

Annotated Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ames History Museum. Iowa Governor Robert Ray is pictured with Maria Pearson, and her husband, John. 1976. *Ames History Museum*. Accessed 20 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of Maria Pearson, her husband, and Governor Robert Ray. The two first met as Maria demanded the reburial of a Native American girl's remains after they were uncovered. Governor Ray continued to work with her, in order to make changes to Iowa's burial code, inspiring other states to follow suit, and the eventual creation of NAGPRA. This source provided me with an image of the two together, proving the diplomacy which took place between them.

---. *Maria Pearson*. *Ames History Museum*. Accessed 26 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is an image of Maria Pearson. She was a Native American activist who was directly involved with Iowa's modifications to their burial code, which protected Native American graves and remains. This inspired other states, and Washington D.C., to recognize the issue and begin making changes of their own. This source provided me with a visual for my website that showed Maria Pearson in the years of her life when she was advocating for laws like NAGPRA to be passed.

Austin, Jan. Two skeletons found in La Jolla, California, in 1976 date back at least 9,500 years. 1 Sept. 1976. *The UCSD Guardian*, UCSD Guardian. Accessed 24 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of two Native American remains found on UCSD's campus in 1976. They were stored and studied at the San Diego

Archaeological Center for decades, despite Native American outcry. After its passage, the remains were filled for under NAGPRA, and became known as the La Jolla remains. This source allowed for me to visually see the remains that were fought over in the La Jolla case, which I used in my project.

Bachor, Susan. E-mail interview with the author. 2 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is an interview that I conducted with Susan Bachor, an archaeologist, and Historic Preservation Officer for the Delaware Tribe. I was referred to her by Katelyn Lucas, and I asked her if she would be able to assist me in my project by providing me with examples of the Delaware Tribe's experience with NAGPRA. She offered to set up a meeting with me, and I sent her a list of questions, but our conversation ultimately failed to materialize. This source provided me with a concept of the Delaware Tribe's work with NAGPRA, allowing me to further research this idea on my own.

"Back to Manahatta." *Vimeo*, uploaded by Stewart Huntington, Vimeo.com, 15 Nov. 2021.

Accessed 8 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is a short documentary about the Lenape, published in collaboration with them. The film discusses their erasure from their homelands, and current efforts to return to these sacred lands of their ancestors. Cities like Manhattan have forgotten their original inhabitants, prompting the Lenape to attempt to re-establish a presence there, as described in this film. This source provided me with background on the Lenape tribe, and some of the erasure that they have had to endure due to colonialism, which assisted me during my interview with Delaware Tribe representative Susan Bachor.

Baker, Reid. Northern Cheyenne tribal member and cultural leader William Tallbull accepting tape duplicates of Cheyenne wax cylinder recordings and other materials being presented by Senator John Melchor of Montana on behalf of the Federal Cylinder Project and the American Folklife Center during a ceremony at the Library of Congress on September 29, 1986. 26 Sept. 1986. *Library of Congress*, Congress.gov / United States Copyright Office. Accessed 7 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of Senator John Melcher and William Tallbull at a ceremony at the Library of Congress. In the photograph, Melcher is presenting Tallbull with Cheyenne wax cylinder recordings and other materials. The two had previously collaborated in drafting Melcher's "Bones Bill," which was the predecessor to NMAI and NAGPRA. This source provided me with a photograph of the two collaborating like they did to draft the bill, which I used when I mentioned Tallbull and Melcher in my project.

"Bones of Contention." Produced by BBC. *Horizon*, produced by BBC, season 31, episode 9, BBC, 23 Jan. 1995. *Internet Archive*. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a television program which aired while NAGPRA was a new law, and debates between Native Americans and archaeologists were common. This program discusses both points of view, with many Native Americans, including Maria Pearson, explaining why they feel that their bones should not be treated as decorations to be hung in a museum, or artifacts to be studied. Multiple archaeologists also had the opportunity to comment, sharing their belief that knowledge will be lost if native bones are repatriated. This source

allowed me to hear both sides of this initial debate, as well as start to understand how NAGPRA might be better carried out, pleasing both parties.

Brinton, Daniel G. "The Aims of Anthropology." *Science*, vol. 2, no. 35, 1895, pp. 241-52.

JSTOR. Accessed 30 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article from a scholarly journal, published in 1895. This article was written when archaeology was a fairly new field, and its goal was to explain the purpose of archaeologists to a wide audience. The ruthless nature of early archaeologists is conveyed well in this article, as grave robbing in the name of study is described in depth. This source provided me with quotes that explain how archaeologists and museums came to hold so many Native American remains and cultural objects, which I used in my project.

Bush, George H.W. "Statement on Signing the National Museum of the American Indian Act."

28 Nov. 1989. *The American Presidency Project*, edited by John Woolley and Gerhard Peters. Accessed 14 Nov. 2021. Address.

This primary source is a transcript of the signing statement that President George H.W. Bush made when signing NMAI. He shared his opinion on the law, highlighting its importance for many natives, and his hope for a future that would be more inclusive and welcoming towards Native Americans. Since NMAI was the predecessor to NAGPRA, this source provided me with background on what the president thought of these laws, as well as giving me a better understanding of NMAI itself.

Delaware Tribe of Indians. The Delaware Tribe (and Delaware Nation) are helping Pennsbury

Manor to help them better interpret the role of Penn's Lenape neighbors. 13 Aug. 2019.

Delaware Tribe of Indians, Official Site of the Delaware Tribe of Indians. Accessed 7 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of representatives of the Delaware Tribe of Indians and Doug Miller, of Pennsbury Manor. The representatives of the tribe were touring sites through money awarded to them from the NAGPRA Grants Program. They visited Pennsbury Manor on this trip, prompting them to later select the manor as a site for an upcoming reburial, which I had a conversation with Doug Miller about. This source provided me with a representation of some of the diplomacy and collaborations which have come out of NAGPRA, with this collaboration specifically leading to a recent repatriation case that I included in my project.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Private collection of Native American artifacts of Indiana man Don Miller*. 2014. *Washington Post*, *Chicago Tribune*. Accessed 22 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of a private collection of Native American artifacts. Since they were a part of a private collection, they were largely unknown, but were also not subject to NAGPRA. This source helped me to understand the relationship between private collections and NAGPRA, and was a photograph that I could display on my website when discussing this issue.

The Goldfinch. "Maria Running Moccasins Pearson." *The Goldfinch*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1 Dec. 1993, pp. 21+. *The Goldfinch*. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This primary source, an article in an Iowa history magazine for children, provides an overview of Maria Pearson, or Running Moccasins. Many credit her to be the first to begin the fight for the preservation of Native American remains and

cultural objects, and the article discusses how she convinced Iowan government to pass the first law in the United States which provided protection to Indian burial grounds. This was accomplished through starting the Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) in 1976. Therefore, this source provided me with background on Pearson and her commitment to the protection of Native remains, making her a key figure in the passage of NAGPRA many years later. I used this and the quotes that were included from Pearson and her grandson in my project.

Google. British Museum's North America Galleries. 2015. *British Museum*, Trustees of the British Museum. Accessed 22 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a view of a display in the British Museum, in their North American Galleries. Since U.S. law does not extend to other countries, NAGPRA does not apply to any of the objects shown in this particular display. This source was used on my website, as it provided me with a greater understanding of the amount of Native American remains and cultural objects which are in international museums, and cannot be repatriated.

Gottlieb, Jeff. "Battle of the Bones." *The Washington Post*, 25 July 1989. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a newspaper article from before NAGPRA was passed. It tells of a debate between Stanford University and University of California at Berkeley over repatriation of Native remains. Stanford had recently repatriated 550 Ohlone Indian skeletons, but Berkeley strongly disapproved of this, with one anthropologist claiming that they would not return any remains to anyone. This source provided me with insight on the shockingly negative stance of

anthropologists on repatriation, before NAGPRA was passed. The anthropologist in this article made many interesting statements in this article, which I found to be eye-opening.

Gross, Jane. "Stanford Agrees to Return Ancient Bones to Indians." *The New York Times* [New York City], 24 June 1989. *Times Machine*. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a newspaper article that discusses a repatriation that took place before NAGPRA was passed. Stanford University had agreed to repatriate the remains of 550 Ohlone Indians, after two years of consultations between the university and the tribe. This event was unheard of, and many began to speculate that it would put pressure on other universities, museums, and other institutions to return what Native remains and cultural objects that they had. Despite backlash from members of the scientific community, Stanford went through with the repatriation. This source provided me with an example of an early repatriation, before NAGPRA, and allowed me to see how repatriations such as this one might have led to NAGPRA's passage.

Hadden, Marcella. *Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe Reburial Ceremony*. 2014. *New York Times*. Accessed 26 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of a reburial ceremony held by the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe. The remains were held by the University of Michigan until they were repatriated under NAGPRA in 2014. This source provided me with a greater appreciation for reburial and homecoming ceremonies held for repatriated remains and cultural objects, and was a picture that I could use to show reburials on my website.

