

## **UC Merced**

### **Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology**

#### **Title**

A Comment on "Puvunga and Point Conception: A Comparative Study of Southern California Indian Traditionalism," by Matthew A. Boxt and L. Mark Raab

#### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5km0r634>

#### **Journal**

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 22(1)

#### **ISSN**

0191-3557

#### **Author**

Ruyle, Eugene E

#### **Publication Date**

2000-07-01

Peer reviewed

term occupation of a place is a very valid enterprise. My concern is whether a rigorous methodology is employed in the research process—one that considers multiple lines of evidence and evaluates alternative interpretations in a critical manner. In the long run, no one is served by poor research methods and weakly argued interpretations. The true test of any interpretation is whether other scholars, native peoples, and interested lay people support the conclusions based on the arguments and evidence presented. This is one reason why I think peer-reviewed research is so important today. Of course, interpretations are always subject to change with the addition of new information. Ultimately, I think the jury on Puvunga is still out.

### REFERENCES

- Bauman, Richard  
1986 *Story, Performance and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruikshank, Julie  
1990 *Life Lived Like a Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Native Elders*. In: Collaboration with Angela Sidney, Kitty Smith, and Annie Ned. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dundes, Alan  
1980 *Interpreting Folklore*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Erdoes, Richard, and Alfonso Ortiz (eds.)  
1984 *American Indian Myths and Legends*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Farris, Glenn J.  
1989 *Recognizing Indian Folk History as Real History: A Fort Ross Example*. *American Indian Quarterly* 13(4):471-480.
- Finnegan, Ruth  
1996 *Oral Tradition*. In: *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 3, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., pp. 887-891. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Haley, Brian D., and Larry R. Wilcoxon  
1997 *Anthropology and the Making of Chumash Tradition*. *Current Anthropology* 38(5): 761-794.
- Lummis, Tevor  
1992 *Oral History*. In: *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments*, Richard Bauman, ed., pp. 92-97. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vansina, Jan  
1985 *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Williamson, Ray A., and Claire R. Farrer (eds.)  
1992 *Earth and Sky: Visions of the Cosmos in Native American Folklore*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.



## A Comment on "Puvunga and Point Conception: A Comparative Study of Southern California Indian Traditionalism," by Matthew A. Boxt and L. Mark Raab

EUGENE E. RUYLE

Dept. of Anthropology, California State Univ., Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840-1003.

THE central point of Boxt and Raab's article lies in their assertion that "widely held understandings of Puvunga are almost entirely a product of anthropological scholarship. This fact is rarely acknowledged" (p. 63). They claim that the "exact location of this community and its archaeological remains were unknown until J. P. Harrington announced his discovery to the academic world 60 years ago: Puvunga had been located" (p. 51). This is nonsense.

### BOXT AND RAAB IGNORE INDIAN ORAL TRADITIONS

First of all, to the extent that Harrington "discovered" Puvunga, he did so by talking to Indians. Boxt and Raab give no indication that they did the same. Boxt and Raab do thank their Indian moni-

tors "for their interest in our work, as well as for graciously sharing with us their perspectives regarding Puvunga and Gabrielino identity" (p. 63), as if to imply that they actually discussed their views with living Indians. This is problematic.

I spoke to Anthony Morales, Chief of the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council, who was "deeply disturbed" by the article and the implication that he or other members of the council were consulted in any way about Boxt and Raab's views on Puvunga and Gabrielino identity. After reading the article, he described it as a "bunch of hogwash" and "demeaning" to Indians. He further stated that he was never interviewed by either Boxt or Raab on his perspectives regarding Puvunga and Gabrielino identity. As far as Morales knows, neither Boxt nor Raab ever presented the views expressed in this article to the Tribal Council. Morales (personal communication, 1999) expressed his view that this article is "just a continuation of the Native American holocaust in modern times, based on the European mentality of trying to make the Native American extinct."

