

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Repatriation in the United States: The Current State of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0gh8q7fw>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Authors**

Daehnke, Jon  
Lonetree, Amy

**Publication Date**

2011

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed



# Repatriation in the United States: The Current State of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

*Jon Daehnke and Amy Lonetree*

Repatriation in the United States today is synonymous with the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Although repatriations of Native American ancestral remains and cultural objects certainly occurred—and continue to occur—outside of the purview of NAGPRA, this law remains the centerpiece of repatriation activities in the United States. NAGPRA is important human-rights legislation, designed first and foremost to address the historical inequities created by a legacy of past collecting practices; the continual disregard for Native religious beliefs and burial practices; and a clear contradiction between how the graves of white Americans and graves of Native Americans have been treated. NAGPRA attempts to address these inequities by giving Native American communities greater control over the remains of their ancestors and cultural objects, and the law has provided some measure of success in this regard. But in the nearly

---

AMY LONETREE is an enrolled citizen of the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin and an assistant professor of American Studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her scholarly work focuses on the representation of Native American history and memory in national and tribal museums, and she has completed an edited collection with Amanda J. Cobb, *The National Museum of the American Indian: Critical Conversations*. JON DAEHNKE is a postdoctoral fellow in the humanities at Stanford University. His research focuses on cultural heritage and the law, public representations of heritage and memory, and the archaeology of landscapes. He is working on a manuscript that explores the dynamic and contested nature of indigenous identity, federal recognition, and tangible and intangible heritage on the Columbia River.

twenty years since its passage, some significant shortcomings of NAGPRA have become readily apparent.

Therefore, part of the purpose of this article is to look at some of these shortcomings in NAGPRA, specifically the problems associated with the large numbers of culturally unidentifiable human remains (CUHRs) that exist in museums and federal agencies throughout the United States. Ultimately, our goal is to question whether NAGPRA actually represents a moment of decolonization in practice or a modified continuation of the status quo. Before reaching that point, however, we provide a brief history of past collecting practices that moved Native American objects and human remains into museums, universities, and federal agencies in the first place and necessitated the passage of a law like NAGPRA. Although this story certainly has been told elsewhere, we argue that it is a story that needs to be told and retold, and that this troubling history is far from a closed chapter. We provide a background to the history of the development of NAGPRA legislation in the United States, as well as a brief discussion about the requirements of the law. This article is designed to discuss neither repatriation as a philosophical construct nor the comparative repercussions that repatriations have had on Native American and scientific communities, but rather to look specifically at the development of NAGPRA and the lingering problems associated with its implementation in the United States.<sup>1</sup>

## BACKGROUND: HISTORY OF COLLECTION

Fascination with Native American material culture and the violation of Native American graves occurred almost immediately after the European settlement of North America. In 1620, Pilgrims uncovered the remains of a small Native American child while searching for caches of corn to rob. They eventually reinterred the corpse, but not before removing and taking the beaded necklaces and bracelets that had been buried with the child.<sup>2</sup> Violation of Native American graves continued into the eighteenth century, and perhaps the most famous incident during this time period involved Thomas Jefferson. Before becoming the third president of the United States, Jefferson excavated a Native American burial mound located near his estate. The excavation was undertaken in order to answer one of Jefferson's questions about Native American burial practices. Although he knew that living Native Americans occasionally visited the mound, he did not ask for permission to excavate nor did he consider simply asking these groups about their burial practices.<sup>3</sup>

The collecting of Native American objects, specifically human skeletal remains, dramatically increased during the early nineteenth century as scholars

utilized human remains to explain physical and cultural differences between peoples. Scholars such as Samuel G. Morton—often recognized as the father of physical anthropology—actively collected human remains for their studies. The collecting of crania especially became more widespread as “scholars attempted to relate intelligence, personality, and character to skull and brain size.”<sup>4</sup> Morton believed that people’s intelligence directly correlated to the size of their brain, and he and others conducted “experiments” measuring several hundred skulls belonging to members of different races. The measurements of cranial capacity and skull shape were really a way to racialize ethnic groups and “to validate theories of white supremacy.”<sup>5</sup> Morton quickly discovered that there were few skulls available for study. He therefore provided economic incentives to soldiers, settlers, and government agents to enter Native American graves in order to collect the remains. The high level of Native American deaths due to disease and other forces of colonization facilitated the task of these collectors.<sup>6</sup>