Harjo, Suzan Shown. "Last Rites for Indian Dead: Treating Remains Like Artifacts Is Intolerable." *Los Angeles Times*, 16 Sept. 1989. Accessed 29 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a newspaper article that reports on the horrors of grave-robbing and the purposeful beheading of Native Americans in the 1800s, in order for scientists to study Native brains and other remains. These remains are still with scientists in museums, and Native tribes who had been robbed of their ancestors have yet to experience any benefits from having their remains studied. In this article Suzan Harjo makes it clear that Congress must act on this issue, as repatriations were not happening on their own. This source allowed me to understand how the push began for Congress to create a law that required repatriations, eventually causing NAGPRA to be passed.

Hennepin County Library. *Measuring a Burial Pit*. 22 July 1928. *Hennepin County Library*. Accessed 25 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of an archaeological expedition conducted in 1928. The photograph shows members of the expedition investigating a Native American burial pit. This source provided me with a better understanding of early archaeological expeditions, and the way that they frequently violated the privacy and beliefs of Native Americans.

Indian Record. *Route of the Longest Walk*. Indian Record, 1978. *Google Books*, Google. Accessed 20 Feb. 2022. Map.

This primary source is a map outlining the route that protesters planned to take during the Longest Walk in 1978. The map was published in the Indian Record, the newsletter for the Bureau of Indian Affairs employees. This source provided

me with an idea of the sheer distance that the Longest Walk spanned, as well as acted as an image that I was able to use while discussing the Longest Walk.

Johnson, Janet. E-mail interview with the author. 6 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is an interview that I conducted with Janet Johnson, a curator at the Pennsylvania State Museum. I initially contacted her to discuss the State Museum's 2000 repatriation of human remains and grave goods to the Delaware Tribe. She also provided me with information and images of consultations with the Delaware Tribe, as well as her personal reflection on NAGPRA. This source provided me with a better understanding of both the failures and successes of NAGPRA, and a picture of a diplomatic consultation which I displayed on my website.

Joseph, Young, and William H. Hare. "An Indian's Views of Indian Affairs." *The North*

American Review, vol. 128, no. 269, 1879, pp. 412-33. *JSTOR*. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is an article from a journal, published in 1879. The article was written by Chief Young Joseph of the Nez Perce tribe. His intent in writing this article was to convey the true culture of Native Americans, which White settlers had not bothered to understand, as they only sought to steal Native land. At one point, he recounts the death of his father, proving the respect that Native Americans show for the dead and their graves. This source provided me with background on the initial misunderstanding of Native culture, as well as some quotes that show their honoring of those who have passed away, which I included in my project.

Kintigh, Keith W. Letter to Daniel K. Inouye. 3 June 1999. *Research Laboratories of Archaeology*, Archaeology @ Carolina. Accessed 24 Nov. 2021.

This primary source was a letter written from the president of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) to the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, of the U.S. Senate Committee of Indian Affairs. In the letter, the president sought to answer a question that Inouye had posed, regarding what issues one might find in a broad interpretation of the term "cultural affiliation." He states that SAA fears that with too broad an understanding of cultural affiliation, the intended definition of the term will be lost, and any tribe, with or without an identity that can be traced back to the artifact or remain in question, will be able to claim cultural affiliation to the artifact or remain. This source allowed me to better understand an issue that archaeologists had with NAGPRA in its early years, as well as opening my eyes to the fact that debates occurred over nearly every aspect of NAGPRA, even down to the definitions of words used in the law itself.

Lewis, Peter H. "ISSUE AND DEBATE; Indian Bones: Balancing Research Goals and Tribes' Rights." *The New York Times* [New York City], 20 May 1986, C3 sec., p. 51. *Times Machine*. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a newspaper article published before NAGPRA was passed. It discusses the issue of improper ownership of Native American remains by museums, and the outcries of Native Americans to have them returned. It references "The Longest Walk," a walk in which emerging Native American activists walked across the nation in order to call attention to native issues, one of which being the mistreatment and improper ownership of Native American

remains. This source allowed me to understand the general view on the Native American rights movement of the time, as well as how events like "The Longest Walk" influenced the eventual passage of NAGPRA.

Lucas, Katelyn. E-mail interview with the author. 23 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an interview that I conducted with Katelyn Lucas, Historic Preservation Officer at the Museum of Indian Culture in Allentown, Pennsylvania. Since the office is affiliated with the Delaware Nation, and is located on Pennsylvania Lenape grounds, I reached out in hopes of gaining perspective on the ways in which NAGPRA works with local tribes, both recognized and unrecognized. However, I was told that discussing unrecognized tribes like the Pennsylvania Lenape went against the belief of the Delaware Nation that there were no longer any Native Americans in Pennsylvania. This interview provided me with another debate that is present in this topic, occurring between recognized and unrecognized tribes, as well as provided me with another interview, as Ms. Lucas referred me to Susan Bachor of the Delaware Tribe instead.

Meighan, Clement W. "Some Scholars' Views on Reburial." *American Antiquity*, vol. 57, no. 4, Oct. 1992, pp. 704-10. Accessed 31 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article from an issue of a scholarly journal, published as the repatriation movement was gaining traction, due to the recent passage of NAGPRA. The article highlights the negative views that many scholars had on repatriation at the time. They feared that there would be terrible setbacks to the field of archaeology, and that their concerns would be ignored, due to the anti-

archaeology stance that was becoming common. This source provided me with background on the general perspective of many scholars when NAGPRA was a new law, and included quotes that I used in my project.

Messinger, Carla. E-mail interview with the author. 28 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is an interview that I had with Carla Messinger of the Pennsylvania Lenape. I contacted her after reading her book *When the Shadbush Blooms*. As an unrecognized tribal member, she gave me a different opinion on NAGPRA than the Delaware Tribe and Nation did, highlighting its failure to work with unrecognized tribes. Gaining federal recognition has been a difficult battle which remains unresolved for the Pennsylvania Lenape. This source allowed me to gain insight on the difficulties of an unrecognized tribe, especially with NAGPRA, which I was able to use when discussing failures of NAGPRA.

Miller, Doug. E-mail interview with the author. 30 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is an interview of Doug Miller, the site administrator at Pennsbury Manor. After finding an article which suggested that the Delaware Tribe would be reburying the remains of 200 ancestors repatriated under NAGPRA. Mr. Miller and I discussed the upcoming repatriation, as well as the delays which the repatriation has experienced. This source provided me with a better understanding of a local repatriation, and a success of NAGPRA. Moreover, it allowed me to reach out to Janet Johnson, of the Pennsylvania State Museum, who Mr. Miller suggested I contact.

"A Minute with Doug Kiel." *YouTube*, uploaded by Penn Museum, Google, 29 July 2014.

Accessed 23 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a video clip from the Penn Museum. The clip is narrated by Doug Kiel, discussing the Native Voices exhibit that was new to the Penn Museum in 2014. The video mentions the exhibit's goal to display Native American culture in a better light, using Native voices to do so. Rather than showing Native American culture as dying and something to be observed from behind glass, the Penn Museum is actively working with Native Americans, as a result of collaborations from NAGPRA. This source provided me with a greater understanding of the positive legacy of NAGPRA, and was a video clip that I used on my website when discussing NAGPRA's legacy.

Morell, Virginia. "An Anthropological Culture Shift." *Science*, vol. 264, no. 5155, 1 Apr. 1994, pp. 20-22. *Gale Academic OneFile*. Accessed 31 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article from a journal. The article discusses NAGPRA's impact on the field of archaeology, focusing on how the law has changed how archaeologists work. They were working more closely with Native Americans, shifting the power that used to lie in the hands of archaeologists to Native Americans. This source helped to be to understand the legacy of NAGPRA, in the form of the way museums and archaeologists were changed by the law, as well as the healing that it brought to Native Americans by giving them power over their past.

NAGPRA Review Committee. "NAGPRA Logo." *U.S. Department of the Interior*, 15 July 2021. Accessed 13 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is the digital logo for NAGPRA, created by the NAGPRA Review Committee. The logo appears on the Department of the Interior's website,

on pages dedicated to information about NAGPRA. This source provided me with a picture to use on the homepage of my website, as well as a color palette for me to base my web design on.

---. *NAGPRA Review Committee Meeting January 2022*. 31 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the members of the NAGPRA Review Committee during a meeting in January 2022. I attended this meeting, to better understand the purpose and goals of the NAGPRA Review Committee, as well as the work that they are currently doing, in order to improve the law. This source provided me with a way to display how the Review Committee has adapted to COVID, and the way that their work has impacted the law.

National Park Service. *NAGPRA Review Committee Meeting August 2019*. 2019. *National Park Service*, U.S. Department of the Interior. Accessed 22 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the NAGPRA Review Committee at an in-person meeting in 2019. The Committee meets frequently to discuss the implementation of the NAGPRA process, and regulate development of the law. This source provided me with a visual on the NAGPRA Review Committee, and a better idea of what they do.