Boxt and Raab fail to examine other sources which might indicate that Indian knowledge of Puvunga is derived from their own oral traditions. They do not cite the ethnohistorical research commissioned by California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) on Puvunga (Altschul 1994). They do not consider the oral testimony given to California's Native American Heritage Commission in public meetings on June 18 and December 3, 1993. (The American Anthropological Association has supported the Heritage Commission on Puvunga; see Overbey [1994].) They do not consider the sworn testimony provided by over a dozen Indian plaintiffs in the Puvunga lawsuit. (The case has twice been appealed to the California Supreme Court, which supported the Indians, not the University; see Ruyle [1995a]; Skomal [1997].)

If Boxt and Raab had discussed their views with living Indians, they may have heard what I heard from Chumash friends. In discussing Haley and Wilcoxon's (1997) article on Point Conception, I was told that the Indian elders decided to talk to

Harrington so that their traditions would be written down and available when future generations of Indians needed them. The Indians, in other words, were using Harrington to ensure that their traditions would not be lost.

### **BOXT AND RAAB IGNORE LONG BEACH'S EARLIEST HISTORIAN**

The fact of the matter is that there has never been any mystery about the location of Puvunga. It was common knowledge in Long Beach decades before Harrington arrived. Before she died in 1918, Long Beach's first historian, Jane Elizabeth Harnett, wrote that

[t]he Indians of San Juan Capistrano, according to Father Boscana, "emigrated from a place called Sejat, distant northeast from the mission seven or eight leagues, and in the midst of a valley, now known by the name of El Rancho de Los Nietos." "Originally," he says, "the inhabitants were numerous, but the success and influence of a holy conquest gradually eradicated their attachment of Sejat and it finally became subject to the spiritual as well as temporal administration of the ecclesiastical mission." Now it is very evident that in describing the location of Sejat Father Boscana has made a slight mistake, for, if it were on Rancho Los Nietos, it must have been northwest of San Juan Capistrano and not northeast, as he declares.

This point is rather important because he describes another Indian village, Pubuna, about which center all the legends of the San Juan Indians concerning the origin of their god, Quaguar, as being also "distant from San Juan Capistrano, northeast about 8 leagues." Now, Hugo Reid, writing 22 years later, tells us that at that time, there still existed on Rancho Los Alamitos (one of the subdivisions of Rancho Los Nietos), an Indian rancheria named Pubugna.

In view, first, of Father Boscana's manifest error in stating the direction of Sejat; second, of the fact that Rancho Los Nietos was distant about eight leagues northwest from San Juan; and, last, of the great similarity of the names Pubugna and Pubuna, it seems reasonable to believe that the two (Reid's Pubugna and Boscana's Pubuna) are identical, in which case we may claim for this vicinity the most interesting of all the rancherias between the mountains and the sea. Whether this rancheria can be identified with the undoubted traces of an Indian

village at the head of Alamitos Bay, is, of course, quite another matter. At present, we have no means of knowing whether this village was one which had existed during the Spanish period, or whether it was one of those many more ancient sites which seem to have been abandoned many years, perhaps centuries, before the Spanish came. The finding of pestles of a type not used by Indians of the later days would seem to point to the latter conclusion. So far, too, nothing of undoubted later origin, such as bits of cloth, beads or iron, which would go to show that the site was occupied in Spanish days, has been discovered. The whole of Rancho Los Alamitos has proved so rich in Indian relics that some other location on the ranch may easily have been the site of Pubugna. Then too, by the time at which Reid wrote, the Indians had adopted the Spanish custom of giving a single name to a whole tract of land on which there might be several villages. Pubugna, a name which undoubtedly designated originally a single rancheria, was, in Reid's time, used to denote all the Indian settlements on the Alamitos Ranch [Case 1927:26-27].

