

Chapter 10. Today's Ohlone/ Costanoans, 1928-2008

In 1928 three main Ohlone/Costanoan communities survived, those of Mission San Jose, Mission San Juan Bautista, and Mission Carmel. They had neither land nor federal treaty-based recognition. The 1930s, 1940s and 1950s were decades when discrimination against them and all California Indians continued to prevail. Nevertheless, the Ohlone/Costanoan communities survived and have renewed themselves. The 1960s and 1970s stand as transitional decades, when Ohlone/Costanoans began to influence public policy in local areas.

By the 1980s Ohlone/Costanoans were founding political groups and moving forward to preserve and renew their cultural heritage. By 1995 Albert Galvan, Mission San Jose descendent, could enunciate a strong positive vision of the future:

I see my people, like the Phoenix, rising from the ashes—to take our rightful place in today's society—back from extinction (Albert Galvan, personal communication to Bev Ortiz, 1995).

Galvan's statement stands in contrast to the 1850 vision of Pedro Alcantara, San Francisco native and ex-Mission Dolores descendant who was quoted as saying, "I am all that is left of my people. I am alone" (cited in Chapter 8).

In this chapter we weave together personal themes, cultural themes, and political themes from the points of view of Ohlone/Costanoans and from the public record to elucidate the movement from survival to renewal that marks recent Ohlone/Costanoan history.

RESPONSE TO DISCRIMINATION, 1900S-1950S

Ohlone/Costanoans responded to the discrimination that existed during the first half of the twentieth century in several ways—(a) by ignoring it, (b) by keeping a low profile, (c) by passing as members of other ethnic groups, and/or (d) by creating familial and community support networks. Those four themes are discussed in this section.

Maintaining Ethnic Pride

Indian people have been able to ignore discriminatory slights by maintaining self-respect and pride in their ethnic background. Validation of the value of that background was bolstered in many families through the examples of their elders. A good example of such an elder is Ascención Solorsano (Mutsun Costanoan of Mission San Juan Bautista, born ca. 1847). She was a "doctora" widely recognized for her ability to heal with herbs. Solorsano not only treated Indian patients, but also members of other ethnic groups (Ketchum Interview 2003). She stored her herbs by

hanging them in a wasp-like collection of some 200 paper bags (J. Mondragon Interview 2003). She was joined in her doctoring by best friend Josefa Bauma, who, although non-Indian, was part of a greater Spanish and Mexican community with close ties to the Indian community (Carrier Interview 2003). Solorsano was paid with whatever people had to give, including food and other articles (Ketchum Interview 2003).

Joseph M. Mondragon (Interview 2003), a grandson, recalls sitting and listening as Solorsano worked with J. P. Harrington to annotate Father Arroyo de la Cuesta's Mutsun Costanoan orthography. Toward the end of Harrington's work with Solorsano he lived in the family's basement; she affectionately referred to him as Juanito. Today Solorsano continues to be remembered and celebrated. "She is still a healer, as her memory serves to heal our community," wrote one of her descendents (Ketchum 2002:206-207). About 30 Ohlone/Costanoans, descendents and friends, were present at the dedication of Ancención Solorsano Middle School in Gilroy in October of 2003.

The Solorsano descendents represent just one of many Ohlone/Costanoan extended families whose elders provided a model for public pride in ethnic identity that allowed them to ignore the discriminatory behavior of others.

Keeping a Low Profile

For many Ohlone/Costanoans it was necessary to remain quiet about one's Indianness. Mission San Jose descendents and siblings Hank Alvarez and Dolores Lameira described the bigotry in the Brentwood area of east Contra Costa county during the late 1930s and the 1940s.

There was another Indian family that lived there.... The man worked for the water system or something.... Nobody ever knew nothing about him; we only knew that they were Indian. But at that time, we would not speak about Indians, because we heard some real bad sounds.... They never said too much, but good people. Good helpful people. And they kept to themselves (Alvarez Interview 2003).

Alvarez himself recalled losing the ability to play with certain children in the 1930s when their parents found out that he was an Indian (Alvarez Interview 2003).

Edward Ketchum, himself raised in the 1950s, learned that his Mission San Juan Bautista ancestors kept their Indianness quiet due to fear of being removed to distant reservations.

I heard people say it was because they were concerned about being taken to, as I remember it, Tehachapi. That was somewhere down around Bakersfield that they were concerned about being taken to. You've got to remember that the Mutsun people were living in the San Juan Bautista area, and they were intermarrying in the early part of the twentieth century with Native people who were from outside of the Mutsun area. There were intermarriages with Tulare. There were intermarriages with people up at San Jose. There were intermarriages with people who were from the Carmel area, and with some people down in the south. So they knew what was happening to the Indian people all over the state, and they knew whenever there was a law passed that put some sort of restrictions on Indians, and they took care to protect themselves because of what had happened earlier (Ketchum Interview 2003).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ References to transcripts of 2003-2005 oral interviews with Ohlone/Costanoans by Archaeological Consulting Services are listed together in a separate "Oral Interview Transcripts" section at the end of the general bibliography; they are cited in the report body with the word "Interview" following the name of the cited individual. The interviews were conducted by two people. In 2003 Randall Milliken interviewed Hank Alvarez and Dorothy Lameira (November 18); Philip Galvan and Andrew Galvan (September 26); and Joseph Mondragon and

The threat of removal was to Tejon Reservation. Indian people from many parts of southern and south-central California were taken there for a few decades after it was established by Congress in March of 1853 (Rawls 1984:151).

Passing as Non-Indian

Ethnic Mexicans and California Indians were both subjected to racial discrimination in the California of the early 1900s. It is generally accepted that Mexicans were considered to be above Indians in the racial hierarchy (Almaguer 1994:9). During 2003 interviews, several Ohlone/Costanoans confirmed this view, describing how their families managed discrimination by claiming Mexican identity. As Tony Cerda, Chairman of the Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe explained,

Even still today, some of them will say, “I’m not Indian.” ... For a long time, it was looked down on. I guess that’s part of what came from the Mission Period, because the Indians were really treated bad, and the Mexican people were treated a little better. In fact, there’s an old lady there in Laverne—she’s about 90 years old—and... a writer, he asked her, “Were there ever any Indians in Laverne?” She said, “Yeah, there used to be a lot of them.” “Well, what happened to them? Where did they go?” “Oh, they became Mexicans” (Cerda Interview 2003).

Valentin Lopez of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Ohlone Costanoan Indians locates the impetus to pass as Mexican far in the past, in the Apprenticeship Acts and other oppressive laws passed by the state of California in the 1850s and 1860s.

When we were growing up, I remember my great aunts always saying when we would go out, “Always say you’re Mexican. Never say you’re Indian.” I always wondered about that. I was talking to an uncle awhile back and I asked him about this and he said, “That goes back to the indentured servitude days.” He said my great aunts were taught that if you’re ever caught by someone powerful or the police to always say you’re Mexican (Lopez Interview 2003).

The phenomenon of passing as a response to discrimination was by no means confined to Ohlone/Costanoans. It spanned every region of the state. The late Vivien Hailstone (1913-2000, Karuk, Yurok and a member of the Hoopa Valley Tribe) had this to say about the effect of prejudice on her people:

All kids should know who they are and be proud of who they are... Before it was so bad to be an Indian that you were ashamed, or you had to be somebody else. Many of the people would say, ‘I’m Filipino,’ or ‘I’m from Canada.’ ‘I’m from the dark French’ or whatever. They’d be anything except Indian. At one time, being Indian was so bad, if you got an education, it didn’t do any good anyway. They wouldn’t hire you... You think anybody would go to an Indian doctor? The banks wouldn’t hire you. Nobody would hire you because you were an Indian. And so in our minds being Indian was so bad, and we didn’t really know why. Why was it so bad to be an Indian? But it’s because of what they did to us, and how they portrayed us—that we were the savages. We were this and we were that. And we thought maybe we

Irene Zwierlein (September 26). That same year Beverly R. Ortiz interviewed Marie Bonillas Ronquillo and Lisa Carrier (August 7); T. Michael Bonillas (August 6); Tony Cerda (August 30); Charlie Higuera and Paul Mondragon (September 19); Edward A. Ketchum and Valentin Lopez (October 11); Richard Miranda (September 12); Ruth Orta and Sabrina Garibay (August 17); Ann Marie Sayers and Kanyon Sayers-Roods (September 6); and on June 6, 2005, Ortiz interviewed Theodore W. Bonillas.

were... The truth will set you free. We can talk about the Holocaust. We can talk about all the things that happened other places, but you can't talk about what happened to the Indians. Our kids know it. We tell our kids. We all know it. And the hurt is still here. So how do you get rid of that hurt? The way to get rid of the hurt is to put it out. Let everybody know, and after awhile it will become history... The truth will set you free. And our kids won't be so angry" (Vivien Hailstone, personal communication to Beverly Ortiz, 1990).

Many Indians resisted the pressure to pass as white. Mission San Jose descendent Ruth Thompson Orta (Interview 2003) recalled that her mother, Trina Marine Ruano, listed Ruth as both Indian and white on her 1934 birth certificate. Despite such exceptions, however, the norm of passing persisted into the late 1900s. Mission Carmel descendent Richard Miranda spoke recently about the continued prominence of Mexican identity into the 1960s and beyond:

I probably grew up more Mexican than Ohlone... The festivals and parties and gatherings and get-togethers and language and culture were much more Mexican, by far, on my Mom's side (Miranda Interview 2003).

Among Ohlone/Costanoan peoples, the decision to identify as Mexican wasn't exclusively one of need, but also one of pride in heritage. Lisa Carrier (Interview 2003), who grew up in the late 1960s, characterizes those years as an era of "low riding and being Chicana." With her non-Hispanic last name, paternal Italian and German heritage, and awareness of her Mexican and Indian background, Carrier sometimes felt she didn't entirely fit in with any ethnic group.

I was very proud of being Hispanic, and that's something that's always been in our family, but there's always been something missing. We always knew that we were Indian... There was almost a hopelessness to it, because we felt like we didn't know enough... I think what's interesting about it is that now that we're learning more, we realize that our ancestors, they did leave hints (Carrier Interview 2003).