---. "Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains from Hawai'i in the Possession of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA." *Federal Register*, vol. 62, no. 112, 11 June 1999. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a part of the Federal Register. Under NAGPRA, once a museum completes an inventory of the Native remains and cultural objects under

their possession, they must publish their findings. In this case, the Penn Museum had assessed two Native remains, in consultation with the Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei, the Hawai'i Island Burial Council, and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. The museum had found that the two remains had cultural affiliation to the Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei. By reading this source, I was able to understand the importance of the process of collection inventory.

---. "Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains from Hawaii in the Possession of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA; and in the Control of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA." *Federal Register*, vol. 62, no. 133, 11 July 1997. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a section within the Federal Register. It is a notice which is required under NAGPRA, making it known publicly that the Penn Museum had completed an inventory of their collections, and, with the guidance of Hui Malama I Na Kupuna 'O Hawai'i Nei, had assessed remains which they were in ownership of. They found that eight remains were culturally affiliated to the tribe, and were thus repatriated by the Penn Museum on behalf of the Academy of Natural Sciences. This source allowed me to understand the process of assessing Native remains and cultural objects, and publishing the findings which come out of such assessments.

---. "Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects in the Possession of The State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, PA." *Federal Register*, vol. 65, no. 208, 26 Oct. 2000, pp. 64232-33. Accessed 7 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is an article from the Federal Register outlining a repatriation of human remains and associated funerary objects from the Pennsylvania State Museum to the Delaware Tribe of Indians and the Delaware Nation. The museum purchased and had remains and funerary objects donated to them from the Overpeck, Montgomery, Printz Park, Chambers, and Wapwollopen Sites. This source provided me with an example of a successful repatriation from more of a Native American perspective, which I included when I discussed successes of NAGPRA in my project.

---. "Notice of Inventory Completion of Native American Human Remains from the State of Hawaii in the Possession of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA." *Federal Register*, vol. 61, no. 200, 15 Oct. 1996. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a part of the "Notices" section of the Federal Register. It details the inventory of the Penn Museum's collections, as well as the assessment of Native remains done by museum officials and representatives of the Hui Malama I Na Kupuna 'O Hawai'i Nei tribe. Through these tests, sixty-two remains were found to be connected to the tribe, and were repatriated by the museum on behalf of the Academy of Natural Sciences. By using this source, I understood the immense amount of planning and coordination it takes to repatriate Native remains and cultural objects, especially when the amount of remains is quite large, as seen in this case.

---. "Scope of Museum Collections." *Museum Handbook: Museum Collections*, 1990 ed., Washington, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 1990, pp. 44-87.

WebHarvests.gov,

www.webharvest.gov/peth04/20041110043254/http://www.cr.nps.gov/museum/publications/MHI/mushbkI.html. Accessed 13 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a museum handbook, which outlines rules and procedures which museums must follow. In chapter two of this handbook, museum collections are discussed, and the newly created NAGPRA is mentioned. This source provided me with knowledge on how a museum would have dealt with NAGPRA, as well as repatriation on the larger scale, when NAGPRA was a very new law.

National Park Service, and Department of the Interior. "Draft Recommendations Regarding the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects." *Federal Register*, vol. 60, no. 118, 20 June 1995, pp. 32163+. Accessed 31 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article in the Federal Register. It consists of the draft recommendations of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service for an amendment being made to NAGPRA, concerning unaffiliated remains and cultural objects. The article's goal was to outline the proposed procedures for repatriations involving unaffiliated remains and cultural objects, in order to elicit public comment so that appropriate changes could be made. Prior to this, there was no required procedure for dealing with unaffiliated remains, making the process difficult for both museums and tribes. This source provided me with background on the first recommendations for unaffiliated remains, as well as

some quotes that show the government's general perspective on the issue, which I included in my project.

Neiburger, E. J. "Profiting from Reburial." *Nature*, vol. 344, no. 6264, 22 Mar. 1990, p. 297.

Accessed 15 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article in a scholarly journal. The article is a statement made by E.J. Neiburger, an archaeologist who was strongly opposed to repatriation. In his comment, he mentioned that he felt the reburial movement was not concerned with how archaeologists felt about the matter, with activists hastily repatriating remains to unaffiliated tribes. His statements were extremely negative on repatriation, providing me with information and quotes that showed what it was like on the other side of the argument, those who were against the passage of NAGPRA.

New Jersey State Museum. *Dorothy Cross doing archaeological field research at the Abbott Farm site near Trenton in 1937*. 1937. *The Encyclopedia of Greater Philadelphia*, philadelphiaencyclopedia.org/archive/prehistoric-native-americans-and-archaeology/#18988. Accessed 19 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of archaeologist Dorothy Cross doing research at the Abbott Farm site in 1937. The photograph represents the work of many early archaeologists, and how their study of Native American burial sites created the need for NAGPRA. This source provided me with an image to convey this, and I used it when discussing early archaeology on my website.

New York Historical Society. Archaeologists investigating a Native American shell pit. *PANYC Archaeology*. Accessed 19 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of New York archaeologists investigating a Native American shell pit. The photograph represents the curiosity of early archaeologists, and their desire to investigate and study Native American culture.

This source provided me with a visual representation of this desire of archaeologists, which I used on my website.

Oxendine, Tom. "The Longest Walk." *Indian Record*, July 1978, pp. 1+. *Google Books*.

Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is an article from a newsletter meant for employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This article informs on "The Longest Walk," describing both what it is and its purpose. The walk was a walk of Native Americans across the nation, in order to protest the unjust treatment of Native Americans.

Specifically, Native Americans sought to oppose the anti-Native legislation that was being introduced in Congress at the time. This allowed me to gain a better knowledge of the walk, and its significance in Native American history.

Panel for a National Dialogue on Museum/Native American Relation. *Report of the Panel for a National Dialogue on Museum/Native American Relations*. Heard Museum, 28 Feb. 1990. *Society for American Archaeology*. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a report issued by the Panel for a National Dialogue on Museum/Native American Relations. The panel was created in response to the issue of varied opinions on the Native American Museum Claims Commission Act, which was introduced in order to solve the issues surrounding Native remains and cultural objects. A year-long effort was made by panel members to allow collaboration between Native groups and museums, in order to find the best

course of action to keep Native objects and remains safe. The panel provided suggestions on how to accomplish this, as well as repatriations. I was able to see how this panel's findings led to NAGPRA, gaining knowledge of initial debates and diplomacy between tribes and museums.

Penn Museum. Kaagwaantaan Centennial Potlatch Celebration. 24 Oct. 2004. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a photograph of the Tlingit Kaagwaantaan Centennial potlatch celebration, held in October 2004. The organizers of the potlatch reached out to the Penn Museum, in order to have them loan several clan hats to the tribe for use in the celebration. This case of successful diplomacy between the Penn Museum and the Tlingit led to further successes, in the form of repatriations. This source provided me with a photograph that I used in my website, as I discussed the potlatch, as well as a visual display of an outcome of successful diplomacy between a tribe and a museum.

---. The Ravine Frontlet Headdress. 2011. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a photograph of the Ravine Frontlet Headdress of the Takdeintaan Tlingit tribe. This headdress was in the Penn Museum's collections, until it was repatriated to the tribe in 2011. This source provided me with a visual on a cultural object that was successfully repatriated from the Penn Museum, which I used when I discussed the repatriation in my project.

---. *Repatriation Claims Received per Year*. Penn Museum, 2003. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a chart created by the Penn Museum, visually showing how many repatriation claims the museum had received since NAGPRA's passage. The chart starts in 1990, after NAGPRA became law, and goes until

2002. Though the chart begins with few claims, over time the number steadily increases. This source provided me with information on the amount of repatriation claims that the Penn Museum received while NAGPRA was still a fairly new law, and proves that it took time for the law to become more commonplace, as more debates were taking place than repatriations during the first few years.

Penn Museum, and New York Times. "A Collection of Skulls." *New York Times*, 13 June 2011. Accessed 27 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a video clip of Janet Monge from the Penn Museum explaining the Samuel Morton Collection. Morton and his colleague collected skulls and studied them, justifying racism in American by claiming that the larger the cranial surface, the more intelligent a person or group of people are. Therefore, as he found larger skull sizes in Whites than he did Native Americans and African Americans, he was able to incorrectly claim that they were inferior to Whites. This source provided me with an explanation of the racism rooted in scientific fields like archaeology and anthropology, and the need for laws like NAGPRA to give back basic human rights to those subject to this racist way of thinking.

Preucel, Robert W. Tlingit consultation visit with Andrew Gamble, Jr. (Kaagwaantaan clan leader), Herman Davis (L'ooknax. ádi clan leader), and Tom Young (Kaagwaantaan Box House leader). Jan. 2008. *Penn Museum*.

This primary source is a photograph from the Penn Museum. The photo is of three Tlingit leaders wearing Tlingit clan regalia, during a NAGPRA consultation

with the museum. This source provided me with an example of what a consultation between tribal leaders and museum representatives might look like, as well as showed tribal leaders being reunited with cultural objects which they had been separated from.