So, we have Reid in the 1850s (Heizer 1968), Harnett sometime before 1918 (see Case 1927), Kroeber (1925); Harrington (1933), Dixon (1973), and Scientific Resource Surveys (1980)—all pointing to the vicinity around the CSULB campus and the present Rancho Los Alamitos as the location of Puvunga. This view is found not only in anthropological sources (Kroeber 1925; Bean and Vane 1978), but also in standard histories of Long Beach and the surrounding area (Quinn 1973; Meyer and Kalayjian 1983; Queenan 1986; DeAtley 1988), histories of Los Alamitos (Robinson 1966; Salzer 1974), general books on the Gabrielino (Johnston 1962), as well as the recent authoritative work by McCawley (1996).

Clearly, anthropologists have played a role in the preservation of Indian traditions, and quite appropriately so. To discuss this role without also examining Indian oral traditions and the writings of historians does a disservice to anthropology.

### **BOXT AND RAAB'S ERROR IN THE LOCATION OF CSULB CAMPUS**

Harnett (see Case 1927) corrected Boscana's "manifest error" in the location of Puvunga (it is

northwest of San Juan Capistrano, not northeast as Boscana wrote) decades before Harrington offered what Boxt and Raab describe (p. 53) as his "somewhat convoluted refutation of Boscana's directions." It is amusing that Boxt and Raab make an error similar to Boscana's in their discussion of the CSULB campus. They write with misleading precision that "The 319-acre (127.6-ha.) campus of CSULB is situated less than one-half mile (0.81 km.) east of the park [Rancho Los Alamitos Historic Ranch and Gardens-EER] in the Los Altos community of the city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, about 20 miles (32.6 km.) southeast of downtown Los Angeles" (pp. 46-47).

A glance at Boxt and Raab's Figure 2 will show that the CSULB campus is located to the west, not east, of Rancho Los Alamitos. Further, a call to any realtor would confirm that the campus is not in Los Altos but just south of it. (The real estate map of Long Beach shows the campus to be in College Park. To the extent that there is a boundary, it runs along Atherton Street on the northern edge of campus.)

So here we have two Ph.D.s in anthropology, presumably with graduate training in map reading and site location, who are unable to give the proper location of the university that employed them. It is not surprising that they are confused about Puvunga.

### **BOXT AND RAAB MISREPRESENT HISTORY OF THE PUVUNGA STRUGGLE**

Boxt and Raab claim that "Over a span of the last 25 years, then, a host of events materially affected sites CA-LAN-234 and -235. What is remarkable in retrospect is that there is no record that these activities were met with resistance or complaint from Indians, anthropologists, or the public" (p. 49). Apparently Boxt and Raab are relying on what they were told by campus officials, for they fail to cite any of the published material on the Puvunga struggle in anthropological sources (Overbey 1994; Ruyle 1994a; Ruyle 1995b; Skomal 1997).



They fail to cite any of the over 150 news articles on the subject. They apparently have not viewed the hour-long video "Sacred Lands, White Man's Laws" on the Puvunga struggle (Dodds and Gray 1994). They have not interviewed any of the Indian plaintiffs in the Puvunga lawsuit. They have not discussed this article with me or Keith Dixon or, as far as I know, anyone else critical of campus development plans. They have not requested copies of the papers on the Puvunga struggle that I have given at professional meetings (Ruyle 1994b, 1995b, 1995c, 1995d, 1996a, 1996b, 1999).

The movement to save Puvunga goes back to the 1970s, when Indian students at CSULB successfully mobilized for the reburial of the Indian remains that had been found on campus in 1972. The land was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974. The university accepted this and modified its development plans accordingly. The president's residence that had been planned for construction on CA-LAN-234 was deleted in 1976, and student housing that had been planned for construction on CA-LAN-235 was deleted in 1978. Public records in the CSU Chancellor's Office clearly show that these changes were made because the sites were "registered in the National Register of Historic Places" and the "purpose of registration is to protect sites" (Board of Trustees 1976, 1978).

