

INDIGENOUS CO-STEWARDSHIP OF PUBLIC LANDS: LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

DENISS J. MARTINEZ, GUEST EDITOR



Before Co-Stewardship and Management of Public Lands: *The Historicity of Indigenous Land Stewardship and Management in Native California*

BEVERLY R. ORTIZ

▲ "To Dream of Balance Between Heaven and Earth," 1990 watercolor by Kathleen Rose Smith (Bodega Miwok/Mihilakawna [Dry Creek] and Goat Rock Pomo, 1939–2023), imaged by Digital Grange, courtesy of Native California Research Institute. This piece expresses the integration of the spiritual and physical aspects of life, the sky shown above and the earth below, with some of its elements depicted in multiples of the sacred four. The four square crosses represent the four directions. The stars represent female Pomo dancers; the diamonds represent male Pomo dancers. The quail topknot basketry designs represent gifts from the earth. The green plant in the center represents bay laurel, a Pomo and Coast Miwok cleansing plant and another gift from the earth.

ABSTRACT

This article begins with a very brief overview of the diverse, multilayered, traditionalist relationships that underpin Native California land stewardship. From there it summarizes the impacts of Spanish, Mexican, and early American colonization on Native Californians and their eons-old relationships with the land, including the outlawing by early Spanish colonizers of cultural burning. These summary discussions provide context for a deeper understanding of the significance of ground-breaking, mid-20th-century Native California organizational initiatives to restore ancestral land management, beginning with the 1940 establishment of the Pomo Indian Women's Club and the 1951 founding of the Northwest California Hoopa Pottery Guild, an effort to preserve ancestral basketry designs in fired clay that would eventually lead to the restoration of regional basketry traditions and the application of cultural burning techniques necessary to generate the growth of the healthy, flexible shoots used to weave a shapely basket. This article ends with the history of the first-ever cultural gathering policy by a California-based, land-holding agency (California State Parks).

INTRODUCTION

The understanding that the earth and sky and all objects in between have life and consciousness underpins the spiritual traditions of Indigenous peoples throughout the continent of the place now known as North America. An interrelated system of powerful, usually ambivalent, supernatural forces is recognized to exist as an integral part of daily experience. People keep the world harmonious (balanced) through prayerful actions, thoughts, and offerings; adherence to rules of proper behavior; and the observance of ceremony in proper seasons on a yearly cycle.¹

Complex and culturally diverse spiritual and socio-political traditions guided people's day-to-day interactions with each other and everything in the natural world, relationships that acknowledged the deep and abiding connections between people, creation, previous generations, community, and place.² As expressed by Kathleen Rose Smith in 1993,

To live in spiritual and physical balance in the same small area for thousands of years without feeling the need to go somewhere else, as my people did, requires restraint, respect, and knowledge of the ways of each animal and plant. As my mother taught me, and she, in turn, was taught, the plants, animals, birds—everything on this earth—they are our relatives, and we had better know how to act around them, or they'll get after us.³

The first non-Indians to intrude on the lives of Native peoples from the place now known as California did so by sea from 1542–1775 and by land from 1769–1776, gradually expanding their reach from south to north. Although these initial newcomers did not stay long, their presence portended a time of tremendous disruption, dislocation, and upheavals to come in the lives of the Native peoples they encountered. Their actions also had enduring environmental impacts, when, for instance, with their ballast and horses they carried seeds of European grasses

and forbs that would initiate the spread of these species across lands stewarded with intent and care by countless generations of Native peoples.

Permanent settlement by Spanish missionaries, soldiers, and later civilians from 1770–1833 initiated a time of incalculable suffering and change for Native peoples. These Spanish colonizers established missions, presidios (forts), pueblos (towns), and land-grant ranchos (ranches) with titles held by the monarchy of Spain, all built and run with Native labor.

Although many Natives resisted missionization, that resistance crumbled in the face of forces beyond their control. Countless Elders, children, and infants died from previously unfamiliar European diseases. Mission runaways were forced to return and corporal punishment was used to keep people in line. Extensive environmental changes resulted from the introduction of cattle, horses, and invasive plants. The outlawing of Native landscape burning added to the coercive pressures that made it impossible to continue living as they had before.⁴

After Mexico achieved independence from Spain in 1821, the colonizers initiated a process to secularize (privatize) mission lands. The number of ranchos greatly increased,

Beverly R. Ortiz, PhD, co-founder and chair of the Native California Research Institute and contributing editor of *News from Native California*, served as a consultant, script writer, and interviewer for the award-winning documentary *Pomo Basketweavers: A Tribute to Three Elders* and as Pomo communities liaison for the National Museum of the American Indian's educational programs for the "Pomo Indian Basketmakers, Their Baskets, and the Art Market" exhibition. She has also worked with numerous Native Northwest California educators and cultural practitioners, including basketweavers, on a variety of projects. beverly.ortiz@nacri.institute

Although Spanish missionaries had promised to one day return mission lands to local Native peoples, only a negligible number of Native individuals ever received any land. Instead, they became unpaid, serf-like laborers on non-Indian-owned ranchos.

most of these covering thousands of acres, their titles now held by individuals. Although Spanish missionaries had promised to one day return mission lands to local Native peoples, only a negligible number of Native individuals ever received any land. Instead, they became unpaid, serf-like laborers on non-Indian-owned ranchos.⁵

While these events completely upended the lives of Native Californians whose homelands extended from today's San Diego to Sonoma counties and easterly into the place now known as the Central Valley, colonization expanded its reach when, in 1850, California became the 31st state in the United States. While historians and others often discuss California's entry into the Union as a "free state" for African Americans, comparatively few follow up to note that, beginning in 1850, the state legislature passed a series of laws that legalized the indenture and *de facto* slavery of the first peoples of the land. These laws also made it illegal for Native people to testify in court, serve on juries, and vote. Although partially repealed after passage of the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation, full repeal would not come until the 1870s.

Citizenship wasn't granted to most California Indians until 1917, and it would not be achieved for all until 1924. Other 1850s to early 1900s impacts of American colonization in the place now known as California include massacres, 18 unratified treaties, family and community separation through boarding schools, and the uneven and incomplete establishment of federal recognition and trust land for only some Tribes indigenous to the state.⁶

While the preceding is but a mere outline of the depth and breadth of the impacts that settler colonialism had, and continues to have, on the lives of Native Californians, and the concomitant depth and breadth of its impacts on the environment, it's offered here as a reminder that

between 1769, when the first Spanish mission was founded in a Kumeyaay homeland, and the relatively recent beginnings of the adoption of government-to-government memorandums of understanding (MOUs) for the co-stewardship and management of public lands, innumerable Native Californians stepped forward and stood up for their rights, including their rights and responsibilities to maintain their eons-old relationships with the land, taking actions that, against all odds, would create the circumstances that enables these MOUs to exist.