The desire for Native American skulls and bodies for scientific research continued throughout the nineteenth century. In 1867, George A. Otis, the curator of the Army Medical Museum (AMM), urged field doctors to send Native American human remains to the AMM. Otis later entered into an agreement with the Smithsonian in which the AMM would receive osteological remains and send the burial and cultural items associated with the remains to the Smithsonian. In 1868, US Army Surgeon General Joseph Barnes also issued a request to medical officers and field surgeons to collect human remains for scientific research. As a result of these orders, roughly 4,500 Native American crania ended up in the AMM collections, many of which were transferred to the Smithsonian Institution during the 1890s.<sup>7</sup> Numerous other sets of Native American remains ended up in European collections as well.

Anthropologists certainly played a role in the early collecting of Native American human remains. Franz Boas, who in part made his reputation by gathering the oral traditions of the Native American cultures of the Northwest Coast, also collected their physical bodies. While conducting ethnographic work with the Kwakwaka’wakw, Boas robbed graves at night, noting that “it is most unpleasant work to steal bones from a grave, but what is the use, someone has to do it.”<sup>8</sup> During his early research on the Northwest Coast, Boas collected roughly one hundred complete skeletons and two hundred skulls belonging to the Kwakwaka’wakw and Coast Salish populations. Boas mostly sold these human remains to the Field Museum in Chicago but sold some later sets of remains to parties in Berlin, Germany.<sup>9</sup> Numerous other celebrated figures of anthropology, such as Ales Hrdlicka and George Dorsey, were also voraciously collecting Native American human remains during this time.

The passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906 also had ramifications for the relationship between anthropology and Native Americans both living and dead. The Antiquities Act, which was intended to protect the cultural resources of the United States by creating a permitting process for archaeological excavation and establishing punishments for looting, in effect further reified the authority that anthropologists held over Native American material culture, including human remains. The act failed to directly consider the interests that Native Americans might have in their own material culture, and it legislated the appropriation of that culture by anthropologists. In effect it turned Native American human remains into archaeological resources and the property of the federal government.<sup>10</sup> As Clayton Dumont notes, “the legislation made no distinction between graves that were thousands of years old and the internment of one’s mother at a tribal cemetery a week or even a day prior.”<sup>11</sup>

It is important to note the broader social and demographic context of the collecting of human remains and other cultural objects in North America. The time period during which many important museum collections in the United States were formed and collecting flourished is viewed as the nadir of Native American existence. Tribal nations across the Western Hemisphere experienced great population declines as a result of European colonization of the Americas. By the turn of the twentieth century it is estimated that only 250,000 Indians were alive in the United States from what may have been a precontact population of fifteen million. Scholars have referred to the dramatic demographic decline resulting from the combination of disease and genocidal governmental policies as the “American Indian Holocaust.”<sup>12</sup> As a result of this demographic collapse Native people were believed to be a “vanishing race.” Therefore, anthropologists at the turn of the twentieth century saw themselves in a race against time and engaged in “salvage anthropology” in order to collect the remnants of what they viewed as a dying people.

At the same time, surviving Native American communities were experiencing extreme pressures to assimilate. The US government enacted a series of assimilation policies, and government-funded boarding schools subjected American Indian children to an educational program aimed at destroying traditional cultures. During this period of assimilation collectors aggressively searched for the “most authentic” artifacts for their collections. It was during this time of enormous upheavals and suffering that most of the collecting took place. Native American people were told there was no place for them as tribal people, yet the material culture that identified their tribal uniqueness—as well as their physical bodies—was highly valued. The scale of the transfer of material culture from Native Americans to anthropologists and collectors was truly staggering.<sup>13</sup> By the time NAGPRA passed in 1990, it was

estimated that museums, federal agencies, and private collectors held anywhere between 300,000 to 2.5 million Native American bodies and millions of cultural objects.<sup>14</sup>

