreed to present keynote addresses. There will be no simultaneous sessions, so all attendees will have the opportunity to hear and discuss all presentations. Presentations will pause half way through the meeting for a series of excursions to sites across the island. Curacao promises to be a unique meeting; one I hope you will not miss.

A call for submissions is on our website:

http://www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/MEETINGS/Conferencia/Connecting%20Continents.pdf
A Taste of San Francisco

SAA’s 80th Annual Meeting, self-contained in the Hilton Union Square, San Francisco, will provide the stage for the largest number of submissions ever, combined with a plethora of tried and true and new activities. This year’s meeting will also feature the reprise of the mobile meeting app, with an improved scheduling feature. Don’t forget to use the hashtag #SAA2015 when talking about any and all things annual meeting related on social media.

You can explore the breadth and richness of the content through the Preliminary Program, which is posted on SAAweb (www.saa.org). Preliminary programs were also dropped in the mail at the end of December. Even if you are already registered because of a participant role, you will want to review the program and take advantage of the workshops, field trips, and special events now open for registration.

November 2015 in Curaçao—SAA/EAA Joint Meeting

For the first time ever, SAA and EAA have organized a joint meeting that will bring together scholars on a tightly focused high-caliber thematic meeting. For our inaugural meeting, we have chosen a theme of great interest to archaeologists on both sides of the Atlantic: slavery, trade, and colonialism. A tremendous amount of work is being conducted on the subjects as archaeologists investigate ancient civilizations, historical empires, and societies swept up in their wake. This is your chance to participate in this inaugural joint conference. There will be no concurrent sessions; all participants will be able to hear all papers. To submit an abstract for consideration by the Scientific Committee, please email the abstract, title, and author name(s) and affiliation(s) to saa-eaa2015@saa.org by February 2, 2015. You can view the full call on SAA’s homepage: http://www.saa.org/.

Participate!

As is customary, the election for the 2015 slate was opened in early January. Please participate in the Society by casting your vote for the next Treasurer-elect, two Directors for the Board, and two members of the 2016 Nominating Committee. Watch for your ballot link in your email.

Staff Transition

Elizabeth (Liz) Haberkorn joined the staff as the new manager, Publications on November 19, 2014. Liz comes to SAA with a strong publishing background developed through her career in the association community. Questions for Liz? Please email liz_haberkorn@saa.org

Online Seminar Series FAQ’s

Since the very successful Online Seminar Series launched in 2013, we have received a number of recurring questions, and I wanted to address some of the most common ones. The full list of FAQ’s can be found here: http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/OnlineSeminars/tabid/1503/Default.aspx. If you have any other questions please contact me at tobi_brimsek@saa.org.

Q: I haven’t participated in an online seminar before. Will I get instructions?
A: SAA sends two emails regarding your online seminar. The first email contains information on how to install and test WebEx in advance of the seminar. The second email contains a link and passcode you will need for access on the day of the class. If you do not have these emails, please check your spam folder—some systems automatically quarantine mass-generated emails.

Q: What computer equipment do I need to participate in an online seminar? Do I need a microphone?
A: The online seminars are PowerPoint slides with audio of the instructor. You may listen to the presentation through phone or computer speakers. Interactivity is via a chat box, so a microphone is not necessary.

Q: I registered but I didn’t receive a confirmation or receipt. How do I obtain one?
A: Make sure to double-check your spam filter, since the original receipt is automatically generated. Please send an email to onlineseminars@saa.org if you need to verify your registration or get a receipt.
Open access (OA) is coming to SAA journals, as government mandates and publishing trends converge. In 2013, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) directed federal funding agencies to develop implementation plans that will make supported research publications accessible to the public. Agency guidelines are now under OSTP review. The open archiving requirement stops short of mandating OA, but that is one public access option. Researchers funded by the EU and other governments, including Mexico, must publish in OA outlets, presently preventing use of SAA journals. Many SAA members have called for OA as a matter of global equity. OA potentially offers SAA journals higher readership and impact, while recruiting a broader set of authors.

The SAA Board and Publications Committee are currently assessing the diversity of options encompassed by “open access.” We added a day to our fall 2014 meeting to discuss a Publications Committee report and other documents on OA, and to confer in person with Publications Committee Chair Deborah Nichols. The Publications Committee will describe OA journal variants, approaches to funding them, as well as open archiving options, in the Archaeological Record’s March issue.

One point is critical: OA is not free. Globally, most high-ranked OA journals shift the financial costs of publication from the consumer/subscriber to the author. This model developed in the biomedical sciences and pervades commercial, and even university, publishing houses. Such academic and commercial presses charge authors OA fees averaging $1700–$3000. Researchers in academic biomedicine and other scientific fields often receive grant subventions to cover author costs, as do those in private industry. Great Britain has covered author fees for academic authors; as does the federal government of Mexico and EU grants include provisions for author fees.

Professional societies must work within this political economy of OA with prudence and creativity. Even operations with digital-only formats, open-source editorial applications, and mainly volunteer editorial staff incur substantial costs. In March’s Archaeological Record, SAA Treasurer Jim Bruseth will summarize what it would cost SAA to continue in-house publishing in a digital-only, OA mode. The Board is mindful of the significant dip in society memberships and associated revenues that historically have accompanied shifts from subscription-based access to open access. Self-publishing risks raising membership dues or imposing author publication fees higher than we deem to be equitable for our less well-subsidized members, especially students and those in developing countries.

The Board agrees that, while open access for SAA journals would be a good thing, ultimately our central obligation is to make any such transition prudently, without threatening either reserves or programs to which SAA is committed. We are studying outcomes for societies moving to OA ahead of us, whether they self-publish, use nonprofit society coalitions, academic publishing houses, or commercial publishers. Balancing such a transition may mean stepwise conversion of journals, over the length of time allocated by federal mandates, carefully monitoring and recalibrating at each stage.

Author equity is a central value that the Board agrees must be considered when evaluating and choosing options for OA. How do we support and encourage those authors least able to cover author-paid fees, without destabilizing our financial base?

In sum, the positives of global open access to SAA journals must be balanced carefully, with SAA’s financial health and with fair opportunities for all authors, members or not, to publish with us.

One other value I want to assure you that the Board holds as we consider SAA’s options is transparency to the membership. This is my motivation in writing to you now, and that of the President, Treasurer, and Publications Committee. As we investigate and deliberate, we will keep you informed.
I first volunteered for the SAA at the 67th annual meeting in Denver, Colorado. Back then, I was a young, eager, and financially challenged undergraduate student. I had decided to capitalize on the opportunity to attend the meeting for free in exchange for some of my time to help where it was needed. I remember being very nervous and excited at the prospect of meeting real working archaeologists from all over the world. As an undergraduate with graduate aspirations, I was informed early on that this was “the big show.” If you wanted your career in archaeology to go anywhere, this was one place where you could meet a lot of potential employers and discover graduate schools. Ever since that first meeting, I have continually strived to make the SAA a part of my career.

Fast forward 12 years and I am now a hard working consulting archaeologist residing in British Columbia, Canada. My first intensive experience working in consulting archaeology also involved working closely with descendant communities while simultaneously completing graduate school at the University of British Columbia. As a graduate student looking for a thesis project, I was presented an opportunity to work for a local First Nations archaeology firm operated by Katzie First Nation. The company had undertaken the contract to fulfill the heritage permit obligations for the newly constructed Golden Ears Bridge. Construction of a feeder route to the bridge impacted DhRp-52, which is a significant, multiple component village site located in southern BC. I took the job and wrote my thesis which examined the lithic collection recovered from DhRp-52. In return, I was tasked with training several Katzie members on lithic analysis, cataloguing, curation, and interpretation of the collection. Over the next two years, our lithics team analyzed over 68,000 lithic artifacts and approximately 100,000 stone beads. The process of capacity building for archaeology within the community during this project was so successful and inspiring that in later years we conducted several lithic analysis workshops for other local First Nations communities in order to promote inclusion of community members in the laboratory process for consulting projects. Here in BC, it is common for local First Nations members to be present in the field during all archaeological projects (including consulting archaeology), but not as common to have participants in the lab. These workshops became an avenue to expand First Nations participation within consulting archaeology.

The experience with Katzie was my motivation for joining the Native American Relations committee two years ago. I was anxious to see how the subject was being approached south of the border, and to learn from others’ successes. My first meeting with the committee was motivating; I found myself sitting with an accomplished and focused group that was determined to put Native American concerns at the forefront of archaeological practice. Unfortunately, as a participant from north of the border, I was limited by my ability to comment on how U.S. legislation affects Native American relationships with heritage management. I did not let this limitation prevent me from speaking up where I could, but it made me realize how different heritage legislation is between Canada and the United States. That said, this is not just a U.S. versus Canada issue. Legislation concerning First Nations relations with regards to heritage is different between the Canadian provinces, as well. Ultimately, we all sought to see First Nations, Native Americans, and other aboriginal communities have more involvement and autonomy over their heritage.

I have spent many hours volunteering in many different capacities within and outside of the SAA and have found rewards in all experiences. I continue to support volunteerism within the organization and encourage others to do so, as well. Volunteering on the Native American Relations committee has provided me with perspectives outside of my own sphere, and I look forward to applying what I have learned to my own professional practice in the future.
HERITAGE UNDER THREAT
SAVING THE ANCIENT GARDENS OF ISTANBUL, TURKEY

Chantel White, Aleksandar Shopov, and Aksel Casson

In the fifth century AD, Byzantine emperor Theodosius II authorized the construction of a massive fortification wall along the western edge of Constantinople. Originally designed to protect the city from western attackers, including Attila the Hun, these walls once formed a formidable barrier to the city. Agricultural activities around the walls are attested in the emperor’s edict, which allowed farm tools to be stored within the lower floors of the inner wall. In the seventeenth century, an impressive series of vegetable gardens and fruit orchards sprang up alongside the walls.

These agriculturally productive spaces, today known in Turkish as bostans, have provided much-needed produce for the city’s residents during the Byzantine and Ottoman periods. Amazingly, some of gardens are still cultivated today, over 1,500 years after the earliest records of agriculture in this part of the city (Sopov and Han 2013). Despite their protected status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, however, the areas along both sides of the Theodosian walls—as well as the walls, towers, and gates—are under serious threat from urban development. In the past two years, the historic vegetable gardens have been bulldozed, and the ancient walls have been damaged by illegal construction projects undertaken by developers and local municipalities.

Soil with a History

In the neighborhood of Yedikule, at the southernmost edge of the Theodosian walls, gardeners still plant and harvest crops of lettuce, cabbage, beets, carrots, onions, and turnips throughout the year. These same garden crops are recorded in early farming manuals for the city, including the Byzantine-era Geoponica written over 1,000 years ago (Dalby 2011). Archaeological evidence of the city’s gardening past is also visible in the 300-year-old Ottoman wells (Turkish: kuyu), which still irrigate the gardens of Yedikule, and in the garden soil, which is full of Byzantine and Ottoman artifacts. In 1939, the Theodosian walls were first des-
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A designated as conservation area, and in 1985 the entire 6,650-m wall complex was added to the UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS) List as a Historic Area of Istanbul (Ahunbay and Ahunbay 2000; Çorakbas et al. 2014).

New Laws, Big Problems
Archaeologists, historians, and environmental activists are working to protect the Theodosian walls and their associated gardens from urban development. But those against the destruction of Istanbul’s heritage face a serious uphill battle. In the past 10 years, new laws have enabled the Turkish government and local municipalities to rezone protected archaeological sites and expropriate private property. Several neighborhoods along the city walls have been rezoned as “renewal areas,” leading to illicit construction work within protected areas. Established conservation plans for these archaeological areas have been altogether ignored, and development has occurred without proper permitting and supervision of the Istanbul Archeological Museum.

In July of 2013, Istanbul’s Metropolitan and Fatih municipalities began construction work along the Theodosian walls in Yedikule. Without disclosing their plans to the public, the municipality rezoned the bostans located within the WHS-protected area for destruction. Several gardens were bulldozed without warning, including a large vegetable garden known as Ismailpasa, a historically documented garden recorded on eighteenth-century Ottoman maps and records. According to a report put forward by the Association of Istanbul Archaeologists, heavy machinery also destabilized portions of the ancient Theodosian wall by removing at least 1 m of soil from its foundation, and backhoes inflicted damage to the easternmost wall by scraping its stone surface (Hurriyet Daily News 2013). A portion of the historic gardens was then buried beneath several hundred tons of dirt and rubble.

Gardens in Peril
Archaeologists and the Istanbul Archaeological Museum were able to temporarily halt construction in the gardens after the developers were found in violation of Turkey’s Protection Act Law No. 2863. Ironically, however, the local government destroyed these protected areas as part of a long-term plan to build an artificial garden between the Theodosian walls and newly constructed residential villas. Their construction plan includes a number of restaurants, coffee shops, and parking lots, many of which will be built adjacent to the Theodosian walls. Recent news reports indicate that the garden-park area envisioned by the Istanbul Metropolitan and Fatih municipalities will extend northward 7 km along the entirety of the Theodosian land walls, destroying historic gardens and evicting local residents along the walls (BirGün 2014).
In November of 2014, Istanbul’s Metropolitan municipality once again began construction in Yedikule without the supervision of the Archaeological Museum. Trenches for large drainage pipes extending at least 2 m deep into the soil have disturbed archaeological sediments where the Ismailpasa vegetable garden once stood, churning up ceramic sherds and other archaeological material, including faunal remains. Construction of an artificial river has begun within meters of the wall, potentially undermining its structural integrity. Furthermore, archaeologists have recently witnessed backhoes depositing construction debris and concrete blocks in direct contact with the easternmost Theodosian wall.

Efforts toward Preservation
The Association of Istanbul Archaeologists continues to advocate for UNESCO protection of the Theodosian walls and gardens. While its listing as a UNESCO World Heritage Site does not offer official legal protection, it does provide an international profile and visibility for the site’s continued conservation. Yigit Ozar, a representative of the Association of Istanbul Archaeologists, has stressed the importance of collective local and international action. Turkish archaeologists have focused their efforts on working with local communities to raise public awareness of the imminent threat to the archaeological sites and the destruction of traditional lifeways in Istanbul (Ricci 2008). Unfortunately, these efforts have been met with insults, intimidation, and physical attacks on archaeologists (Ozar, personal communication 2014).