Support Networks and Gatherings

Gatherings of family and friends bolstered Ohlone/Costanoan individuals through the early and mid-twentieth century. In the north, some of the families of the Verona band lost touch with one another as they left the Pleasanton area to find work during the 1920s and 1930s. The large Marine/Alvarez/Galvan/Nichols/Sanchez/Thompson extended family (all descendents of Avelina Cornates of Mission San Jose and immigrant Rafael Marine), however, continued to get together often. Hank Alvarez, born in 1922 and currently the oldest member of the family, remembers extended family gatherings in Niles Canyon when he was a child.

I've got a lot of people. They're all important to me. My mother and my dad, and all my uncles and aunts, and their children. I was born in Santa Cruz and I was raised in Alvarado, Hayward, Watsonville, Salinas. And then we moved to Brentwood. And when I was a child, still a little guy, we used to have gatherings, and I used to enjoy this, the whole family would show up, in Niles Canyon. We used to have, like with the water ... [interviewer: "the creek?"; Alvarez nods] ... and everything, for picnics. We used to really enjoy it, because the kids would all get together and we'd have a ball (Alvarez Interview 2003).

Philip Galvan, Hank Alvarez' half-brother, had similar memories. He remembered that the family gatherings were held at a number of unspecified locations.

They [the extended family] lived all over the place, and we used to go visit them and the family used to get together. Lucas lived someplace, then they'd come together, we'd go see Trina [Rauno], Aunt Trina, all that (P. Galvan Interview 2003).

In the Mission San Juan Bautista descendent community, key figure Ascención Solorsano played a role beyond that of family head during the first part of the twentieth century. Her descendent Edward Ketchum described that role:

She was also like a labor contractor. She would find people work, so they would come there. After a while, she not only found work for our Indian people, but for Indian people who came from other states and countries, such as Mexico. She knew a whole group of people around the greater Gilroy area who needed prunes picked, garlic tended, or those types of fruit jobs. (Ketchum Interview 2003).

Upon the death of Ascención Solorsano, the family home continued to serve as a refuge. According to Ketchum:

My grandmother moved into her grandmother Ascención's house. It was like an assembly place. People would come there all the time, and she would feed people when they came, but they would also leave food there. So there was this natural tie that made it a type of gathering point. There was a fairly large group of Mutsun people living in this area. There was the Sanchezes just a few houses down the street, the Espinosas, the Higueras, the Moreños. There were some other families who were Indian, but they weren't California Indians. What's their name? Charvez. They were Pueblo Indians. There were also some other people. This part of Gilroy had a lot of Indian people, so they had created a group there that had some constant contact (Ketchum Interview 2003).

Such family and community support networks had a basis in the old ways, according to Ketchum.

There was a tie [to traditional ways]. Maybe we couldn't do the traditional things that we did in the past, but there were ways the family could work together to find sustenance. There was a lot of sharing between families. If somebody caught a great, big fish, we didn't have freezers. You'd cut that thing up and share it with everybody in the community. Everybody could share in your good fortune. So there was that community, tribe, or group, and it kept going on.... They were always looking out to see that everybody was surviving, that things weren't completely out of control. If somebody needed a place to live, we'd make sure that they had some place to live, and that they were taken care of (Ketchum Interview 2003).

Marie Bonillas Ronquillo, a Mission San Juan Bautista descendent who grew up in the late 1950s through '60s, recalls regular gatherings of her extended family.

Growing up as a little girl, we gathered...as a family from the very beginning. I...think it was every Friday, we were at somebody's house, and...all the musicians, they knew to bring their instruments, whether it be a guitar, accordion, harmonica, drums, trumpets, whatever they had... They were supposed to sing and play. My mom with her sisters harmonizing, singing a song with their cousins, or my grandmother, my mom's mother, singing a song... That was how it was supposed to be... My mom coming from a family of nine, they understood that when their family was together, that was what was important in life. She [Marie's "Grandma Ree"] was known to always feed people. With nine children, she always had enough food for when company came over. It was just the way we were raised (Ronquillo Interview 2003).

The extended Bonillas family gathered frequently in Yosemite, sometimes camping near the home of a cousin of Marie's grandmother, a Yosemite elder named Phoebe Hogan. Marie Ronquillo's father, Theodore W. Bonillas, recalled the gatherings, which could include anywhere from 20 to 100 people:

We'd camp in the Indian Village in Yosemite, and we'd talk with her [Phoebe] all the time, learning different things about the tribe from up there... We...camped right

there next to her house. The rangers tried to run us out, but she said, “No. No. These people are Indian people, and they’re my guests. They stay here,” and they left us alone... We used to barbeque deer [chuckles]...with all the Indians there in the park, and we had a lot of fun. I used to go fishing with them (Bonillas Interview 2005).

The elders who participated in these support networks transmitted native cultural traditions in both overt and covert ways.

Indian cultural tradition became subsumed within Hispanic tradition in the experience of Lisa Carrier. Thinking back on the frequent gatherings of her Hispanic-oriented extended family through the 1970s and 1980s, Carrier realized that the stories, songs, poems, and imitations shared by family members as entertainment reflected old-time tradition:

Looking back at our pictures, and going back and doing the research, you know what, those weren’t Mexican ways. Those were our Indian ways... We’ve been storytelling for years. We just didn’t know what it was (Carrier Interview 2003).

Mid-twentieth-century Ohlone/Costanoan family and community networks and gatherings provided more than social and economic support. They also served as the foundation for a cultural renaissance that developed in the latter part of the century, when being Indian no longer carried a stigma.

MID-TWENTIETH-CENTURY THEMES

In this section we discuss some mid-twentieth-century themes that were important to Ohlone/Costanoans at the time and continue to be important in memory today. We begin with an overview of responses to the Great Depression, then discuss Ohlone/Costanoan family members’ involvement with Indian boarding schools, and end with a discussion of Ohlone/Costanoan experiences as United States citizens in World War II and the Korean conflict.

The Great Depression, 1929-1941

The Great Depression began with the stock market crash of 1929 and ended with the United States’ entry into World War II. It still evokes vivid memories in the minds of the Ohlone/Costanoans who experienced it. They weathered its hard times by relying on their social support networks, and by combining local employment, including cannery work, with a variety of old and new subsistence techniques. Joseph Mondragon’s mother told him how his grandmother taught her how to use a plant called doveweed to catch fish in Adamson Creek near Gilroy:

“Grandma and I, we’d take this washtub and we’d go up the creek and find a pool,” and they’d get this weed and they’d mash it up in the thing and then they’d spread it at the head of the stream... “And 10 minutes later we’d run down to the other end, here comes all the fish, belly up” (J. Mondragon Interview 2003).

Edward Ketchum, another Solorsano descendent, remembered that his grandmother, herself Ascención Solorsano’s granddaughter, continued the tradition of native plant use.

When I was young, I can remember our grandmother. We would take a hike into the hills behind Gilroy, and she would say, “This is this type of plant,” and “This is that type of plant.” Grandma would pick mushrooms there. She said you could cut a fungus that was growing on one of the trees and fry it. And she said, “This is where they collected this.” And we’d hike all the way to the top of the hill, and she would tell us the name of the different plants she had seen on the way up there, and then we’d look out over the whole valley, and she would say, “This is where the people

lived” (Ketchum Interview 2003).

Gleaning the fields helped many Ohlone/Costanoans during the depression and after. As Ketchum remembers it:

When you talk about going from picking prunes and those sorts of things, an additional item, at least in our family, is that we also gleaned fields. After they picked beans with an automatic harvester, there would be these rolls of beans, and we would go through the fields. I can remember as a small child going through the fields picking out all the beans that the harvesters had left. You’d pick them up, put them in gunny sacks, and take them home. You’d break open the pods and push out the beans. We got twenty or thirty pounds of beans off of this field that had already been picked. So when all else failed, families would get together and glean fields (Ketchum Interview 2003).

The family of Hank Alvarez, who was raised in Alvarado, Hayward, Watsonville, and Salinas, moved to Brentwood during the depression. There the family gathered wild mushrooms in early winter and a salad green with milky sap. They raised chickens, rabbits, vegetables, and cabbage and they made their own tortillas. His step-father also made beer, and if it went bad his mother used the resultant vinegar for pickling (Alvarez Interview 2003).

Indian Boarding Schools, 1930s

A small number of Ohlone/Costanoans attended the Indian boarding schools at Sherman Institute in Riverside, California, Chemawa in Oregon, and Stewart in Carson City, Nevada. To Theodore W. Bonillas (Interview 2003), who was a young child in the 1930s, being sent to a boarding school was the verification of a young person’s identity as an Indian. He reasoned that he “couldn’t be Indian,” because he was not sent to one of the boarding schools, even though “they were still taking kids from the families, and putting them in these special schools.”

Lawrence Domingo Marine (Mission San Jose descendent) attended Sherman Institute from 1931 to 1940 (photocopy of telegram provided by Muwekma Ohlone Tribe). There he met and married Pansy Potts, daughter of Northern Maidu author, cultural consultant and activist Marie Potts, who served as editor of *Smoke Signals*, a mid-twentieth-century publication of the Federated Indians of California (Castenada 2006). In later years their son Marvin Marine trained as a traditional Maidu dancer (Lamiera Interview 2003).

Some of those taken to the schools did not have to stay. After Ralph Franco (Mission San Juan Bautista descendant) was taken by “the authorities” to Stewart Boarding School, Martha Herrera de Orozco, “who had some authority in the tribe” traveled with her husband to remove him from the school and take him home (Lopez Interview 2003).

World War II and the Korean War

Ohlone/Costanoan men have enlisted to serve their country since World War I.⁴⁵ Among the many Ohlone/Costanoan people whose World War II service was specifically pointed out by friends and family members are Mission San Jose descendents Henry (Hank) Alvarez, Robert Corral, Ben L. Guzman, Frank H. Guzman, Ernest Marine, Lawrence Marine, Arthur M. Pena, Robert Sanchez, and Lawrence Thompson, as well as Mission San Juan Bautista descendent Joseph M. Mondragon.

⁴⁵ Fred Guzman, Mission San Jose descendent from Pleasanton, California, was drafted into the army at Fort Mason, San Francisco, on August 5, 1917, served in France, and was discharged at the San Francisco Presidio in December of 1918 (photocopies of enlistment and discharge papers provided by the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe).

Mission San Jose descendent Ben L. Guzman, born 1920, enlisted on November 5, 1942, in San Francisco. At the time of enlistment, records show that he had finished one year of high school, then worked as a rock crusher. He enlisted as a private for “the duration of the War or other emergency, plus six months, subject to the discretion of the President or otherwise according to law.” Frank H. Guzman, born 1926, enlisted in San Francisco on July 21, 1944 under the same terms, after graduating from grammar school, then working as an automobile serviceman (Ancestry.com enlistment records, courtesy of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe).