The Indian remains uncovered in 1972 were reburied in 1979, and the sign identifying the area as Puvunga was also put up at that time. The students were promised that the entire area would be preserved because it was on the National Register. Campus officials have denied that any such promise was made, but their own files support the Indians on this issue. Thus, this was not undeveloped land that happened to be on the National Register of Historic Places; it was undeveloped *because* it was on the National Register and because Indians had fought to preserve it.

For a dozen years, Indians were able to visit the site in peace for prayer and meditation. They did not object to the land being used for organic gardening, nor did they object to its use as a summer day camp

for youngsters (including my two sons). Neither of these uses conflicted with the spirituality of the land cherished by Native Americans.

The situation changed when campus officials announced their plans to build a strip mall on the site. In December 1992, campus officials filed a false and misleading negative declaration stating that "No cultural resources are known to exist on site." This evoked a storm of protests from Indians, state officials, archaeologists, gardeners, students, and residents.

In response, campus officials brought in the contract archaeologist they had employed earlier. In a stormy confrontation with campus officials and this archaeologist on February 28, 1993, a group of about 40 Indians (including veterans of the earlier struggle at Puvunga as well as at Point Conception) demanded that Puvunga be preserved. They further insisted that the archaeologist be removed because of her "long past history of destroying sacred land that all Native Americans cherish." Thus, it was only after campus officials decided to build a strip mall on CA-LAN-235 and were frustrated in their attempt to conceal its National Register status that they hired Boxt and Raab for a "cultural review."

#### **BOXT AND RAAB MISREPRESENT THEIR WORK AT CSULB**

Here again, Boxt and Raab misrepresent the situation, claiming that "CSULB became the focal point of protests and legal challenges by Indians, anthropologists, and others after university officials announced a feasibility study to develop portions of campus terrain" (p. 45). The purpose of the "cultural review" by Boxt and Raab was clearly stated by CSULB Interim President Karl Anatol:

Unconvinced that Puvungna really lies under the Gardens, Anatol hopes results of the archaeological survey will allow CSULB to continue with plans to develop 22 acres of land. . . . If Puvungna is indeed discovered under the site, Anatol said, "obviously the university will have to change its plans--not outright, not totally. There are ways to deal with the recognition of sites that still allow agencies and concerns to carry on with their projects" [Cox 1993:1].

As archaeologist Chester King, a veteran of the Point Conception struggle, observed, "They're trying to use archaeology as a smoke screen to destroy the site. I think everybody knows that and is seeing that, and the University is still trying the same game. I'm tired of it." (Dodds and Gray 1994).

In stating that "Owing to heightened concerns about CA-LAN-235, this site was not included in these studies" (p. 50), Boxt and Raab imply that Boxt's archaeological digs on campus did not include the National Register site out of some kind of sensitivity to Indian concerns. In fact, CA-LAN-235 was not included in Boxt's studies because another archaeologist was hired to do the job. Although Interim President Anatol had promised that the cultural review would be conducted with "the greatest possible respect and sensitivity to the interests of Native Americans," campus officials hired another firm for a massive backhoe excavation of Puvunga: "A grid will . . . be placed over the entire parcel, and 20-m long trenches will be excavated with a backhoe 20-m apart" (Altschul 1993:20).

While these plans were being made, Indians were holding a round-the-clock vigil at Puvunga to protect the site, and the Native American Heritage Commission wrote to the university recommending "complete avoidance of the site as the appropriate and only acceptable mitigation measure." (See further discussion in my comments on Haley and Wilcoxon's [1997] paper on Point Conception [Ruyle 1998]). Boxt and Raab do cite Boxt's reports on his archaeological digs on campus, but this is problematic as these reports are not available for independent review. Campus officials have repeatedly refused to release these documents, citing "verbal instructions" from university lawyers. Further, although Boxt and Raab base their ideas on the Haley and Wilcoxon (1997) article, they fail to mention the storm of criticism which that article evoked from the Chumash (Burns 1997) or the anthropological community (see the various comments in *Current Anthropology* 39[4], 1998).