The events described below are proffered as examples of the many hidden stories that warrant knowing, remembering, honoring, and documenting as part of the work of co-stewardship/management of public lands. Those presented here are focused on community-based restoration of Native California basketry, including access to and management of basketry materials. These are followed by an early example of the codification into public policy of Native cultural materials gathering rights.

POMO EFFORTS TO RENEW BASKETRY

Pomo Indian Women's Club

As a senior citizen, she [Elsie Allen] was driving to San Francisco doing seminars at the age of 70. She was never home. She was ... kind of a basketweaving social butterfly, if you will, in terms of really going wherever the need or desire was to learn.

—Linda Aguilar McGill, granddaughter of Elsie Allen⁷

When Sara Greensfelder coordinated the first California Indian Basketweavers Gathering in 1991, out of which a statewide organization of Native California basketweavers formed the following year, she credited Makahmo (Cloverdale) Pomo elder Elsie Allen (1899–1990) as one of the individuals who inspired her. As Sara told it:

In 1986, Pomo weaver Elsie Allen had told me a poignant story of being run off one of her gathering sites by an irate, shotgun wielding property owner; and how she had felt so frightened and discouraged she nearly gave up weaving. After a reporter at a local paper heard about the incident and printed a story about Elsie, offers of help poured in: 'Come to my land and gather your materials, I will help you.' The expressions of support renewed her courage and determination, even though a close relative had urged her to 'let the basket die, along with all the old basketweavers.'

Another story Elsie told was of going to dig sedge roots at an old gathering site which had become a state park. She and a friend set up a card table, put out a tablecloth and



▲ Elsie Allen on the porch of her home, ca. 1978, photo by Scott M. Patterson. To learn more about Elsie, here's a link to Part 2 of the award-winning *Pomo Basketweavers: A Tribute to Three Elders* that features her, "Pomo Basketweavers #2- Elsie Allen" (28½ minutes).

picnic basket and each took turns at pretending to enjoy a leisurely afternoon picnic while the other crawled into the undergrowth to dig her roots. Elsie laughed at the recollection and so did I, but at the same time I felt outraged that an elderly Indian woman should have to sneak around to get her materials in a place where her people had dug roots for countless generations.⁸

One story that Elsie did not tell Sara that day, but might have, is that of the Pomo Indian Mother's Club, established in 1940; later renamed the Pomo Indian Women's Club "to include those who were not mothers."⁹ Elsie served on the club's basket committee.

Through this committee, Elsie and her mother Annie Burke had learned that the display of baskets, and the demonstration of basketry techniques, could help improve "Indian-white" relations by dispelling negative stereotypes about the Pomo.¹⁰ Committee members not only reached out to the dominant society, but to their own young people, whose pride had been assailed by policies and attitudes that marginalized Pomo and other American Indians in the Ukiah area. Extensive social science field research conducted in Ukiah between 1934 and 1948 documented these policies and attitudes, the latter revealed in the statement of an automobile salesman who, although living in a town named for the

Yokayo Pomo people, felt compelled to declare that, "The Indians in this valley are the worst kind of human beings alive."¹¹ This racist sentiment was expressed in nearly identical terms by the owner of one of three drug stores in town: "The Pomos are the lowest form of human beings on earth."¹²

Against this backdrop, the following 1947 description of the club's structure and its activities take on extraordinary potency, despite how ordinary those activities might seem if their context was different:

As a group they plan and control the majority of the social and other events. They organize activities which include contacts with people outside the tribal group as well as many of the 'intra-tribal' affairs. They decide when dances should be held and when neighboring groups should be invited.

The club meets once a month, while the officers, consisting of a duly-elected president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, meet twice a month. Dances are scheduled monthly or oftener, depending on the season of the year. The club sponsors trips for members to represent them and present the Pomo arts and crafts in white communities in the surrounding area. It has had exhibitions and presentations in San Francisco.

The club has become the means of contact between the Indians and the various white communities. It also deals with governmental officials on such matters as hot school lunches for children, aid for non-ward Indians, and other problems of this kind.

The club provides a place for young people to gather and have a good time. At the dances it is possible to keep drinking at a minimum, and to have a certain amount of supervision of the younger members of the population in a pleasant and enjoyable atmosphere. The age range of the individuals who attend the affairs is from babes in arms to aged men and women.¹³

From this it can be seen that the club's basket committee functioned as one part of a broader effort by club members to serve the needs of the regional Native community. It formed, in part, as a response to a decline of Pomo basketry that had several causes, including a post-Depression lack of a viable economic outlet for selling baskets, the difficulty in obtaining materials due to habitat loss from cultivation, and a desire to not stand out as Indian.¹⁴

The shame evinced in being Indian was something that the basket committee could and did address by inducing non-Indian interest in basketry. The public event that launched the committee's work was organized by the local Indian Service nurse, "Miss Murphy," a member of the non-Indian women's Saturday Afternoon Club. Nurse Murphy arranged for three Pomo women to come and demonstrate acorn-making and share pinole, beadwork, and baskets at a Saturday Afternoon Club meeting. Afterward, "a young Indian who had participated in the program" observed,

I was noticing that before the program ... the whites seemed to think that the Indians were just plain Indians and that's all. They didn't know a thing about them, and didn't care. But after the program, it was really funny how they suddenly became interested in the Indian way of doing things, and realized for the first time that the Indian must have had some way of getting along before the days the whites came.¹⁵

In subsequent years members of the basket committee traveled throughout the San Francisco Bay Area giving presentations and displaying baskets.

Hinthil Women's Club

Although the Pomo Indian Women's Club disbanded in 1957, a similar organization, the Federated Hinthil Women's Club, replaced it until the mid-to-late 1970s. According to Harriet Rhoades, Hinthil's one-time secretary, the club hosted social activities for regional Native peoples, including basketry classes with Elsie Allen and holiday events. It also sponsored an annual scholarship.¹⁶

In 1972, Elsie Allen brought Pomo basketry to an even wider audience with the publication of her book *Pomo Basketmaking: A Supreme Art for the Weaver*. In it, Elsie wrote,

There is a beautiful feeling to have these useful and lovely baskets grow into being under the work of your own hands and the designs that grow with them....

In the last four years I have taught the art of basketweaving at Mendocino Art Center in Mendocino City. Several weekends in the spring are set aside to teach the students how to gather material and later on they are shown how to cure and finally weave the baskets. I would have from eight to sixteen students.... I am happy to teach all and would be especially happy if some local Indian girls would become interested in learning this art.¹⁷

The shame evinced in being Indian was something that the basket committee could and did address by inducing non-Indian interest in basketry.