## LEGAL FRAMEWORK: A BRIEF HISTORY OF NAGPRA LEGISLATION

The vast number of Native American objects and ancestral bodies held in museums and federal agencies led to vocal Native American activism beginning in the 1960s. This activism eventually led to the passage of repatriation and burial laws in the United States at the state and federal levels.<sup>15</sup> The United States was the first nation to pass comprehensive repatriation legislation at the federal level, including the National Museum of the American Indian Act (NMAIA) and NAGPRA.<sup>16</sup> The NMAIA applies exclusively to the collections of the Smithsonian Institution and grew out of the 1986 discovery by Cheyenne religious leader William Tallbull that the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History held the remains of roughly 18,500 Native Americans.<sup>17</sup> Provisions for the repatriation of these human remains (as well as Native American human remains held by other Smithsonian Museums) were included in legislation that established the National Museum of the American Indian. This legislation required the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution "to inventory and identify the origin of human remains and associated funerary objects in the Smithsonian's possession or control and expeditiously return them upon the request of lineal descendants or culturally affiliated Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations."<sup>18</sup> The NMAIA became law in November 1989.

The US Congress passed legislation the following year that applied similar repatriation procedures to all federal agencies and any institutions that receive federal funding (most notably museums). NAGPRA was passed in 1990 and signed into law by President George H. W. Bush. NAGPRA is designed to provide "various repatriation, ownership and control rights to Native American individuals and families who are the lineal descendants of a deceased Native individual and to Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations."<sup>19</sup> It is principally human-rights legislation crafted in response to the disparate treatment of Native American graves in comparison to non-Native American graves. It is also, however, American Indian law, property law, and administrative law.<sup>20</sup> NAGPRA does not apply to private individuals or institutions that do not receive federal funds.

Like the NMAIA, NAGPRA requires affected institutions to produce general summaries and specific inventories of cultural objects that are subject

to NAGPRA. The four principal types of cultural objects that are subject to NAGPRA are human remains, funerary objects (associated and unassociated), sacred objects, and items of cultural patrimony. Summaries are designed to provide information about collections of unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony to Native American tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations that might be interested in requesting repatriation of these objects. Summaries are not object-by-object inventories of collections, but rather are estimates of the number of objects in collections, descriptions of the kind of objects, and references to the methods, dates, and locations from which the collections were acquired. Inventories are an item-by-item list of human remains and associated funerary objects and are designed to facilitate the repatriation of these objects to Native American tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations. Inventories should provide clear descriptions of these cultural objects and are intended to help establish “cultural affiliation” between these objects and present-day organizations. Importantly, inventories and the resulting determinations of cultural affiliation must be completed in consultation with potentially affected Native American tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations. Some tribal voices, however, have questioned how extensive these consultations have been in practice.

NAGPRA requires that human remains and associated funerary objects must be repatriated to direct descendants or culturally affiliated Native American tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations. Cultural affiliation requires a reasonable connection between the present-day organization making the repatriation request and the earlier tribe or group from which the cultural objects come. Geographical, kinship, biological, archaeological, linguistic, folkloric, oral tradition, historical evidence, expert opinion, and other relevant information can be used to establish cultural affiliation.<sup>21</sup> Cultural affiliation is determined by a preponderance of the evidence and does not need to be demonstrated with scientific certainty. Additionally, no single line of evidence is supposed to be given more weight than any other. This aspect of NAGPRA is very important to tribal communities as it is one means by which the law attempts to overcome some of the strong bias that was shown previously in favor of “scientific” evidence. For the first time, legislation codified the equality of indigenous evidence, such as oral histories, alongside the “scientific” evidence of archaeologists and physical anthropologists.

We should note that repatriations of cultural objects and ancestral remains have occurred outside of and prior to the passage of the NMAIA and NAGPRA. For instance, in 1989 the Nebraska state legislature passed an unmarked burial law that forced the Nebraska State Historical Society to repatriate the remains of more than four hundred Pawnee, and numerous other states have passed similar unmarked burial laws.<sup>22</sup> A few institutions, like

Stanford University, repatriated human remains to tribal communities prior to the passage of NAGPRA. Still, the primary mechanism for repatriation in the United States is NAGPRA, and any understanding of the repatriation landscape in the United States must place this law at the center.