We hope to inform the American archaeological community of an increasing threat to cultural heritage in Turkey and to advocate for an international campaign focused on the continued protection of the Historic Areas of Istanbul. In addition, in light of the current construction projects occurring in Yedikule and other neighborhoods without proper permits or supervision from the Istanbul Archaeological Museum, we recommend that the Theodosian walls and historic vegetable gardens be placed on the UNESCO List of World Heritage Sites in Danger.
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IN BRIEF

Q: I do not live in the Eastern Time zone. Can you offer online seminars that accommodate members in my time zone?
A: The online seminars currently require staff support from our Washington, D.C., office. Therefore we schedule them between 9:00 am-5:00 pm Eastern Time. We make every effort not to schedule classes before 9:00 am Pacific Time.

Q: I tried to register right after I got the email announcement but the registration link was not working and/or I could not find the registration link on the web page. Where is the link? Is the system down?
A: If you do not see a link that means the class is full. This can happen when the class has filled up quickly, and we are still in the process of shutting down the registration page.

Q: If it's an online seminar how can it be sold out?
A: While the software has “seat” limits, SAA wants our online seminars to be as interactive as possible, so we limit class size to allow for Q & A between instructor and participants.

Q: I see that groups can register an unlimited number of participants so why aren't there more group seats available?
A: Each registration—whether individual or group—is for only one internet connection. It is the number of internet connections that is limited by our license. This preserves the quality of the presentation. It is also why group users must all be present at the same physical location to view the presentation.

Q: I could not get a seat in the seminar—can I watch it online?  OR  Q: I registered/paid for an online seminar but I won't be able to attend because of a scheduling conflict. Will it be available for viewing after the class?
A: SAA will be recording and archiving the one hour free online seminars on SAAWeb in the near future. The recordings will be available only to our members as a benefit of membership in the Society. 
When the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was passed in 1990, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) registered its apprehension of the membership over the impact of repatriation upon archaeological research in North America. Initial predictions held that the legislation was detrimental to the interests of science and would significantly impede our understandings of ancient history in the United States. In the intervening years, criticism of NAGPRA has been tempered with an appreciation for the transformations it, alongside self-critical examinations of archaeological practice, has brought to our discipline’s engagement with Native American tribal communities.

Discussions of NAGPRA, however, continue to evoke strong feelings and reactions. Most recently, the comments and public meetings regarding the implementation of 43 CFR 10.11—the Regulations for the Disposition of Culturally Identifiable Human Remains—spurred a litany of public opinion and official responses from a variety of professional organizations. This included the SAA, American Association of Physical Anthropologists, and even the National Academy of Sciences. Some of these organizations challenged the new regulations, indicating their potential deleterious impact upon archaeological and bioarchaeological research.

While NAGPRA has fundamentally altered the ways in which archaeologists, universities, museums, and other institutions in the United States consult with Native American tribes, many of these changes have been positive and ultimately beneficial for our discipline. The buzzwords of archaeology in the twenty-first century—collaboration, community practice, public archaeology, accountability, civic engagement, research ethics—reflect a disciplinary-wide shift towards a more engaged, collaborative approach to archaeological practice. While NAGPRA is not the only contributing factor in this development, it remains a pivotal piece of legislation that determines the kinds and quality of relationships developed between archaeologists and Native American tribes and communities.

In light of the ongoing dialogue about NAGPRA and debate concerning 43 CFR 10.11, we, the Committee on Native American Relations, believe that highlighting the research possible within the context of NAGPRA is critical to understanding the wider implications of such legislation on the future of North American archaeology. The contributions from this special issue examine current issues in NAGPRA-related consultation and highlight new trajectories of collaboration, involving a variety of stakeholders.

The SAA Committee on Native American Relations
This special issue was developed as a result of a long-standing discussion between the SAA Executive Board and the Committees on Native American Relations (CNAR) and Repatriation. With the 2010 election of Margaret W. Conkey as SAA President came the invitation for a retreat that would allow these committees and the executive board to meet for an open discussion of Section 10.11. The purpose of the retreat was to find potential solutions surrounding the implementation of the regulations, and further foster dialogue between CNAR and the Repatriation Committee. This retreat was held in the spring of 2010 at the Amerind Foundation in Dragoon, Arizona.

The discussions that occurred in Dragoon spurred three actions on the behalf of the SAA: (1) the development of a survey of SAA membership to gauge current opinions on the implementation and resulting impact of NAGPRA, to be disseminated to the membership within the coming year; (2) the dedication of the 2011 Presidential Plenary session concerning NAGPRA, Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains, and the future of consultation and collaboration, entitled “NAGPRA: Creating the Next Generation of Research Questions and Practices”; and (3) preparation of special issues of
NAGPRA AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF COLLABORATION

The SAA Archaeological Record featuring NAGPRA-related research and collaborative efforts between archaeologists and indigenous communities in the Americas. Kisha Supernant edited the first special forum of The SAA Archaeological Record entitled “International Collaborations” (2012:28–50), which highlighted instances of archaeological and heritage collaboration with indigenous communities.

Research Beyond NAGPRA

There is a diversity of working relationships and partnerships that have been established between archaeologists and tribal communities throughout the United States that range from federally or state-mandated consultation to fully collaborative, community-based research partnerships. This special issue highlights a selection of those partnerships to demonstrate to the membership that there is research beyond NAGPRA in North America. Furthermore, as members of CNAR, we feel it is important to provide a forum for archaeologists, museum professionals, and tribal professionals to address how they balance the many legal, moral, ethical, and practical challenges that they face in both consultation and collaborative processes.

The establishment and strengthening of relationships between Native Americans and heritage professionals is a key theme throughout the articles included in this forum. As Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Nash state here, NAGPRA-mandated repatriation has provided us with a starting point for discussion on where collaborative archaeology will venture. Much scholarship has focused on the perceived destruction of the archaeological record with the repatriation of Native American individuals labeled as Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains (CUHR) under NAGPRA (see Kakaliouras 2012 for an overview of reactions to repatriation within the discipline in the United States). Less attention has been paid to how archaeologists can overcome the rigid confines of mandated repatriation and consultation to create mutually beneficial projects.

Megan Noble shares her experiences repatriating ancestors labeled as “Culturally Unidentifiable” at the Burke Museum in her article “Beyond 10.11: Repatriation of Culturally Unidentifiable Remains from Areas Unknown,” and includes valuable lessons learned in approaching a potentially polarizing topic. Concludes that a meaningful consultation process is critical for navigating the 10.11 regulations and accomplishing the shared goals of repatriating ancestors. The case study from Ian Kretzler similarly describes how Fort Vancouver successfully partnered with an intertribal coalition to repatriate ancestors who were labeled as CUHR under NAGPRA. Kretzler asserts that archaeologists must acknowledge that archaeological practices have created the need for repatriation, and insists that the cooperative relationships established in repatriation efforts should extend into other areas of archaeological practice.

Outside the confines of legally mandated consultation, formalized research and learning collaborations create unique opportunities for archaeologists and descendant communities to better understand the past. In their article, “Ho’oke’oke ‘eyooku’uka’ro “We’re working with each other”: The Pimu Catalina Island Project,” Desiree Martinez and Wendy Teeter discuss how the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project approach starts from a basic premise—acknowledging the right of the community to be an active participant in heritage research and education—thus providing an avenue for the Tongva to reclaim their history and assist in the production of a shared and inclusive history. In Sara Gonzalez’s article “Of Homelands and Archaeology,” the comparison of the Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail and Pinnacles National Park Archaeological Projects similarly explores the potential of community-based research to transform, and ultimately benefit, the ways in which tribal historic resources are studied, cared for, and represented.

Michael Newland describes the Society for California Archaeology’s (SCA) partnership with California tribal communities to conduct climate change research in his article “Climate Change, Archaeology, and Tribal Collaboration: A View from California.” This partnership represents an entirely new direction of collaboration, one that is designed to address such issues as rising sea levels, eroding sea edges, and forest fires threatening the conservation and preservation of coastal and forest sites, sacred places, and burials. The opening of dialogue between the SCA and federally and state recognized tribal communities is critical to the development of a plan to deal with these threats to tribal heritage and the archaeological record. And, while the projects described by Martinez and Teeter, Gonzalez, and Newland were not generated through NAGPRA-related consultation, they provide valuable examples of how developing indigenous, collaborative-based research benefits all research partners. Such partnerships are important within a NAGPRA context, demonstrating how collaboration that extends beyond mandated consultation has the potential to resolve complex issues surrounding the care and disposition of tribal cultural resources.

Dorothy Lippert and Alston Thoms provide critical yet personal reflections of our discipline’s shifting relationship with tribal communities in the United States. Alston Thoms dis-
cusses how his engagement with tribal elders and community organizations in Washington and Texas has informed his approach to archaeology, helping him to refine his understanding of the importance of tribal histories in foodways-related research. Lippert surveys the changes she has observed in repatriation, first from her initial experiences as an archaeology graduate student and now as a professional in the Smithsonian Repatriation Office. Her perspective on NAGPRA-related issues is an important reminder of the magnitude of the work that is yet to be completed at both the national and global level.

Conclusion

As Dorothy Lippert states “It is clear that the repatriation laws were not the death blow to archaeology that some had foreseen. They certainly revealed deficiencies in how the profession relates to tribal people, but at the same time, the laws pushed us forward and made us stronger.” NAGPRA has helped to usher in changes to archaeological practice, and has created a greater appreciation for both the value of indigenous perspectives and their inclusion in decisions regarding the management and treatment of indigenous heritage.

We thank the contributing authors for sharing their perspectives and insight into NAGPRA-related and collaborative research. Collectively, they demonstrate the rich and varied field of relations established with tribal communities and call attention to the innovations and new directions of archaeological research in the United States.
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Since the 1970s, the concept of "informed consent" has driven the ethics of scientific research on humans in the United States. With the revelations of the Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment, in which impoverished African Americans were subjected to deleterious medical trials without their consent over the course of four decades, a resulting national commission published The Belmont Report in 1978. This new ethical code instructed that future research must protect the autonomy of all research subjects and treat them with respect by empowering subjects with informed consent—meaning to give subjects a full account of the proposed research and allow them to accept or decline the anticipated benefits and risks.

The Belmont Report applies to living human subjects—not deceased ones. Yet, we contend that the concept of "consent" provides a key frame to consider the ethics of human remains that reside in museum collections. In fact, the notion of consent over human remains is already codified in Western law and ethics. The first right over human remains is widely acknowledged to belong to the individual who occupies the body. For example, if you choose or decline to have your organs, face, or entire body donated to medical science (or display, in the case of the plastinated remains presented in the infamous blockbuster exhibit Body Worlds), then your choice is widely respected by society as well as in the courts. However, if a person were to become deceased before signing an organ donation card, the next-of-kin would have the right to determine the fate of that deceased body. If someone were to die a kinless pauper, the state would be empowered to give consent on the final disposition of the body. Although more than a century ago, the U.S. government has given archaeologists the authority to care for human remains discovered in archaeological contexts, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and similar state laws have now shifted our sense of responsibility to consider the viewpoints and values of descendant communities. Beyond these nested rights of control (from individual to kin to state), for centuries Western society has generally regarded graves as sacred and cemeteries as “God’s Acre”—places inviolate. (Notably, for nearly 400 years, these Western protections were not extended to Native Americans, a disparity which largely led to the repatriation battles and the passage of numerous federal and state reburial laws starting in the 1980s.)

If this reasoning were not convincing enough to establish the importance of consent over human remains collections, then we could draw upon the moral obligations we have as a multicultural society. The duties we have are not necessarily to the dead, but to the living. Museological and scientific values of human remains are important, but they are not the exclusive values in our society. Numerous people of myriad cultural backgrounds express a deep affinity to the deceased. At a minimum, inter-cultural respect requires us to ethically consider these diverse, alternative sets of values of life and death. Museum administrators must weigh the consequences of their choices, not only on human remains as if they exist in a social vacuum, but how their actions will impact the cultural and spiritual well-being of the living, too. Often, we would suggest, the duties of inter-cultural respect require museum professionals to seek the consent of community members for the disposition of human remains under their institution's care.

Our position is that a foundational ethical principle for human remains collections in museums is to determine, so far as is possible, the consent for their stewardship in museums. In the absence of consent from the individual (a rarity with archaeological collections), while recognizing the obligations under the law, consent should be sought in a nested set of communities, expanding outward from kin to clan/village to tribe to regional tribal consortia to inter-tribal coalitions if need be, inter-faith dialogue. At the Denver Museum of Nature & Science, NAGPRA has compelled us to reflect on the broader ethical terrain of the care for human remains in collections.
NAGPRA AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF COLLABORATION

43 CFR 10.11: Culturally Unidentified Human Remains
The Denver Museum of Nature & Science (DMNS) is the fourth largest natural history museum in the United States (measured by attendance) with a collection of nearly 60,000 cultural artifacts. In 2007, the DMNS staff resolved that it had the obligation to proactively address through consultation the future of the 67 culturally unaffiliated Native American human remains left in its collection. To be clear: our decision was not necessarily to repatriate these remains, but to consult with the potentially related individuals and tribes to try to negotiate a mutually agreeable solution. Although we were open to repatriation from the start, we did not want to assume that the tribes would necessarily want repatriation; we wanted the outcome to be determined through dialogue, not abstract presumptions about the ethical course to take. In short: we were seeking consent for any decision about stewardship that might be taken.

In three consecutive years, the DMNS received NAGPRA grants from the National Park Service (NPS) to consult with 142 tribes (using satellite video-conferencing technology), grouped in regional consortia—the American Southwest, Rocky Mountains, Great Plains, Midwest, and Northeast. We began this work before the regulations for culturally unidentifiable human remains (43 CFR 10.11) were promulgated in 2010, though once they were established we were well-positioned to quickly comply with the new rules. Agreements for all of the remains under the 10.11 rule established that one, or several, tribes would take the lead in reburying the remains. By the end of 2015, we anticipate that all of these remains will have been returned to the claimant tribes.