As recalled by Kathleen Rose Smith (Bodega Miwok/Mihilakawna and Goat Rock Pomo),

I had heard about Elsie Allen, and she wrote a book of how to weave Pomo baskets. And that is the first time I had ever heard of a Pomo weaver teaching outside of the tradition of just teaching your relatives how to weave.¹⁸

Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study¹⁹

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Elsie Allen and several other notable and accomplished Pomo people, including basketweavers Mabel McKay (Long Valley Cache Creek Pomo, 1907–1993)²⁰ and Laura Fish Somersal (Mihilakawna/Wappo, 1992–1990),²¹ participated in the Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study, the outcome of a United States Army Corps of Engineers plan to build a reservoir in Northern Sonoma County that would inundate multiple Mihilakawna and Makahmo Pomo cultural sites, including basketry materials gathering sites used by countless generations. The unheeded protests against the project by Pomos and others culminated in a legal challenge to the adequacy of the project's environmental impact statement by a group of plaintiffs that included the Dry Creek Band of Pomo Indians. After the judge ruled that the Corps was deficient in its assessment of impacts on cultural resources, including basketry materials gathering sites, and in its lack of an impact mitigation plan, the Corps contracted with Sonoma State University's Anthropological Studies Center to complete the impact study.

Not wanting to let non-Indian archaeologists and cultural anthropologists study and interpret their cultures without them, several Pomos came forward to participate in every aspect of what became known as the Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study (the Study), including service on its Native American Advisory Committee. Interviews were conducted with Elders and a cultural exhibit planned, the latter now one component of a visitor center near the dam.



▲ “Dry Creek Pomo Village Site,” 1979 watercolor by Kathleen Rose Smith, imaged by Digital Grange, courtesy of the Native California Research Institute. This piece depicts an ancestral village site in the artist’s Mihilakawna (Dry Creek Pomo) homeland at a location now buried beneath the waters and silt of Lake Sonoma, which was created after the building of the Warm Spring Dam. Artist Kathleen Rose Smith painted this watercolor when she became one of the last of her people to see this site, with its remnant house pits. At the time, Kathleen was representing her people as an archaeological field technician during the construction of the dam by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

▶ LEFT TO RIGHT David Peri (Bodega Miwok, 1939–2000, Kathleen Smith’s cousin), Lucy Lozinto Smith (Mihilakawna, 1906–2000, Kathleen’s mother), Kathleen, and Laura Fish Somersal (Mihilakawna/Wappo) at Warm Springs, ca. 1980 COLLECTION OF KATHLEEN SMITH

To view 12 minutes of 1993 footage of Kathleen discussing basketry, the Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study, and the cultural philosophy with which she was raised about people’s place in the world, go to https://youtu.be/XrDO_8Dg_TV.



The Study, the first of its type in the country, included major ethnobotanical research and the transplantation of basketry sedge away from the area of inundation with the guidance of the basketweavers. Today that sedge is reserved for harvest by Pomo basketweavers and their guests under the oversight of the Dry Creek Band of Pomo Indians Cultural Committee, with adherence to the cultural protocols established by the weavers.²²

The Study also resulted in a number of reports, including several that feature its ethnobotanical, basketry, and broader cultural elements.²³

Northwest California Efforts to Renew Basketry²⁴

In 1990, Vivien Hailstone (Karuk/Yurok/Member of the Hoopa Valley Tribe, 1913–2000)²⁵ described for me what it was like to grow up Indian in the Klamath-Trinity River area in the early 1900s:

Before it was so bad to be Indian that you were ashamed, or you had to be somebody else. Many of the people would say I'm Filipino, or I'm from Canada. I'm from the dark French or whatever. They'd be anything except Indian. At one time, being Indian was so bad, if you got an education, it didn't do any good anyway. They wouldn't hire you.... You think anybody would go to a doctor [of Native heritage]? The banks wouldn't hire you. Nobody would hire you because you were an Indian. And so, in our minds being Indian was so bad, and we didn't really know why. Why was it so bad to be an Indian? But it's because of what they did to us. They portrayed us as the savages. We were this and we were that. And we thought maybe we were.²⁶

Vivien's remarks not only mirror the statements made about shame by members of the Pomo Indian Women's Club, but also those of an unidentified Yokayo Pomo man during the same time period, who said it was "useless for an Indian to spend time and money in order to get an education or learn a trade because the whites wouldn't give an Indian a job anyway—except doing work in the fields."²⁷

Also during the same time period, Josephine Peters (Karuk/Shasta/Abenake, 1923–2011),²⁸ born nearly 9½ years after Vivien and several miles upriver, experienced the impact that colonization had on basketry:

After the whites came in here, they tried to rule all of us—tell us what to do, and take things away from us, like weaving baskets. When we saw somebody coming, we'd hide it; just grab everything up, and throw it behind a chair, or some other place, and cover it up with a towel.... Well, after the government schools closed down, and everybody

came back, most of the younger people had to learn the Indian ways all over again. A lot of them never did go back to it.... Baskets were really dying out. Hardly anybody was making them anymore, because they had no [market] for it. They were scared to go out and sell it to someone, so we started making pottery.²⁹

As with the Pomo Indian Women's Club's Basket Committee, it was an Indian Service Field Nurse, Lura Black, who provided the means, this time through pottery, for Karuk, Yurok, and Hupa people to reclaim and restore their basketry traditions.

Hoopa Pottery Guild

The Hoopa Pottery Guild began its work in 1951 after Nurse Black noticed sources of clay along the road during her drives to the Hoopa Valley Reservation. By then, basketry materials had become increasingly hard to obtain and fewer and fewer women wove. According to Vivien, as quoted in a 1967 newspaper article, pottery filled this void:

The designs and shapes of the pottery blend themselves well with the nearly lost native Indian art of basket weaving.... Clay for the pottery is relatively easy to obtain. It can be found almost anywhere locally, and requires very little preparation. It does give us an outlet for expression of our native art.³⁰

As guild membership grew, a pottery studio was built in Hoopa. Although this building was lost in a 1964 flood, another was constructed in Hoopa on Presbyterian Church grounds by Presbyterian youth from as far away as Hayward under the supervision of Reverend Charles Messinger, who "was also instrumental in raising money for the project."³¹ By the time the church decided to discontinue the building's use for pottery, guild potters had acquired their own wheels and kilns and continued their work at home.³²

Throughout the guild's early years, whenever its members got together, they discussed cultural traditions. As their pride and numbers grew, the women became empowered to begin teaching basketry. According to Josephine,

We tried to save the basket designs by putting it on pottery. And then finally the weavers started coming back. We taught it in school, we had evening gatherings, and we'd gather materials. I had people coming here to the house to sit down [and learn].... With the kids in school, we'd start out maybe with twenty to twenty-three students. When I ended up, I had two left, but the two that stuck with it, they're really good weavers today. Some of them would come back [to it] later.³³