Sakiestewa, Ramona. *Washington D.C. NMAI Exterior*. 2004. *Ramona Sakiestewa*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the exterior of NMAI in Washington D.C. It was designed by Ramona Sakiestewa, who worked with the project's architects to make the building have cultural significance to Native Americans through its key elements. This source provided me with more information on the significance of NMAI to Native Americans, as well as a visual of the building, which I used on my website.

Science. *UCSD student Aries River Yumul speaks to protesters in favor of repatriation*. 2009. *Vassar*, Vassar College. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of a UCSD student protesting the lawsuit of the University's scientists due to their opposition to the University's choice to repatriate the La Jolla remains. This source provided me with an idea of the stance of those in favor of the repatriation of the La Jolla remains, and served as a photo that I used on my website.

Smithsonian Institution, and Chip Clark. *Kennewick Man*. 2006. *Science*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the skeletal remains of Kennewick Man, laid out to form an anatomically correct skeleton. Anthropologists at the Smithsonian worked with Kennewick Man's nearly 300 bones and bone fragments

to create this skeleton, observing and studying an ancient set of remains as they did so. This source provided me with an idea of how important Kennewick Man was to scientists, and I was able to use it on my website.

---. *Opening of American Indian Museum with Elders on Mall*. 2004. *Smithsonian Institution Archives*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of Native American elders on the Washington D.C. Mall on the day of the 2004 opening of NMAI. After NMAI was enacted in 1989, the combined collections of the Heye Foundation and the Smithsonian were temporarily stored in the lower Manhattan, in the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House. During this time, NMAI was being constructed in Washington D.C. This source provided me with a representation of the Native Americans elders who saw through NMAI's creation, and allowed me to better understand the opening of NMAI in 2004.

---. *Smithsonian physical anthropologists Karin Bruwelheide and Douglas Owsley discuss positioning of the Kennewick Man skeleton during the anatomical layout of the remains*. 2006. *Yakima Herald*, Yakima Herald Republic. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of two Smithsonian anthropologists working with the remains of Kennewick Man. They are discussing the proper anatomical layout of his remains, and studying ancient skeletons through working with the remains of Kennewick Man. This source provided me with a better understanding of the scientific benefits of Kennewick Man to archaeologists and anthropologists, and I was able to use it as a photograph for my website.

Smithsonian Institution, and Brittney Tatchell. *A clay reconstruction of the face of Kennewick Man*. 2014. *Smithsonian Magazine*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the skull of Kennewick Man next to a clay reconstruction of what his face is thought to have looked like. The clay face was based on forensic facial reconstruction. This source provided me with an idea of what Kennewick looked like, and served as a photograph that I was able to use as I discussed Kennewick Man.

Smithsonian Institution, and Jeffrey Wayne Tinsley. *Exterior of the George Gustav Heye Center of the National Museum of the American Indian in the Alexander Hamilton Customs House in New York City prior to its renovation*. 1991. *Smithsonian Institution Archives*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the exterior of the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Custom House in 1991. The photograph was taken prior to the renovations done on the building to turn it into the George Gustav Heye Center of the National Museum of the American Indian. The Heye Center opened in 1994, and temporarily housed most of the collections that would be transferred to NMAI on its opening in 2004. This source provided me with a better understanding of the Heye Center, and I was able to use it as a photograph when I mentioned NMAI on my website.

---. *Installation of Compression Ring*. 2002. *Smithsonian Institution Archives*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of construction on the Washington D.C. NMAI in 2002. At the time of the photograph, construction has been taking place

for about a year, and the building is nearing completion, as it was officially opened in 2004. This source allowed me to understand the work that was involved in the construction of NMAI, as well as served as a photograph that I used on my website.

Smithsonian Institution. *Smithsonian Secretary Robert McCormick Adams signs Memorandum of Understanding with the Museum of American Indian*. 8 May 1989. *American Indian Magazine*, Smithsonian Institution. Accessed 20 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of the Smithsonian Secretary, Robert McCormick Adams, signing the with the Museum of the American Indian, or the Heye Foundation. NMAI caused the two museums to merge their Native American collections, and form the larger National Museum of the American Indian. The Memorandum of Understanding allowed for the transfer of the collections to proceed. This source provided me with a photo that I used on my website of the collaborations that took place for NMAI, and later NAGPRA, to happen.

Society for American Archaeology. "Statement on S. 1980 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act." Letter to Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, 14 May 1990. *Society for American Archaeology*. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a statement issued by the Society for American Archaeology on their views of NAGPRA. While they make it clear that they understand the importance of NAGPRA, and mostly support the legislation, they also make it clear that they find some faults with it. They feared that the scope of cultural affiliation might be too broad, and that excavations might be halted

completely, regardless of NAGPRA compliance. This source allowed me to better understand NAGPRA from the perspective of an archaeologist, as they saw that NAGPRA would permanently alter their chosen field.

Star and Tribune Company. *Expeditions' First Bowl Discovery*. 8 July 1928. *Hennepin County Library*. Accessed 23 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of a 1928 University of Minnesota archaeological dig in New Mexico. The Native American remains and cultural objects found during this dig have since been deemed as stolen, and have been filed for under NAGPRA. This source provided me with insight on what an early archaeological site might have looked like, as well as proved how the line between archaeologists and grave robbers has been blurred significantly due to NAGPRA.

State Museum of Pennsylvania. State Museum of Pennsylvania consultation with Delaware Tribal elders in 2011. 2011, Harrisburg, PA.

This primary source is a photograph of representatives of the State Museum of Pennsylvania with Delaware Tribe elders in 2011. The photo was taken during a consultation between the museum and the tribe, over NAGPRA and repatriation-related issues. As it was taken after the museum's initial repatriation to the Delaware Tribe and Delaware Nation in 2000, the photo represents the continued diplomacy and collaborations between museums and tribes that comes out of NAGPRA. I used this source as I discussed the State Museum and the Delaware Tribe's collaborations, following the repatriation in 2000.

Two Bulls, Marty. "The Saga of the 8,500 Year Old Kennewick Man." *Native Science*, WordPress, 2015. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022. Cartoon.

This primary source is a cartoon of Kennewick Man. It shows him reading a DNA report which reveals that he is Native American, as an archaeologist reads over his shoulder. Kennewick Man is shown to be much more human than the archaeologist, showing archaeologists as inhumane animals who take what is not theirs. This source allowed me to see a Native American argument for the repatriation and reburial of Kennewick Man, and I used the cartoon on my website.

United States, Congress, House. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

United States Code, title 25, section 3001-3013. *Congress.gov*, Library of Congress / United States Copyright Office. Accessed 14 Oct. 2021.

This primary source is a United States statute. It is the original Native Americans Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), which provided me with a basis on what NAGPRA is, why it was passed, and what the law provides.

---, ---, House. National Museum of the American Indian Act. United States Code, title 20, section 80q - 80q-15. *National Museum of the American Indian*, Smithsonian Institution. Accessed 3 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a United States statute. It is the predecessor to NAGPRA, as it applies only to the Smithsonian, stating that the museum must return all cultural object and bodily remains which belong to native tribes, if the tribes ask. Otherwise, all other native objects are to be moved to the National Museum of the American Indian, which was created under this act.

---, ---, Senate, Indian Affairs Committee. *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: Indian Affairs Committee Oversight Hearing*. Google Books, Google, 20 Apr. 1999, books.google.com/books?id=V5voPDLJ554C&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false. Accessed 18 Nov. 2021. 106th Congress, S. HRG. 106-57.

This primary source is a transcript of an Indian Affairs Committee oversight hearing. It took place nine years after NAGPRA had been passed, and many had seen issues with its legislation. This hearing took place so that amends could be made to the law, making its intent and its specifics clearer. From reading this document, I discovered a major issue with NAGPRA in its early stages. Many struggled to interpret what the scope of cultural affiliation was, which impeded the repatriation process. I used this information as background and these early issues with NAGPRA as a connection to the theme in my project.

---, ---, Senate, Committee on Indian Affairs, U.S. Senate. *Key Federal Agencies' and the Smithsonian Institution's Efforts to Identify and Repatriate Indian Human Remains and Objects*. Testimony of Anu K. Mittal, Director Natural Resources and Environment. *Turtle Talk*, WordPress, 16 June 2011. Accessed 27 Nov. 2021. 112th Congress, 1st session.

This primary source is the testimony of Anu K. Mittal, the Director of Natural Resources and Environment in the Government Accountability Office (GOA). The purpose of the testimony was to share with the Senate Committee of Indian Affairs what GOA had found in its study of federal agencies and their compliance with NAGPRA, as well as the Smithsonian, and its compliance with NMAI. It

found that while some agencies were doing better than others, there were still many issues with inventories, repatriations, and overall compliance with both of the laws. This source allowed me to see through a first-hand study the difficulties that many agencies had with NAGPRA, as well as NMAI, and how much effort it took, and will take, to fully accomplish what these laws sought to achieve.

---, ---, Senate. Native American Cultural Preservation Act. *Congress.gov*, Library of Congress / United States Copyright Office. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021. 99th Congress, 2nd session, Senate Bill 2952, introduced 18 Oct. 1986.