## “UNFINISHED BUSINESS”: CULTURALLY UNIDENTIFIABLE HUMAN REMAINS

The central contentious issue concerning NAGPRA implementation in the United States is the treatment and disposition of CUHRs. Human remains for which no cultural affiliation with a present-day Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization can be sufficiently determined are considered to be CUHRs. Human remains are designated as CUHRs for three primary reasons: (1) insufficient evidence or provenience to identify the affiliation of remains, (2) identification of remains to an earlier group for which there is no present-day tribal organization, and (3) affiliation of human remains to a modern-day tribal organization that is not federally recognized as an Indian tribe. Due to the contentious nature of this issue, regulations for the appropriate disposition of CUHRs were not issued when NAGPRA regulations were initially promulgated. Instead, a section was reserved for future use, leaving this very central aspect of repatriation as “unfinished business.” In October of 2007, the US Department of the Interior finally proposed regulations for the disposition of CUHRs and opened the proposal to public comment. Responses to the proposed regulations, however, demonstrate that they are highly contentious.<sup>23</sup> The regulations for the disposition of CUHRs were eventually published on March 15, 2010, and went into effect on May 14, 2010. The regulations are controversial, to the point that some scientific organizations and museums have threatened lawsuits. Exactly how the regulations will play out in practice remains to be seen.

Although there are certainly a variety of nuanced views on the issue of CUHRs, in general any differences in viewpoint regarding CUHRs reflect whether one interprets NAGPRA principally as a repatriation law designed to return human remains to tribal organizations or as legislation reflecting a compromise between Native American interests and those of the scientific community.<sup>24</sup>

The issue of CUHRs is so central, in part, due to the magnitude of the numbers of human remains designated as “culturally unidentifiable.” James Riding In notes that institutions having NAGPRA responsibilities reported holding at least 150,887 Native American human remains.<sup>25</sup> Of this number, however, only slightly more than 32,000 have been culturally affiliated, leaving



nearly 119,000 sets of human remains as “culturally unidentifiable.” This means that roughly 80 percent of the human remains currently in the collections of museums and federal agencies have been determined to be culturally unidentifiable, and therefore the status of their disposition is in question. Additionally, Andrew Kline notes that the majority of CUHRs came into institutional collections from scientific excavations, and therefore theoretically their designation as unaffiliated cannot be due to lack of adequate provenience.<sup>26</sup>

This data has led some to view the disproportionately high number of CUHR designations as a reflection of continued colonialism and racism in the repatriation process. For instance, *Riding In* argues that the high number of CUHR designations is indicative of institutional barriers established to reinforce archaeologists’ control over archaeological collections and as a way to circumvent repatriations.<sup>27</sup> This includes the possibility that museums and federal agencies, especially those institutions that view NAGPRA as antisience legislation, often use a standard for affiliation that exceeds the “preponderance of the evidence” standard that NAGPRA requires. Furthermore, *Riding In* notes that a fatal flaw in NAGPRA is that federal agencies and museums are ultimately the institutions empowered to make the final determination of affiliation, rather than tribal organizations, and therefore cultural affiliation is principally based on “scientific” views of cultural affiliation rather than tribal views.<sup>28</sup> Although designations of affiliation are expected to be made in full consultation with Native American tribes, in practice, consultation is too often cursory at best and at times nonexistent.

An additional issue surrounding CUHRs centers on the status of nonrecognized tribes. Non–federally recognized Indian nations do not have direct standing to make NAGPRA claims. Therefore, human remains ancestral to nonrecognized Indian tribes are automatically considered culturally unidentifiable. Although there is nothing in NAGPRA to preclude the transfer of human remains to nonrecognized tribes, these transfers must be approved by the national NAGPRA Review Committee. Furthermore, transfers to nonrecognized Indian nations are purely voluntary and solely at the discretion of the federal agency or museum that holds the collections. In response to this weakness in NAGPRA, some groups have made NAGPRA claims as coalitions consisting of recognized and nonrecognized Indian nations. But despite the approval of such coalitions by the national NAGPRA Review Committee, the formation of tribal coalitions has been opposed by the Society for American Archaeology.