When Mission San Juan Bautista descendent Joseph Mondragon enlisted in 1942, he had been working with his family, helping construct Fort Ord by doing cement finishing. In 1943 Mondragon began three years of overseas service in the Navy. At the end of the war, eschewing a future in cement work, he went on to a 20-year career in the military.

When I joined the military...what you did is what you were known by, unless you made Chief Petty Officer. And they knew I was Indian. They used to call me Chief, no matter what [laughs].... I was an accountant. I ran offices on ships. Heck, I retired from the Ticonderoga, and we used to do 18 or 19 million dollars of cash business a year, plus unknown millions to begin with. So I ran the finance office for four years on board, and then I retired from there (J. Mondragon Interview 2003).

Native Americans did not serve in segregated units during World War II, unlike African Americans. Mission San Jose descendent Dorothy Lameira remembers that her dark-complexioned brother, Ernest Marine, was assigned to a black outfit and enjoyed his time in the unit (Lameira Interview 2003).

Ohlone/Costanoan men have continued to serve in the military in war and peace times since World War II. Theodore W. Bonillas (Interview 2005) served in the Navy, attached to the Army, during the Korean War. He was stationed on an amphibious landing craft traveling along the eastern coast of Korea, taking supplies, food and ammunition to troops, picking up Marines and some soldiers, and picking up the dead. One day, while off-loading ammunition, the North Koreans started shelling the unit from behind, killing some of his buddies and wounding him. While he was in the service, Bonillas was told that his ethnic identity was Caucasian, despite his protestations to the contrary. After the war, he turned toward “the Indian way.” As he put it, “I had to find out who I was, and what I was, and this was one way to find out.”

The men mentioned above are just a few of the many Ohlone/Costanoans who have served in the U.S. military. They were chosen for recognition here because material about them emerged during our interview efforts.

National Cemetery Burials

It is a matter of pride to many Ohlone/Costanoan families that some of their ancestors are buried at the Golden Gate National Cemetery at San Bruno, California. Among those so honored are Mission San Jose descendents Anthony Guzman, Frank Guzman, Fred Guzman, and Henry A. Nichols (US Department of Veterans Affairs 2006).

LAND REPARATIONS AND RESERVATION POLICY, 1930S-1970S

The themes addressed in this section highlight the differences between federally recognized tribes and non-recognized groups of Indian people during the twentieth century, both in everyday experience and in the nature of the legal environments in which they lived. The first and second sections examine the history of a set of lawsuits over land reparations that directly involved the Ohlone/Costanoans. Subsequent sections will show that federal reservation termination and federal

tribal relocation policy, directed toward land-holding federally recognized tribes in the mid-twentieth century, also had a profound effect on Ohlone/Costanoans.

The California Indian Jurisdictional Act and Case K-344

On May 18, 1928, the California Indians' Jurisdictional Act (45 Stat. 602) became law, authorizing the California attorney general to file suit on behalf of California Indians to compensate them for the land that was taken as a result of the unratified treaties of 1851-1852. In accordance with the Act, a roll was prepared tracing the lineage of individual California Indians to an ancestor alive in 1850, the year California became a state. It is that roll that we utilized to inform our discussion, at the end of the last chapter, regarding the presence of various tribes of California Indians in San Francisco and San Mateo counties during the 1920s.

Ohlone/Costanoans were among the Indian people who enrolled themselves and their families under the Jurisdictional Act. Most of the families who enrolled list the home mission of their parents, and sometimes grandparents, on the line asking for "name of the Tribe or Band." Example application sheets, shared with us by the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, provide tribal information as follows:

- Application 08419—Joe Binoco...Mission San Jose Indian band
- Application 10293—Francisca Nunez...Mission Tribe, San Jose Mission
- Application 10296—Magdalena Armija...Tribal name unknown
- Application 10298—Lucas Marine...Ohlones (Tribal name unknown)
- Application 10299—Joseph Aleas...Mission Tribe (Olanian), San Jose Mission
- Application 10300—Bell Stokes... Olanian Tribe, Alameda County
- Application 10301—Phoebe Inigo...Mission Indian, Mission San Jose
- Application 10675—Catherine Peralta...Mission San Jose
- Application 10676—Margarita Piñas...Mission San Jose
- Application 10681—Dolores Marine...Mission San Jose
- Application 10682—Trina Marine...Mission San Jose

The reference to "Ohlone" and "Olanian" indicates the common use of variations on "Ohlone" in the Mission San Jose area during the 1920s and 1930s. (The origin and varied applications of the term "Ohlone" were discussed in the final section of Chapter 2).

The law suit by the State of California went forward in federal court in 1929 as case K-344. Federal executive opposition was strong and an initial decision proving federal government liability for California Indian land losses did not come down until 1942 (Forbes 1969:104-105). The initial penalty settlement of 1944 is described by Omar Stewart.

On December 14, 1944, the U.S. Court of Claims awarded the Indians of California \$17,053,941.98 for the 18 reservations the Indians were promised in 1851-1852 but did not receive. But from that amount the federal government deducted as an offset \$12,029,099.64, the amount spent by the government for the benefit of the Indians of California over the years, including reservations. There remained \$5,024,842.34 (Stewart 1978:706).

Congress authorized the payment of \$150.00 to each Indian on a corrected and updated roster of California Indians in 1950, but left a portion of the award in the U.S. treasury (Forbes 1969:106).

Ohlone/Costanoans and the Indian Land Claims Commission

Not all land claims were settled under the 1944 agreement that ended case K-344. It had become clear during hearings for that case that extensive lands had not been covered under the 18 treaties of 1851-1852, and that many groups, including mission descendents, deserved payment for loss of another 60 million acres. Congress passed the Indian Claims Commission Act in August of 1946, authorizing Indians to bring forth claims to the commission that had not been addressed under K-344. The act stipulated that any claims against the U.S. must be filed within five years (Stewart 1978:707).

The Ohlone/Costanoans of the Monterey Bay Area and those of the San Francisco Bay Area organized separately to seek reparations under the Indian Claims Commission Act. The initial organizing efforts of the Monterey Bay Indians are well documented. On November 16, 1946, 53 members of the “group of California Indians at Monterey” adopted a resolution authorizing A. Eloiza Ardaiz and three attorneys to act on their behalf, subject to the approval of the Commission of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior.⁴⁶ On November 17, 1946, 15 others signed up in Monterey County. On December 3, 1946 31 more signatories in Monterey County did the same. On Feb. 18, 1947, nine more signatories added their names in Monterey County. On February 28, 1947, 21 more signatories in Monterey County and seven in San Benito County joined the group. Finally, on August 18, 1948, the Acting Commissioner of the BIA in Washington D.C. approved “the foregoing contract dated February 8, 1948, between the group of Indians at Monterey, California, and Reginald E. Foster, Walter W. Gleason, and A. Brooks Berlin...subject to the condition that this approval is given without any determination by me as to whether the groups of Indians constitute a ‘tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians’ within the intendment of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946” (National Archives, San Bruno, documents in possession of Irene Zwierlein).

The Mondragon family of the Gilroy area was involved in the Monterey Bay Area effort, recalled family member Joseph M. Mondragon, who was an adult at the time. “They approached the local ones and Mama was represented... My mother never left the house, but she knew everybody because they’d come to her.” About Eloiza Ardaiz’s selection as delegate, Mondragon explained, “Her people come from San Juan... They were known as the Canos... She was the only one with a college education. So we made her chairperson to represent us” (J. Mondragon Interview 2003).

Less documentation is available for the initial response of the San Francisco Bay Area Ohlone/Costanoans to the Indian Land Claims Commission. We know that a “Bay Area California Indian Council” existed by 1947 and that its president was a man named Grover C. Sanderson, because the family of Ernest G. Thompson retained his membership card. The card, dated May of 1947, states that he was a member of the “Mission” tribe of Indians and was a “member in good standing” of the Bay Area California Indian Council (photocopy of card provided by Muwekma Ohlone Tribe). Thompson, who had been born in 1912, was a son of Magdalena Armija and the senior Ernest Thompson (of the Santos family of the old Verona band). We do not have any more information on the Bay Area California Indian Council at present. However, Ernest Thompson’s half-

⁴⁶ A. Eloisa Ardaiz appears in records available to us to have been a key organizer of Indian claims to the Land Commission in central California. On October 25, 1946 six signatories in Stanislaus County had “individually and collectively” appointed “A. Eloisa Ardaiz as our delegate to meet with the delegates of any and all tribes, bands, organizations or group of Indians of California for the purpose of naming and appointing Reginald E. Foster and associated attorneys to represent us as our legal counsel in the prosecution to a final conclusion of any and all claims which we may have against the United States Government” (National Archives material in possession of Irene Zwierlein).

sister, Ruth Thompson Orta, then in her early 20s, recalls driving her mother Trina Marine Ruano to claims case meetings in the San Francisco Bay Area during the 1950s (Orta Interview 2003).

By the end of the five year period during which claims cases were brought forward, August 13, 1951, 23 separate petitions had been filed for various groups of Indians in California. One summary of the claims cases states:

For Indians wholly within the state of California there were two groups claiming to represent all the Indians of California (Dockets 31 and 37) as well as separate petitions from 46 bands of Mission Indians, Yokiah (Central Pomo), Shasta, Yana, and Achumawi (Stewart 1978:706-707).

Legal maneuvering on the claims cases to the Indian Claims Commission continued into the 1950s. Further meetings were held in Berkeley and San Francisco in 1954 and 1955 respectively (Stewart 1978:707).

During the time that requests were being made for reparations through the Indian Land Claims Commission, other actions were being taken with regard to further reparation payments under the original provisions of the 1928 Jurisdictional Act. In 1954, Congress once more amended the 1928 act to allow appeals until June 30, 1955 (68 Stat. 240). On that date, the Secretary of the Interior approved a roll bearing 36,095 names. Litigation continued. The Indians Claims Commission consolidated the many separate post-1946 claims into just two claims, Dockets 31 and 37, in 1964 (Stewart 1978:706-707). Then a law authorizing a new roll of California Indians eligible for reparations was passed on September 21, 1968, through which many younger Ohlone/Costanoans were enrolled. Mission San Jose descendent Trina Marine Ruano enrolled her extended family, including the children of those enrolled after 1928, while Dolores Marine Galvan enrolled her immediate family members (Field et.al 1992:418, 421; Ruth Orta, personal communication to Beverly Ortiz, 1994).