▲ Josephine Peters with some of her pottery, ca. 1971. On left, a basketry eel trap and pottery with a “people sitting around fire” basketry design. The other pottery designs are Josephine’s own innovations. COLLECTION OF JOSEPHINE PETERS

An early effort to merge pottery and basketry occurred in May 1955 when the guild set up a display at the Eureka Hobbies-in-Action show at the Eureka Women’s Clubhouse. The late Lizzie Smith and Josephine Peters, both wearing basket hats, demonstrated basketry behind a table arrayed with guild member pottery. The press called this “one of the most fascinating exhibits at the show.”³⁴

In 1966, the Hoopa Pottery Guild’s first Art and Pottery Exhibit, held in the guild’s new studio, included pottery and basketry displays for the enjoyment and education of its estimated 150 attendees. The next year, guild mem-

bers began teaching pottery classes in the Hoopa Valley through the College of the Redwoods. By then they had secured “an exclusive contract with a leading San Francisco art dealer to market their products.”³⁵

Cultural Renaissance

Efforts to restore basketry occurred hand-in-hand with efforts to restore Karuk, Yurok, and Hupa cultural traditions in general, with some of the basketweavers involved in both initiatives, all started, in part, to dispel negative images in popular media about their own people and American Indians in general.

For instance, throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, Vivien Hailstone's father David Risling Sr. (1887–1982) organized summertime cultural shows at varied events, including county and state fairs held locally and as far away as Anadarko, Oklahoma. Others focused on cultural presentations and demonstrations for elementary and secondary school teachers, college professors, and students. As Josephine Peters explained it to me in 2001:

Everybody hated Indians at that time.... Pop Risling, Vivien's dad, wanted to show people that Indians weren't bad, and that they didn't have to be afraid of them.... They had a culture. They knew how to do different things.³⁶

Basketry was often a featured part of these events. In 1957, for example, 38 teachers from Sacramento schools joined Sacramento State College students as guests of the Hoopa Valley Tribe. David Risling Sr.'s son-in-law, the late Ernie Marshall Sr. (Hoopa), welcomed the participants, stating his hope (reminiscent of that of the Pomo Indian Women's Club) that the "interest of others might be an incentive to the Hoopa people to start now to preserve their songs, legends and dances before they are forgotten." As part of this event, Lizzie Smith and Josephine Peters shared basketry.³⁷

As the years passed, the creative exchange of ideas among the various artisans resulted in many new, unique, and innovative objects, at once beautiful and utilitarian and a visual statement of pride.

On June 19, 1959, in the Hoopa Valley, Vivien Hailstone opened I-Ye-Quee (a warm greeting in the Yurok language), a gift shop through which locally created cultural objects were sold. The event was commemorated with a basket, woven by the late Ella Johnson (Yurok), that included the shop's opening date woven into its otherwise reddish-brown woodwardia overlay center.

In addition to pottery and baskets, the store provided a local outlet for stunning jewelry created by guild members, all inspired by the old ways, but also reflective of contemporary influences and individual creativity. As the years passed, the creative exchange of ideas among the various artisans resulted in many new, unique, and innovative objects, at once beautiful and utilitarian and

a visual statement of pride, such as basketry medallion necklaces, basketry keychains, and cigarette lighters encased in open-twined basketry.³⁸ As Vivien explained about these innovations:

We are trying to express ourselves in adapting the old to the new to show people that we are Indians of today, not two hundred years ago.... We are doing the modern thing and yet we have the Indian designs and are using the Indian traditional materials from the things around us.³⁹

Initiation of Basketry Classes

By the mid-1960s, efforts were underway to secure reliable sources of basketry materials for classes. Two of those materials, hazel and bear-grass, require fall burning to grow the long, straight, flexible shoots and blades suitable for weaving. When one woman with hazel on her property burned it, the fire got away, and she ended up in jail. As Vivien later recalled:

That was our first experience, so we didn't do baskets for a few years, until we were able to get material. Then we decided that we're not going to make the [whole-shoot hazel] utility baskets. We're just going to make fancy baskets. And there's plenty of willow there, so we started doing little things using the willow.⁴⁰

Through subsequent and sustained education and advocacy, by the time the basketry classes were launched in 1966, the women had secured the necessary materials with the cooperation of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and private individuals.⁴¹ Recalled Vivien:

I went to the Forest Service and told them about the grasses [a colloquial reference to bear-grass, a type of lily with clustered, grass-like leaves used for a light-colored design element], and so they went on the mountain with me. I showed them where to go ... and they burned for us. That was a great thing, I thought. That's when I realized that people aren't really against us. They just don't know.⁴²

The resurgence of basketry in Northwest California accelerated with the Civil Rights Movement. By the time basketry classes had begun to be offered, the California Indian Education Association was forming. Soon to follow were such programs as California Indian Legal Services and Shasta County's Local Indians for Education, Inc. (LIFE), all initiatives in which the basketweavers were involved.

In 1967, the Ad Hoc Committee on Indian Education planning the First All-Indian Statewide Conference on

California Indian Education in North Fork, California, sent out a letter asking those Native Californians who received it to send two delegates from their areas “interested in improving the education of our Indian children to attend as participants in our conference.” The letter also included a request for Indian objects to display, for much the same reason that such objects had been displayed during presentations to non-Indians by the Pomo Indian Women’s Club. As stated in the letter,

We plan to have displays by various statewide Indian organizations as well as exhibits from the various areas of the state. We would welcome any Indian arts, crafts and artifacts from your area that delegates would care to bring and add to the exhibit. We feel that an exchange of ideas through meetings, displays, and exhibits is educationally vital to the welfare of our children as it serves to improve the “Indian image” in the eyes of both our Indian and non-Indian people alike.⁴³

Leona Alameda (Yurok, 1910–2008), by then one of the finest potters in the Hoopa Pottery Guild, served on the planning committee as coordinator of the display, as did Vivien Hailstone, with Elsie Allen a conference attendee.⁴⁴

Yurok-Karok-Hoopa Weavers of the Klamath-Trinity Arts and Crafts Association

In 1966, the newly formed Yurok-Karok-Hoopa Weavers of the Klamath-Trinity Arts and Crafts Association, with basketry materials now secured, announced plans to begin teaching basketry at the Hoopa Pottery House in the fall, with registration at the I-Ye-Quee Gift Shop. Ella Johnson served as instructor and Josephine Peters as associate instructor.