Concern also exists among tribal communities regarding the treatment and use of human remains designated as CUHRs. For example, there is fear that members of the archaeological and museum communities treat the designation of human remains as CUHRs as a permanent status that consequently signifies *de facto* ownership. As a result, these human remains are available for research

and for use as teaching collections. Many tribal communities note, however, that guidance for NAGPRA clearly states that the culturally unidentifiable status is not a fixed category and can change as a result of either the introduction of new information or a change in recognized status. These communities note that the goal of NAGPRA is the repatriation of all human remains, not the determination of which human remains are to be left behind for analysis.

## CONCLUSION: NAGPRA AS DECOLONIZATION?

One cannot underestimate the importance of NAGPRA as an act that extends the same burial rights and protections to indigenous people over their dead that is afforded to all US citizens. Additionally, NAGPRA forces the anthropological and museum communities to at least acknowledge the hard truths of the history of past collecting practices and do what is morally and legally right in the present by repatriating human remains and cultural objects in museums and federal agencies affiliated with contemporary indigenous people. Since its passage in 1990, a number of successful repatriations have taken place that brought great healing and comfort to Native people and also helped the scientific community to begin to take the necessary steps to put things right. However, although we recognize that some positive collaborations and repatriations have taken place since the passage of NAGPRA, we caution against subscribing to a narrative of progress when assessing the current situation of NAGPRA compliance in the United States or equating NAGPRA with decolonization. Dumont, who in a review of the anthology *Opening Archaeology: Repatriation's Impact on Contemporary Research and Practice*, edited by Thomas W. Killion, notes this same caution:

I worry that the text [*Opening Archaeology*] is part of a larger effort to minimize the ugly, racist history of archaeology and physical anthropology so that scientists can avoid taking responsibility for examining how their research-driven agendas are complicit in the legacy of atrocities committed by their anthropological predecessors. And all of this, I fear, is a strategy for maintaining the upper hand in the emerging fight for the nearly 120,000 ancestors and millions of stolen objects that they have declared "culturally unidentifiable." I am concerned that stories full of flowery relationships between the tribes and scientists are political cover for a legally mandated consultation process that has been minimized, trivialized, obfuscated, and in too many instances not happened at all.<sup>29</sup>

As suggested by Dumont, the current struggle over the status of CUHRs illustrates that NAGPRA implementation as it stands today does not represent an act of decolonization. Regardless of whether the status of these ancestral remains as culturally unidentifiable is due primarily to poor record

keeping, attempts by museums and agencies to keep these remains from being repatriated, or the historical ambiguities of federal recognition and nonrecognition, the result is the same: under NAGPRA, the vast majority of Native American human remains are not presently being repatriated. Furthermore, many members of the anthropological community have remained steadfast in their opposition to the repatriation of CUHRs. A truly decolonized view of repatriation would start from the position that all Native American human remains—including CUHRs—be under the control of tribal communities; that repatriation of CUHRs, if desired by tribes, be completed in accordance with protocols established by Native American groups; and that all scientific study and use of CUHRs stop immediately.<sup>30</sup> Although collaborations between anthropologists and Native Americans have grown in recent years, the current state of NAGPRA compliance illuminates that there is still unfinished business. Repatriation, we argue, is the most important aspect of collaboration, and if archaeologists cannot collaborate with tribes by standing up for tribal primacy in determining what happens to all Native American human remains, then our other forms of collaboration become much less relevant. There remains, therefore, a great deal of work to do before we can assert that NAGPRA is an act of decolonization in a “postcolonial” world.

## NOTES

This text was previously published in the *Handbook on Postcolonialism and Archaeology*, edited by Jane Lydon and Uzma Z. Rizvi (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2010), 215–23.

1. See Heather Burke, Claire Smith, Dorothy Lippert, Joe Watkins, and Larry Zimmerman, eds., *Kennewick Man: Perspectives on the Ancient One* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008); Mille Gabriel and Jens Dahl, eds., *Utimut: Past Heritage—Future Partnerships* (Copenhagen, Denmark: IWGIA, 2008); Thomas W. Killion, ed., *Opening Archaeology: Repatriation’s Impact on Contemporary Research and Practice* (Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2008); and Devon A. Mihesuah, ed., *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000).