Stewart's (1978) discussion of the status of the land reparation fund as of 1971 and the final payments in 1972, under both the 1928 Jurisdictional Act and the 1946 Indian Claims Commission Act is summarized here:

As of June 30, 1971, \$6,408,630 judgment fund plus interest had been distributed to Indians of California in per capita payments from the case authorized in 1928. Remaining in the fund to be distributed was \$1,496,246.08 as of that date.... The payment was a minimum compensation of \$1.25 per acre for 8,619,000 acres promised in the 1851- 1852 treaties, less the value of the 611,226 acres actually made available to California Indians in reservations and rancherias as well as any other benefit... (Stewart 1978:706-707).

The enrollment to receive shares from the claims cases under the laws of 1928 and the Claims Commission Act of 1946 was completed in December 1972. Almost 70,000 Indians received \$668.51 each, making the final payment near 46 million dollars (Stewart 1978:709)

When reparations payments finally did come, the money was welcomed by most who received it. One of Irene Zwierlein's cousins purchased a car with the money, which they drove until it finally gave out (Zwierlein Interview 2003). T. Michael Bonillas (Interview 2003) was "happy to get the money," since it arrived some "three days before Christmas."

Participation in the claims cases caused some Ohlone/Costanoans to forego their reticence to identify themselves as Indians. Lisa Carrier recalls that although her great-grandmother never spoke about being Indian, "All she ever told my...grandpa when each kid was born each year for about

twenty years [laughs quietly] was 'Register them. Make sure you register them. They're Indians. They need to be registered' " Carrier's great-grandmother, who lived in Oakland at the time, was the only Mission San Juan Bautista descendent to identify herself as "Mutsun" on a 1928-1930 application (Carrier Interview 2003).

Termination of Federal Reservations, 1948-1970s

Although no Ohlone/Costanoan bands had been granted a federal reservation, changing federal policies directed at federally recognized Indian people have affected Ohlone/Costanoans in the past and continue to affect them today. In 1948 the federal government initiated a plan to terminate any special status of American Indians. Edward Castillo described the new termination program:

After the war, as the United States spent millions of dollars rebuilding Germany and Japan, the government hoped to rid itself of its embarrassing failure to "rebuild" Indian nations by simply withdrawing government aid to Indian people. This philosophy was expressed in the Hoover Commission survey of 1948. Indeed that year the Bureau of Indian Affairs declared its intention to "terminate" all government services to all Indians and divide their tribal assets (land and resources) among individuals... Its implementation would detribalize native groups and put their property on tax rolls as well as repudiate the federal government's moral commitment and responsibility to aid the people whose poverty and powerlessness it had created (Castillo 1978a:122).

Dillon S. Myer was appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs by President Truman in 1950 to reduce the role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and carry out termination, something Myer vowed to bring about with "an orderly progression from initiation to conclusion" (Parman 1994:131). During the reign of a succeeding Commissioner of Indian Affairs under Dwight D. Eisenhower, the U.S. House of Representatives issued House Concurrent Resolution 108 in 1953 that "ordered the secretary of interior...to recommend legislation to end federal responsibility" over all Indians in four states, including California, and to do the same for specific tribes in other states. Its companion, Public Law 280, permitted five states, including California, to "exercise both criminal and civil jurisdiction over reservations."

By February 15, 1954, hearings had begun on several termination bills for individual tribes, culminating in six termination acts, including the 1958 Rancheria Act (27 Stat. 619 as amended by 78 Stat. 390) aimed at eliminating the federal trust responsibility for California's smallest land bases, initially purchased for specific tribes and other "homeless California Indians." While several rancherias resisted termination, 36 assented, their residents convinced that this would free them from BIA oversight. They soon began to realize the negative consequences of the policy on their existence as coherent tribes (Parman 1994:134-147; Castillo 1978a:123).

By the 1970s several rancherias were filing individual suits to become unterminated, i.e., to have their tribal status restored. In 1978 California Indian Legal Services filed *Tillie Harwick v. United States*, arguing that "the government had breached its trust responsibility and the provisions of the Rancheria Act by not preparing adequately for termination." The rancherias won their case and as a result, 17 tribes were unterminated (none of those in the San Francisco Bay Area). Other tribes were dismissed from the case, but retained the right to file separate suits. Many of those latter groups have been successful in becoming unterminated since then (Gendar 1992:14). Among them are three groups of Sonoma County at the north end of the San Francisco Bay Area:

- Cloverdale Rancheria of Pomo Indians, Sonoma County (restored in 1983).
- Lytton Rancheria (Pomo Indians), Sonoma County (restored in 1991).
- Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria, Sonoma County (restored in 2000).

Beginning in the 1990s, several unterminated rancherias have sought to establish new land bases at various locales within Ohlone/Costanoan tribal territories. Tribes that have done so include Lytton, Scotts Valley, Guidiville, Lower Lake Koi, and the California Valley Miwok Tribe (see Indian Gaming Issues section below).

Federal Relocation Policy, 1950s-1968

Relocation was a federal policy that arose as an adjunct to the concept of termination. Relocation, initiated in the 1950s and ended in 1966, encouraged federally recognized American Indian people to move from rural reservations to urban areas, where they were promised employment assistance in the form of vocational training and jobs (Boyer 1997:89; Parman 1994:132). As elaborated by Parman:

[BIA Commissioner] Myer's placements were in low-paying and seasonal jobs, and only 3,000 Indians found "permanent" jobs. Without improved social services, relocation could not relieve Indian poverty (Parman 1944:132).

Relocation brought large numbers of Indian people to California's urban centers from reservations in other parts of the United States:

The government estimates that since the beginning of the relocation program as many as 60,000 to 70,000 out-of-state Indians have settled in the Los Angeles or San Francisco bay area. This accounts for more than one-half of the relocated Indians in the United States (Castillo 1978a:123).

Relocation helped make California's American Indian population larger than that of any other state in the United States in 1980, second only to Arizona in 1990, and again number one in 2000. It also relegated California's indigenous people to a relatively small percentage of the American Indian population of the state.

Instead of assimilating and acculturating the American Indian population, relocation resulted in the establishment of several multitribal institutions and organizations and the importation of newer forms of multitribal cultural expression, such as powwows. Adam Fortunate Eagle, a Chippewa from the Red Lake Indian Reservation in Minnesota, wrote about the importance of the powwows that began to take place in San Francisco, then proliferated in central California:

Indians began to find each other, partially out of loneliness and confusion in their new urban surroundings and partially out of an urge to share a cultural identity. First came the picnics in Golden Gate Park that grew into drumming and singing sessions. These grew into a powwow circuit of social gatherings that, often unconsciously, made their own subtle political statement of cultural unity and affirmation (Eagle 1992:12).

A few years later, in 1997, Fortunate Eagle wrote more about multitribal cultural phenomena.

So great was the hunger for powwows that we would gather even when it meant serving a white man's need for a Hollywood version of Native America: The Indian Days powwow at San Jose's Frontier Village amusement park... The powwow was open to all Indians, and, even if it served to entertain tourists and sightseers, it also filled our growing need for cultural expression.

All over the Bay Area, picnics were growing into powwows almost every weekend. The government had certainly not intended or wanted such a resurgence of traditional gatherings... The powwows in rented halls and public parks gradually expanded under the sponsorship of new Indian clubs. Some of them, such as the Sioux Club and the Navajo Club, formed around tribal identities; others, such as the Four Winds Club, focused on social objectives (Eagle 1997:53-54).

Some Ohlone/Costanoans began to attend powwows as both observers and participants. They also became involved with some of the new multiracial institutions and organizations. These included the San Jose Indian Center (which no longer exists) and Oakland's Intertribal Friendship House. The Intertribal Friendship House, established "in the 1950s during the early years of relocation," is one of the two "oldest still-operating urban Indian organizations in the United States," the other being the Chicago Indian Center (Lobo et.al. 2002:xix).

Despite the gradually increasing visibility of Ohlone/Costanoans in the eyes of the larger American Indian community of central California, they have often been overlooked by that larger community, or when not overlooked, considered in wistful terms as though they played no role in society. This attitude is reflected in a poem written by Sac and Fox International Indian Treaty Council activist Dennis Jennings, excerpted here (Jennings 2002:87):

DEDICATION POEM FOR OCHE WATT TE OU/REFLECTION

(Performed at Yerba Buena Gardens, San Francisco, October 17, 1993)

*Now that
most of the Ohlones
are under our feet
too few left to recognize,
whole families going unrecognized
as city officials discuss with a Russian
what to do with the old military land.*

OHLONES

*(as if they ever called themselves that until lately)
lived here (at this place) in the Garden of Eden,
still live among us (these genetic remnants),
these all too human original people of this place.
All different races of tribes live here now—
only one or two generations removed from their lands*

INDIAN

all around you now.

ASSERTION OF SOCIETAL RECOGNITION, 1964-1980

Although Ohlone/Costanoans participated in the 44-year-long land case struggle, from 1928 to 1972, that process was invisible to most other Californians. Ohlone/Costanoans began to make their political and cultural presence known publicly in the mid-1960s, and have continued to do so in an ever-increasing number of venues. The initial public stances, those that occurred up through 1980, are the subject of this section.

Protection of the Mission San Jose Ohlone Cemetery

In 1964-1965 a group of Mission San Jose descendants came together, with the help of the American Indian Historical Society, to prevent a freeway from going through the Ohlone Indian Cemetery in Fremont, California. In late 1964, Dolores Marine Galvan of the Marine/Alvarez/Galvan/Nichols/Sanchez/Thompson extended family (Mission San Jose descendants) read in the newspaper that the California Department of Transportation was planning to build a freeway through

the district of Mission San Jose that would force the removal of the Mission San Jose Indian cemetery (Lamiera Interview 2003). The cemetery was a very important spot to the family, whose members had been buried there as late as 1925 (P. Galvan Interview 2003).

Even before 1964, Rupert Costo of the American Indian Historical Society (AIHS), then a California Division of Highways engineer, had been involved in surveying the cemetery property (*Oakland Tribune*, February 2, 1965). Costo, a Cahuilla from southern California, had formed the American Indian Historical Society (AIHS) together with his wife, Jeanette Henry Costo. The AIHS was based at the Chataqua House in San Francisco. Two important goals of the AIHS were to advocate for the protection of ancestral burial grounds and for change in the way California Indians were portrayed in state textbooks. They joined forces with Dolores Galvan's family to force the Department of Transportation to try to alter the route of the freeway, Highway 680, near Mission San Jose. At a meeting on the issue with the Fremont City Council, Dolores Marine Galvan told the authorities: "You want to put a road through my mother's grave" (A. Galvan Interview 2003). The route of the freeway was changed.