The association announced its plans through a press release by an unidentified author published in a local paper, a significant contemporaneous account of the reasons for the association’s work and its urgency, including an explication of the impact of a Forest Service prohibition on cultural burning, and the advocacy that turned that prohibition around, as well as the assertion of basketry as art (not craft), a point emphasized time and time again by weavers, including Elsie Allen in the title of her book. Here’s an excerpt from the press release:

Historically the art of basketry, as practiced by the members of the Yurok, Karok, and Hoopa tribes of this area, reached its zenith as a skill and craft. This art was purposeful as well as ornamental and was a tremendous influence on the culture of these people. These artful skills and crafts produced ceremonial baskets, water tight baskets, baskets

for food gathering and sifting, and many other uses. Each with its own design, purpose and decorations. Each constructed by a talented and skilled artist with the pride that goes with excellence.

Time has wrought severe changes in this priceless art of basketry. Our people had to abandon their way of life, their former skills and become like Europeans. The passage of time continually brings changes in our ways and our thinking. However, we realize that although we must learn the white man’s ways we still must be ourselves and preserve our songs, dances, art and skills that are representative of our heritage and culture.

Laws as well as time contributed to the decline of the art of basket weaving. The Forest Service laws prevented the practice of burning specific areas where the particular grasses grew that were necessary for the weaving of the baskets. Without this annual burning and the resulting new growth of these particular grasses and shoots, the raw materials simply were not available for continuing this art. Only recently, my family, local people and our friends throughout the state expended a great deal of time and effort to correct this law that was so damaging to our culture. We are now permitted the privilege of gathering materials from forests and public domain lands.

As a result of these conditions we began to turn to pottery made from clay that is native to this area. We were gradually being forced to this transfer of our skills, talents and art. As our interest in pottery grew a group of ladies formed a pottery guild in 1951. This guild created lots of interest and a pottery house was constructed. The skills steadily improved and soon the projects created by the guild members were winning many awards at local and state fairs. These award winning exhibits contributed in no small way to the recognition of our skills but also as an addition to our economy.

This time nature attempted to hasten the departure of our culture by completely destroying our guild building and many homes as well as countless artifacts and treasured relics of our past during the great flood of 1964. However, the oldest mission church in Hoopa, the Presbyterian Church, realized the importance of the guild building and the purpose of its organization and thus felt that they could help most by building a new pottery house.

We the members of the Pottery Guild have recently revised our bylaws to include any other forms of local arts and crafts. This was the next step to revive the nearly lost art of basket weaving.

We are now organizing a program to teach the art of basketry, which includes the selection of raw materials, treatment of raw materials, the techniques of weaving and design.

We presently plan to begin our lessons about the middle of November and our new formed group will be called the Yurok-Karok-Hoopa Weavers.⁴⁵

The first class commenced on November 9, 1966, at 2 pm; the second on the same day at 7 pm.⁴⁶ June Bosworth, a participant in the initial series of classes whose husband worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, wrote in 1967 another important contemporaneous account that highlights the basketry materials resource issues involved. Note, too, the emphasis on basketry as a form of art, and the funding sources:

Many tribes were represented among the students; Yurok, Karok, Hupa, Wiyot, Sioux, Pomo, Wintoon [Wintun], Pueblo, and San Juan.

Some of the obstacles Mrs. Hailstone and her teachers had to overcome were difficult. The reeds and branches [colloquial words; true reeds aren't used in area basketry and are rarely used in any form of Native California basketry, and "branches" refers to shoots] used in weaving of the baskets were not easy to come by. Many miles were walked, many streams were waded, the annual 'burning' to obtain the new growth of special grasses and shoots had to be done.

All of this had to be completed before the reeds and branches could be gathered and prepared into kits for the first lesson. Finally to the surprise and delight of many of the students, Mrs. Hailstone informed us that the reeds and bundles were prepared but she was still looking for one more very necessary item—a porcupine! We were all encouraged to keep an eye out for a porcupine; for his quills were to be dyed and woven into the design of the baskets....

The baskets had to be exact, the weaving had to be done just so, or you found yourself starting all over again. The nimble fingers of Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Peters made it look so easy, but there were many sighs and groans as some of the students were told to "pull it out and start all over."

With a twinkle in her eye Mrs. Johnson would tell us, "Now you want to do it right, don't you?" Soon our groans turned to smiles of delight as our baskets finally began to take shape....

We were told that the U.S. Forest Service had assisted this program by the controlled burning of hazel bush; of the blue

[sandbar] willow sticks that had been peeled and bleached [in the sun]. The spruce roots had to be cooked, split and stripped....

Klamath-Trinity Fine Arts Center is proud to have been able to assist in this program. The Save the Children Federation from New Mexico and the Indian Arts and Crafts Board office in Washington, D.C. through the counseling and advice of Edward Malin had brought to this area a renewed interest in the "art of basket weaving."⁴⁷

These basketry classes were so successful that within the year Vivien and Leona had begun helping the Klamath and Smith River people start some of their own.⁴⁸ By the fall of 1970, with Vivien's leadership, the Hoopa-based classes began to be taught through College of the Redwoods extension services. Until instructors became certified as "eminent persons," they had to accept minimum wage as "assistants" to the credentialed, non-Indian art "instructors" who merely took attendance. Now extension courses are no longer necessary, as teaching takes place throughout all levels of area schools, and at springtime and summertime basket camps.⁴⁹

By the time the Fifth All-Indian Statewide Conference on California Indian Education occurred in 1973, Vivien was able to report that the practice of basketry and other cultural traditions was now secure in the Hoopa Valley, due in part to the establishment of Indian trustees for the reservation school.

▼ LEFT TO RIGHT Ken Allen (a local teacher), Vivien Hailstone with student's basket, Josephine VanLandingham (Peters) with basket she made, and Ella Johnson with baskets she made, 1970.
COLLECTION OF VIVIEN HAILSTONE



There is a completely different attitude from two years ago. We have created an atmosphere that is so great to be Indian, everybody wanted to do everything. You want to make baskets. At one time they said, 'The Indian girls don't want to make baskets, they don't want to have anything to do with it.' Well, it is not that way any more.... I know how I felt when I had to hide these things when the white people came. We could only be Indian when we were by ourselves.... We could sing our songs, we could eat our Indian food and all of this. In my time, I lived between two worlds, but now there are really great things happening in our area.