43 CFR 10.15(b): Failure to Claim
The regulations for 43 CFR 10.11 defined culturally identifiable to mean that the remains held at least some geographic context. This narrow definition left the DMNS (and many other museums) in the bind of dealing with human remains that are believed to be “Native American” under the law, but lack provenience information. At the DMNS, this left 20 remains for further consultation under another section of the regulations, 43 CFR 10.15(b): “Failure to claim where no repatriation or disposition has occurred.” Like the CUHR regulations, this section was so controversial at the time NAGPRA became law (and still when its implementing regulations were promulgated) that it was “reserved”—meaning that this section would be written at a future date. However, it looks like that date is still very far in the future.

In 2012, the DMNS received another NPS NAGPRA grant to address these last human remains in the museum’s collections. Not wanting to wait for that unknown future and embracing the ethical obligation to seek consent, we sought and received NPS funding to: (1) build on our previously existing relationship with the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe in Colorado; (2) form a close consulting partnership with federally recognized tribes from different regions—Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, West Coast, Alaska, Hawaii—of the United States; (3) expand on these tribal partnerships to engage in consultations with other key tribal groups from each region; and finally, (4) consult with all federally recognized tribes, Alaska Native entities, and Native Hawaiian Organizations regarding final disposition of the remains.

On February 26, 2013, DMNS hosted our first inter-tribal NAGPRA consultation with regional tribal partners (Central Council Tlingit & Haida, Seneca Nation, Osage Nation, Pueblo of Acoma, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Tachi-Yokut Tribe, Tonawanda Band of Seneca) to address the final disposition of the human remains for which we have no provenience information whatsoever. The assembled tribes asked the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe to take the lead in requesting disposition of the remains.

On October 9, 2013, DMNS hosted our second, larger inter-tribal consultation, with representatives of 23 tribal groups from around the nation. After serious and lengthy deliberations, the assembled groups again recommended that the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe take the lead in jointly requesting disposition of the remains for reburial on tribal lands in Colorado. We then sent letters explaining this agreement and proposal to 566 federally recognized tribes and 77 Native Hawaiian organizations. To date, none have objected. Thirty-six groups have agreed to jointly request the disposition, and 21 have submitted letters of support for this proposed disposition.

On April 10, 2014, the National NAGPRA Review Committee considered the disposition request and approved it for recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior. It is our hope that these last remains will be buried by the end of 2015.

Beyond NAGPRA: Inter-Faith Dialogue
There still lingers one last group of human remains in the Museum’s collections. Over the course of the Museum’s 114-year history, a small number of non-Native American human remains from a range of ad hoc sources have been accessioned into the collections. Given that our approach to these individuals is bounded by ethics, as much as the law, we
believe that the standard of informed consent should apply to them, as well. Essentially, the idea was to extend the ethical mandates of NAGPRA to non-Native American human remains.

In the fall of 2014, we convened an inter-faith meeting, which included a professor of anatomy, a Catholic minister, Buddhist and Hindu practitioners, a Unitarian minister, a Cherokee tribal member, a professor of religious studies, and museum staff. (Representatives from other faiths were also invited, such as a rabbi and imam, but could not attend for various reasons.) The several-hour dialogue was broad and compelling. Each person was given the chance to voice his or her viewpoints, while collectively working towards consensus. Several individuals emphasized the need for respectful burial, especially since these particular collections hold little to no research or educational value. However, some suggested that the fate of the earthly remains was not of great consequence. The Unitarian minister offered to lead an interfaith re-burial service, emphasizing our appreciation for and gratitude towards those whose remains were being reinterred. The Catholic minister commented that our collective good intent was an important factor in the development of such a service, which must communicate dignity and respect for the deceased. The professor of anatomy provided a strong voice for scientific values, particularly drawing on the policy statements of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists; she successfully swayed several participants to consider studying and fully documenting the remains before any potential reburial. The final consensus of the panel was that limited scientific analysis, perhaps including three-dimensional scanning, should be performed to ensure that no more information could be discovered about the remains. After such documentation is complete, the remains should be buried with a multicultural ceremony at a location to be decided.

We are taking this recommendation into consideration as we work towards a final decision on these remains. However, we feel that no matter the outcome, we have successfully explored a process for how to develop culturally and ethically appropriate understandings of treatment of the dead. Through this work we have engaged in a process to proactively consider the broader relationship between human remains, informed consent, and the future of museum anthropology.
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The Regulations for the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains (43 CFR 10.11) under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) became effective May 14, 2010, in a flurry of controversy and concern (American Association of Museums; American Association of Physical Anthropologists; Birkhold 2011; Smith et al. 2010; National Museum of the American Indian, National Museum of the American Indian, and National Museum of Natural History; Society for American Archaeology). Three years later in July 2013, the human remains of 53 culturally unidentifiable (CUI) Native American individuals were respectfully put to rest by seven different tribes on the Central Washington Plateau. The disposition of these Native American remains to the tribes was never taken lightly; it came at the culmination of almost two years of thoughtful consultation, discussion, and negotiation involving 47 tribes over a broad geographic region, two museums, and one university anthropology department. This case study from Washington State demonstrates how multiple tribes worked together under the newly adopted regulations to navigate complex decisions leading to reburial of CUI Native American human remains, and how cultural and scientific institutions can be a resource to support these efforts, and where appropriate, take proactive steps that are not outlined in the existing regulations to aid the process.

Culturally Unidentifiable Remains
Prior to the promulgation of 43 CFR 10.11, requests to transfer CUI remains were required to be presented to the NAGPRA Review Committee for a recommendation, and forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior for authorization. Between 1994 and 2010, 83 requests were submitted, and 66 of these were authorized for transfer (National NAGPRA Program 2013:33). This was a time-consuming and costly process, requiring a great deal of initiative from tribal representatives and museums to assemble supporting documentation.

The 43 CFR 10.11 regulations streamline this process and can expedite repatriation. As with NAGPRA as a whole, the fundamental requirement under the disposition of 43 CFR 10.11 is consultation. After consultation, tribes may claim remains based on a geographic connection prioritizing tribal or aboriginal lands. After the claim is initiated and the geographic connection is confirmed by the museum, a Notice of Inventory Completion is published in the Federal Register, and the museum can proceed with transfer to the claimant tribe(s).

Between May 14, 2010, when the new regulations were promulgated, and September 30, 2013, 101 Notices of Inventory Completion for CUI remains were published in the Federal Register. These notices account for a minimum of 1,068 individuals (National NAGPRA 2013). While the dramatic increase in Notice publication and repatriations should be noted as an accomplishment, it should also be noted that, just like the years immediately following the passage of NAGPRA, there has not been a wholesale repatriation of human remains. At the average rate since 2010 (285 CUI individuals repatriated per year), repatriating the 116,883 individuals currently identified as CUI under NAGPRA would take another 410 years. That low rate should not demoralize tribes and museum and agency professionals actively working towards repatriation, or suggest that museums and agencies are not fully in compliance with the law. Rather, it is intended to shed light on the complexity of the situation and remind us that the end goal is not necessarily to remove all Native American human remains from museum and scientific collections, but to allow Native American tribes to make informed decisions about the disposition of Native American human remains. In many instances, Native American tribes may not be ready or interested in claiming CUI human remains. Our role as repatriation professionals is to comply with the law by identifying the appropriate tribes, reporting relevant remains, initiating the conversations, and ideally helping to remove any real or perceived obstacles to repatriation.
Burke Museum and University of Washington Anthropology Department CUI Project

In 2010, the Burke Museum and the University of Washington (UW) Anthropology Department received a National NAGPRA Documentation Grant to consult with tribes about human remains designated as CUI. These human remains fell into three categories: (1) human remains with specific provenience information that were listed as CUIs, but which might be culturally affiliated with additional information gathered during the consultation process; (2) human remains with vague regional provenience information, e.g., “Washington State” or “Snake River”; and (3) human remains with no provenience information. This latter category of remains does not fall under the 43 CFR 10.11 regulations, but, as explained below, the Burke and UW Anthropology Department included them in this consultation process with good results. Tribal representatives were brought together to discuss not only the human remains that fell under the 43 CFR 10.11 regulations, but also the remains of 13 individuals that had no provenience information. In fiscal year 2013, this was one of the four cases heard by the NAGPRA Review Committee that went beyond 43 CFR 10.11 (National NAGPRA Program 2013).

The first step was the initiation of regional face-to-face meetings to discuss all three categories. Because over 90 percent of the remains held by the Burke Museum and UW Department of Anthropology were from Washington State, the primary focus of the consultations was on tribes with aboriginal territory in Washington. Separate regional consultation meetings were conducted in eastern and western Washington. This geographic division was consistent with the cultural division between communities of the Columbia River Plateau on the east side of the Cascade Mountains and the Coast Salish and coastal communities in western Washington. Although a statewide repatriation coalition did not exist, the Columbia Plateau Inter-Tribal Repatriation Group (CPITRG) in eastern Washington had a long history of collaborative repatriation work and, in this case, this history of cooperation helped.

Provenience or Limited Provenience Human Remains

Tribal representatives quickly agreed that human remains subject to 43 CFR 10.11 (including those with vague provenience information) were relatively unproblematic and should be addressed in Notices of Inventory Completion as soon as possible to permit disposition. Aboriginal land was determined based on final decisions of the Indian Claims Commission (ICC) as well as territories defined by the 1850s treaties or later Executive Orders. Multi-tribal treaties were typical in western Washington. Using the treaty data, multiple tribes had equal authority for remains from land addressed in the treaty. While final judgments of the ICC provided the most tribally specific data, they also omitted any land that was considered overlapping tribal territory and didn’t address the complexity of the relationship between ICC tribal groups and contemporary federally-recognized tribes. In cases of potential conflict, the Burke Museum stated which groups they believed were legally eligible to claim the remains and allowed tribal representatives to determine for themselves who would claim the remains. In a few cases of competing claims, the museum facilitated conversation between tribes, but for the most part, the respective cultural resource departments and tribal governments came to an agreement on their own accord.

Human Remains Lacking Provenience

For the remains with no provenience information, tribal representatives were faced with difficult questions about the appropriate disposition of Native American individuals with unclear cultural and historical connections. Should scientific analysis be utilized as a tool to better inform the group where remains should be reburied, and with what ceremonies? Should the remains be categorized by morphological or taphonomic differences, and be reburied in separate locations based on the statistical results of measurements? Should traditional spiritual work be conducted on the remains to determine potential reburial locations? Should all of the above be pursued? And what if the results of such work conflicted? How would the group make decisions? Would those decisions potentially cause conflict within tribal communities?

While the viewpoints varied throughout the consultation process, tribal representatives consistently prioritized the need to respectfully reinter the human remains. The group carefully considered how scientific and traditional spiritual methods could improve their decision-making process. Tribal representatives discussed the use of scientific tools ranging from destructive genetic studies to nondestructive morphometric analyses. Destructive studies were quickly ruled out by the tribal representatives. Morphometric and taphonomic analyses were then explored as an option to provide a statistical probability of originating in eastern Washington, western Washington, or somewhere else. The tribes, the Burke Museum, and the University of Washington consulted with physical anthropologists to determine the complexity and potential degree of accuracy of such studies. Among the several physical anthropologists consulted, there was a wide variety of opinion of the confidence of such statistical data
applied in this case. A few tribal representatives were fundamentally opposed to any further scientific analysis, regardless of whether it was destructive or not.

The Burke and UW were faced with deciding whether they supported the repatriation efforts for CUI remains that were not required under current regulation to be repatriated. In this particular scenario, it would be difficult to make a case to retain the remains for future research needs. The remains lacked meaningful context information. Scientific analysis may well have been able to provide additional provenience information; however, collections of unknown remains are rarely the subject of research. For example, in 13 years at the Burke Museum, there were no research requests pursued on the culturally unidentifiable remains with unknown provenience. Therefore, it is difficult to justify withholding such remains for perceived future research needs over the current repatriation requests.

When it became clear that there was a shared goal of repatriation, but not consensus on the best way to move forward, a conference call was arranged. This was the most attended meeting of the entire consultation process, with 19 attendees from 15 different tribes. The outcome was that neither scientific methods nor spiritual methods would be used to determine provenience in order to rebury remains in separate locations with separate ceremonies; rather, the remains from unknown locations would be buried at a single location in the center of the state with participation from multiple tribes.

Because there were multiple institutions participating, four separate agreements were drafted for signature. These agreements (the Washington State Inter-Tribal Disposition Agreement) were drafted by the Burke Museum and tribes and circulated widely for signature. Three options were available to tribes: (1) tribes requesting disposition, (2) tribes that did not request disposition of the human remains but did support the disposition to the claimant tribes, or (3) tribes that did not support the agreement. There was a range of 9 to 12 tribes requesting disposition, 4 to 6 signing in support, and no tribes signing that they did not support the agreement.

For the remains with completely unknown provenience, the group still needed to present the case to the NAGPRA Review Committee for recommendation because they fell outside of 43 CFR 10.11 regulations. The Museum and four tribal representatives presented the situation for consideration at the 2012 Meetings in Washington, DC. The Review Committee voted to recommend for disposition without any further discussion.

Tribal representatives were then challenged with identifying a reburial location suitable to all participating tribes. Tribes quickly identified and approached an individual tribal member and requested that his family’s private property be used for the reburial. This site selection allowed for site protection, and all tribal participants were invited to participate in the joint reburial ceremony.

During this process, decisions were made through consensus. The tone was respectful and museums, tribes, and scientists exchanged information and worked towards a collective goal. This case study is just one of many examples throughout the country (most notably the Denver Museum of Nature and Science) (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2011; Colwell and Nash in this volume) where the CUI regulations are encouraging dialogue between tribes, museums, and scientists where the multiple viewpoints and histories are not mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed, but rather can support the interests of the other in a respectful manner.

Angela Neller, Curator of the Wanapum Heritage Center, shared her thoughts on the Burke/UW’s project in her 2013 testimony to the NAGPRA Review Committee:

> Overall, the repatriation was an opportunity to build partnerships with institutions, tribes, and individuals. It provided a venue to support each other and gain practical experience while at the same time accomplishing the primary goal of returning the ancestors to the ground. It is a model to the rest of the country from start, with the documentation grant, to finish of how the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains with no provenience can be accomplished.