Then, in October of 1964, the AIHS announced that it had applied to the Oakland Diocese of the Catholic Church for title to the "Ohlone Indian Cemetery" at Mission San Jose. The Diocese responded positively, giving a quitclaim title to the "Ohlone Indian Burial Ground" to the AIHS on January 6, 1965 (Costo 1965a). Initial plans were to make the site a "monument and memorial to the Indians of America" (Costo 1965b:12, 1965c:4,5). In 1971 the AIHS deeded the cemetery to the Ohlone Indian Tribe, with Philip Galvan, a son of Dolores Marine Galvan, as grantee (Levy 1978a:487). Since that time the cemetery has been maintained by Philip Galvan (P. Galvan Interview 2003). The site has since been used as a place to rebury native Californian remains that have been disturbed during construction projects (A. Galvan Interview 2003).

Other activities spun off from the struggle to protect the Mission San Jose cemetery. By August of 1965, the Ohlone Indian Historians chapter of the AIHS had been formed, with members from 20 households. Michael Galvan was chair and his father Philip Galvan served as its Secretary-Treasurer. In an article in *The Indian Historian*, the chapter members were quoted as calling themselves "Men of Extinction," a word play on the perception that "the Ohlone Indians ... are extinct" (Costo 1965d).

Philip Galvan's involvement with the cemetery led to expanded efforts to educate the public about Ohlone/Costanoans, including at workshops sponsored by AIHS in Hoopa and Fresno. In 1966 Galvan created a small exhibit about the Ohlone in Brentwood's Bank of America. Public interest in the exhibit led to further research and the creation of a portable, 16-case cultural exhibit which Galvan shared at various Contra Costa County schools during lunchtime presentations. Upon hearing that a professor at De Anza College in Cupertino had said the Ohlone were extinct, Galvan visited the professor and was interviewed by the school. Other speaking engagements followed, including at a Palo Alto school that was subsequently named Ohlone Elementary (P. Galvan Interview 2003).

Alcatraz Island Occupation, 1969-1971

The complex attitudes of Ohlone/Costanoans (and other California Indian people) toward broader pan-Indian issues is illustrated by their reaction to the occupation of Alcatraz Island. A diverse group of native people calling themselves the "Indians of All Tribes" occupied Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay for 19 months, from November of 1969 through much of June of 1971. The occupation began on the evening of November 9, 1969, when 14 individuals, mostly Indian college students, jumped off the boat they had chartered with several others and swam to the Island. They carried a proclamation stating, "We, the native Americans, re-claim the land known as Alcatraz Island in the name of all American Indians by right of discovery." It elaborated the occupation's goals as the development of a Center for Native American Studies, an American Indian Spiritual Center, an Indian Center of Ecology,

an Indian Training School, and an American Indian Museum, none ultimately achieved on the island itself (Eagle 1992:60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 73; Talbot 1997:105).

The November 9 occupiers were removed by U.S. marshalls the next day. However a larger group exceeding 80 people returned on the morning of November 20, 1969. Men, women, and children, they brought gear necessary for a long stay. Most were reportedly college students, including students enrolled in the San Francisco State University Native American Studies Department's first-ever course, "Native American Heritage" (NAS 20), as well as students from U.C. Berkeley and U.C. Riverside (Kemnitzer 1997:115-117; Castillo 1997:120). At least one of the persons enrolled in NAS 20—Frank David Williams—was Ohlone/Costanoan, although it isn't clear whether or not he ultimately joined the occupation (Castillo 1997:118). Many of the original Alcatraz occupiers were associated with or influenced by the intertribal United Native Americans, established in the Bay Area in 1968.

Over the next 18 months federal authorities monitored the situation as local San Francisco Bay Area citizens brought water and supplies to the Island, and Indian activists visited from across the country, and non-Indian civil rights activists visited from around the world. The assembly of occupiers went through constant turnover, and relationships among the occupation leadership were at times tense. Eventually, public support for the occupation waned. On June 10, 1971, the occupation ended when armed federal marshalls, FBI agents, and special forces police came onto the island and removed the last occupiers, five women, four children, and six men.

In an ironic turn, Ernest Thompson of the large Marine/Alvarez/Galvan/Nichols/Sanchez/Thompson extended family of Mission San Jose descendents, was hired as a night watchman at Alcatraz by the National Park Service after they acquired the property. He worked there for many years, beginning in October of 1973 (*Sacramento Bee*, December 23, 1980, p. B2).

The Alcatraz occupation had a profound affect on American Indian activism in the following months and years. According to Troy Johnson and colleagues it initiated...

a unique nine-year period of Red Power protest that culminated in the transformation of national consciousness about American Indians and engendered a more open and confident sense of identity among people of Indian descent. Between 20 November 1969 and the Longest Walk in 1978, there were more than seventy property takeovers by Indian activists. This series of collective actions is referred to as the Alcatraz-Red Power Movement (ARPM) because it started with—and was modeled after—the Alcatraz takeover. Certainly, many individual Indian people were politically active before and after this period, but what made the movement so powerful were the large numbers of organized demonstrations and the property seizures aimed at airing national and local Indian grievances (Johnson et al. 1997).

The reaction to the Alcatraz occupation was mixed among California Indians. In a subtle way, it was mixed "within" California Indians, as Castillo, himself a Cahuilla from southern California, explained:

My own reaction evolved from enthusiastic support to more serious reflection: "Oh, no. Here we go again." At that time, all of California's professional Indian leadership positions were held by Indians from out of state. This grated on those of us who were from California tribes, but the non-California Indians could not comprehend our concern. More troubling still, these leaders would be claiming California Indian land based on a treaty the government had made with the Lakota Indians! After some serious thought, though, I decided the positive potential would outweigh the negative. I would take part in the proposed demonstration with hopes that other California Indians would participate as well. I reasoned that we would go to the island, make our stand, be arrested, and then attempt to get the message to the

nation that the native peoples of America were being seriously neglected in the civil rights struggle (Castillo 1997:122).

Years later, Mission San Jose descendent Philip Galvan, a member of an older generation than Castillo, described his reaction to the Alcatraz occupation at the First Annual Gathering of Ohlone Peoples at Coyote Hills Regional Park in Fremont, October 1, 1994,

It's always been among the natives that you do not trespass in other areas that don't belong to you... We always thought it was wrong for other people to be on Alcatraz. They were from all different tribes (P. Galvan, personal communication to Beverly Ortiz, 1994).

Recently, Andrew Galvan, Philip's son, took the same point of view:

The Ohlone people considered Alcatraz to be part of our traditional homelands, land we had never relinquished to anyone, Indian or non-Indian. The occupation organizers did not consult with the indigenous group or ask members to join the occupation... (A. Galvan Interview 2003).

Other Ohlone/Costanoans have supported the Alcatraz occupation. Tony Cerda, a Mission Carmel/Mission Dolores descendent who did not take part in the 1969-1971 action because he was not in the area, has found a way to support the idea of the Alcatraz occupation. He currently attends commemorative ceremonies at Alcatraz with his tribe's Humaya Dancers (*Contra Costa Times*, November 29, 2002).

They never had any indigenous people from that area participating with them before. I don't know why they stay away. It's their business. They can do whatever they want. But I think it's important that we have our presence, and we participate in the things that are going on in that area, even though we don't live there, for originally we were from that area (Cerda Interview 2003).

Lee Road Cemetery Protection

Another example of Indian resistance to cultural site disruption in Ohlone/Costanoan country took place in Santa Cruz County in mid-1975. This was a nearly violent showdown over the desecration and destruction of an Indian cemetery on Lee Road near Watsonville. Patrick Orozco, a Pajaro Valley Ohlone, had grown up as part of a family that watched over this graveyard. His grandmother told him how his great grandfather would stop at the cemetery to pray, telling his family "Your people are there. Respect them and protect them" (Orozco and Robin 2002).

When a developer began bulldozing the burial ground for a warehouse site, Orozco and other local Indians could not prevail upon local authorities to protect the cemetery. Armed with rifles and bows and arrows, they entered the graveyard at night. They planned to physically occupy the site to prevent its further destruction, non-violently if possible (they had agreed among themselves not to shoot first), but violently if necessary (they would shoot back if fired upon). In Orozco's words: "We understood that we might lose our lives defending our religious rights, our culture, our people. When day break came, we faced a sea of law enforcement and weaponry" (Orozco and Robin 2002:99).

Political leaders worked out a compromise at the last minute, not wanting to face the responsibility for killing Indians who wanted to protect ancestral graves. A settlement allowed the developer to build his warehouses on the already bulldozed half of the graveyard, and give the undamaged remaining half of the site and five acres of adjacent land to the local Ohlone/Costanoans (Orozco and Robin 2002:100). Orozco remembered that the effort to preserve the Lee Road cemetery "opened up our eyes."

We saw that we had a need to research our way of life and to learn what was left in regard to our songs and dances and traditional way of life (Robin and Orozco 2002:216).

Working with the National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 required the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements to assess potential impacts to cultural, historic and environmental resources from development projects on federal lands. It took a few years after passage of that act for regulatory statutes to come into effect and for citizens, including Indians, to learn how to use the statutes to try to protect places of value to them.

For non-federal projects, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 required the preparation of Environmental Impact Reports by public agencies in California to assess potential impacts to cultural, historic and environmental resources from development, and to develop a plan to avoid or mitigate “significant effects, where feasible.” CEQA Section 15064.5 governs the protection and mitigation of cultural features, including “Native American graves and artifacts; traditional cultural landscapes; natural resources used for food, ceremonies or traditional crafts; and places that have special significance because of the spiritual power associated with them” (<http://www.nahc.ca.gov/guidelines4mon.html>).

By the mid-to-late 1970s, both Ohlone/Costanoans and American Indians of non-California heritage were providing input under NEPA regarding federally funded projects in the San Francisco Bay Area. Prominent among them was Wayne Robeson (Choctaw), who lived for many years in the City of San Pablo. The prominence of non-Californian American Indians in site protection was the result of the same relocation policies and subsequent multitribal activism that had led to the Alcatraz events.