Everybody wants to do the arts and crafts. Everybody wants to do basketry.... We're doing other arts and crafts, too. Last year when the Indian students graduated, there was a drum beat. In one place where there are many Indians, they wore Indian dresses, they sang Indian songs, and they graduated. Indians are getting married in their Indian dress. We're Indian and it is really great. The only way that this can be accomplished is to become involved and we are very much involved up there.⁵⁰

Sixteen years later, in 1989, Vivien reflected on the process through which interest and pride in weaving baskets was nurtured, beginning with Pottery Guild meetings:

Right in the beginning it was hard.... When I first started our class, it wasn't popular, so nobody wanted to do it. Just a few of us started out. We started sharing the different names of the plants. We'd say some Indian words. We would tell Indian stories and whatnot, and more people got interested and started coming in. I think the whole thing was about beginning to feel good about yourself. That it's okay to be an Indian. Now it's popular to be an Indian. Now I can see things happening that I would never think would ever have been done. But it is happening.⁵¹

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION GATHERING POLICY

While Hoopa Pottery Guild initiatives and the Warm Springs Cultural Resources Study mark some of the first successful regional advocacy efforts by Native Californians to influence public policy around access to cultural materials, another effort, which also has a through line to basketweavers, would

▼ Karuk/Shasta/Abenake herbalist Josephine Peters points out false Solomon's seal (*Smilacina racemosa*) in a patch of vanilla plant (*Achlys californica*), ca. 2001. BEVERLY R. ORTIZ



result in statewide access. It occurred on September 16, 1985, when William Briner, then director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), signed DPR's "Traditional California Indian Gathering Policy."

This policy's genesis was a meeting initiated by State Park Archaeologist E. Breck Parkman that took place in the office of California Native American Heritage Commission Executive Director William "Willie" Pink, with Willie's assistant, the late Nancy Evans, on one side of Willie, and Breck's supervisor, the late Dr. Paul Nesbitt, a state historian and supervisor of the Cultural Heritage Section, on the other. Breck, who accompanied Paul to the meeting, as did the late John McAleer, another state historian, got to know Willie while conducting an archaeological survey at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park in San Diego County in the early 1980s. Now Breck, Paul, and John had come to meet with Willie and Nancy to discuss ways the two agencies might work together. As Breck recalled it,

Paul asked Willie what we could do to help California Indians. Willie ... brought up the difficulties that basket-weavers were having accessing materials, such as the danger of CalTrans spraying roadsides where people often gathered basketry materials. Paul and I agreed that we could help. When we got back to the office, Paul took the lead in drafting a policy and then had me review and add to it. We did this within a few days after our meeting with Willie.⁵²

Four members of DPR's Native American Advisory Committee, including Vivien Hailstone, Clarence Brown (Pomo) and Fern Southcott (Kumeyaay from Cuyamaca) were among those who reviewed and commented on it. Review then shifted from DPR's cultural resources staff to its natural resources staff, resulting in a more rigidly defined gathering permit approval process.⁵³

The introduction to the 1985 policy defined DPR's role in cultural and natural resource preservation, before stating, "In order to preserve and interpret California's cultural traditions to the State Park System's visitor, it is necessary to foster cultural continuity by permitting certain traditional ethnic groups to use traditional resources in units of the State Park System." It also made clear that the hunting or collecting of animals wasn't part of the policy, since that activity was covered by policies of the California Department of Fish and Game (now the California Department of Fish and Wildlife).

To access resources covered by the policy, Native California applicants had to meet the following seven conditions quoted here:

- I. The materials collected are for use by individuals or groups in maintaining their folklife and/or as part of an approved interpretive program.
- II. Unit resources shall not be collected for commercial purposes.
- III. The amounts of resource material collected cannot have a significant impact on cultural and natural resources of the unit.
- IV. Rare and endangered plants shall not be collected; and, certain especially identified communities or areas may be excluded also, as identified by the Resource Protection Division.
- V. Collecting methods and locations shall not interfere with the health and safety or quality of experiences of other visitors to the unit.
- VI. Superintendents may specify where, when, and how such activities occur. Generally, cultural and natural preserves and state reserves are excluded areas, unless collecting is allowed as a special management technique.
- VII. The Department's collecting permit application, DPR 65A, must be used for approval or denial of a resource collecting request; copies of the finished form must be forwarded to the Department's Resource Protection Division.

Although the policy would be hugely impactful, as implemented, it was only effective in some situations. At the time, for instance, some DPR staff ecologists found the gathering of cultural plant materials by Native peoples difficult to accept, while others more knowledgeable about Traditional Knowledge and Native land management practices readily embraced it, since they understood that, when tended properly, the plants would increase in vigor, health, and numbers.

Other points of disconnect revolved around the definitions of "commercial purpose" and "significant impact." Since basketry teachers need places to take their students to harvest, it was unclear if such use would be deemed "commercial" or "significant." Also, the prohibition of commercial sale was at odds with the policy's stated intent to "foster cultural continuity," since the time needed to practice ancestral traditions could mean time

Some DPR staff ecologists found the gathering of cultural plant materials by Native peoples difficult to accept, while others readily embraced it.



▲ Kathleen Rose Smith gathering seaweed, ca. 1991. BEVERLY R. ORTIZ

not available for other employment. Thus, the sale of at least some of the objects made from the materials gathered could be essential.

So, since most of the permit requests were for basketry materials, in response to these concerns, in the late 1980s, the state issued a written statement clarifying that while the sales of the materials gathered was prohibited, sales of any baskets made from those materials was allowed.

The effectiveness of the policy was also contingent on Native California awareness of it, their need for access to plant materials growing in state parks, and their ability to complete the application to the satisfaction of reviewing staff. In the policy's initial years, although nearly all requests were for basketry materials, there also were some for storm-toppled old-growth redwood for a Yurok dugout, and for soapstone (steatite).

The policy has also always had jurisdictional issues, with some cultural materials in state parks such as seaweed under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game. In fact, in 1989 Native Californians, most from varied Pomo Tribes, formed an *ad hoc* Traditional Food Gathering Committee and worked with the Heritage Commission to get an exemption approved by Fish and Game that would allow Native Californians to harvest more seaweed than the then-allowable ten pounds “wet.”⁵⁴

As for the DPR policy, by May 1989 there were at least six successful applications, including access to bulrush and redbud by Elsie Allen, who was originally denied until other staff intervened; access to redwood logs to enable construction of six dugouts for ceremonial use by the Hoopa Valley Tribe; the gathering of a small amount of obsidian (although the applicant was not local, this was allowed since obsidian was a trade item and the applicant was a skills instructor); the gathering of bear root (*angelica*) for use in traditional doctoring; the gathering of shed elk antlers for elk horn purses and spoons; and access to various plant foods and medicine.⁵⁵

During this same time frame, two other applications were denied. The most confounding was an application for access to two handfuls of maidenhair fern (*Adiantum aleuticum*, aka black or five-finger fern) in Fern Canyon at Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park by Violet Moore (Yurok). Not only was the Fern Canyon stand extensive, but the gathering of it requires neither cutting nor digging, but rather the pulling of selected stems away from their below-ground, interlocking rhizomes. As Violet expressed it to Breck at the time, “Why do you think those ferns are so lush?” suggesting to Breck “that the canyon is so full of ferns because they were cared for through collection and pruning by her Yurok ancestors.”⁵⁶