NAGPRA and other cultural resources laws have undoubtedly changed the power dynamic between archaeologists and tribes. The CUI regulations clearly place the tribes in the decision-making role about the disposition of these categories of ancestral remains. While there may be valid concerns about some of the finer points of the CUI regulations, and it is easy to get stuck in the theoretical quagmire of balancing the interests of scientists and tribes, it is important to move beyond and remind ourselves that those interests are rarely mutually exclusive, and when applied through a meaningful consultation process, the CUI regulations provide the necessary tools and flexibility.
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Notes

1. The author was the Burke Museum, Archaeology NAGPRA Coordinator, at the time of the project.

2. Tribal lands are clearly defined by the regulation. Aboriginal lands, however, is more ambiguously defined. “Aboriginal occupation may [emphasis added] be recognized by a final judgment of the Indian Claims Commission or the United States Court of Claims, or a treaty, Act of Congress, or Executive Order.” While this vagueness does permit museums to interpret and apply the regulations in inconsistent manners, it also allows institutions the required flexibility to ensure that appropriate tribes are brought to the table for consultation.

3. In hindsight, the initial focus on regional meetings may have encouraged a slight fractionalizing of the group, accentuating regional differences, and not providing access to one uniform discussion. Future recommendations would be to include all potential players to all of the relevant conversations.
The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) has fundamentally restructured the practice of archaeology in the United States. The law represents a crucial step in remedying archaeology’s history of appropriation, desecration, and misrepresentation of Native American heritage and culture. However, as the growing ranks of culturally unidentifiable human remains (CUHR) demonstrate, difficult questions persist. Disseminated in 2010, the Final Rule stipulates repatriation protocols for CUHR, which provided needed clarity on this issue. Yet forging lasting partnerships between Native American communities and archaeologists requires more than legislation and regulatory guidelines. Rather, we must commit to repatriation efforts that recognize the history that has made repatriation necessary, acknowledge and respect Native American communities’ ongoing ties to human remains regardless of affiliation status, and extend the cooperative partnerships established in these contexts to other aspects of archaeological practice.

These qualities are characterized in a recent repatriation between Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the University of Washington’s Burke Museum, Oregon State University (OSU), and the Vancouver Inter-Tribal Consortium (VITC), a coalition of Native American tribes from the Pacific Northwest. This case highlights how CUHR can stimulate innovative approaches to repatriation and lay the groundwork for future collaboration.

“Culturally Unidentifiable” Human Remains

In recent years, NAGPRA’s failure to outline proper procedures for CUHR has emerged as the law’s most significant oversight. CUHR represent approximately 120,000 individuals, or nearly 70 percent of all inventoried human remains held by federally funded institutions (National NAGPRA 2013). Whether these individuals should be available for repatriation has triggered considerable and often contentious debate within the discipline, raising serious questions about NAGPRA’s intent and Native American identity.

That the majority of Native American human remains have been designated “culturally unidentifiable” also has called into question the efficacy and inclusiveness of NAGPRA’s cultural affiliation process. There is evidence to suggest that federally funded institutions—who hold the final say in affiliation determinations—have not conducted appropriately extensive consultations or have not fully considered tribes’ affiliation claims (Government Accountability Office 2011).

In many cases, however, affiliating human remains with a particular tribe may be impossible due to poor documentation. Thousands of CUHR lack basic contextual and provenience information, such as site location and date of excavation. While this partly reflects imprecise excavation and curation practices from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, museum acquisition procedures from this period also are an issue. At the Denver Museum of Nature & Science, for example, many CUHR were procured via grave robbers and nineteenth century trading posts (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2011). NAGPRA seeks to amend centuries of scholarly mistreatment and desecration of Native American burials. The continued curation of thousands of illicitly obtained human remains under the “culturally unidentifiable” moniker serves as a stark reminder that the law’s intent has not been fully realized.

Complicating the issue further is that many CUHR are likely affiliated with non-federally recognized Native American groups, with whom consultation is not required. Whether these groups should be included in repatriation proceedings remains an open question, especially among tribes. Many tribes take issue with the federal recognition process, but worry that formal inclusion of non-federally recognized
groups in repatriation proceedings may lead to the erosion of tribal rights in other arenas (Brown and Bruchac 2006).

Despite these challenges and concerns, Native American communities remain committed to the repatriation of CUHR. In recent years, the formation of repatriation consortia representing federally recognized tribes and non-federally recognized groups has proven particularly effective in repatriating CUHR. While consortium composition varies, they are often structured to represent all tribes or groups potentially affiliated with remains. Guided by a sense of shared responsibility toward Native American ancestors, these coalitions successfully eschew critiques regarding whether individuals will be repatriated to the “correct” tribe (Kretzler 2012).

The success of tribal consortia has not gone unnoticed. The recently promulgated Final Rule, which is intended to clarify and accelerate repatriation of CUHR, encourages the development of mutually agreeable disposition plans between agencies and consulted tribes, including consortia. The rule outlines more specific disposition procedures if tribes cannot agree. Designation of human remains as “culturally unidentifiable” is in large part a product of NAGPRA’s rigid affiliation process. The Final Rule is more flexible, which in turn permits the development of case-by-case solutions tailored to the unique circumstances presented by each set of CUHR. Therefore, though repatriation consortia predate the promulgation of the Final Rule, they continue to be relevant to discussions regarding the repatriation of CUHR and the future of NAGPRA.

Repatriation of CUHR from Fort Vancouver

In 1824, seeking to enhance their control of the region’s burgeoning fur trade, the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) established Fort Vancouver on the banks of the Columbia River in present-day Vancouver, Washington. The fort served as HBC’s administrative center for a vast seven hundred thousand square mile territory, which extended from Mexican California to Russian Alaska and from the Pacific Ocean to the Rocky Mountains. In subsequent years, the fort emerged as a major trading post, boasting a large and diverse population of visitors and settlers from various European nations, as well as Native communities from the Northwest Coast, Great Plains, Eastern Seaboard, and Hawaii.

Figure 1. Fort Vancouver, ca. 1845. (University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections, UW269722).
Between 1860 and 1948, Fort Vancouver was administered by the United States Army under the pretense of facilitating Euro-American settlement in the region. However, the army’s presence was often made manifest in violent clashes with local Native communities. The late nineteenth century saw repeated imprisonments at times extending for many months, of Native American individuals and families.

The current Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was established in 1948. Today, the fort is a popular tourist attraction, featuring reconstructed stockades and buildings from the HBC era, and frequent archaeological investigations.

As a result of official and unofficial excavations, several Native American burials located on fort grounds were disturbed in the mid-twentieth century. Sixteen individuals were excavated during two periods of highway construction in 1952 and 1977 and curated at the Burke Museum; and the skull of another individual unearthed at an unknown date was donated to OSU’s Department of Anthropology in 1999. Though these remains were determined by each institution to be Native American, due to the fort’s historically diverse resident population they could not be culturally affiliated.

The push to repatriate these CUHR—or more appropriately, the Vancouver Ancestors, as they were known by the VITC—was instigated by the Cowlitz Indian Tribe of Longview, Washington. According to Dave Burlingame, director of the tribe’s Cultural Resources Department, the Cowlitz were spiritually obligated to seek repatriation, for their beliefs are that ancestors must be cared for, even after death. Burlingame noted that “every day they spend in violation is a day we aren’t caring for them properly. And if we continue to do nothing to rectify the situation, we are not caring for our Ancestors, our People, or our Land” (personal communication 2012).

In early 2008, the Cowlitz approached Fort Vancouver, the Burke Museum, and OSU with a request to repatriate the remains via a tribal consortium. Officials at each institution responded with enthusiastic support. The Cowlitz spearheaded the formation of the VITC and worked to ensure that the consortium was broadly inclusive. Invitations were sent to tribes based on two criteria: an historical connection to Fort Vancouver, or a possible connection to the remains. Criteria were determined by fort burial records and ethnohistorical accounts of cranial deformation, which was observed on some of the individuals. In all, the Cowlitz extended VITC membership to approximately 50 Native American tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations.

VITC invitations were sent to federally recognized tribes as well as non-federally recognized groups. Having participated in a lengthy struggle for federal recognition, the Cowlitz are “mindful of the difficulties in attaining federal recognition,” maintaining that “possible affiliation with an Ancestor does not depend upon whether a group of Indians has been recognized by the federal government…the bond between modern Indian people and their Ancestors exists regardless of the legal status ascribed to the modern claimant by a non-Indian party” (Bagheri 2008:1). Others echoed this view, stating that consortiums are an effective way to include non-federally recognized groups in the repatriation process (Thorsgard, personal communication 2011). Among the invitees, 12 federally recognized tribes and 3 non-federally recognized groups chose to join the consortium; others declined but voiced their approval of and support for the repatriation effort.

Fruitful cooperation between Native American communities and archaeologists hinges on open communication and mutual respect. It also requires honest recognition of the events that have made repatriation necessary. Discussions between the VITC and Fort Vancouver, the Burke Museum, and OSU repeatedly emphasized the complex, and at times, troubling history of Fort Vancouver and the illicit excavation of many of the Vancouver Ancestors. Situated within this larger historical context of military imprisonment and burial desecration, the need for and parties’ commitment to repatriation was kept at the fore. This commitment was subsequently codified in a memorandum of understanding, which specified that consortium members could visit the Vancouver Ancestors at any time and be assured that the remains would not be subjected to any scientific testing.

Finding appropriate reburial locations has proved challenging for many Native American communities, many of whom cannot reinter individuals near their original burial location due to forced migrations and land dispossession. It was important to the VITC that the Vancouver Ancestors be reburied as close to their original location as possible. Fort officials acknowledged this request and identified a quiet and low foot-traffic area on fort grounds that the VITC agreed was suitable for reburial.

Having agreed to repatriation, the parties presented their plan to the NAGPRA Review Committee in late 2008. Praising the parties for their cooperation, the committee unanimously approved their proposal. The Vancouver Ancestors were laid to rest the following year.
Future Partnerships

Repatriation has been the subject of considerable discussion in archaeology. Yet it is often considered in isolation, with comparatively little attention paid to the ways in which successful repatriation efforts can lay the groundwork for future partnerships. At a historically complex site situated in an urban environment with heavy developmental pressures, Fort Vancouver will continue to be the subject of academic and mitigation archaeological studies. Celebrating Fort Vancouver’s diverse history, acknowledging its role in the dislocation of Lower Columbia Native American communities, and resolving future issues such as inadvertent discovery of human remains, necessitates cooperative partnerships between fort officials and tribes. Put another way, Superintendent of Fort Vancouver Tracy Fortmann, believes there is simply “no way forward” (personal communication 2012) without working with tribes. Because of the repatriation of the Vancouver Ancestors, and the goodwill and interpersonal relationships it created, future collaborations are all the more likely.

The repatriation of the Vancouver Ancestors provides a blueprint for those embarking on CUHR repatriation efforts in accordance with the Final Rule and others working to make repatriation part of a more collaborative, culturally conscious, and responsible archaeology practice. NAGPRA will continue to play a central role in repatriation in the United States, but as the work at Fort Vancouver demonstrates, truly successful repatriation efforts will increasingly require creative solutions and lasting cooperative partnerships rather than bare minimum legal compliance.
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1. The VITC included the following federally recognized tribes: Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation, Nisqually Indian Tribe of the Nisqually Reservation, Snoqualmie Tribe, Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation, and Stillaguamish Tribe of Washington; and the following non-federally recognized groups: Clatsop-Nehalem Confederated Tribes, Snoqualmoo Tribe, and Wanapum Band.
For decades, Tongva (Gabrielino) community members, the original inhabitants of the Los Angeles Basin, have actively battled multiple misconceptions about the community and its origins: that they are extinct; are relative latecomers to southern California, arriving as part of the “Shoshonean Wedge”; or are an imagined community of Mexican Americans lying about their heritage for personal gain and notoriety. These misinformed interpretations have hindered the Tongva community’s ability to assert their sovereign rights over the treatment of their cultural items, sacred spaces, and ancestral remains under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). As a result, Tongva community members have created a number of educational programs at local museums and heritage sites to provide accurate information. However, these public programs do not necessarily reach the archaeologists who shape the academic discourse regarding Tongva history and cultural ways. To combat this situation, the Tongva community is working with scholars to develop research programs, such as the authors’ Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project (PCIAP), to demonstrate that the Tongva are a vibrant living cultural community with a deep history within its southern California traditional territory. Most importantly, Ho’eeexokre ‘eyookuuka’ro, “We’re working with each other,” to ensure that Tongva history is represented in a way that honors the ancestors and told from a Tongva point of view.

Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project and Indigenous Archaeology

The Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project (PCIAP), a collaborative project with members of the Tongva community, conducts research to dispel the imagined cultural history of Santa Catalina Island in particular, and Tongva territory generally. Conceived in 2007 by the authors and Cindi Alvitre, the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) for Catalina Island as identified by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), PCIAP uses an indigenous archaeology approach to teach and understand the Tongva past. Indigenous archaeology was originally defined as “archaeology done with, for and by indigenous people”. Our approach integrates Tongva perspectives during research development, execution, analysis, interpretation, and presentation. We decolonize traditional research agendas by acknowledging issues such as power, control, and authority within archaeological interpretation. Although some archaeologists fear that an indigenous archaeology approach favors indigenous perspectives over others, that is not the case. The mission is to create an archaeological future that incorporates and integrates a multiplicity of voices, both Native American and non-Native American, to narrate the stories of the past, stories that are empirically grounded collaborative research.

Countering Extinction

Although PCIAP has a number of traditional archaeological research objectives, of paramount importance is attending to the immediate needs of the Tongva community (see Teeter et al. 2013). One such need, as briefly described in the introduction, is correcting the idea that the Tongva are extinct. This perception was based on the limited research methods and definitions used by early researchers while trying to quickly document the “vanishing” California Native American cultures in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The death of the Tongva was propagated in the writings of Alfred L. Kroeber, considered the father of Native California ethnography. However, this “extinction” runs counter...
to the active cultural lifeways, as detailed in Tongva family histories.