This primary source is the Native American Cultural Preservation Act, a bill introduced to Senate by Senator John Melcher. The intent of this bill was to make it such that any Native remains found on federal lands were required to be repatriated to their associated tribe. This bill was drafted after Melcher was approached by Cheyenne tribe member William Tallbull, who was concerned over the massive amount of Native remains that were sitting in the collections of the Smithsonian. While this bill was never enacted, by using this source, I was able to see how it led to NMAI, and later NAGPRA.

---, ---, Senate. *Joint Hearing Before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, and the Committee on Rules and Administration*. Testimony of Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, US Senator from Hawaii, Chairman Select Committee on Indian Affairs. *Google Books*, Google, 12 Nov. 1987, books.google.com/books?id=05al30OtQVAC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021. 100th Congress, 1st session, S. 1722, and S. 1723.

This primary source is the testimony of Senator Daniel K. Inouye during a joint hearing, on two different bills, S. 1722, and S. 1723. S. 1722 would allow for the National Museum of the American Indian to be established, as the Heye Foundation/Museum of the American Indian would become a part of the Smithsonian Institution, and the two would have their collections displayed in the new museum. Inouye's statement discusses the importance of this bill, as the Heye Foundation/Museum of the American Indian and the Smithsonian both had massive collections of Native remains and objects, and neither institution were properly honoring or displaying what they had under their possession. This source provided me with background on original legislation that led to both the law and museum of NMAI.

---, ---, Senate, Committee on Indian Affairs. *To Enhance Protections of Native American Tangible Cultural Heritage, and for Other Purposes*. Govinfo, U.S. Government Publishing Office, 9 Dec. 2020. Accessed 5 Dec. 2021. 116th Congress, 2nd session, Senate Report 308.

This primary source is a report from Senate, which was meant to accompany S. 2165, or the Safeguard Tribal Objects of Patrimony Act of 2020. The bill sought to build on what had been started by NAGPRA, further preventing against the illegal sale of Native remains and cultural objects. This source traced NAGPRA's legacy to a bill from just last year, proving debates surrounding the law are ever-present, as well as diplomacy between Native groups and museums.

---, Ninth Circuit Court (9th Cir.). *Bonnichsen v. United States*. *Federal Reporter, Third Series*, vol. 367, 19 Apr. 2004, pp. 864-82.

This primary source is a court case, in which the ownership of the remains of "Kennewick Man" was debated. This source showed the competing cultural and scientific interests that can cause some of the debate under NAGPRA. It proves some of the limitations of NAGPRA to protect Native American human remains, as the court originally ruled that the remains were so old that cultural affiliation could not be traced back to any specific tribe. Later, after some tests were run, the government revised its decision, and repatriated the remains, but the further study that was necessary to reach this conclusion violated the cultural beliefs that NAGPRA was passed to protect. I will use this court case as background information, as it is an example of a downfall of NAGPRA.

---, ---. *Navajo Nation v. U.S. Department of Interior. Federal Reporter*, vol. 819, 6 Apr. 2016, pp. 1084-102.

This primary source is a court case between the Navajo Nation and the United States Parks Service. Native remains were discovered on Navajo sacred lands. When the Navajo requested it back, the Parks Service wanted to go through the entire process of NAGPRA. However, the Navajo argued that since the remains were on their land, such a lengthy process should not be necessary, and the court eventually ruled in agreement with their statement. This case provided me with some detail on Native American cultural beliefs and how federal and tribal interests overlap on certain lands. I used it as an example of a case in which NAGPRA was not the best way of protecting tribal interests.

---, ---. *White v. University of California. Federal Reporter*, vol. 765, 27 Aug. 2014, pp. 1010-33.

This primary source is a court case which took place between scientists at the University of California and the University of California and the Repatriation Committee of the Kumeyaay Nation over two human skeletons (the La Jolla remains), approximately 9000 years old, that were discovered during an archaeological project on the UCSD campus in 1976. The Repatriation Committee sought for the remains to be repatriated under NAGPRA, and the University agreed to repatriation, but the scientists of the University insisted that the research value of the remains was too great for them to be returned. They sued the University in order to prevent the repatriation from going through, but the tribe refused to be present in court, so the case was dismissed, and the University was able to go through with the repatriation. I used this case as background information, allowing me to understand that some opposition to repatriation is based on a different value put on human remains and cultural objects because they have scientific research potential to increase of knowledge of early human diet and disease.

---, Third Circuit Court (3d Cir.). *Thorpe v. Borough of Jim Thorpe*. *Federal Reporter*, vol. 770, 23 Oct. 2014, pp. 255-67.

This primary source is a court hearing which as concerned with a dispute between the Borough of Jim Thorpe, a Pennsylvania municipality, and some of Jim Thorpe's descendants, over Mr. Thorpe's remains. Thorpe was a famous Olympic athlete and a member of the Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma, the Native American group. When he died, his widow allowed him to be buried in the newly named Borough of Jim Thorpe as a way of honoring him, but his descendants

later sued, as they wanted his remains to be relocated to tribal lands under NAGPRA. However, the court ruled that this case was more of a familial debate than one that fell under NAGPRA. I used this case as background on some of the limitations of NAGPRA to resolve every sort of Native American burial dispute.

University of Iowa Office of the State Archaeologist. Iowa Governor Robert Ray with Maria Pearson. 1976. *Center for Art Law*. Accessed 20 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of Maria Pearson and Governor Robert Ray. The two continued to collaborate after their initial meeting when Maria Pearson demanded for him to return and rebury the remains of a Native American girl, which had been uncovered. This source provided me with a visual of one of their continued collaborations, which I used on my website.

Warren, Ted S., and The Associated Press. *The flag of the Chinook Nation is displayed as tribal members and supporters gather outside the federal courthouse in Tacoma to bring attention to their effort to regain federal recognition on Jan. 6, 2020*. 2020. *The Seattle Times*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of members of the Chinook Nation and supporters gathered outside of the Tacoma federal courthouse. The Chinook Nation sought to raise awareness over the issue of federal recognition, in hopes of gaining support for their cause. This source provided me with an example of a tribal nation working towards federal recognition, which I used when discussing how NAGPRA does not apply to unrecognized tribes.

---. Tony A. (Naschio) Johnson, center, tribal council chairman of the Chinook Nation, beats a drum as he leads tribal members and supporters to the federal courthouse in Tacoma on

Jan. 6, 2020, as they continue efforts to regain federal recognition. 2020. *The Seattle Times*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of members of the Chinook Nation working towards federal recognition. The photograph shows them beating on drums as they walk towards Tacoma's federal courthouse. This source provided me with a photo of a tribal nation working towards and protesting their lack of federal recognition, which I used on my website.

Washington, D.C., Legislature, Senate, Committee on Indian Affairs. *Providing for the Protection of Native American Graves and the Repatriation of Native American Remains and Cultural Patrimony*. National Parks Service, 26 Sept. 1990. Accessed 13 Nov. 2021. 101st Legislature, 2nd session, Senate Report 473.

This primary source is a report from the Senate concerning NAGPRA. It provided me with background on the congressional debate surrounding NAGPRA, connecting to the theme. The nature of the law lends itself to debates, as it causes two parties to discuss the ownership of a culturally affiliated object or remain. This source also gave me information about the issues that many were concerned with in regard to the legislation.

Washington Post. *Native Americans march past the White House*. 1978. *Boundary Stones*, WETA. Accessed 20 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of Native American protesters during the Longest Walk. They have just reached their destination of Washington D.C. and have been photographed just outside the White House. This source provided me

with an image of protesters during the Longest Walk, which I was able to use on my website.

White House Archives. *President George Bush Signing the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in 1990*. 16 Nov. 1990. *History Colorado*. Accessed 6 Jan. 2022.

This primary source is a picture taken of President George Bush signing NAGPRA. The photograph was taken on the day that NAGPRA became law, as President Bush was reading through and signing it. This source provided me with a photograph that I was able to utilize on my website, as well as insight on what the signing of NAGPRA looked like.

Worthington, Rogers, and Chicago Tribune. "Where Archeologists See Discovery, Indians See Only Lost Souls." *Chicago Tribune*, 24 July 1988. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This primary source is a newspaper article published two years before NAGPRA was passed. The article reports on the debate that had been growing between museums and their scientists and Native Americans, as they take opposing views on studying Native remains. While Native groups feel that they experience no benefit from having their ancestor's remains studied, scientists disagree, and feel that they are doing essential work. This source allowed me to understand the extent of the debate between scientists and Native Americans, and the "cultural clash" that took place between them both before and after NAGPRA was passed.

York, Kevin. *Lenape Nation of Pennsylvania member Rick Quiet Hawk Welker, who has been fighting for federal recognition, photographed at a powwow at Mauch Chunk Lake*. 2021. *Philadelphia Magazine, Metro*. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022.

This primary source is a photograph of a member of the Lenape Nation of Pennsylvania, at a powwow. The Lenape Nation has been fighting for federal recognition for years, arguing against the position that there are no longer any Native Americans in Pennsylvania. This source provided me with a better understanding of the fight of the Lenape Nation, and served as a photograph that I used on my website when mentioning non-federally recognized tribes.