2. Russell Thornton, “Who Owns Our Past? The Repatriation of Native American Human Remains and Cultural Objects,” in *Studying Native America: Problems and Prospects*, ed. Russell Thornton (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), 387–88.

3. James Riding In, “Our Dead Are Never Forgotten: American Indian Struggles for Burial Rights and Protections,” in *“They Made Us Many Promises”: The American Indian Experience, 1524 to the Present*, ed. Philip Weeks (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 2002), 296.

4. Thornton, “Who Owns Our Past?” 388.

5. Riding In, “Our Dead Are Never Forgotten,” 298.

6. *Ibid.*

7. Suzan Shown Harjo, introduction to *Mending the Circle: A Native American Repatriation Guide*, ed. Barbara Meister (New York: American Indian Ritual Object Repatriation Foundation, 1996), 3–4. See also, James Riding In, “Six Pawnee Crania: Historical and Contemporary Issues

Associated with the Massacre and Decapitation of Pawnee Indians in 1869," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 16, no. 2 (1992): 101–19.

8. As cited in Riding In, "Our Dead Are Never Forgotten," 306.

9. *Ibid.*

10. Joe Watkins, "The Antiquities Act at One Hundred Years: A Native American Perspective," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, eds. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 192–93.

11. Clayton W. Dumont Jr., "The Politics of Scientific Objections to Repatriation," *Wicazo Sa Review* 18 (2003): 117.

12. Russell Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1942* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987).

13. Douglas Cole, *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).

14. Walter R. Echo-Hawk and Roger C. Echo-Hawk, "Repatriation, Reburial and Religious Rights," in *American Indians in American History, 1870–2001: A Companion Reader*, ed. Sterling Evans (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002), 180.

15. See James Riding In, "Decolonizing NAGPRA," in *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook*, eds. Waziyatawin Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 2005), 53–66; and James Riding In, "Graves Protection and Repatriation: An Unresolved Universal Human Rights Problem Affected by Institutional Racism," in *Human Rights in Global Light: Selected Papers, Poems, and Prayers, SFSU Annual Human Rights Summits, 2004–2007* (San Francisco, CA: Treganza Museum Anthropology Papers 24 and 25, 2007–2008), 37–42.

16. Timothy C. McKeown, "Considering Repatriation Legislation as an Option: The National Museum of the American Indian Act (NMAIA) and The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)," in Gabriel and Dahl, *Utimut: Past Heritage—Future Partnerships*, 134.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*, 136.

19. Jack F. Trope, "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act," in Meister, *Mending the Circle*, 8.

20. See Timothy C. McKeown and Sherry Hutt, "In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Twelve Years After," *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law and Policy* 21, no. 2 (2003): 153–212; and Jack F. Trope and Walter R. Echo-Hawk, "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: Background and Legislative History," *Arizona State Law Journal* 24 (1992): 35–77.

21. Trope, "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act," 11.

22. Riding In, "Our Dead Are Never Forgotten," 316.

23. For an overview, see Ora V. Marek-Martinez, "NAGPRA's Achilles Heel: The Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains," *Heritage Management* 1, no. 2 (2008): 243–60.

24. Riding In, "Graves Protection and Repatriation," 39.

25. Riding In, "Graves Protection and Repatriation," 39. See also Andrew Kline "Who Are the Culturally Unidentifiable?" 2007 National NAGPRA report, [www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/review/Who%20are%20the%20Culturally%20Unidentifiable.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/history/nagpra/review/Who%20are%20the%20Culturally%20Unidentifiable.pdf) (accessed June 9, 2009).

26. Kline, "Who Are the Culturally Unidentifiable?" 9.

27. Riding In, "Graves Protection and Repatriation"; Riding In, "Decolonizing NAGPRA."

28. Riding In, "Graves Protection and Repatriation," 39.

29. Clayton Dumont, review of *Opening Archaeology: Repatriation's Impact on Contemporary Research and Practice*, by Thomas Killion, *Wicazo Sa Review* 24, no. 1 (2009): 118.

30. Riding In, "Decolonizing NAGPRA," 64–65.