It is not clear why Boxt and Raab fail to discuss a very significant site on the CSULB campus

excavated by Boxt in the spring of 1993. As indicated above, Boxt's report on this site is not available, but a reporter for the campus newspaper gave me a one-page typewritten statement written by Boxt. This stated in part:

Excavations produced hundreds of shell beads, dozens of pieces of earthenware pottery, deer bone tools used to make projectile points, projectile points, cores that generated chipped stone tools, lithic waste flakes, and hundred of pounds of shell debris suggest that small bands of people utilized this site at certain seasons over a period of three or four hundred years. Radiocarbon dates confirm this assertion. Dates of T.S.N. 2 range from 1500 A.D. to 1850 A.D. The presence of steatite indicates trade with either Santa Catalina Island or Sierra Pelona near Palmdale. The presence of manos, mortars, and pestles indicates that the site's inhabitants processed seeds, acorns, and possibly small animals (rodents, etc.) for food [Boxt 1993].

During the 1993 excavation, a tooth from a human infant was found, but not reported to the coroner's office as required by state law. It was only repatriated after the Native American Heritage Commission notified the coroner's office of the find.

Following Boxt and Raab's convoluted argument ("the older an archaeological site is, the less likely it is to be connected with the Chingchinich tradition"), the site would seem to be a candidate for the historic Puvunga. A detailed discussion of Boxt's findings here would certainly be appropriate. Why is this site not discussed?

### BOXT AND RAAB MISREPRESENT INDIAN BURIAL

Boxt and Raab assert that the identification of the Indian remains discovered at CA-LAN-235 in 1972 is based solely on "a two-page report" at UCLA. This is what Raab claimed in his court deposition in the fall of 1993. Raab's error was pointed out by Keith Dixon at the December 1993 meeting of the Native American Heritage Commission in Long Beach. In fact, the definitive identification was made in 1979 by Judy Suchey, the forensic anthropologist employed by the Los Angeles County Coroner, and reported in a letter to campus

President Steve Horn. This was covered in the Puvunga video (Dodds and Gray 1994) and I also quoted Suchey's letter in my response to Haley and Wilcoxon (1997) (Ruyle 1998). Yet Boxt and Raab continue to insinuate that there is some question about the identification of the remains.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The article by Boxt and Raab is a shoddy and irresponsible piece of work. It is unclear how an article so lacking in substance could be accepted by an otherwise respectable journal. Unfortunately, space and time preclude a complete examination of the errors, misrepresentations, and half-truths of the Boxt and Raab article. I hope that serious students of the Puvunga struggle will consult the Puvunga web site (access through my own web site: [www.csulb.edu/~eruyle](http://www.csulb.edu/~eruyle)), where fuller criticism of the article will be posted by the time it is in print.

This paper should never have been accepted for publication. The authors clearly lack the training in social and cultural anthropology which might qualify them for a study of "Indian Traditionalism." They do not employ such traditional anthropological methods as participant observation, collection of life histories, or structured interviews. Worse, they ignore completely what Malinowski described as the "final goal, of which the Ethnographer should never lose sight. This goal is, briefly, to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realise *his* vision of *his* world" (Malinowski 1922:25, italics in original). The native point of view on Puvunga has been well expressed by the Director of the CSULB American Indians Studies Program.

. . . the site in question is sacred not because it may contain artifacts or remains of ancient Gabrielinos (simply removal and reburial of bones will not lessen the significance of the land), it is sacred to the Gabrielino because this campus sits on the land on which a new religion was born in the person of Chungichnish. This religion became the center of the tribes' existence. Even though no one else can remember the sacredness of this land, the Gabrielino are bound up in that history and are therefore called upon to remind us all that we are walking on land that remembers another people,

the Gabrielino of Puvunga and another god, Chungichnish [Jacobs 1993:3].