Despite these and other new laws regarding environmental and cultural resource protection, during the 1970s sites continued to be destroyed without any Ohlone consultation, such as the previously mentioned Lee Road cemetery.

Ohlone/Costanoans and the Native American Heritage Commission

An important agency for aiding the enforcement of laws protecting California Indian traditional cultural properties is the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), established in the Office of the Governor of California in 1976. The Commission has an executive staff and nine appointed commissioners from throughout the state. It works cooperatively with state agencies to identify and contact groups that may be culturally affiliated with particular burial grounds, sacred sites, and museum collections. It also maintains a confidential list of sacred sites, which is shared with planners only on a need-to-know basis. It maintains lists of Indian people from the various tribes available to work with developers, construction companies, and local agencies in situations where traditional cultural properties may be harmed.

The NAHC is authorized to designate a “most likely descendent” (MLD) for the treatment and disposition of Native American skeletal remains and associated items that may be present with them. When unmarked Indian graves are encountered, the Heritage Commission staff assigns a designated person from among most likely descendents (MLDs) to work with property owners to proceed in light of pertinent laws. (Unmarked Native American cemeteries are not legal cemeteries under California law.)

Patrick Orozco and Ella Rodriguez (1932-2005) were the first two local Native Americans to work directly with the Heritage Commission as monitors (Patrick Orozco, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 2006). Like Orozco, Rodriguez had also worked to save the Lee Road site (Orozco and Robin 2002:108). As a result of the latter experience, Irene Alvarez, Orozco, and Rodriguez formed the Ohlone Indian Cultural Association as a branch of the Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Association. A turning point for increased Ohlone/Costanoan involvement in site

preservation, Orozco remembers, was the 1977 archaeological investigation of the Holiday Inn site in San Jose (Patrick Orozco, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 2006).

PERTINENT THEMES FROM 1980 FORWARD

Some Ohlone/Costanoans today participate in activities focused in the realm of political action and social justice, while others work to renew (and some to interpret) traditional language and/or cultural skills. A few individuals work in both the political and cultural arenas. This concluding section examines themes within both domains.

Ohlone/Costanoan Efforts for Federal Recognition or Re-recognition

Federal recognition of tribal status became a central concern of many Ohlone/Costanoan groups in the early 1980s, as they were faced with the fact that only federally recognized tribes can negotiate with the United States government on a government-to-government basis in order to resolve cultural preservation issues, obtain a land base, and qualify for certain health care and education assistance programs. In regard to the importance of Federal recognition, Jacquelin Jensen Kehl (Mission San Juan Bautista descendent) wrote in 2001:

Under the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Native American human remains and associated grave objects held by federally funded institutions are required by law to be returned to culturally affiliated tribes. In Ohlone territory, this has become impossible because we are no longer federally recognized and therefore cannot rebury our ancestral remains through federal channels (Kehl in Kehl and Yamane 2002:77).

Edward Ketchum, a leader of the Amah/Mutsun Band of Ohlone/Costanoan Indians, expressed NAGPRA's importance when discussing sacred places in his traditional territory:

We believe we will be limited in our ability to protect this valuable heritage unless we are a federally recognized tribe. Once our anonymity served to protect us, now it is an impediment to our federal recognition (Ketchum 2002:206).

In order to secure federal recognition, petitioning groups must meet seven criteria, including that they have "been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis since 1900," that a "predominant portion" of their membership "comprises a distinct community and has existed as a community from historical times until the present," and, most difficult to prove, that they have "maintained political influence or authority over" their membership "as an autonomous entity from historical times until the present" (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations 25, Chapter 1, Section 7).⁴⁷ These have often been difficult criteria to meet, especially for the Ohlone/Costanoan groups, who have been coping with imposed institutions and immigrant populations for over 200 years (see Leventhal et al. 1994, 2003).

The following Ohlone/Costanoan groups are known to have applied for Federal recognition:

- Costanoan Band of Carmel Mission Indians (9/16/1988)
- Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe (5/9/1989)
- Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan/Mutsun Indians (6/9/1989)

⁴⁷ The federal regulation describing criteria for federal recognition is Code of Federal Regulations Title 25—Indians, Chapter 1, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Part 83, Procedures for Establishing that an American Indian Group Exists as an Indian Tribe, Section 7, Mandatory Criteria for Federal Acknowledgment.

- Amah/Mutsun Band of Ohlone/Costanoan Indians (9/18/1990)
- Esselen/Costanoan Tribe of Monterey County (11/16/1992)
- Ohlone/Costanoan - Esselen Nation (12/3/1992)
- Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe (8/24/1994)
- Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsun Tribe (12/7/1994)

Appendix E of this report presents details on the status of each of these petitions.

The Advisory Council on California Indian Policy is a statewide Indian council created by Congress in 1992 to provide advice and recommendations on California Indian special status problems. The Council held a meeting in Monterey on November 18-19, 1994; the testimony they heard centered on many issues, among them the need for assistance in becoming federally recognized. Among the people giving testimony were several Ohlone/Costanoans, including Loretta Wyer, then Chairwoman of the Ohlone-Esselen Nation, Irene Zwierlein of the Amah Mutsun; Joseph Mondragon, Administrator of the Amah Mutsun; Anthony Miranda of the Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Patrick Orozco of the Pajaro Valley Indian Council, and Tony Cerda of the Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe. The Council then set up a Recognition Task Force. Rosemary Cambra of the Muwekma Ohlone tribe served with twelve others on the Task Force (Bedrosian and Fisher 1994:1-3).

In 1997 the Recognition Task Force issued its report to Congress, concluding that the federal acknowledgement process was unfair to California Tribes. It cited the need to inject “elements of historical reality and fundamental justice into the inquiry surrounding the questions of tribal status in California” and called for the adoption of legislation that would “allow currently petitioning tribes the option of either using a modification of the current federal acknowledgment process administered by the BIA, or transferring their petitions to an independent Commission on California Indian Recognition, created by Congress to administer a California-specific process for unacknowledged California Indian groups” (Recognition Task Force 1997:23). Neither recommendation has been enacted.

The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe went to federal court in December of 1999, suing the Department of Interior/BIA to expedite their petition, which at the time was expected to take up to twenty years to reach the top of the list for evaluation. The court ordered that the recognition petition be put on a fast track. In 2002 the decision came out rejecting the Muwekma petition. Neal McCaleb, Department of Interior Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, stated: “The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe does not exist within the meaning of federal law” (*Oakland Tribune*, December 6, 2002, Local p. 6). The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe responded that this was an unlawful political decision, and filed suit in U.S. District Court. Its attorney argued that the entire federal recognition process is grossly unfair, since it requires all tribes to document a continuous community during periods of history when both governmental and society-wide economic, social and cultural policies were stifling and destroying tribal identity, preventing the maintenance of the tribe (*Oakland Tribune*, December 6, 2002, Local, p. 6). Since 2006, a number of complex court rulings have allowed their petition to move forward, although no formal BIA ruling has yet been made.

As of 2008, none of the eight petitioning Ohlone/Costanoan groups has been granted federal recognition. They are not the only petitioning groups having difficulty receiving determinations. As of September 2002, a total of 250 tribal recognition cases had been submitted to the BIA, nationwide. Of those 250 cases, only 15 groups had been granted recognition, 19 had been denied recognition, 1 was in “pending determination” status, 2 had been settled through other means, 55 had been sent back to the petitioners as only partially documented, 114 were letter petitions with no documentation, and 21 were being studied or awaiting study by the BIA (Association of American Indian Affairs 2003). A group that monitors the recognition process stated recently, “It will take no fewer than 42 years to complete the processing of the present petition backlog” (Association of American Indian Affairs 2006).

Heritage Resources Protection Since the 1970s

An emerging problem for the Ohlone/Costanoans since the 1970s has been the fact that the strongest laws that protect traditional cultural properties are federal laws, and those federal laws recognize agrievements only to members of federally recognized Indian tribes. Most important among such laws is the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), which provides a process for museums and Federal agencies to return certain Native American cultural items—human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony—to lineal descendents, culturally affiliated Indian tribes, and Native Hawaiian organizations.

Despite the lack of legal standing for non-federally recognized tribes some California institutions have conducted reburials in cooperation with non-federally recognized San Francisco Bay Area Indian groups. In 1989, a year before the passage of NAGPRA, Stanford University, in cooperation with the Muwekma group and other Ohlone/Costanoans, reburied several hundred human skeletons from earlier archaeological excavations and public donations (Cambra 1991; Gomez 1991:24). Not all Ohlone/Costanoans concurred with the idea of massive reburial of museum collections. Andrew Galvan (1990) was a prominent voice against repatriation of the Stanford remains.

It is most often the case that reburied Native American skeletal remains are those discovered from recent ground-disturbing activities. Some have gone to the Ohlone Cemetery in Fremont, but most are reburied on the property where they were disturbed, through agreements reached between property owners, archaeologists, and involved Indians. In 1994 Andrew Galvan estimated that in the last 25 years, he and his father had buried “the remains of about 3,000 Indians” at the Ohlone Indian cemetery, “including bones unearthed at Bay Area construction sites and skeletons relinquished from museum collections” (Bruggers 1994:5A).

Some Ohlone/Costanoans have chosen to become archaeologists. In 1984 the Muwekma Ohlone tribe established the first Ohlone/Costanoan cultural resource management firm, Ohlone Families Consulting Services. It was created to “address the burial issue and assist Indian families” (Cambra 1991:426; Field et.al. 1992a:421). That entity has discontinued direct archaeological research work since the 1990s. Another Ohlone/Costanoan, Andrew Galvan, participated in the establishment of Archaeor, an archaeological research firm, during the mid-1990s. Archaeor continues to do archaeological research in 2008 (see <http://www.archaeor.com>).

Today individual Ohlone/Costanoans serve in one or more capacities when ancestral cultural sites are affected, as most likely descendants (MLDs) for purposes of deciding upon the disposition of discovered human remains, as monitors during ground-disturbing activities, and even as archaeologists. Individual perspectives can vary greatly when it comes to issues of site protection and preservation, such as: (1) what capacity, if any, to serve in; (2) whether to oppose development projects outright; (3) how to mitigate impacts of proposed developments; (4) whether or how much to allow analysis of human remains and cultural objects; (5) whether or what objects may be archived in museums or put on public display; and (6) whether human remains should remain in situ, be buried as near as possible to the place where they were originally found, or be buried at a dedicated cemetery (see, for instance, Cambra 1991; Jacobus 1993; Brinson 1994; Rockstroh 1994; Frederick 1996:5,12-15; Rosenberg 2000; Yamane 2002b:201-204).