What Kroeber and others did not consider while trying to identify intact California Native American communities was the historical trauma endured by these same communities as a result of the violent colonial settler practices of the last 300 years. The Spanish Christian missionaries forced the Tongva to strip away the visible signs of their “paganess,” with mission neophytes learning to curtail their “Indian” practices while under the watchful eye of the priests. During the American period, the outward expression of Tongva identity continued to be hidden due to multiple state and locally sanctioned atrocities such as the California State Legislature paying bounties for Native American heads and scalps, as well as the routine incarceration and subsequent auctioning off of “drunken” Native Americans to Californios by Los Angeles city officials. To avoid these de-humanizing and degrading practices, Tongva community members hid in plain sight, taking on Spanish and Mexican cultural traits outwardly (clothing, speech, mannerisms, etc.) to avoid being identified as Tongva. Their very survival depended on society believing they belonged to any other cultural group other than a Native American community.

Although Tongva community members seemed to have assimilated into the greater Los Angeles Hispanic culture, in private and outside the view of government officials and the general public, they continued to practice their traditional Tongva culture and traditions to ensure transmission of these practices to the future generations.

Reclaiming History

Ethnographic and archaeological essays of southern California propagate the notion that the Takic-speaking Tongva moved into the southern California from the Great Basin around 4,000 Before Present (B.P.), “wedging” themselves between the Hokan-speaking Chumash, located to the north, and the Yuman-speaking Kumeyaay, located to the south. Originating in Alexander S. Taylor’s observation, on the physical location of language groups in the mid-nineteenth century, Alfred Kroeber legitimized the theory through his research, which is now accepted as fact and without need for further evidence by most California archaeologists. This Shoshonean Wedge, or Shoshonean “intrusion” theory, is counter to the Tongva community’s knowledge about their history and origins. Tongva oral tradition states that the Tongva have always lived in their traditional territory, with their emergence into this world occurring at Puvungna, a well-known village site with cultural exposures documented in Long Beach on the campuses of Rancho Los Alamitos, California State University, Long Beach, and the Veterans Administration Long Beach Healthcare System facility.

Despite the community’s deep and ongoing history, the uncritical acceptance of the “wedge” theory has ramifications for the Tongva’s attempts to claim cultural affiliation to human remains and items older than 4,000 B.P. under NAGPRA. Cultural affiliation is determined between a tribe and human remains when “the preponderance of the evidence—based on geographical, kinship, biological, archeological, anthropological, linguistic, folklore, oral tradition, historical evidence, or other information or expert opinion” reasonably leads to that conclusion. However, as discussed above, the academic foundation “wedge” theory has already decided that some other Native American community lived on the land prior to Tongva settlement, often leaving Tongva repatriation claims to be denied.

As the authors have described in their recent article “Returning the tataayiam honuuka’ (Ancestors) to the Correct Home: The Importance of Background Investigations for NAGPRA Claims” many scholars have used data (i.e., skeletal measurements) from human remains looted by Ralph Glidden to support the interpretation of the relatively recent arrival of the Tongva to the Los Angeles Basin. Based on the authors’ and others work through provenience, provenance, and physical anthropological research, it can no longer be assumed that the human remains within early nineteenth century collections are either Tongva or Chumash. Instead, other ethnicities have been identified, possibly as a result of Glidden’s practice of buying human remains regardless of origin. As a result “any conclusions drawn from Glidden’s problematic skeletal collection should be considered suspect” (Martinez et al. 2014). PCIAF is re-evaluating the data used to support these provocative theories to ensure that Tongva history is accurately portrayed.

Educating the Future: Tongva Perspectives at the Forefront

In order to support and widen the use and value of indigenous archaeology as an approach, PCIAF developed the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Field School (PCIAFS) to expose potential future archaeologists to a Tongva perspective of the archaeological record and the surrounding environment, whose history on the southern Channel Islands and the mainland is 10,000 years long (Figure 1). First taught through the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and now offered through California State University, Northridge, PCIAFS students learn that artifacts should not be val-
ued solely for their research potential. Via guest lectures and hands-on workshops lead by Tongva and other Native American community members, students are taught that archaeological sites, artifacts, and the natural landscape are viewed as ancestors that are to be honored and respected. They are not things to be managed, but instead are infused with life and power, and need protection (Figure 2). Certified by the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), students learn directly from Tongva community members how archaeology, development, and the cultural resources management industry have impacted their ability to practice and maintain their cultural and spiritual traditions along with rigorous and innovative archaeological methods and techniques that forefront minimally invasive procedures. Through this unique experience, the authors hope students acknowledge that the Native American present is directly connected to their past and future, and will take this realization with them to their future archaeological endeavors with the highest ethical standards. By the end of our seventh season, we will have trained more than 82 students from all over the country and documented more than 100 sites.

Reciprocity of Knowledge: Native Cultural Resources Practitioners’ Training

An inherent practice within southern California Native American communities is reciprocity. In the past, reciprocity usually took the form of goods or food given to those in need, knowing that they would be returned to the provider at some future date. Reciprocity not only solidified cultural and social ties, but also ensured cultural and physical survival during times of stress, environmental or otherwise. Community members who had access to the most resources usually gave the most. The authors have accumulated a vast amount of knowledge regarding the protection of cultural resources and felt that this information should be shared with not only Tongva community members, but with other Native American communities. Although we assumed we would be able to share this knowledge through PCIAFS, we found that potential California Native American community members were unable to attend PCIAFS due to familial obligations and work responsibilities. Additionally, since the course was offered through a university, the cost of attendance was often prohibitive, especially for tribal members from impoverished non-federally recognized tribes. As a result, we created the Pimu Catalina Island Native Cultural Resources Practitioners’ Training in 2010. This intensive week-long course used the same pedagogical premise as the regular field school and was open to tribal monitors, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), or concerned tribal members who worked with tribal cultural resources in an official or unofficial capacity (Figure 3). Participants are not only introduced to traditional archaeological method and theory, but they are also introduced to federal and state environmental review process and learn how they can effectively participate in such processes. Additionally, critical strategies were shared with participants on how to respond to consultation request letters and evaluate cultural resources assessments and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs)/Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) while being mindful of their
responsible to keep confidential sacred and specialized cultural knowledge.

Participant costs were covered through grants from UCLA Law School’s Tribal Learning Community & Educational Exchange Program (TLCE). In continuing the practice of reciprocity, participants were encouraged to share the knowledge gained with other Native American community members. Although the training is currently on hiatus, we hope to continue the training in the near future. Past participants stated that the training was extremely helpful in their struggle for cultural resources protection within and outside their tribal communities (personal communication, Alexis Walllick 2014).

Although PCIAP has accomplished many of the original goals and objectives within the last 8 years, there is still much work to be done. Changing the way that archaeologists and the general public think about the Tongva community and their history has been difficult. Even with the direct testimony of Tongva leaders and elders regarding their history to government officials and scholars, Tongva continue to be denied their place in history. The PCIAP team will continue this work striving for the return of Tongva ancestors and promoting their stories and lives as part of the deep history of the Los Angeles Basin.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for their continued support of the Pimu Catalina Island Archaeology Project: the Gabrielino (Tongva) Community; Catalina Island Conservancy; California State University, Northridge; Catalina Island Museum; University of Southern California; Cotsen Institute of Archaeology; UCLA Tribal Learning Community and Educational Exchange Program; Nakwatsvewat Institute; Fowler Museum at UCLA; Catalina Island residents; and Sara Gonzales and Ora Marek Martinez for their editorial comments.
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Fort Ross State Historic Park (FRSHP) features the remains of a nineteenth century Russian American Company colony. Perched on a cliffside overlooking the Sonoma coast, Fort Ross’s reconstructed stockade complex is represented as a distinctly Russian space, even though the majority of the settlement’s residents were Indigenous peoples, hailing from Alaska, California, Hawaii, and Siberia. For the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, Fort Ross is Metini, their ancestral homeland, a place they granted the Russians, Native Alaskans, and others permission to visit. While Fort Ross challenges the notion of a singularly Spanish California, the contributions of these Indigenous residents—and specifically, the Kashaya’s history within their own homeland—are largely absent from the represented past at the state park.

The erasure of Native communities from public memory is even more pronounced at places like Pinnacles National Park, located in central California. Here, the management of 16,000 acres of wilderness area is predicated on the assumption that Pinnacles is, and should be, a landscape free of human intervention. For the local tribal community, the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, this wilderness management strategy speaks of a significant colonial legacy: their physical displacement from and the dispossession of their homelands.

The study of colonial landscapes and heritage at Fort Ross and Pinnacles is framed as an opportunity to understand the dynamic cultural, political, and ecological impacts of colonialism upon the Kashaya and Amah Mutsun. Furthermore, we are using the knowledge generated through KPITP and PNPAP to develop culturally sensitive heritage and landscape management practices that integrate both archaeological principles and indigenous cultural values into the study, care, and representation of these homelands. My work on both of these projects is part of a long-term, multi-sited comparison of indigenous, collaborative, and community-based archaeologies. The following discussion of these projects is thus oriented to the contributions that indigenous, collaborative archaeology makes to the practice of archaeology and the management of tribal cultural resources.

Indigenous Archaeologies

Both projects contribute to the growing field of indigenous archaeologies—what George Nicholas (1997) refers to as archaeology done with, for, and by indigenous communities. The defining characteristic of this approach is not whether someone is indigenous, but rather that there is a concerted attempt to integrate indigenous perspectives into the process and practice of archaeology. The goal of using indigenous epistemologies is to generate a more critical understanding of the past, thus improving both the empirical and interpretive quality of archaeological narratives.

Integrating indigenous epistemologies into our practice begins with an acknowledgment that indigenous communities have a basic human right to determine and negotiate the conditions of research on and about them. Indigenous archaeologies attempt to situate archaeology in more respectful and engaged practices by affirming this acknowledgment through collaboration that builds shared authority and mutual respect between tribal communities and archaeologists.
NAGPRA AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF COLLABORATION

Table 1. Elements of a Community-Based Archaeology Research Protocol.

1. Community works in partnership with researchers to set standards and protocols for research.
2. Research goals integrate community needs and perspectives alongside those of archaeologists.
3. Community members are compensated for their time and work at levels consistent with other paid research consultants.
4. Community has the right to determine how to share and/or disseminate the results of research.
5. Community has the right to determine the process of research on sensitive topics.
6. Collaboration is envisioned as a long-term commitment.
7. Research methods are developed in accordance with community perspectives and values.
8. Research contributes to the capacity of a community to manage its cultural resources.

The use of *archaeologies*—in the plural—is purposeful here, and it indicates that collaborative research is unique to the partnership through which it is developed. While the details of collaboration often differ according to the specific needs of tribal communities and research partners, increasingly indigenous archaeologies rely upon community-based participatory models for research (Atalay 2012). The common thread that links community-based research projects to one another is that opportunities exist for all partners to actively participate in the process of research—from the initial design of research questions and goals to the formats used to disseminate knowledge produced through collaboration. Drawing on the comparison of indigenous research frameworks, Table 1 outlines the common elements of a community-based archaeology research framework. This list is not exhaustive, but rather reflects a minimum set of guidelines upon which researchers can elaborate to develop a participatory research process.

Indigenous Archaeologies of Colonialism: KPITP and PNPAP

Humanizing the process of research is a core feature of both the KPITP and PNPAP indigenous research frameworks, as it is from the development of personal and mutually accountable relationships that research partners can begin to work productively with one another. I refer to this process as establishing an *archaeology of respect* (Gonzalez 2011). The primary way both projects establish respect is through a community-based research protocol that outlines the shared responsibilities and direct participation of tribal elders, scholars, and archaeologists. In the following section, the core features of KPITP and PNPAP are briefly outlined, highlighting how the indigenous, collaborative approaches used benefit both archaeology and the community partners involved in each project.

In examining the intersection of Indigenous practices, colonial processes, and their long-term outcomes, both projects are concerned with using archaeology to aid each community in the present. As such, research is framed as a critical intervention wherein archaeological data concerning past practices benefit each community. These benefits range from developing educational and cultural programming to building a tribal approach to managing cultural resources.

It is important to note, however, that each project is but a single component of both the Kashaya and Amah Mutsun's larger, ongoing efforts to understand the specific cultural, material, and ecological legacies of colonialism. Archaeological research is thus one of many avenues communities can use to understand their history of colonization, to reconnect with homelands and heritage, and develop their capacity as self-determined nations.

The Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail Project

In the case of KPITP, the central concern is with the ways in which ancestral sites in FRSHP are managed and represented to the public. As initially noted, the current interpretive programs at Fort Ross highlight the park's Russian heritage. The tribal community, California Department of Parks and Recreation, and archaeologists are working to change this represented landscape so that it is more inclusive of the Kashaya's heritage and their current relationship to their homeland. As the project name suggests, we are constructing a walkable cultural heritage trail and companion website that will introduce visitors to the wider cultural landscape of *Metini* through a combination of on-site interpretation and Kashaya histories. The project itself represents the outcome of more than 20 years of collaboration between the research partners.

For the tribe, the educational nature of the Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail and its associated field schools contributed to their goal of using archaeology as a medium for teaching youth about their heritage. Usually, lessons about Native American history are taught in university classrooms by non-Native professors. In this case, Kashaya taught students directly about their history and heritage through lessons which students were able to personalize through their own adoption of Kashaya cultural values in their daily routines.
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and field practice. The potential risks of involving students as equal partners in collaboration were offset by our collective ability to train the next generation of anthropologists and archaeologists. This was a significant benefit for both the community and research partners.

Coinciding with the initiation of KPITP in 2004, the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians established a Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and assumed full control over cultural and environmental resources within the tribe’s traditional territory. As many Native communities in the U.S. develop their own tribal historic preservation programs, a key concern is developing strategies for managing tribal resources that work not only for archaeologists, but also for the distinct needs of individual tribal communities. Given Kashaya concerns over the practice of archaeology on ancestral sites, which is seen as potentially spiritually dangerous, work on the trail and its associated archaeological mitigation projects created an opportunity to develop a culturally sensitive plan for managing tribal resources.