Zimmerman, Larry J. "Webb on Reburial: A North American Perspective." *Antiquity*, vol. 61, no. 233, Nov. 1987, pp. 462-63. Accessed 30 Dec. 2021.

This primary source is an article from a journal. The article is written by an archaeologist, who discusses the painful past of the field, and the negative opinion of scientists on Native Americans. He makes it clear that in his experience, it had not been until the uproar of reburial demands that archaeologists began to pay a small amount of attention to the struggles of tribes. This source provided me with background on how Native Americans were treated by archaeologists, and included some quotes, both of which I utilized in my project.

Secondary Sources

Bachor, Susan. "Reburial of Delaware Ancestors on the East Coast." *Official Site of the Delaware Tribe of Indians*, edited by Delaware Tribe of Indians, 2 Dec. 2017. Accessed 5 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is a webpage from the website of the Delaware Tribe of Indians. The site was authored by an interviewee of mine, outlining her experience with the repatriation and reburial of ancestral remains of the Delaware

Tribe. It discusses that remains and cultural objects which are privately owned are not under the jurisdiction of NAGPRA, but that the tribe still found success in repatriation, through their connections in the East Coast. This source provided me with information on a fairly local repatriation success, despite a shortcoming of NAGPRA.

Bray, Tamara L. *The Future of the Past: Archaeologists, Native Americans, and Repatriation*.

Routledge, 2012. *Google Books*. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book which focuses on the complexity of the repatriation debates that led up to and were caused by NAGPRA. This chapter is about the evolving of the field of archaeology into a more humanistic study, due to repatriations. It mentions how NAGPRA has created both debates between tribes and museums, as well as forced them to make contact with one another, carrying out diplomatic meetings. This source provided me with information on the legacy of NAGPRA, as well as information which supported my connection between NAGPRA and debate and diplomacy.

Brown, Dylan. "The Spoils of Wars and Massacres: NAGPRA 25 Years Later." *Indian Country Today*, 9 June 2015. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is an article that commemorates twenty-five years since the passage of NAGPRA. It discusses the immense amount of work that remains to be done, with many remains and cultural objects in museums still marked as "culturally unidentifiable" and thus are not yet repatriated. Despite a new regulation made to NAGPRA, referred to as the 10.11 rule, which reduced the amount of evidence needed to prove cultural affiliation, many museums are still

finding ways to stall and prevent repatriations. This source provided me with information on the ongoing debates between museums and tribes, and the continued lack of progress that is being made on repatriations.

Brown, Michael F., and Margaret M. Bruchac. "NAGPRA from the Middle Distance: Legal Puzzles and Unintended Consequences." *Imperialism, Art, and Restitution*, edited by John Henry Merryman, 2009 ed., Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2009, pp. 192-217. *Penn Libraries: University of Pennsylvania*. Accessed 5 Dec. 2021.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book which discussed the issue of repatriation for many different groups of people seeking the return of their art and other objects. This chapter reports on NAGPRA specifically, and what it had accomplished about 15 years after its passage. The chapter homed in on the idea that while heated debates in courtrooms were employed as a repatriation tactic for quite some time, many began to see that conversations, or diplomacy, between museums and Native tribes was a far more effective way of resolving such issues. This source confirmed my prior stance that debates over NAGPRA eventually allowed for better diplomacy to take place and provided me with more information on this idea.

Capriccioso, Rob. "Scientists Ponder NAGPRA Lawsuit." *Indian Country Today*, 15 Apr. 2010. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a newspaper article which reports on a rule change that was proposed to NAGPRA in 2010. The change would have made it so that remains that museums could not trace back to any specific tribe would instead be returned to the tribe which was closest to the land where the remains were found,

rather than staying at the museum. However, scientists greatly opposed this change, and the article discusses the lawsuit against the rule that they were considering. This source gave me background on rule changes to NAGPRA, as well as introducing me to lawsuits against these changes, and the debates that might come out of that.

Cattabiani, Mario F. "JUST PROPERTY?; LENNI LENAPE BONES SPARK RENEWAL of EFFORTS to GET TRIBE RECOGNIZED as ONE OF THE STATE'S NATIVE PEOPLES." *The Morning Call (Allentown, PA)*, 7 May 1998, p. A01. *Gale OneFile: News*. Accessed 24 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a newspaper article which outlines a major issue with NAGPRA. The ancestors of Lenni Lenape tribe member Carla Messinger are in the Harrisburg State Museum, and despite her support from other members of both the Lenni Lenape tribe and other tribes across the nation, her efforts to get these remains returned have been futile. The Lenni Lenape are not federally recognized, and therefore do not fall under the legislation of NAGPRA. Federal recognition has instead been granted to the Delawares, a tribe of Native Americans from Oklahoma, who split from the Lenni Lenape when settlers began to arrive on the East Coast, pushing back Native tribes. I was able to gain knowledge of a fairly local example of a failure of NAGPRA from this source, as many tribes still have yet to be recognized, and cannot benefit from NAGPRA until they are.

Colwell, Chip. "Can Repatriation Heal the Wounds of History?" *Conversations in Critical Cultural Heritage*, special issue of *The Public Historian*, vol. 41, no. 1, Feb. 2019, pp. 90-110. Accessed 5 Dec. 2021.

This secondary source is a report published in a scholarly journal. The report, written by Chip Colwell, an advocate for repatriations of Native objects and remains, makes it clear that while not explicitly stated in the law, NAGPRA's goal was to heal. It sought to heal the relationship between Native nations and museums, and at the very least apologize for past wrongdoings and violations of Native rights by museums in the past. This source allowed me to understand the concept of healing through repatriation, a vital part of my thesis and my project as a whole.

---. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. Paperback edition. ed., Chicago, U of Chicago P, 2019.

This secondary source is a book that follows the journey of four different tribes and their experiences, and challenges, with repatriation through NAGPRA. The book shares a message of hope, discussing the changes that have been made to museums, with empty spaces in display cases left to be symbols of change, signs of successful repatriations. It also describes NAGPRA as an ongoing debate. It is a debate over the past and a debate that extends into the future. I utilized this information and these descriptions in my project, as they connect to the theme and prove the legacy of NAGPRA.

Cooper, Karen Coody. "Introduction." Introduction. *Spirited Encounters: American Indians Protest Museum Policies and Practices*, Lanham (US), AltaMira, 2008, pp. 1-13. Google

Books,

www.google.com/books/edition/Spirited_Encounters/jiWSAHvKN14C?hl=en&gbpv=1&kptab=overview#ba_cen=lat_e7:%20400468052%0AIng_e7:%203541613421%0A&ba_loc=19085. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a book which provides an overview of Native American protests in regard to museums. The introduction discusses the lack of representation which Native Americans had in museums, unable to properly care for their remains or cultural objects, as well as unable to tell their own story. Additionally, the introduction states that these protests of museums across the nation heavily contributed to the passage of legislation of NAGPRA, as museums were forced to reevaluate their practices. From this source, I was able to understand Native American museum protests, as well as trace back NAGPRA to its beginnings.

Denver University Museum of Anthropology. "Human remains with no cultural affiliation that are pending in the NAGPRA process." *Denver University Museum of Anthropology*, 7 May 2021. Accessed 21 Feb. 2022. Chart.

This secondary source is a chart from the Denver University Museum of Anthropology. The chart outlines the number of unaffiliated remains that are unable to be repatriated by the NAGPRA process in each region of the nation. This source provided me with information on the scale of the issue surrounding unaffiliated remains and the NAGPRA process, as well as served as a graphic which I used on my website.

Ellis, Linda. "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)."

Archaeological Method and Theory: An Encyclopedia. NPS Archeology Program.

Accessed 7 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a reproduction of a section in an encyclopedia. It provided me with basic background information about NAGPRA, which helped in the construction of my project. Through outlining the main purposes of the law, I gained a better understanding of how NAGPRA works and is applied in different repatriation processes.

Fine-Dare, Kathleen S. "History of the Repatriation Movement, 1980s." *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*, Lincoln, U of Nebraska P, 2002, pp. 85-114. *Internet Archive*. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book that discusses the Native American repatriation movement. This chapter goes into detail about the 1980s role of bringing awareness to the issue of improper ownership and making the need for a law more prominent. It also focuses on the two major repatriation cases prior to NAGPRA, which were the return of Zuni War Gods and Wampum Belts to six Native nations. This source allowed me to gain insight on the repatriation movement, as well as initial repatriation cases, which set a precedent for those that followed.

Gurian, Elaine Heumann. "What Is the Object of This Exercise?" *Civilizing the Museum: The Collected Writings of Elaine Heumann Gurian*, London, Routledge, 2006, pp. 33-47.

Accessed 30 Dec. 2021.