Those Ohlone/Costanoans who choose to serve as MLDs relative to the disposition of human remains under California law are assigned to specific cases by the Native American Heritage Commission. As of 2006, the Heritage Commission utilized a two-tiered approach in assigning MLDs in traditional Ohlone/Costanoan territories. People who can trace their ancestry to specific village locations are called in as MLDs if unmarked graves are discovered in the vicinity of the village. Where no Ohlone/Costanoan families have ties to local villages, MLDs are assigned in sequential

order from the full list of potential Ohlone/Costanoan MLDs (Larry Myers, personal communication to Randall Milliken, 2006).

The Gaming Issue in Ohlone/Costanoan Territory

The proliferation of casinos on Indian lands in California since the 1980s affects Ohlone/Costanoans in two ways. First, as Ohlone/Costanoan groups move forward with attempts to seek federal recognition and a land base, they find themselves opposed by neighbors who accuse them of being interested only in starting a casino. Second, year by year they witness one non-local untermiated tribe after another attempt to gain permission to buy land and set up a casino somewhere within traditional Ohlone/Costanoan territory in the potentially lucrative San Francisco Bay Area.

The background to the development of Indian gaming in California dates to the early 1980s, when some federally recognized southern California tribes sought to develop slot machine and card game gambling. Those efforts were blocked by local law enforcement because “Nevada-style” gambling was prohibited under the California constitution. The tribes, who held their lands as sovereign nations, to a certain extent outside of state and local jurisdiction, sued in federal court to be able to conduct gaming on their lands. In the 1987 *Cabazon/Morongo* decision, the United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of the tribes. The federal government then stepped in to exercise a measure of regulatory control of gambling on all Indian reservations.

In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA). The IGRA established a federal commission to oversee tribal gaming operations and gave federally recognized tribes various levels of jurisdiction over three classes of gaming. They were given complete control over traditional tribal gambling (Class I); control with commission approval over bingo and non-banked card games (Class II), if the state where they resided allowed such games; and the ability to carry out Nevada-style gambling (Class III) in cases where they could make a compact with their own state government.

Blocked by the California state constitution from developing gaming compacts with the state government, a group of California federally recognized tribes put an initiative on the state ballot—the Tribal Government Gaming and Economic Self-Sufficiency Act—to overturn the prohibition. It passed overwhelmingly in the November of 1998 election. The Indian victory was short lived, however, as the California Supreme Court overturned the law as unconstitutional. In response, a coalition of 58 tribes then put a follow-up initiative for a constitutional amendment on the ballot. California voters passed this amendment, called the “California Indian Self-Reliance Act,” in March of 2000. It allows Nevada-style gambling and delineates how the proceeds will be shared among California’s tribes.

Under the IGRA’s Section 20, terminated tribes that have been restored to Federal recognition, but are landless, can acquire new lands to put into trust for gaming purposes if they can show significant historic or cultural ties to the land in question. But as of 2006 no Ohlone/Costanoan groups were federally recognized. Therefore they have been excluded from moving forward with gaming under the IGRA.

Recently restored California tribes from outside of the San Francisco Bay Area, rendered landless in the earlier termination cycle, have been seeking to purchase land and establish casinos on lands within Ohlone/Costanoan territory under IGRA Section 20. They include: (1) Scotts Valley (Sugar Bowl) Rancheria, which has proposed a casino on industrial land near Richmond; (2) Guidiville Rancheria, which has proposed a casino at Point Molate with the concurrence of the Richmond City Council. They have been opposed by Muwekma; (3) The Lower Lake Koi Tribe, which proposed to establish a casino near the Oakland Airport, but has since withdrawn its application. They had been opposed by Muwekma (field data of Beverly Ortiz). Additionally, a never-terminated, but reconstituted tribe, the California Valley Miwok, proposed to establish a casino within Mutsun Ohlone territory near Hollister. They were opposed by the Amah Mutsun Tribal

Band of Costanoan/Ohlone Indians and have since withdrawn that application, although a new one is pending within Mutsun territory (field data of Beverly Ortiz).

One terminated rancheria—the Lytton Rancheria—has been successful in establishing a territorial base within Ohlone/Costanoan territory in San Pablo on the east side of San Francisco Bay. The Lytton Rancheria membership are Southern Pomo and Wappo descendants whose original rancheria was in the Alexander Valley, Sonoma County. They were able to have the federal government purchase a one-time card room, Casino San Pablo, and its adjacent parking lot, in trust on their behalf due to an amendment placed by Congressman George Miller on a 2000 Federal Omnibus Indian spending bill. They currently run electronic bingo games at the site. As of 2006 two bills are pending that would restrict gaming at this site by the Lytton Rancheria, Senate Bill 113 which would repeal the allotment of lands to Lytton Rancheria, and House Bill 2353 which would require the tribe to meet the administrative provisions of Section 20.

Federal law directs that land purchases for newly restored tribes are to be made within areas with which the tribe has historic or cultural ties. To meet this qualification, the restored tribes that want to purchase San Francisco Bay Area lands have made a number of arguments. Some have claimed they once passed through Ohlone territory to trade. Some have noted that parts of Ohlone territory were within their BIA Service Area following twentieth-century relocation. Some have asserted cultural ties to Ohlone territory without any historical evidence. During an April 28, 2006, consultation hearing about proposed revisions to Section 20 in Sacramento, the BIA's Director of the Office of Indian Gaming Management, George T. Skibine, stated that Congress did not intend historic or cultural ties to be limited to traditional tribal territory, although this is the central concern for Ohlone/Costanoans seeking federal recognition (personal communication with Beverly Ortiz). In sum, the issue of Indian gaming in California, and in traditional Ohlone/Costanoan lands, is fluid and changing rapidly.

Ohlone/Costanoan Cultural Expression

Since the 1970s many Ohlone/Costanoans have participated in intertribal pan-Indian events—gatherings, picnics, meetings and pow-wows—that have helped to foster renewed pride in their American Indian heritage. Pan-Indian activities, while generally rooted in Plains Indian expression, are a central means of public affirmation for Indians from all areas, both unifying them and providing a context for the development of the contemporary indigenous revival of each group. Many Ohlone/Costanoan people who have participated in pan-Indian activities have been stimulated to develop California Indian cultural traditions and the unique traditions of their own specific ancestors.

Linda Yamane has probably been the single most active individual in the field of Ohlone/Costanoan material culture revival. She is a descendent of Margarita Maria (SCA-B 32) of Tucutnut, the largest village of the Rumsen local tribe of the Carmel Valley when the Spanish arrived. For about two decades Yamane has been tracing the history of the Rumsen Costanoan language group and resurrecting aspects of a rich cultural tradition.⁴⁸ Her work has included the revival of the skill of making traditional baskets, including how to properly harvest the sedge, willow, bracken fern, bulrush and other plants which provide the raw materials for this practical art form. She has edited books of stories and histories of her people. She has also recovered Ohlone/Costanoan musical forms, traditional games and how to make tule boats. Yamane describes her purpose in her own words here:

⁴⁸ The Rumsen local tribe spoke the language codified in the linguistic literature as Rumsen Costanoan. Some descendents, among them Linda Yamane, prefer the spelling Rumsien, following an alternative orthographic tradition.

Our language, stories, baskets and songs connect us to our past. They connect us to the people we have come from and to this place that is our home and the home of our ancestors. These things empower us with the truth. They defy the stereotypes. They bring us pride and dignity—and they bring honor and respect to our ancestors (Linda Yamane, personal communication to Beverly Ortiz, 1995).

Yamane not only works to revive language and material culture skills for her own people, but also shares her successes by teaching others and educating the public through museum and park programs.

The tradition of reaching out to teach the public at large about the heritage of the various Ohlone/Costanoan language groups was initiated many years ago by some of the people who are now elders. Joe Mondragon (Interview 2003) described to us how he gave talks in schools in the Gilroy area in his younger days. Philip Galvan (Interview 2003) told us similar stories about his teaching activities in the San Francisco Bay Area, with special thanks to a boss who allowed him to give talks at schools during his lunch hour.

Patrick Orozco of the Watsonville area, has been actively sharing information about Ohlone/Costanoan material and spiritual culture for over 30 years in the Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey County areas, visiting schools, parks, and community events. Although he is Chumash and Ajachmen by heritage, he grew up in Watsonville and was married to a Rumsen woman. In 1978 Orozco established a dance group, Amah-Ka-Tura. He was inspired to establish the group out of a desire to bring songs that had been recorded in the early 1900s by anthropologists in written form or on wax cylinders “back to life.” By 1996 Amah-Ka-Tura had grown to include some 15 dancers, aged six to 29, of multiracial background. Today the group, with a repertoire of some 30 songs, includes Rumsen, Pomo and Chippewa members, among others (Patrick Orozco, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 2006). As a representative of the Pajaro Valley Indian Council, Orozco shares the remembered songs, dances, and stories, shows dance regalia and musical instruments, and promotes respect for his cultural legacy within the larger public (Yamane 2002b:99, 217).

The Humaya Dancers are another group that features interpretations of traditional Ohlone/Costanoan dances. The original Humaya Dancers were founded by Chemo Candelaria in 1986. Candelaria, an American Indian Movement activist, was a member of Amah-Ka-Tura for many years, where he learned most of the songs and dances presented by the Humaya dancers. His repertoire also included a closing song shared with him by “Grandpa” Raymond Stone (Paiute/Shoshone). Years later, Tony Cerda, Chair of the Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, began a second Humaya Dancers after meeting Candelaria.⁴⁹ Cerda received some song tapes from Patrick Orozco, who he first met at a gathering of American Indians in Washington, D.C. The second Humaya Dancers, whose repertoire is similar to that of the first, has its own unique interpretation of the songs (Chemo Candelaria, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 1984-1987; Chemo Candelaria Interview 2003; Patrick Orozco, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 2006).

A modern group that is reviving traditional Ohlone/Costanoan songs of the Monterey Bay Area is the Mak Tcunnui Singers. Their songs derive from early wax cylinder recordings re-recorded onto cassette tapes. Linda Yamane obtained the materials and began to share Rumsen songs with other Rumsens and the general public in the early 1990s. Soon, she was joined in singing by Carol Bachmann (Ohlone), Marie Bonillas (Rumsen/Mutsun), Jacquelin Jensen Kehl (Mutsun), and Richard Miranda (Rumsen), who took the name Mak Tcunnui Singers.