The result of our collaboration with the THPO is our low-impact research methodology that integrates both archaeological and Kashaya principles into the management and representation of cultural resources within FRSHP. Our low-impact research methodology is premised on recovering a maximal amount of information from ancestral resources while minimizing the potential for physical and spiritual disturbances, and by extension, to the tribal community (Gonzalez 2011). We minimize the danger of archaeological fieldwork by: (1) adopting cultural laws that relate to the sharing of knowledge into our daily practice; and (2) limiting the physical disturbance to ancestral resources. Observance of cultural laws ensured the safe participation of all project members—tribal elders, scholars, archaeologists, and students—and was the primary way that we demonstrated respect for ancestral resources and the tribal community. Building respect fostered an openness of communication between research partners so that tribal elders and scholars could remember and share histories of Fort Ross and Metini, thus enriching the interpretation of Metini’s history.

In terms of fieldwork, the methodology consists of a multi-stage field strategy in which a suite of non-destructive, minimally invasive archaeological methods are used in successive stages in order to build an increasingly detailed and informed understanding of sub-surface archaeological deposits. These data are then integrated and compared in order to identify the boundaries of sites and locate potential activity areas and sub-surface features. Within this framework, excavation is envisioned as a precise “surgical operation” and is only undertaken when there is enough information to warrant the excavation (Lightfoot 2008).

This culturally sensitive, low-impact methodology has significant benefits for the tribal community, as well as archaeologists. For the community, conducting archaeology in this manner presents a viable means of using a technique (archaeology) that is potentially spiritually and physically dangerous, but which has the capacity to reveal considerable knowledge concerning tribal traditions. For archaeologists and park managers, the methodology presents both a medium to work alongside the Kashia THPO to study and manage ancestral resources in a way that acknowledges the shared concern of protecting and preserving cultural resources.

The Pinnacles National Park Archaeology Project

PNPAP is a joint fire sciences project involving the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, the National Park Service (NPS), archaeologists, and environmental scientists. The project itself is an outgrowth of previous collaboration between the tribe, NPS, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation on various environmental management projects. In this case, the tribe approached archaeologists to develop a local study of the McCabe Canyon study area, a wilderness area within Pinnacles that contains two unique stands of white root sedge and deer grass. Both of these indigenous plants are vital resources for basket making and are of significant importance to the tribal community.

According to tribal histories and ethnohistoric accounts, these plants were also actively managed by Native communities, and in the case of the deer grass, through the use of fire. Thus, McCabe canyon provided an ideal environment in which to conduct a large-scale survey of environmental and archaeological resources, and test for evidence related to indigenous landscape management practices. Through PNPAP, we are using a combination of archaeology and environmental sciences to trace how the environment and plant ecology of Pinnacles changed in relation to the shifting cultural landscapes of colonial California. In particular, this study redresses colonial outcomes; specifically, the dispossession of tribal homelands from the Amah Mutsun and the resulting impact it has had on both the tribal community and the local ecology.

As a project concerned with recovering information related to indigenous landscape management practices, we are also investigating the ways in which such traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) can be used to develop sustainable strategies for managing the contemporary Pinnacles landscape.
Referring back to the discussion of research as a form of critical intervention, this research is reconnecting the tribe with its homelands by learning how to care for the land through the application of TEK. This is a key component of the tribal community's cultural revitalization efforts.

For land managers and archaeologists, this research has the potential to reveal the extent to which California Native communities managed their homelands. Studying the connection of tribal communities to their environments also has the potential to have a positive impact on current landscape management practices. Given that California and the Intermontane West struggle with wildfires, we are also exploring the degree to which caring for the land in accordance with this knowledge might assist us in managing fire risk in contemporary landscapes like Pinnacles National Park.

Conclusion

In comparing the Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail Project and the Pinnacles Archaeology Project, there are three key contributions that indigenous, collaborative archaeologies make. First, indigenous frameworks for research establish a process for reciprocal collaboration that inspires rigorous and creative thinking about the conditions and practice of research. As more and more archaeological projects in North America and elsewhere implement community-based research, we are poised to see not only the difference they make in terms of creating a more equitable and just practice of archaeology, but also their positive impact on archaeological interpretation and methodology. Second, collaboration between archaeologists and tribal communities leads to creative and flexible frames for studying, managing, and representing indigenous heritage. The low-impact methodology developed through KPITP, which was further refined through our work on PNPAP, demonstrates the value of integrating indigenous and archaeological principles. Implementation of this methodology resulted in more effective strategies for managing tribal cultural and environmental resources. It is a credit to both projects that other THPOs and archaeological projects are adopting elements of this methodology in their own work.

Finally, for the first time in over 100 years, a human-set fire was sparked in McCabe canyon. This event was not only a watershed moment for the tribal community, but one for archaeology and the park. The archaeology of respect that PNPAP and KPITP generate provided the basis for resolving critical issues for both tribal communities and archaeologists. These examples, as well as those contributed by Martinez and Teeter (this issue) and Michael Newland (this issue), demonstrate how partnerships with tribal communities contribute to archaeology’s ability to protect and preserve archaeological resources. There is the potential through this kind of collaborative, community-based research to leave positive, lasting legacies so that in the future, archaeologists can see the connection between past practices and contemporary communities clearly in our imaginations.
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Notes

1. The Kashia Band of Pomo Indians of Stewart’s Point Rancheria is the official, political name of the federally recognized tribal government. Tribal members and anthropologists also commonly use the alternate spelling “Kashaya” to refer to the community. For the purposes of this paper, I use Kashia to refer to the tribal government and Kashaya/Kashaya Pomo to refer to the tribal community.
Climate change is a global phenomenon that affects everyone. The Society for California Archaeology (SCA) recognizes that California faces a wide spectrum of climate change-related impacts, and that these impacts will have a deleterious effect on our state’s important cultural resources. These resources include archaeological sites that have great significance to the public and to researchers, but are of particular concern to Native American tribal communities. However, a tribe’s response to, and position on, climate change differs among individual members as well as between the many different tribal communities. Archaeologists are similarly conflicted in their response, as well. Sensitivity to cultural differences between tribes, and between tribes and archaeologists, is critical to the future success of collaborative projects that aim to protect or document cultural resources before these resources are damaged or destroyed in the wake of climate change.

Impacts of Climate Change on California Coastal Sites

The world’s major scientific organizations are united in their assessment that climate change is the result of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2014:4; National Academy of Sciences 2011; Royal Society 2005; United States Department of State 2014:6). The evidence for climate change is pervasive and is shown through several indicators, from sea level rise, to ocean acidification, to changing global temperatures. Evidence also indicates that climate change is affecting forest communities, making them more susceptible to disease and infestation, and subsequently, to fire.

It has been predicted that, over the next century, sea levels could rise anywhere between .2 to 2.0 meters (Church et al. 2013:1204; United States Global Change Program 2014:823). California coastal Geographic Information Systems models prepared by Phillip Williams and Associates (PWA) show that, at the upper end of these projections, areas where bedrock consists of diatomaceous sandstone or other friable rock will be eroded heavily, in some cases up to a quarter mile inland, resulting in a massive loss of coastal edge sites as well as a loss of many sites that are presently above the projected sea level rise. These latter sites will be subject to new erosive forces that will also cause them to collapse into the ocean (PWA 2009). If this happens, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of archaeological sites along the California coast and its interior bays and delta will be destroyed. As rainfall and temperature patterns change in response to climatic shifts, thousands of interior sites will become increasingly vulnerable to fire, post-burn erosion, and fire suppression efforts. Already, extreme reservoir draw-downs have resulted in exposed sites getting looted in California and elsewhere in the U.S. (Carlton 2014; Toner 2013). Recent observations at one coastal site in particular, CA-SMA-238, a well-documented shell midden site in Año Nuevo State Park, indicates that sea level rise and a shift in wind direction have caused the loss of this important indigenous site (Hylkema 2013). The rapid loss prompted an emergency data recovery effort, and exemplifies the severity of the situation. We can no longer wait to act.

The SCA’s Climate Change and California Archaeology Project

The effects of our changing climate will span the jurisdictions of many land-holding public agencies. Although these agencies have ongoing stewardship responsibilities for the cultural resources within these lands, the extent of climate-related impacts will be beyond the means of any single agency. There is no single educational institution or private firm with the financial or infrastructure resources to assess the scope of these impacts statewide. However, the SCA, as
the largest archaeological organization focused on California, can assist these agencies.

Among several major contributions that the SCA can provide are conducting inventories and seeking grant funding in collaboration with non-profit and university partners. Also, SCA committee staff can serve as coordinators between agencies and tribal communities.

In anticipation of these needs, the SCA has launched the Climate Change and California Archaeology Project. A work plan for the state has recently been made available to the public at http://scahome.org/sca-climate-change-and-california-archaeology-studies.

The goals of the project are two-fold. The first is to inventory public lands with particularly vulnerable resources that will be affected by climate change, and to get that information to the relevant public agencies and tribes for discussion. The second is to present the findings of our studies to the public. By achieving these two goals, the SCA can serve to stimulate public dialogue about climate change and how we should respond as citizens and governments.

Archaeological surveys have already been underway since 2012. By providing professional guidance, regional expertise, and an overarching framework for the studies, the SCA hopes to accomplish what no individual agency or university can do alone.

Tribal Collaboration

Tribal involvement and collaboration in the design, fieldwork, and interpretation of findings is a critical component of this effort. However, we recognize that the issue of climate change, and responses to it, can be a profoundly spiritual question. Many California tribes buried their dead along coastal bluffs. It is not uncommon for storm events or coastal erosion to expose these remains. Federal agencies have ongoing regulatory responsibilities regarding repatriation of human remains under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 and implementing regulations 43 CFR 10.11. With the increasing impacts of climate change, increasing consultation between agencies and tribes on these sensitive issues can be expected.

Discussions have already been held with several tribes along the California coast, and reveal that, for some, the key decision is whether climate change is the will of the Creator or solely the work of humans. If the former, many tribes may feel that the erosion of sites and burials should be left to continue, with any concerns focused on the possible exposure and looting of sites in vulnerable locations. If the latter, they may expect a robust response from agencies with regulatory responsibilities in the tribe’s ancestral territory.

The significance of this decision cannot be understated. While this decision is primarily a spiritual one, depending on the size of a tribe’s ancestral territory, the decision can have an effect on broad land-management decisions across multiple agencies and their relationship with the tribe. Existing government-to-government treaty obligations, memorandums, and programmatic agreements may complicate these decisions. As climate change will be an ongoing concern of increasing complexity and impact, how a tribe perceives climate change, and what the tribal government’s response will be, may change over time. Early and frequent consultation as well as meaningful relationships with tribes and appropriate tribal cultural authorities are the key to future successful consultations and a more complete understanding of the archaeological sites that are threatened. Often, the gathering of information on coastal sites represents a sharing of sacred and culturally protected information, and understanding or interpreting that information can only be achieved through mutual trust established by meaningful consultation with a tribal group.

Previous meetings that the current author has had with coastal tribal representatives in different areas of the state suggest that many tribal members are already noting the impacts of climate change on ancestral collection areas, fishing locales, and the rapid erosion of previously stable or slowly eroding sites. Each tribe is intimately familiar with the coastal areas within their ancestral territory, and the impacts of climate change will be recognized soon even among those communities not yet affected. The SCA can prepare for this increasing awareness and work with the concerns that will inevitably arise among the people as the magnitude of the situation becomes more apparent.

For this project, the SCA has adopted the protocol that, where a tribal group chooses not to participate and does not want the study conducted by non-tribal archaeologists, that component of the survey within that tribe’s territory is to be postponed until such a time that a mutual agreement can be reached. The factors leading to decisions made by a tribal council are complex and multi-faceted, and it is unlikely that individuals outside the tribe would have a complete understanding as to why a tribe has chosen not to participate. It is not the place of archaeologists to interfere with that process. The SCA’s view is that a mutual understanding with tribal groups is key to the project’s long-term success.
Conclusion

For nearly five decades, the SCA has committed to encouraging responsible archaeological research and to sharing the results of that research with the public. Archaeologists work more closely now with tribal partners than in the past, and will continue to do so. The SCA has a large membership that believes that archaeological sites have important cultural and educational value.

Many of these sites are now threatened, at a scale that spans the responsibilities of multiple agencies and tribes. The SCA has an opportunity to help identify threatened sites and to assess ongoing and future impacts from climate change in collaboration with tribal partners. New technology, new methods, new partnerships, and robust existing databases now make this undertaking feasible. Similar efforts are underway in Scotland through the Scottish Coastal Archaeology and the Problem of Erosion (SCAPE) program; the UNESCO World Heritage Centre has put the impacts of climate change on world heritage sites at the top of their concerns (UNESCO 2014). Globally, the threats that climate change poses to cultural resources are slowly gaining attention. By working closely with tribal partners, and respecting those that choose not to collaborate, the SCA can both bring this issue into the public spotlight and provide a model for similar efforts nationwide.
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A n article of mine that was published in 1997 reveals a lot to me about how things have changed since the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the National Museum of the American Indian Act (NMAI) were passed and how my own development as an archaeologist occurred in the shadow of these laws. The article in question, “In Front of the Mirror” (Lippert 1997), is in the volume Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground, published by the SAA Press. This book derives from a series of sessions held at the 1996 SAA annual meeting and, predictably, includes papers written by Native Americans and archaeologists and a few Native American archaeologists, such as myself. The sessions were held six years after NAGPRA was signed into law, four years after the Quincentennial of Columbus’s landing, and notable to me, six years after I started graduate school. The volume reflects the nature of these times. I wrote the article to explain some of the challenges of being a Native archaeologist, but I find that a lot of these challenges were specifically related to the cultural landscape of archaeology in the early years of repatriation.

In the article, I argued for an increase in the number of Native American archaeologists. This may have been partially because I was the only Native archaeologist in my graduate school program and because I was seeing few others at the annual meetings. I remember meeting up with Leonard Forsman (Suqamish Tribe), Phil Cash Cash (Cayuse/Nez Perce), and, occasionally, Roger Echo Hawk (Pawnee Nation). It was phenomenal to me to see that I wasn’t the only Native American at the SAA meetings! Back then, there were probably only six people who either had doctorates or were working full time as archaeologists. Today, there are at least 17 with Ph.D. degrees and a much larger number of people with Master’s degrees or with considerable expertise who are currently working in our profession. I think that the rising participation of Native Americans in archaeology is due to an increased need in the profession for our specialized knowledge and abilities. Laws like NAGPRA and the National Historic Preservation Act require federal agencies and academic institutions to consult with tribal experts. Some tribes have active archaeology programs and others have extensive research programs. All of this means that new Native archaeologists need not feel alone in their perspectives, as I did back in 1996.