### REFERENCES

- Altschul, Jeffrey H.  
1993 Technical Proposal. Phase Two Archaeological Study. California State University, Long Beach. Report on file at Statistical Research, Tucson, Arizona.
- Altschul, Jeffrey H. (comp.)  
1994 Puvunga: A Review of the Ethnohistoric, Archaeological, and Ethnographic Issues Surrounding a Gabrielino Rancheria Near Alamitos Bay, Los Angeles County, California. Draft report on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
- Bean, Lowell John, and Sylvia Brakke Vane  
1978 Cults and Their Transformations. In: Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California, Robert F. Heizer, ed., pp. 662-672. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Board of Trustees of the California State University  
1976 Agenda of the Committee on Campus Planning, Building and Grounds, September 21, 1976. Document on file at the Chancellor's Office, the California State University, Long Beach, California.
- 1978 Agenda of the Committee on Campus Planning, Building and Grounds, November 28, 1978. Document on file at the Chancellor's Office, the California State University, Long Beach, California.
- Boxt, Matthew  
1993 Untitled report on excavations at California State University, Long Beach. Document in possession of the author.
- Burns, Melinda  
1997 Point of Contention. Santa Barbara News-Press, December 26, pp. A1, A14.
- Case, Walter H.  
1927 History of Long Beach and Vicinity, In Which is Incorporated the Early History Written by the Late Jane Elizabeth Harnett. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Publishing Company.
- Cox, John  
1993 Anatol to Move Organic Garden. Daily 49er (CSULB newspaper), March 16, p. 1.
- DeAtley, Richard  
1988 Long Beach, The Golden Shore: A History of the City and the Port. Houston: Pioneer Publications, Inc.

- Dixon, Keith  
1973 National Register of Historic Places Inventory Nomination Form. Report on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Dodds, J. Scott, and Lynne C. Gray  
1994 Sacred Lands, White Man's Law (video). Minneapolis: Native American Television, Inc.
- Jacobs, Mary  
1993 Guest Columnist. Multicultural News, Newsletter of the Multicultural Center, California State University, Long Beach 1(3):2-3.
- Johnston, Bernice E.  
1962 California's Gabrielino Indians. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum, Hodge Anniversary Publication Fund, Vol. VIII.
- Haley, Brian D., and Larry R. Wilcoxon  
1997 Anthropology and the Making of Chumash Tradition. *Current Anthropology* 38(5): 761-794.
- Harrington, John P.  
1933 Annotations. In: *Chinigchinich: A Revised and Annotated Version of Alfred Robinson's Translation of Father Gerónimo Boscana's Historical Account of the Belief, Usages, Customs and Extravagancies of the Indians of this Mission of San Juan Capistrano Called the Acagchemem Tribe [1846]*, Phil Townsend Hanna, ed., pp. 91-228. Santa Ana, CA: Fine Arts Press.
- Heizer, Robert F. (ed.)  
1968 The Indians of Los Angeles County: Hugo Reid's Letters of 1852. Los Angeles: Southwest Museum Papers No. 21.
- Kroeber, Alfred L.  
1925 Handbook of the Indians of California. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw  
1922 Argonauts of the Western Pacific. New York: Dutton.
- McCawley, William  
1996 The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles. Banning, CA: Malki Museum Press.
- Meyer, Larry L., and Patricia Larson Kalayjian  
1983 Long Beach: Fortune's Harbor. Tulsa, OK: Continental Heritage Press.
- Overbey, Mary Margaret  
1994 AAA Statement on Puvungna Community. *Anthropology Newsletter* 33(2):39.
- Queenan, Charles F.  
1986 Long Beach and Los Angeles: A Tale of Two Ports. Northridge, CA: Windsor Publications, Inc.
- Quinn, Charles Russell  
1973 History of Downey: The Life Story of a Pioneer Community, and of the Man Who Founded It—California Governor John Gately Downey—From Covered Wagon to the Space Age. Downey, CA: Elena Quinn, Publisher.
- Robinson, W. W.  
1966 Los Alamitos: The Indian and Rancho Phases. *California Historical Society Quarterly* 45(1):21-30.
- Ruyle, Eugene E.  
1994a University Officials, Indians At Odds Over Archaeological Site. *Society for California Archaeology Newsletter* 28(2):17-18.  
1994b Let My People Grow! Partisan Anthropology and the Struggle to Save Puvungna and the Organic Gardens. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, Atlanta.  
1995a CSULB Lawsuits Raise Ethical Issues for Anthropologists. *Anthropology Newsletter* 36(9):15-16.  
1995b Archaeology as a Political Weapon: The Story of Puvungna. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Anthropological Association, San Francisco.  
1995c Lies, Bribes, and Archaeology: The Story of Puvungna. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, Washington.  
1995d Refugees in Their Own Land: The Gabrielino/Tongva Indians of Southern California. Paper presented at the Conference on Human Rights Violations and Refugees' Plight: National and International Dimensions, California State University, Long Beach.  
1996a Anthropology and Indigenous Populations. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.  
1996b Indian Spirituality, White Man's Law: The Story of Puvungna. Paper presented at the Second Annual Symposium of the California Institute of Integral Studies, San Francisco.