The success of the policy in subsequent years has depended on the goodwill of both gatherers and DPR staff, and an underlying willingness to open park units to traditional gathering practices. Through experimentation, education, and mutual accommodation, successful applications have, gratefully, increased.⁵⁷

In fact, as testament to the policy's ongoing importance, it's currently undergoing revisions under the leadership of Dena Mitchell, DPR's Tribal affairs MOU analyst, “who leads DPR's current work on agreements with Tribes, including gathering agreements which are being added to Tribal MOUs, when requested by Tribes.”⁵⁸ This includes

work with Fish and Wildlife to clarify the jurisdictional issues inherent in the policy.⁵⁹

CONCLUSION

A notable through line in these stories of change-making through education and advocacy centers on the courage, vision, determination, and utter generosity of Elders and culture bearers to honor the hardships and sacrifices of previous generations by working to ensure the thrivance of their people, traditions, and eons-old relationships with the land. It is hoped that the recounting of these examples of change-making will inspire a broader telling, remembering, and publication of countless others since, in so doing, we can more fully understand and honor the foundation on which co-stewardship/management of specific public lands is built, as well as the foundation of a wide range of land stewardship initiatives occurring in places and contexts outside of the realm of co-stewardship/management of public lands.

To this end, elsewhere in this issue of *Parks Stewardship Forum*, you'll find two later examples, that of the California Indian Basketweavers Association, established in 1992, and Following the Smoke, initiated in 1997, where, through a close reading, it will become clear that the latter initiatives have through lines to the earlier examples provided here.

ENDNOTES

1. Field research from 1979–present with cultural practitioners from every region of the state; Lowell John Bean and Sylvia Brakke Vane, “Cults and Their Transformations” in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8 (California), Robert F. Heizer, vol. ed., William C. Sturtevant, general ed. (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978). Please note that in this instance “cults” refers to religious practices and rituals, and, in this context, is completely unassociated with the pejorative meaning that this word has come to carry. For culturally specific summaries of the other diverse spiritual traditions of Native North Americans, see the following volumes of the *Handbook of North American Indians*: Volume 5 (Arctic, 1984), Volume 6 (Subarctic, 1981), Volume 7 (Northwest Coast, 1990), Volume 9 (Southwest, 1979), Volume 10 (Southwest, 1983), Volume 11 (Great Basin, 1986), Volume 12 (Plateau, 1998), Volume 13 (Plains, 2001), Volume 14 (Southeast, 2004), and Volume 15 (Northeast, 1978).
2. Field research 1979–present, op. cit.; for more about the spiritual traditions of Native Californians, see the culturally specific chapters in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8 (California), op. cit., pp. 128–609.
3. Kathleen Rose Smith, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1993.
4. Robert H. Jackson and Edward Castillo, *Indians, Franciscans, and Spanish Colonization: The Impact of the Mission System on California Indians* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985); Rupert Costo and Jeanette H. Costo, *The Missions of California: A Legacy of Genocide* (San Francisco, CA: Indian Historian Press for the American Indian Historical Society, 1987); Randall Milliken, *A Time of Little Choice: The Disintegration of Tribal Culture in the San Francisco Bay Region 1769–1810* (Menlo Park, CA: Ballena Press, 1995), pp. 219–226; and Rose Marie Beebe and Robert M. Senkewicz, *Lands of Promise and Despair: Chronicles of Early California, 1535–1846* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2001).
5. Edward Castillo, “The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement,” in Robert F. Heizer, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8 (California), William C. Sturtevant, general ed. (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), pp. 104–107; and George Harwood Phillips, *Indians and Intruders in Central California 1769–1849* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993).
6. Edward Castillo, “The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement,” in Robert F. Heizer, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 8 (California), op. cit., pp. 107–127; Brendan C. Lindsay, *Murder State: California’s Native American Genocide, 1846–1873* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015); and Benjamin Madley, *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846–1873* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, The Lamar Series in Western History, 2016).
7. Linda Aguilar McGill, pers. comm. with David Ludwig, August 9, 1992.
8. Sara Greensfelder, untitled essay in “California Indian Basketweavers Gathering,” a special report edited by Beverly Ortiz and the staff of *News from Native California* (Winter 1991/1992), p. 2.
9. Sherrie Smith-Ferri, *Weaving a Tradition: Pomo Indian Baskets from 1850–1982*, dissertation in anthropology, University of Washington (1998), p. 220.
10. Marsha Ann McGill, “The Pomo Women’s Club,” *News from Native California* 4(3): 22–23 (1990); Frederick Elliott Robin, *Culture Contact and Public Opinion in a Bi-Cultural Community*, MA thesis in the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University (1943), pp. 52–55.
11. Marsha Ann McGill, “The Pomo Women’s Club,” op. cit., p. 23.
12. Juliette Lombard, *The Migration of Women from the*