In addition, there are many more funding resources available for tribal people wishing to study archaeology. The royalties for the volume in which my 1997 paper was published (Swidler et al. 1997) are earmarked for the SAA Native American Scholarship fund, which provides grants to Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Native Alaskans for training and for graduate and undergraduate work. The title of this paper referenced an experience of looking into an obsidian mirror and seeing an image perhaps not dissimilar to that seen by its ancient owner. I believed then and now that Native archaeologists are vital to the growth of our profession. I am fortunate to be able to see that so many others agree with me. The SAA Scholarship fund continues to grow, due to the generous authors who continue to donate their royalties to the fund and the success of the Silent Auction held at the annual meeting.

The diversity and scope of the applications for the SAA Native American Scholarships is phenomenal and, as a recent chair of this committee, I came away from the last round of application review feeling excited and satisfied that the future of archaeology will be guided by the good hands and bright minds of the next generation of Native scholars. Ora Marek-Martinez (Navajo) applied for the Parker/NSF scholarship on behalf of employees of the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department, all of whom are tribal members. Joseph Aguilar, recipient of the Graduate Scholarship, is researching the anthropological phenomenon of resistance movements in the context of the Pueblo Revolt Period (1680–1696) by utilizing the approaches of the field of Indigenous...
NAGPRA AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF COLLABORATION

Archaeology. And Alicia Mary Olea (Santa Rosa (Cahuilla)), applied for the Parker/NSF scholarship in order to attend the 2014 Utah State University archaeological field school in Grand Junction, Colorado. These, and all of the other applicants, are the bright future of our profession.

While I focused on education for tribal people in my 1997 paper, I think that, at the time, I couldn’t yet conceive of methods for tribal people to educate archaeologists. Certainly, the sessions that produced that volume were a means of education, and, over the years, there have been many more SAA sessions that have given Native American archaeologists the opportunity to present our theories and perspectives. In addition, many tribes now have their own research programs and archaeology departments. Some, such as the Chickasaw Nation, are visionaries in how partnerships can develop. The Chickasaw Nation provided funding to the Archaeological Conservancy to purchase a parcel of land near Tupelo. The tribe maintains the land, which is the location of a historically known Chickasaw village. For a tribe that was forcibly removed from their homeland, it is hard to overstate the significance of gaining a foothold in their original territory. This is just one example of the types of partnerships that can evolve when archaeologists and Native people work together.

One aspect that has changed in the intervening years is that I no longer conduct skeletal research. This is not out of a lack of interest, but because I work full-time in the repatriation program at the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH), and this kind of active research program is not an aspect of my job. When I was drafting this article, I had a brief thought that I was in some ways taking the easy way out because I don’t have to do the very involved work of consulting with tribes about a potential research project and I don’t have to steel myself for the emotional work of working directly with human remains. Listening to the stories of those ancestors, however, is a complex art, and because I actively work in repatriation, I’m still around human remains and I consult with tribes on a daily basis. And, I have to deal with the emotional distress of confronting the source of the human remains in the NMNH collections. I remember reading about two Choctaw women who died in a Mobile, Alabama, hospital and whose crania were sent to the Smithsonian in 1869. It seemed to me that being Choctaw and being dead were the only reasons they were identified as museum specimens and I promptly ordered a medic alert bracelet that reads, “Do not accession my remains into the collections of the NMNH.” The bracelet is only partially a joke.

Repatriation was never going to be the end of archaeology, but I can see that, back then, I had no idea how much things would change. Projects like the Great Lakes Research Alliance for the Study of Arts and Culture (https://grasac.org/gks/gks_about.php) allow for the digital unification of Great Lakes tribal heritage. The website allows Native and non-Native scholars to curate knowledge about items in museum collections worldwide. It reflects the tenets of NAGPRA in that it acknowledges the importance of tribal perspectives and recognizes tribal rights when it comes to identification and understanding of material culture. Caddo artist Jerri Redcorn held a community scholar internship at the NMNH to research ancient ceramics, illustrating how museum collections can be leveraged to maintain and continue traditional art.

Yet some difficult challenges lie ahead. It will be necessary to do more work on resolving the issue of the culturally unaffiliated individuals. Many tribes have found it difficult to work with specific universities and have received little explanation of how certain groups of human remains were labeled as culturally unidentifiable. Cases like these reveal that, while NAGPRA did a lot to provide a means for repatriation, it did not address the power imbalance inherent in the status quo.

In addition, repatriation programs of all types are underfinanced. NAGPRA grants are project-specific, and, all too often, a tribe may want to begin repatriation work but lack the organizational knowledge and funding to set up an office to do the research needed to develop a repatriation project. It is common for tribes that have a Tribal Historic Preservation Office to ask the director of that office to assume repatriation responsibilities, but I hear from tribes all the time about how much work comes into these offices, and because repatriation is such a sensitive activity, it takes a lot of time to manage the cases. Tribes need financial support to begin their programs, as well as guidance in how to work with museums and universities on repatriation. Museums and universities are as underfunded as ever and would also benefit from program funding.

The question of international repatriation still needs to be addressed. The recent auction of Hopi masks by the Neret-Minet auction house in Paris illustrates the commodification of sacred material. Many allies worked with the tribe to ensure that some of the masks would return home, but even the intervention of the U.S. Ambassador to France did not prevent the sale. A related issue is the number of Native American remains in museum collections overseas. At the present time, there are no international agreements that mandate repatriation or, at the very least, prohibit the sale of
sacred material. We might think of international repatriation as being at the same stage that American repatriation was 35 years ago or so; institutions were aware of the problem, but saw no need to do anything about it.

In general, I remain hopeful about the future of repatriation. I believe that the impact on archaeology has been for the better, resulting in new ways of working together and new ways of understanding our ancestors. It is clear that the repatriation laws were not the death blow to archaeology that some had foreseen. They certainly revealed deficiencies in how the profession relates to tribal people, but, at the same time, the laws pushed us forward and made us stronger.
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Beginning in the late pre-NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) era and continuing to the present, my consultation with tribal government representatives has been an ongoing process. It is my research interest in land-use intensification and hot-rock cooking technologies among hunters and gatherers that has turned out to be of common interest to some of the tribal representatives with whom I have worked. Finding this common ground—based in a shared belief in the importance of traditional foodways and root foods (i.e., geophytes)—has been mutually beneficial and was achieved through NAGPRA-mandated exchanges.

My research interests began in Texas when I first encountered “stone-boiling rocks” as an undergraduate student in the late 1960s and when I surveyed and excavated fire-cracked rock features as a graduate student in the late 1970s. I further developed these interests at Washington State University, where I undertook my Ph.D. work in the late 1980s, and when I served as project director on cultural resources management (CRM) projects for the Center for Northwest Anthropology in the Northern Rocky Mountains of Washington and Montana.

**Consultation with Federally Recognized Tribes in the Northern Rockies**

Each project entailed establishing working relationships with tribal representatives, as per consultation requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consultation heightened my awareness of the conflicts inherent in implementing aspects of the American Indian Religious Freedom Act and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act. During the 1980s, many large-scale projects in the Pacific Northwest included hiring fieldworkers from tribes in the region. Multiple opportunities to communicate with tribal members increased the chances of finding common ground. With NAGPRA came widespread concerns about the future viability of archaeological research, on one hand and, on the other, the danger posed by non-Indian archaeologists having significant roles in determining what was sacred or profane (Thoms 1998).

In the 1990s, my research in the Northern Rockies continued at Texas A&M University (TAMU). I taught field schools held in conjunction with CRM projects under Forest Service and Corps of Engineers jurisdictions. Consultation exchanges afforded an opportunity for my students to hear directly from tribal leaders regarding their concerns about NAGPRA, about the conduct of CRM, and, expressly, about archaeological investigations that adversely affected their past.

Among the tribal representatives in the Northern Rockies with whom I interacted were three women—Adeline Fredin (Colville, tribal historian), Alice O’Connor (Kalispel, elder), and Lorain Caye (Kootenai, CRM liaison)—who discussed their personal interests in traditional foodways. These women were knowledgeable about geophytes and how they were procured and cooked during ethnographic times. They were accustomed to using knowledge about their traditional foodways as a means to maintain tribal cultural heritage, especially intergenerational solidarity. They were keenly aware that today’s diet-related health problems are far more pervasive than in the ethnographic past. For an example, see the Kalispel tribal webpage (http://kalispeltbire.com/) section on “land and culture,” which lists “camas dig and bake” and “bitterroot gathering” as cultural activities, as well as the “camas path” section, which promotes “enrichment of the whole person.”

Alston V. Thoms

Alston V. Thoms (a-thoms@tamu.edu) is Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology at Texas A&M University.
Adeline Fredin willingly shared her knowledge about the role of “Rock” in creation stories and helped me to understand important differences in the way the Colville used the word “camas” in reference to the region’s geophytes and root grounds. Several years before the passage of NAGPRA, she also ushered me though recovery of human remains culturally affiliated with the Colville Confederated Tribes, and she introduced me to their perspectives on repatriation, avoidance, and protection-in-place of grave sites (Fish 2008).

Alice O’Conner educated my crews, my students, and me about the trials and tribulations of digging and processing camas (Camassia quamash) and gathering other plant foods. She provided on-site instructions for our successful construction and use of a Kalispel-style earth oven with a rock-heating element to bake camas bulbs for two days. Our archaeological data indicated that the underlying technology was millennia old in the homeland of the Kalispel people. From a NAGPRA perspective, Alice’s knowledge of multigenerational cookery evidenced cultural affiliations. It also enlightened and impelled my own research and that of my graduate students.

During two field seasons, Lorain Caye provided my students with eye-opening insights into Kootenai concerns about protecting tribal heritage. She also demonstrated advantages of multicultural perspectives through her running commentaries on our fieldwork and actualistic cooking experiments—grilling on heated stones, stone boiling, and baking in earth ovens with rock-heating elements.

I returned to Texas in 1989 to begin an academic career at Texas A&M University that included directing the Center for Ecological Archaeology, which was a CRM-based research program. I was well-versed in the need for respectful tribal consultation and well-armed with first-hand knowledge from tribal communities about the importance of geophytes and hot-rock cookery. Such knowledge was likely to be useful in a land where burned-rock middens were especially common. Moreover, Texas archaeologists were already recognizing that, along with agave and other desert succulents, wild geophytes, including eastern camas (Camassia scilloides), grew in abundance, and ethnographic records illustrated that they were baked in earth ovens with rock-heating elements.

Consultation with a Non-Federally Recognized Group in Texas

Although I began my Ph.D. studies with a budding interest in hot-rock cookery that originated from fieldwork in Texas, I had yet to gain an appreciation of the research benefits of learning directly from Indian people. As noted, that appreciation stemmed from my roles in legally mandated consultation with tribal representatives in the Northern Rockies during the decade preceding NAGPRA’s passage. During my earlier public school, undergraduate, and graduate days in Texas, I mistakenly did not consider Indians as reliable sources of archaeologically useful information. After all, most available literature depicted Apache and Comanche people as relative newcomers to Texas who were relocated to reservations in Oklahoma. Furthermore, anthropological and archaeological wisdom of the day held that most of Texas’s ancient inhabitants, excepting the Caddo, were extinct. In short, I believed that most of the scientifically useful knowledge that Indian people once held was probably lost. Such learned ignorance on my part and, arguably, that of most archaeologists in those days was a legacy of perceived scientific duty and a related sense of entitlement to document extinct populations (Thoms 1999).

Among the ostensibly extinct people were groups known collectively as Coahuiltecans; they were the native inhabitants of south Texas and northeast Mexico. Most of them reportedly perished as a result of European diseases and warfare. Survivors were integrated into Hispanic communities in the aftermath of forced acculturation during the eighteenth century at various missions in and near San Antonio and along the Rio Grande.

Much to my surprise when I returned to Texas and began large-scale excavations for a reservoir project near San Antonio, I learned that the city was home to a group of loosely organized mission-Indian descendants—Tap Pílam Coahuiltecán Nation (Tap Pilam). Among other things, Tap Pilam endeavored to repatriate and rebury human remains disinterred at Mission San Juan Capistrano as part of archaeological investigations in the 1960s and 1970s designed to learn more about ostensibly extinct Coahuiltecans. Tap Pilam is among more than 250 federally non-recognized Indian groups in the U.S. In 1994, some of the members formed American Indians in Texas at Spanish Colonial Missions (AIT-SCM; http://aitscm.org/index.html) as a nonprofit organization. In 1997, they formally initiated the federal recognition process with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

As part of the reservoir project near San Antonio, we began consultation with Tap Pilam representatives in 1990. Although burials were not encountered, we had recovered two isolated human teeth from a thin midden deposit at the Richard Beene site that dated to about 7,000 radiocarbon years B.P. The reservoir project, including our ongoing excavations, was cancelled in 1992 by public referendum.
Approximately 1,200 acres of the abandoned reservoir site are now under the control of the Land Heritage Institute, a non-profit organization dedicated to multicultural land-based education, research, and tourism, with plans for AIT-SCM’s cultural center to showcase the area’s archaeology (www.landheritageinstitute.org). Consultation continues and now encompasses mutual interests in ancient foodways and heritage preservation.

In 1998, the Center for Ecological Archaeology was funded by the San Antonio Missions National Historic Park to assess the applicability of NAGPRA to the remains of some 200 individuals and associated funerary objects disinterred from one extant and two abandoned church floors at Mission San Juan. A variety of evidence clearly showed significant cultural affiliation to Coahuiltecs, but NAGPRA was not applicable, given that Tap Pilam was not federally recognized and there were no identified direct descendants of the interred. Nonetheless, several months before our study concluded, AIT-SCM secured release of the skeletal remains from the San Antonio Archdiocese, the institution that retained formal control of the remains and associated funerary objects, which were then held by the University of Texas at San Antonio. Tap Pilam reburied the human remains at Mission San Juan (Thoms 2001). Its membership subsequently obtained and reinterred funerary items.