This secondary source is a section from a book of a collection of writings from a member of the scientific and museum world. In this section, she discusses the evolving of museums, proclaiming that due to the passage of laws such as NAGPRA, ideas of ownership and museum collections have been blurred, no longer what they used to mean. Items are being returned, and collections focus less on objects, and more on respectfully telling a story of Native history. She acknowledges the cultural clash that continues to exist between tribes and museums, but also makes it clear that when the two collaborate, they can better museums, changing them into institutions that honor groups of people that they stole from in the past. I used quotes from this source in my project, as well as utilized some of the information on how museums are evolving as background when I constructed my project.

Hill, Liz. "A Warrior Chief Among Warriors: Remembering U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye."

American Indian, vol. 15, no. 1, spring 2014. Accessed 27 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is an article in the American Indian Magazine, published by the National Museum of the American Indian. The article commemorates his work in opening the National Museum of the American Indian, celebrating his successes in working with the Smithsonian to do so. He built upon a bill proposed by Senator Melcher, which would allow all remains found on federal lands to be repatriated to their affiliated tribe. This bill began to form NMAI, as he expanded it to also encompass cultural objects, and fought for the Smithsonian to be required to repatriate culturally affiliated remains and cultural objects and put the

rest on display at the National Museum of the American Indian. This article provided me with background on NMAI, and how it came to be.

"Home From School: The Children of Carlisle." Produced by Geoffrey O'Gara and Sophie Barksdale. *Independent Lens*, season 23, episode 5, PBS, 23 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a television program which focused on the efforts of the Northern Arapaho to have the remains of three of their ancestors repatriated. At the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, an Indian boarding school which sought to teach its students the ways of the Whites, many, including three Northern Arapaho boys, were subject to grueling labor, were mistreated, and were exposed to diseases that were deadly. These boys died on school grounds, and over a century later, their tribe was finally able to take them back home, laying them in the land of their people. This program provided me with background information on another shortcoming of NAGPRA, as the school grounds were not considered a museum, and were therefore not included under NAGPRA. This made repatriation efforts much more difficult for the Northern Arapaho tribe.

Juliet Isselbacher. "The Spirit of the Law." *Harvard Magazine*, vol. 124, no. 1, Sept.-Oct. 2021, pp. 21-25.

This source is a secondary magazine article. It records the Peabody Museum's efforts to catalog and repatriate cultural objects. It provided me with background knowledge on the application of NAGPRA, and some of its strengths and weaknesses.

Kunze, Jenna. "Why Don't Indigenous Children Buried at Carlisle and Other Former Indian Boarding Schools Qualify for Repatriation Under NAGPRA?" *Native News Online*, 8 Aug. 2020. Accessed 24 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is an article published by an online news outlet, Native Online News. The article discusses the difference of opinion which surrounds the remains of the children who died at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School. Tribes which have had their ancestors buried on the federal lands for years are seeking repatriations under NAGPRA. However, the US Office of Army Cemeteries, who oversees the graveyard, claims that NAGPRA does not apply to the children's remains, and have instead implemented their own process of repatriation, which does not work well, further slowing down repatriation efforts. Many claim that since the graveyard is on federally owned lands, NAGPRA does apply, but the army refuses to recognize this. This source allowed me to understand another kind of debate could come out of NAGPRA, as people argue over whether it is applicable in different situations.

"Local Contexts." *Vimeo*, uploaded by Local Contexts, Vimeo.com. Accessed 3 Nov. 2021.

This is a secondary video clip. Founded by Jane Anderson, Local Contexts is committed to creating culturally sensitive labelling for native objects. This video clip appeared in a panel run by the University of Pennsylvania. It provided me with background on how these labels have been created and how they are helping museums identify the origins of cultural objects. This indicates the diplomacy between museums and native tribes.

Madeson, Frances. "The Excruciating Legacy of NAGPRA." *Indian Country Today*, 13 Sept. 2018. Accessed 16 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is an article reporting on the gathering of around seventy people to discuss their experiences with NAGPRA. In this way, the article is able to dig deeper into the legacy of NAGPRA, mentioning the benefits and failures of the law. While NAGPRA has succeeded in bringing tribes and museums closer through consultations, it has also caused problems for tribes, such as having no ceremonies for reburial and needing to prove their connection to their ancestors. The law can sometimes force them to violate their own beliefs. This source provided me with information on the successes and failures of NAGPRA in the long term, which I used in my project when discussing its legacy.

McKeown, C. Timothy. "Tallbull's Quest." *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Struggle for National Repatriation Legislation, 1986-1990*, Tucson, U of Arizona P, 2013, pp. 1-27. *Google Books*. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a chapter within a book which discusses the struggle for legislation that would allow Native groups to have their remains and cultural objects returned to them. Specifically, this chapter mentions William Tallbull of the Cheyenne tribe, and his attempts to have the Smithsonian repatriate his grandfather's pipe. While there looking at it, he was horrified at the number of Native remains that the museum had in its collections, prompting him to go to Senator John Melcher, who began drafting the Native American Cultural Preservation Act, which became a predecessor to NMAI and later NAGPRA. This

source provided me with background on more figures who were crucial in the introduction of both NMAI and NAGPRA.

McKeown, Timothy C. "CONSIDERING REPATRIATION LEGISLATION AS AN OPTION

The National Museum of The American Indian Act (NMAIA) & The Native American Graves Protection & Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)." *Utimut: Past Heritage - Future Partnerships: Discussions on Repatriation in the 21st Century*, by Mille Gabriel et al., Copenhagen, IWGIA, 2008, pp. 134-47. *Academia.edu*. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a section within a book that focuses on how legislation which allowed for repatriations of Native American remains and cultural objects came to be. It provides information on Cheyenne religious leader William Tallbull's efforts to eventually enact NMAI, as well as the recommendations of the Panel for a National Dialogue on Museum/Native American Relations which led to NAGPRA. I was able to gain insight on the people and events which caused NMAI and NAGPRA, as well as receive an in-depth explanation of how NAGPRA works from reading this source.

Mihesuah, Devon A. "American Indians, Anthropologists, Pothunters, and Repatriation: Ethical, Religious, and Political Differences." *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?*, Lincoln, U of Nebraska P, 2000, pp. 95-105. *York University*, www.yorku.ca/kdenning/Documents/DevonMihesuah2000-AmericanIndians,Anthropologists,Pothunters.pdf. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book on Native Americans and repatriation. The section focuses on the ethical, religious, and political differences between Native Americans and anthropologists, as well as grave-robbars. As

stated in the chapter, anthropologists and other scientists tend to feel that their work is of the utmost importance, while Native Americans struggle to find any benefit from the study of their ancestors' remains and cultural objects. Scientists and grave robbers disregard the religion of Native cultures to continue their work, making the issue of repatriation a religious issue for Native Americans. This source provided me with background on the clash between scientists and grave robbers, and Native Americans, as well as the issue of religion in regard to NAGPRA and repatriation.

Museum of Indian Culture. "Delaware Nation Historic Preservation Office at the Museum of Indian Culture." *Museum of Indian Culture*. Accessed 28 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a page on the Allentown Museum of Indian Culture's website. It discusses the museum partnering with the Delaware Nation of Oklahoma, in order to open a Historic Preservation Office. Since the tribe was originally from Pennsylvania, the opening of the office allows the Delawares to be more connected to their homelands, as well as better respond to concerns over NAGPRA and historic preservation in the area of the museum. This source improved my knowledge of historic preservation, as well as showed me a case of a local museum making an effort to help a tribe with NAGPRA.

"My People's Bones." *Vimeo*, uploaded by Wartburg Knight Vision, Vimeo.com. Accessed 25 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a student-produced film on the life and legacy of Maria Pearson, an advocate for Native American rights. She went to the governor of Iowa and asked him for the return of her people's bones, sparking the fight for the

passage of legislation that would protect Native American remains within Iowa.

The film goes on to mention her work across the nation, discussing with others the importance of the Iowan law, and encouraging other states to begin forming similar laws of their own. This eventually led to the passage of NAGPRA, encompassing all states of the U.S. This source allowed me to understand how the beginnings of NAGPRA originated with Maria Pearson.

"NAGPRA, Repatriation, and Cultures of Scientific Anthropology." *Vimeo*, uploaded by Ann M. Kakaliouras, Vimeo.com. Accessed 4 Nov. 2021.

This video clip is a secondary source. I gained perspective from watching it, as it described the two sides of the argument for and against NAGPRA. Prior to watching, I did not understand how anyone could be against NAGPRA, but this video provided me with insight. I now know that it is primarily those working in the anthropology field that feel this way. As students, their final project is to find a site, like a native grave, and excavate bones. Therefore, they feel an attachment to these bones which they have excavated and studied, and worry for their continued access to researching the bones if they are returned.

Pember, Mary Annette. "A History Not Yet Laid to Rest." *The Atlantic*, TheAtlantic.com, 24 Nov. 2021. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is an article which reports on Native American boarding schools. It discusses their impact on many Native Americans, as well as new efforts of the government to make amends and apologize for the cruel mistreatment of many children within these schools. Additionally, it includes information about repatriations of the remains of Native children which were

buried in school cemeteries. from this article, I was able to understand the extent that these schools affected Native American tribes and families, as well as see the importance of repatriation of remains of the children which attended the boarding schools.