- Ukiah Valley in California to the San Francisco Bay Region*, MA thesis in the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University (1942), p. 15.
13. Burt W. Aginsky and Ethel G. Aginsky, "A Resultant of Intercultural Relations," *Social Forces* 26(1): 84–87 (1947), p. 85.
 14. Elizabeth Florence Colson, *A Study of Acculturation Among Pomo Women*, MA thesis in anthropology, University of Minnesota (1940), pp. 89–91; Elizabeth Colson, *Autobiographies of Three Pomo Women* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Archaeology Research Facility, 1974), p. 202.
 15. Frederick Elliott Robin, op. cit., p. 55.
 16. Harriet Rhodes, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 2007.
 17. Elsie Allen, *Pomo Basketmaking: A Supreme Art for the Weaver* (Healdsburg, CA: Naturegraph Publishers, 1972), pp. 14–15.
 18. Kathleen Rose Smith, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1997. Within the confines of their respective cultural traditions, something that Elsie Allen, Mabel McKay, and Laura Somersal certainly wished and worked for, but never witnessed, was a florescence in the numbers of Pomo people weaving baskets. Their hope has now come to pass, largely due to the relatively recent founding of the Pomo Weavers Society (PWS) by Silver Galletto (Cloverdale Rancheria). Silver started making baskets in 1991 while a student at Santa Rosa Junior College. Soon thereafter, he attended the first-ever California Indian Basketweavers Gathering discussed elsewhere in this issue of *Parks Stewardship Forum*. During an interview I conducted with Silver at the time, he told me that his greatest wish was to be able to help other Pomos learn basketry, so that there would be many more Pomo weavers than there were at that time, a wish he has amply fulfilled. For more about Silver and the PWS, visit <https://www.silvergalletto.com/>. To read my portrait of Silver when he was first starting to weave, see "Silverio Espinoza" in "California Indian Basketweavers Gathering," a special report, op. cit., pp. 8–9.
 19. The last of the Study's several reports, *Before Warm Springs Dam: A History of the Lake Sonoma Area*, is now available online at https://asc.sonoma.edu/sites/asc/files/warmspringsreport_full.pdf, while a compressed version is available at https://asc.sonoma.edu/sites/asc/files/warmspringsreport_full-compressed.pdf.
 20. For more about Mabel McKay, see Greg Sarris, *Mabel McKay: Weaving the Dream* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994).
 21. For more about Laura Fish Somersal, see Beverly Ortiz, "Laura Somersal," in *Native American Women: A Biographical Dictionary*, Gretchen M. Bataille, ed. (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1993).
 22. Kathleen Rose Smith, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1989–1996, 2006; Sherrie Smith-Ferri, op. cit., 245–252; and field research, 1983–2018.
 23. These include, in chronological order: David W. Peri and Scott M. Patterson, "The Basket is in the Roots: That's Where It Begins," *Journal of California Anthropology* 3(2): 17–32 (1978); David W. Peri and Scott M. Patterson, *Ethnobotanical Resources of the Warm Springs Dam-Lake Sonoma Project Area, Sonoma County, California* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1979); David W. Peri, Scott M. Patterson, and Jeannie Goodrich, *History of the Transplanting of Sedge, Angelica and Lomatium, Warm Springs Dam-Lake Sonoma Project* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1980); *Ethnobotanical Mitigation: Warm Springs Dam-Lake Sonoma* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1982); David W. Peri and Sally McLendon, *Notes on Southern Pomo Basketry* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1984); David M. Peri and Scott Patterson, *The Mihilakawna Pomo of Dry Creek* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1984); David W. Peri, Scott M. Patterson, and Susan L. McMurray, *The Makahmo Pomo: An Ethnographic Survey of the Cloverdale (Makahmo) Pomo* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1985); *Ethnobotanical Mitigation: Warm Springs Dam-Lake Sonoma, California* (San Francisco: US Army Corps of Engineers, 1993); and David W. Peri and Scott M. Patterson, "Pomoan Plant Resources Management," *Ridge Review* 4(4): 1–3 (1993).
 24. For more about these efforts, see Josephine Peters with Beverly Ortiz, *After the First Full Moon in April: A Sourcebook of Herbal Medicine from a California Indian Elder* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2010), pp. 51–61.
 25. For more about Vivien Hailstone, see Beverly R. Ortiz, "With Respect: Vivien Hailstone 1913–2000," *News from Native California* 14(1): 13–17 (2000). Regarding the variant spellings of "Karuk," "Karok," "Hoopa," and "Hupa" in Vivien's tribal affiliation and the overall text of the article, the preferred spelling "Karuk" supersedes the earlier "Karok" that, according to linguist William Bright, came into "general use" by community outsiders after the 1877 publication of Stephen Powers' *Tribes of California*. The spelling "Hupa" refers to the people in relation to their culture and homeland, while today's federally recognized Hoopa Valley Tribe, named for the place, has members from more than one ethnic group,

- e.g. Vivien Hailstone identified herself as Karuk and Yurok ethnically and as an enrolled member of the Hoopa Valley Tribe.
26. Vivien Hailstone, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1990.
 27. Juliette Lombard, op. cit., p. 17.
 28. For more about Josephine Peters, see Josephine Peters with Beverly Ortiz, op. cit., pp. 27–86.
 29. Josephine Peters, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 2001.
 30. Josephine Peters, scrapbooks of 1950s–1970s newspaper clippings, most undated and lacking the newspaper’s name, clipped from the *Blue Lake Advocate*, *Eureka Times-Standard*, *Ferndale Enterprise*, *The Humboldt Times*, *Sacramento Bee*, *Klam-ity Kourier* (Willow Creek), and *Yreka Times-Standard*.
 31. Ibid.
 32. Field research, 1987–2009.
 33. Josephine Peters, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 2001.
 34. Josephine Peters, scrapbooks of 1950s–1970s newspaper clippings, op. cit.
 35. Ibid.
 36. Josephine Peters, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 2001.
 37. Josephine Peters, scrapbooks of 1950s–1970s newspaper clippings, op. cit.
 38. Field research, 1988–2005.
 39. Gwen Cooper, Ken Marin, and Roy Cook, *Fifth Annual State Conference and American Indian Education Workshops, California Indian Education Association* (San Diego: Superintendent of Schools, 1973), p. 48.
 40. Vivien Hailstone, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1988.
 41. Jack Forbes, *Report of the First All-Indian Statewide Conference on California Indian Education, North Fork, California* (Modesto, CA: Indian Education Association, Inc., 1967), p. 50.
 42. Vivien Hailstone, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1988.
 43. Jack Forbes, op. cit., p. 50.
 44. Ibid., p. 54.
 45. Josephine Peters, scrapbooks of 1950s–1970s newspaper clippings, op. cit.
 46. Ibid.
 47. June Bosworth, “Nearly Lost Tradition of Basketry Being Returned by Hoopa Artisans,” *Humboldt Times*, California–Oregon Roundup, April 4, 1967, p. 11. Due to the time involved in creating kits of basketry materials, in later years basketry class teachers commonly provided imported cane and raffia in substitution of ancestral basketry materials; students who demonstrated a commitment to continue to weave transitioned into the use of the ancestral ones. For more about porcupine quills, see articles in this issue of *Parks Stewardship Forum* about the California Indian Basketweavers Association and Following the Smoke.
 48. Jack Forbes, op. cit., p. 50.
 49. Beverly Ortiz, “Baskets of Dreams,” *News from Native California* 2(4): 28–29, p. 29 (1988); credential documents in possession of Josephine Peters; and field research from 1997–present.
 50. Gwen Cooper, Ken Marin, and Roy Cook, *Fifth Annual State Conference and American Indian Education Workshops, California Indian Education Association*, op. cit., p. 48.
 51. Vivien Hailstone, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, 1989.
 52. E. Breck Parkman, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, September 5, 2024.
 53. E. Breck Parkman, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, February 26, 2003.
 54. For more about this, see Beverly Ortiz, “Seaweed from the Coast: Restoring Collecting Rights,” *News from Native California* 4(2): 6–9 (1990).
 55. Nancy Evans, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, February 27, 2003; E. Breck Parkman, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, February 26, 2003, and September 5, 2024.
 56. Nancy Evans, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, February 27, 2003; E. Breck Parkman, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, August 19, 2024.
 57. For more about the policy and related documents, see https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30611#:~:text=The%20Department%20issues%20California%20Native,be%20found%20on%20this%20list.
 58. Leslie L. Hartzell, DPR cultural resources division chief, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, August 28, 2024.
 59. Patricia Garcia, DPR Tribal affairs program manager, pers. comm. with Beverly R. Ortiz, September 3, 2024.