Sustained NAGPRA-related and general consultation with Tap Pilam has fostered mutual respect. Shared knowledge and scientific research provides information used by AIT-SCM to promote healthy lifeways. Collaborative activities include the following:

- In the mid-1990s, discussion forums between Tap Pilam members and Texas archaeologists were sponsored by the Texas Archeological Society and the Council of Texas Archeologists.
- In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Tap Pilam members presented lectures to approximately 1,000 students enrolled in Indians of North America classes at TAMU.
- In the aftermath of a major flood in 2002 that inundated portions of the Richard Beene site, Ramon Vasquez, executive director of AIT-SCM, discovered the mid-segment of a chemically weathered mammoth (Mammuthus columbi) tibia with helical breakage patterns, arguably human-caused (Thoms et al. 2007).
- In 2005, Tap Pilam members participated with TAMU graduate students in monitoring landscape stabilization work at the Richard Beene site (Reyes 2007).
- In 2009, TAMU and other archaeologists, AIT-SCM leaders, and others joined in grant proposals to identify ancient plant-food microfossils in the remains of earth ovens and to relate findings to health improvement through heritage awareness.
- In 2010 and 2011, Tap Pilam members, along with representatives of federally recognized tribes (Comanche and Mescalero Apache), participated with my students and me in public-setting demonstrations of hot-rock cooking (earth ovens, barbacoa, and stone boiling); participation of the recognized tribes was funded by the U.S. Army through its Cultural Resources Program at Fort Hood as part of its tribal consultation program.
- At present and in light of regulations for Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains, we are discussing with Tap Pilam the possibility of studying dental calculus from south Texas burials that are presently housed at various institutions; the objectives here are to better understand paleodiet and to develop baseline data for assessing modern diet-related health issues among descendants of missionized Indian populations.

Concluding Comments
The foregoing accounts illustrate how my processual endeavors to understand and learn from cook-stone technology were enabled by listening to serendipitously encountered Indian women within contexts of pre- and post-NAGPRA tribal consultation. These days, such exchanges are by design, with expectations for increasingly collaborative and mutually beneficial results. Fortunately, many archaeologists have had similar interpersonal experiences that resulted from NAGPRA consultations. Certainly, there is a need for such exchanges. NAGPRA’s development, promulgation, and ensuing controversies underscore the dark history of white-Indian interactions in the U.S. Similar legislative histories or attempts worldwide call attention to global inequality regarding who usually tells established tales of the past and why that is so.

Consultations with tribal representatives reveal a diversity of perspectives regarding the value of archaeological research. In my opinion, there are usually individuals out there who are willing to bridge conflicts in fashions they see as beneficial to, or at least protective of, tribal concerns. My case studies testify to the importance of building mutual respect through sustained consultation with members of Indian communities. Collectively, we found foodways to be more reliable and less impeded pathways toward allaying suspicions and forming alliances than those in which consulta-
tion begins and ends with, or is limited to, NAGPRA-related concerns.

A story in *Indian Country Today* titled “Salish Bounty: Tulalip Tribes Host Traveling Food History Exhibit to Illustrate Correlation to Indian Health” (de la Harpe 2012) and an article on the National Indian Health Board website titled “Traditional Food Project: Native Diabetes Wellness Program” (National Indian Health Board 2013) are among a multitude of examples that promote health issues and the benefits of traditional foods. The challenge at hand is to reach out to Indian communities and to open doors to meaningful collaborative paleodietary projects that contribute relevant archeological and bioarchaeological data to the missions of their established wellness programs.
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IN MEMORIAM

DR. GEORGE STUART
1935–2014

Dr. George Stuart, chair of the National Geographic Society’s (NGS) Committee for Research and Exploration, 1994–1998, and as staff archaeologist since 1960 an influential committee member for many years, died at his home in Barnardsville, North Carolina, on June 11, 2014, at the age of 79. Through the NGS, he was a major benefactor of Mesoamerican, and especially Maya, archaeology for several decades, shaping research through his advocacy of projects to support with grants which, though not large by the standards of federal bodies such as the National Science Foundation and National Endowment for the Humanities, were promptly evaluated, swiftly available, and often renewed on the basis of success.

George Edwin Stuart III was born in Glen Ridge, New Jersey, on April 2, 1935, but was raised in Camden, South Carolina, did his BS in geology at the University of South Carolina in 1956, and was a quintessential Carolinian all his life. Although he took an MA at The George Washington University in Washington, DC, in 1970 during his tenure at NGS, his PhD was from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, with a dissertation on his boyhood interest, the archaeology of central South Carolina.

Despite these Southeastern US interests, which included fieldwork in Georgia between 1952 and 1958, and brought the award of an honorary Doctor of Letters from Belmont Abbey College, North Carolina (1985) and a Distinguished Alumnus Award from UNC (2007), it is for his contributions to Mesoamerican archaeology that George Stuart will be most widely and fondly remembered.

His Maya career began as surveyor on the NGS-Tulane University Expedition to Dzibilchaltun in Yucatan (1958–1960: his map was not published until 1979) under E. Wyllys Andrews IV, where his drafting and artistic talents first came to notice and landed him a job as a cartographer/draftsman in the map division of National Geographic in Washington, DC. He also codirected the Cobá Archaeological Mapping Project in Quintana Roo in 1974–1975, working with William Folan and his team.

In 1968 he researched, compiled, and drew the NGS “Archaeological Map of Middle America: Land of the Feathered Serpent,” which appeared as an insert in the National Geographic Magazine (Vol. 134, No.4). Its 24-by-18 inches packed in an amazing amount of data, and the reverse added an index, a detailed map of the Valley of Mexico showing the Aztec and later landscape, and a time chart illustrated by sculptures. It sold out, was reprinted with minor additions in 1972, and remains a treasured and useful resource to many of us. The subsequent “Land of the Maya” map (NGM Vol.176, No.4, 1989) was similarly useful.

By 1975, George Stuart had become a writer and editor for the magazine and for NGS books and films. In 1980 he was promoted to senior research cartographer, and in 1990 senior assistant editor for archaeology of the magazine itself and a member of the Editorial Planning Council. His good sense, good advice, and good humor made him an increasingly valued member of the NGS core staff, and this enhanced his influence on the Research and Exploration committee.

When he became the committee’s chair in 1994, he acquired an annual discretionary fund. One year, he noted, a misplaced decimal point by the accounting division multiplied this tenfold; he utilized it all for pressing archaeology projects. He instituted small (less than $5,000) grants made on his own initiative to get what he saw as important projects off the ground, notably some by graduate students who would not have succeeded at committee grant level. His acumen was borne out by several of these becoming formal, multi-year Research Committee-funded investigations, as were some that he took to the committee and argued for on the basis of a hunch that they would repay a modest $25,000 of immediate support. While he and the committee were wary of engendering open-ended commitments of the kind that had funded the Leakeys’ human origins research in Africa for many years—so that four years was the normal time limit on any project receiving funds—he would also suggest to those who had been successful and looked like continuing that they simply think of another project and submit it to the committee. In this way George Stuart became a veritable Maecenas for Mesoamerican archaeology.

At the same time, he was writing popular books for the NGS Special Publications division: Discovering Man’s Past in the Americas (1969), The Mysterious Maya (1977), and Lost Kingdoms of the Maya (1993) were all co-written with his first wife, Gene S. Stuart (1930-1993) and combined a high level of scholarship with an easy style and superb illustrations. He also wrote Archaeology and You (1996) with Frank McManamon, published jointly by NGS, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) and the National Parks Service; Ancient Pioneers: the First Americans (2001); and oversaw Peoples and Places of the Past for the Historical Atlas Division of NGS (1983).

George Stuart was also a serious Maya scholar: with David Stuart, the youngest of his four children with Gene and a
noted Maya epigrapher and art historian, he wrote Palenque: Eternal City of the Maya (2008), a book about the first Maya site to be seriously explored. His interest in the intellectual history of Maya studies yielded an examination (2003) of the contribution made by Constantine S. Rafinesque (1784–1840), and the superb “Quest for Decipherment: An Historical and Bibliographical Essay on the Study of Maya Hieroglyphic Writing” (1992). He was an ardent bibliophile, on one occasion mortgaging his house to buy a set of Lord Kingsborough’s Antiquities of Mexico (1829–1833). He kept the dozen elephant-folio volumes in his office in a tall stack on the floor, and enjoyed the incredulity of visiting colleagues. He built a library extension when he moved to Barnardsville, which became the focus for his research and for occasional small conferences; his 15,000 books were donated to the University of North Carolina’s Wilson Library in 2007, but he remained active in Maya scholarship.

In 1985, realizing that advances in Maya hieroglyphic decipherment were outrunning the capacity of general Mesoamerican journals to accommodate the resulting studies, and also that many needed to be short monographs rather than articles, Stuart started the series Research Reports on Ancient Maya Writing, published from the Center for Maya Research that he established as a non-profit corporation in Washington, and available by subscription. The first two reports were in fact very short—on the Yaxha Emblem Glyph as yax-ha and on a new child-father relationship glyph noted on Tikal Stela 31, both by David Stuart. The third, on problematic emblem glyphs, was by Stephen Houston in 1986; in 1987 a further eleven reports appeared. The last of these, report 14, was at 52 pages by far the longest to date, and was David Stuart’s classic Ten Phonetic Syllables. As the series became established, George Stuart recruited Jeff Splitstoser, a fellow member of the Pre-Columbian Society of Washington, DC, as managing editor. This proved useful when, after an hiatus in 2002-2004, publication resumed from the Boundary End Archaeology Research Center (BEARC, www.precolumbia.org/BEARC), a second nonprofit that Stuart had established in Barnardsville after his retirement from NGS and move away from Washington with his second wife, Melinda Young Frye, whom he had married in 1994. BEARC continues to operate, and its research output, in future online, will be among his legacies. The print series of Research Reports ended with number 60 in September 2013, The Rise of Chak Ek, on an aspect of the Dresden Codex Venus table, written by a group of long-term inmates in a California state prison whom Stuart had encouraged in their hieroglyphic studies and supplied with publications. It was a thoughtful, generous, and intellectually productive act absolutely typical of George Stuart, and the last thing he did before the onset of his final illness.

He was honored in diverse ways: in 1992 by election as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, the world’s premier archaeological society; in 1996 by the SAA with a Presidential Recognition Award after he had set up the Gene S. Stuart Award “to honor outstanding efforts to enhance public understanding of archaeology” in “the most interesting and responsible original story or series about any archaeological topic published in a newspaper or magazine”. In 2000 the SAA added their Award for Excellence in Public Education: in addition to his output of books and articles from NGS, George Stuart had given classes in venues ranging from local colleges to grade schools. In 1997 Harvard’s Peabody Museum gave him the Tatiana Proskouriakoff Award for “outstanding achievement in the study of New World archaeology”. He was an honorary citizen of both Guatemala City, where the Universidad Francisco Marroquin in 2006 also gave him the Orden del Pop (Order of the Royal Mat—a symbol of Maya rulership), and Valladolid in Yucatan. He loved the Maya and their land, and was himself a man universally and affectionately respected across the whole profession of Mesoamerican and wider New World Archaeology.

Professor Norman Hammond, ScD, FSA, FBA 
Senior Fellow, McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Cambridge University; Associate in Maya Archaeology, Peabody Museum, Harvard University; Emeritus Professor of Archaeology, Boston University.
For the first time ever, SAA and EAA have organized a joint meeting that will bring together scholars on a tightly focused high-caliber thematic meeting. For our inaugural meeting, we have chosen a theme of great interest to archaeologists on both sides of the Atlantic: slavery, trade and colonialism.

Slavery and colonialism are topics of great interest to American and European archaeologists. Scholars generally tend to work within the theoretical and methodological confines in which they were trained. Consequently, these topics are treated quite differently in different countries. Our objective is to break down these barriers by inviting leading scholars to present, debate, and discuss various theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches to these topics using examples from throughout the world and not restricted to Europe, Africa or the Americas. We equally welcome examples from different periods in time, such as perspectives that can be offered from the classical world and others.

A tremendous amount of work is being conducted on the subjects as archaeologists investigate ancient civilizations, historical empires, and societies swept up in their wake. This is your chance to participate in this inaugural joint conference. In doing so, you will join four leaders of the field, who have agreed to give the following keynote addresses:

Kathleen A. Deagan, Distinguished Research Curator Emerita, Florida Museum of Natural History
"Colonialism, Slavery and Trade: a (North) Americanist Perspective"

Corinne L. Hofman, Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden University, Netherlands
“The Nexus1492 project, New World Encounters in a Globalizing World”

Tom Gilbert, Centre for GeoGenetics, Copenhagen Denmark
Hannes Schroeder, Centre for GeoGenetics, Copenhagen Denmark
“The Eurotast Project, Exploring the History, Archaeology and New Genetics of the Transatlantic Slave Trade”

Roberto Valcárcel Rojas, Departamento Centro Oriental de Arqueología, Holguín, Cuba
“The Caribbean and the Indigenous Slavery in the New World”

There will be no concurrent sessions; all participants will be able to hear all papers. To submit an abstract for consideration by the Scientific Committee, please email the abstract, title, and author name(s) and affiliation(s) to saa-eaa2015@saa.org by February 2, 2015. Abstracts should not exceed 200 words.

You can view the full call on SAA’s homepage: http://www.saa.org/.
WE WANT YOU! VOLUNTEERS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING!

For the 80th annual meeting in San Francisco, California. SAA is seeking enthusiastic volunteers who are not only interested in archaeology but who are also looking to save money and have fun.

To give volunteers more flexibility, SAA will again require only 8 hours of volunteer time! The complimentary meeting registration is the exclusive benefit for your time.

Training for the April 15–19 meeting will be provided from detailed manuals sent to you electronically prior to the meeting along with on-the-job training. As always, SAA staff will be on hand to assist you with any questions or problems that may arise.

For additional information and a volunteer application, please go to the SAAweb (www.saa.org) or contact Shelley Adams at SAA: 1111 14th Street, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005, Phone +1 (202) 559-5881, Fax +1 (202) 789-0284, or e-mail Shelley_Adams@saa.org.

Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis until February 3, 2015.

See you in San Francisco!