1998 The Making of Chumash Tradition: Replies to Haley and Wilcoxon. *Current Anthropology* 39(4):487-491.

1999 Sacred Sites in Urban Settings: The Case of Puvungna. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Anthropology of Religion Section of the American Anthropological Association (held jointly with the Central States Anthropological Association), Chicago.

Salzer, George

1974 A Brief History of the Rancho Los Alamitos. *Los Fieros* 11(3):111-127.

Skomal, Susan N.

1997 Puvungna Prevails in Round 4. *Anthropology Newsletter* 38(2):18.

Scientific Resource Surveys

1980 Archaeological Test Report on the Japanese Garden Arboretum/Museum Site Located on the Campus of the California State University at Long Beach. Report on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, University of California, Los Angeles.



## Reply

### L. MARK RAAB and MATTHEW A. BOXT

Department of Anthropology, California State University, Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff St., Northridge, CA 91330-8244.

**EUGENE** Ruyle and Keith Dixon, long-time advocates of Puvungna-related issues and members of the Anthropology Department at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB), are active stakeholders in the current debate. Since Ruyle and Dixon also offer the most critical reviews of our article, we turn our attention to their comments first. Although Ruyle and Dixon emphasize somewhat dif-

ferent issues, they reflect quite similar lines of commentary. The reader will notice, for instance, that Ruyle and Dixon essentially ignore the major points made by our article. Instead, both commentators adopt a strategy favored by trial lawyers: If you cannot refute your opponent's arguments directly, distract the jury with confusing side issues and character assassination. These diversionary tactics are designed to destroy the credibility of our article on three grounds: it leaves out vital information; we are guilty of sloppy scholarship; and we are "hired guns," somehow enticed by the administration of CSULB to propagate ideas inimical to Native Americans and historic preservation. Let us look at these charges more closely.

### SINS OF OMISSION?

Ruyle and Dixon say we omitted important issues and information from our article. Ruyle, for example, criticizes us for not reporting in detail the perspectives of contemporary Indians, and for not adequately discussing the "Puvunga struggle." Both Ruyle and Dixon maintain that we failed to provide an accurate history of archaeological investigations on the CSULB campus, including what they say are misinterpretations of a Native American burial discovered a number of years ago. Curiously, Dixon focuses most of his comments on legal documents, personal correspondence, and an unpublished manuscript. This tactic complicates assessing our article published here, since the documents to which Dixon refers are not before the readers of this volume. On the other hand, this approach affords plenty of opportunity for creating confusion and introducing *ad hominem* judgments.

Each of the points outlined by Ruyle and Dixon is interesting in its own right. There is no question that Indians hold important perspectives on Puvungna, views to which they and others are deeply committed. The CSULB campus has an extensive and interesting history of archaeological investigation. We see nothing to keep Ruyle and/or Dixon from airing their perspectives on these topics in print. But our article in this volume is not primarily