Penn Museum. "Repatriations." *Penn Museum*.

This secondary source is a webpage from the Penn Museum's website. It includes information on every repatriation that the Penn Museum has made to date. The page is divided up into sections, each dedicated to a different repatriation process with a different tribe. By reading through this page, I was able to better understand how a museum carries out repatriations. I was also introduced to a series of repatriations with the Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna O Hawai'i Nei tribe, which I followed to their entries in the Federal Register.

Pevar, Stephen L. *The Rights of Indians and Tribes: The Basic ACLU Guide to Indian and Tribal Rights*. 2nd ed., Carbondale, Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1998.

This book is a secondary source which is a handbook to the rights of Native Americans. It provided me with background information about these rights, as well as served as something I could consult with, to determine the definitions of tribes, cultural objects, and other similar terms. I utilized the book's information and returned back to it frequently while completing my project.

Preucel, Robert W., et al. "Out of Heaviness, Enlightenment: NAGPRA and the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology." *Expedition Magazine*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2003, p. 21. *Penn Museum*.

This secondary source is an article from a magazine published by the Penn Museum. The article was written by people employed by the Penn Museum and the University of Pennsylvania, and who are directly involved with the museum's Native collections and NAGPRA compliance. Focusing on the museum's experiences with NAGPRA, the article reviews the successful repatriations which the museum has carried out, as well as how the museum plans to continue to comply with NAGPRA in the future, as new challenges arise. This source provided me with background on a local museum's work with NAGPRA, allowing me to understand how NAGPRA affects museums.

Romero, Simon. "Burial Ground Under the Alamo Stirs a Texas Feud." *The New York Times*, The New York Times Company, 25 Nov. 2021. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is a newspaper article reporting on recent events of a tension brewing between the Tāp Pīlam tribe and Texas officials. The site of the Alamo is now celebrated as the location of the famous 1836 battle in the Texas Revolution, but it was built on top of a Tāp Pīlam cemetery. Tāp Pīlam tribe members are seeking protection for the remains of their ancestors, as well as a chance to be more involved in the telling of the Alamo's story. However, Texas officials refuse to protect the Native American remains, as they chose to only advertise the history of the battle, rather than admit to some of the horrors that the Tāp Pīlam tribe had to go through. This source allowed me to understand how failures of NAGPRA are still prevalent, even today, and how governmental officials can still be resistant to honoring Native American history.

Rosier, Paul C. "Repatriation of Ancestral Remains." *Native American Issues*, Westport (Conn.), Greenwood Press, 2003, pp. 87-112. *Google Books*. Accessed 30 Dec. 2021.

This secondary source is a section from a book which explores some of the major issues affecting Native American tribes today. This section goes into detail about repatriation issues, discussing the struggle for repatriation of ancestral remains, as tribes and museums have very different stances on the issue. It also states that the NAGPRA process can allow for tribes to take control of their past, helping them to heal. This source provided me with information surrounding the healing of tribes through NAGPRA, as well as some quotes from notable figures in the repatriation movement, which I included in my project.

Small, Zachary. "Push to Return 116,000 Native American Remains Is Long-Awaited." *The New York Times*, The New York Times Company, 6 Aug. 2021. Accessed 26 Nov. 2021.

This secondary source is an article which was recently published, discussing the work that remains to be done in terms of museums and other institutions repatriating their collections of Native American remains and cultural objects. In many cases, institutions have claimed to find no specific cultural affiliation from any tribe to the object in question, preventing them from needing to repatriate the object under NAGPRA. Therefore, a reform movement has begun, in hopes of improving NAGPRA, and allowing these objects and remains to be repatriated to their tribes. I was able to see the magnitude of the work that still needs to be done on NAGPRA, as well as the many issues with the current repatriation process, from reading this source.

TEDxMileHigh. "Why Museums Are Returning Cultural Treasures." *TED*, TED Conferences, July 2017. Accessed 5 Dec. 2021.

This secondary source is a TED Talk, hosted by Chip Colwell, an archaeologist and museum curator who supports the efforts of NAGPRA to repatriated Native remains and cultural objects. This recording of his talk shows him discussing major ideas within his book "Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture," such as the struggle for repatriation of the Zuni War gods from museums both in the United States and outside the United States, where NAGPRA does not apply. His information provided me with more background knowledge on NAGPRA, its shortcomings, and the difficulties that he knows of, as a former museum curator for the Denver Museum, of the repatriation process.

Thomas, David Hurst. "Legislating the Skull Wars." *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*, New York City, Basic Books, 2000, pp. 209-21.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book on the battles between archaeologists and Native Americans, due to their difference of opinion on the study of Native remains and cultural objects. This chapter focuses on the events that led to the passage of NAGPRA, including information on early archaeology and the reburial movement of the 1970s and 1980s. Additionally, the section includes repatriation cases that followed NAGPRA's passage. This source provided me with background on the period of protests and heated debates that led to NAGPRA, as well as quotes from this time that I included in my project.

Thornton, Russell. "Repatriation as Healing the Trauma of History: Cases of Native Americans in the United States of America." *The Dead and Their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy, and Practice*, by Cressida Fforde et al., London, Routledge, 2002, pp. 17-25. *Google Books*. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

This secondary source is a chapter from a book which focuses on Native repatriation and reburial issues. The chapter discusses the painful past of archaeology and Native Americans, as many robbed their graves in the name of science. This led to the repatriation movement, which, as this chapter mentions, has the power to heal the trauma of history, which can negatively impact whole tribes if not dealt with. This source provided me with background on the repatriation movement's roots, as well as its goal to heal tribes who have been suffering from wounds of the past.

Treuer, Anton. "Terminology." *Everything You Wanted to Know about Indians but Were Afraid to Ask*, Young Readers ed., Montclair, Levine Querido, 2021, pp. 11-26.

This secondary source is a book which focuses on credibly answering common questions related to Native Americans, as the author is Native American. While the information in this book is extremely varied, and is all incredibly enlightening, the first section in this book is most closely related to my topic. Entitled *Terminology*, this section answered questions about how one should and should not refer to Native Americans and their tribes, as well as providing a bit of backstory on how these names originated. While there is no clear answer, I was able to understand how I should most respectfully go about referring to Native Americans in my project. Therefore, I used the information in this section as

background on the origins of Native terminology, as well as directly in my project.

United States Department of the Interior, and National NAGPRA Program. *Journeys to Repatriation: 15 Years of NAGPRA Grants (1994-2008)*. National Park Service / U.S. Department of the Interior, 2009.

This secondary source is a book which outlines the purpose of the NAGPRA Grants program. The book has sections on how the program benefits both museums and tribes, providing them with grants of money that allow them to fund the repatriation of native objects and remains. It also discusses how the repatriation process strengthens the relationship between these museums and tribes, a key example of NAGPRA's legacy. The grants are vital to the success of NAGPRA, especially as more museums and tribes begin to seek repatriation opportunities. I used the information within this book as background on the NAGPRA Grants program, as well as using some of its information to contribute to my knowledge of NAGPRA's successes and its legacy.

Williams, Lucy Fowler, et al. "Finding Their Way Home: Twenty-Five Years of NAGPRA at the Penn Museum." *Expedition Magazine*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2016, pp. 29-37. *Penn Museum*.

This secondary source is an article in a magazine published by the Penn Museum. It celebrates twenty-five years of NAGPRA in the Penn Museum, discussing its efforts to honor and respect Native remains and cultural objects, repatriating them under NAGPRA whenever possible. The article includes multiple NAGPRA case studies, in which challenges involving repatriation are displayed. Therefore, by using this source, I was able to gain knowledge of the challenges of NAGPRA in

museums, as well as the triumphs of the Penn Museum in regard to successful repatriation.

Woods, Christopher, and Penn Museum. "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)." *Penn Museum*.

This secondary source is a section on the Penn Museum's website, dedicated to NAGPRA. The webpage briefly outlines what NAGPRA is, and how it has changed how the field of anthropology operates. Additionally, the page includes a letter from Christopher Woods, the director of the museum, to the general public, which discusses the museum's repatriation efforts in response to the passage of NAGPRA. This source provided me with information on how NAGPRA works in museums, through a local lens.

Zott, Lynn M. "How Do Disputes over Resources and Artifacts Affect Native Americans?"

Native Americans, Detroit, Greenhaven Press, 2012, pp. 111-52. Opposing Viewpoints.

This secondary source is a book about Native Americans. While it covers a wide variety of topics surrounding Native Americans, its third chapter focuses on repatriations of Native artifacts and resources, and more specifically, has two sections which discuss NAGPRA, its issues, and its relevance today. It makes the argument that while repatriation of newly found cultural objects is important, those which were found hundreds of years ago require more studying, and therefore cannot be repatriated quite so easily. Additionally, the chapter explains a possible route for archaeologists to take when dealing with NAGPRA. It suggests that when a cultural object is found, it is to be studied immediately, with Natives present, and is then to be given back soon after.