⁴⁹ Recent cultural transmission among Ohlone/Costanoans has occasionally involved non-local Indians. For instance, Cerda and Candelaria met through Robert John, a protégé of Paiute elder and medicine man Raymond Stone (Chemo Candelaria, Interview, 2003).

Ann Marie Sayers, Mission San Juan Bautista descendent, has developed a center for traditional California Indian ritual and healing, including a traditional dance house, on her property at Indian Canyon near Hollister. In opening her property for various cultural activities by California Indians and others, Sayers follows a tradition learned from her mother:

My mother believed that when ceremony stops, so does the earth. I too believe it. She would feed 20, 30, 40 people every weekend. And, some people ... like the Williamsons [Ann Marie's godparents] when they came down, they'd bring three or four cases of tuna and sardines . . . they had Fortune Fisheries. If they worked in the fields, they'd bring a crate or two of whatever it was that they worked with. And, they'd go home sometimes with more than what they would come. That was the thinking of sharing, which was very beautiful (Sayers Interview 2003).

Sayers hosts an annual Indian Canyon California Indian Storytelling Festival and Native Art Show. Also, groups of school children come to Indian Canyon to see its ethno-botanical display and Ohlone/Costanoan crafts and traditional structures (Imrie 2002, Sayers 2002).

Language Restoration Programs

Descendents of the speakers of three different Costanoan languages have begun to revive those languages. They have been aided by participation in one or more of the biennial "Breath of Life" workshops, weeklong language workshops held at UC Berkeley. The Breath of Life program was established by Professor of Linguistics Leanne Hinton (1996:189-247), who also coordinates a master-apprentice program in California Indian languages. At the workshops, linguists are partnered with community members who want to restore their ancestral languages, but have no living speakers from whom to learn. The workshops grew out of a 1992 Tribal Scholars Language Conference, which brought California Indians from every region of the state together at a Marin County site to discuss ways to keep California Indian languages alive. Linda Yamane (Mission Carmel descendent) was one of several participants at the original 1992 conference.

Rumsen Language Restoration – In 1987 Linda Yamane became the first Ohlone to initiate research with the goal of restoring her ancestral language, called Rumsen by linguists and called Rumsien by Yamane herself. She accessed the J. P. Harrington linguistic field notes on microfilm at San Jose State University, taking notes, microcopying pages, and painstakingly mastering Harrington's unique writing system so she could speak, sing and write poetry in the language. She listened to and mastered ancestral songs, converted from early wax cylinders onto cassette tapes. In the process she accessed personally meaningful details of cultural knowledge. (Linda Yamane, personal communication with Beverly Ortiz, 2006).

[Y]ou look through everything and find all the pieces, and eventually you hope that you can put it all together right. But there is just so much there... It's not just words on a piece of paper, but it's saving something from the past that connects with people now (Yamane [1992] in Hinton 1996:207).

Mutsun Language Restoration – When Quirina Luna-Costillas found a publication of Mutsun words and phrases recorded by Spanish priest Arroyo de la Cuesta, she began a quest to revive the language. She and her cousin, Lisa Carrier, have attended all but one of the Breath of Life workshops held at U.C. Berkeley since the summer of 1992. They have poured through J. P. Harrington's Mutsun field notes and Marc Okrand's 1977 Mutsun grammar. Luna-Costillas and Carrier founded the Mutsun Language Foundation in 2001. The Mutsun Language Foundation has developed a variety of interactive language learning tools, including flash cards, recordings, phrase books, coloring books, and a limited distribution Mutsun version of the Dr. Seuss classic *Green Eggs and Ham* that uses the words for "snake-like" to represent a train (Schulman 2001). Luna-Costillas and Carrier

have also collaborated with linguist Natasha Warner on a Mutsun dictionary. Luna-Costillas's third child Jonathan, having been raised hearing Mutsun spoken in his home, actually spoke his first word in Mutsun (Maclay 2002). Several Mutsuns meet monthly to study and speak the language together. Recent activities by the Mutsun Language Foundation (2006) are described on their active website.

Chochenyo Language Restoration – In July of 2003 Juliette Blevins, a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley, and Jon Rodney, a UC Berkeley linguistics graduate student, began working with six Muwekma tribal members, all women, who wanted to learn Chochenyo, the San Francisco Bay Costanoan dialect of the Mission San Jose area (Tremain 2004:16). Muwekma member Shelia Guzman, whose paternal great-grandfather was Harrington consultant Jose Guzman, had become interested in her heritage after the birth of her first child in 1994. Guzman participated with the other women, including Monica Arrellano, Gloria Arrellano and Michelle Sanchez, in the 2003 Breath of Life workshop at UC Berkeley. At the workshop, Guzman developed a song she entitled “Ten Little Coyotes” in the Chochenyo language, to the tune of Ten Little Indians (Tremain 2004:16-19). In 2004 the women went to Connecticut to share with the Mashantucket Pequot, who had started a language group of their own (Alan Leventhal Interview 2003).

Internal Group Dynamics and Inter-Group Tensions

Today's organized Ohlone/Costanoan groups exist by the consent of their membership. Modern Ohlone/Costanoan groups maintain their identities through their programmatic efforts to reach their goals (such as working on federal recognition or on their language programs), through their group social gatherings and internal governmental meetings, and for some, through their efforts to have their interests recognized by local representatives of federal, state, and county governments and special districts. No laws at any level of government decide how they should be organized or what their goals should be.

For the larger Ohlone/Costanoan groups, no events are more important than their annual gatherings. The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area has been holding such gatherings since the 1980s. In recent years they have gathered for Christmas parties, often at Stanford University, with recent attendances topping 180 tribal members. The Muwekma Ohlone have also organized a tribal “cultural campout” in the summer months at Del Valle Regional Park every year since 2001, with attendance often approaching 100. Farther south, the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Costanoan/Ohlone Indians have been holding annual gatherings in recent years. Their September 2005 gathering, chaired by Valentin Lopez, included presentations by Maidu, Miwok, and Pomo dance groups (Tumgoren 2004). According to Quirina Luna-Costillas, it was the first time in nearly 100 years that the Mutsun had danced (Tumgoren 2004).

As group self-awareness and cultural consciousness has grown, so to has tension and disagreement over leadership, goals, and legitimacy within geographic areas. During the last two decades, eight Ohlone/Costanoan groups have initiated the process for federal recognition, as was noted in a section above. Four of those groups derive predominately from Mission San Carlos Borromeo families (Costanoan Band of Carmel Mission Indians, Esselen/Costanoan Tribe of Monterey County, Ohlone/Costanoan - Esselen Nation, Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe), one derives predominately from San Juan Bautista families (Amah/Mutsun Band of Ohlone/Costanoan Indians), two derive from the general Monterey Bay Area (Costanoan Ohlone Rumsen-Mutsun Tribe and Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan/Mutsun Indians) and one derives predominately from Mission San Jose families (Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe). The fact that four separate groups from Mission San Carlos Borromeo (Carmel) have sought federal recognition reflects fission among those Carmel descendants. Serious disagreements regarding goals and leadership have also taken place among Mission San Juan Bautista and Mission San Jose descendants, although they have not been reflected in multiple recognition petitions. Among the Amah group of Mission San Juan Bautista, a

split occurred in the late 1990s, driven by controversy over the legitimacy of officer elections; the split left one faction in control of the group's non-profit organization and the other faction in charge of the group's large annual gathering. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, while maintaining its core leadership and a very large membership, has seen some of its original members leave the group, in some cases to represent Ohlone/Costanoan interests as individuals, and in one case to found a Northern Valley Yokuts group in the Stockton area.

A major source of disagreement between Ohlone/Costanoan groups regards the geographical extent of west-central California territory which one group or individual may rightfully represent in the public arena. Ohlone/Costanoan people are often asked to participate in cultural events sponsored by federal, state, and local agencies. One long-standing public event, initiated in 1985, is "Ohlone Days" at Henry Cowell State Park in central Santa Clara County, where descendants of the Mission San Carlos Borromeo, Mission San Juan Bautista and Mission San Jose Ohlone/Costanoans have presented songs, stories, and material arts (Uccello 1995). Another is the "Gathering of Ohlone Peoples" at Coyote Hills Regional Park in southwest Alameda County, where Mission San Carlos Borromeo, Mission San Juan Bautista, and Mission San Jose descendants have gathered since 1994, again to share songs, stories, and material arts. While all Ohlone/Costanoan descendants are invited to most such public events, some Ohlone/Costanoan groups have chosen not to participate out of a concern that "pan-Ohlone" involvement in presenting culture to the public misrepresents the geographic, cultural, and historic differences among the Indian descendants from separate Franciscan mission areas and separate specific Costanoan language traditions.

Interaction and Non-Interaction with the GGNRA

Since its inception, the GGNRA has reached out to the full list of Ohlone/Costanoan groups from the San Francisco to the Monterey Bay Area, inviting them to partake in park utilization planning sessions and cultural interpretation activities without regard to the degree of their ancestral association with the San Francisco Peninsula. Some Ohlone/Costanoan groups and unaffiliated individuals have been very active in their participation in one or both of these types of activities. (The detailed history of such interaction is beyond the scope of this report.)

The largest San Francisco Bay Area Ohlone/Costanoan group, the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, has not been formally involved in GGNRA park planning or cultural interpretation. They take the stance that they cannot participate in government-organized cultural events at the Presidio, in light of the fact that Monterey Bay Area Ohlone/Costanoans are invited and recognized by GGNRA staff as representatives of the indigenous people of the San Francisco Bay Area.

In addition to formally sanctioning cultural interpretation events, the National Park Services has accommodated Ohlone/Costanoan requests to use GGNRA lands for their own ceremonies. At one such event, Elder Tony Cerda of the Costanoan-Rumsen Carmel Tribe performed a healing ceremony, the purpose and import of which he described as follows:

The whole world is alive... It's not a dead thing going around in space... What we did was healing ceremonies for the land. And we did that right on the beach. And right there we had all the elements; we had the water, the land, the fire, and the wind... When we do a healing, a land ceremony, we call the spirits in, and we feed those spirits, and we ask them to join us, and we feed them, and then we send them off. When we do a crossover ceremony, we bring all those spirits in, and we send them off to the Creator. Now, I believe that, like I said before, we're a spirit in a human body. Where did we come from? We came from the spirit world. Where are we going? We're going back to the spirit world. Now, every indigenous culture in the world believes that (Cerda Interview 2003).

