

DISTRIBUTION: *Wencel*

DOCKET FILES (ENVIRON)

"TIC-OR"

NRC-PBB

Local-PDR

Attorney, OELD

VMoore

JJackson/GKnighton

MSlater

EP-1 Reading

DSE Reading

MAY 19 1978

Docket Nos.: 50-275
and 50-323

Mr. Garland J. Gordon, Chief
Interagency Archaeological Services
450 Golden Gate Avenue
Box 36062
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Mr. Gordon:

Enclosed, please find a copy of the April 26, 1978 correspondence between Salvador Ruiz and Roger Peters. We are forwarding this letter to you because it is related to the information we sent on April 21, 1978, regarding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Generating Station near San Luis Obispo, California.

Of particular interest, Mr. Ruiz clarifies his reaction to the Chumash-related portion of PG&E's public information center for the Diablo Canyon facility. You should thus modify our information on this matter as we reported it on page 3 of our meeting summary dated March 9, 1978. Mr. Ruiz also states his opinion regarding the eligibility of the Diablo Canyon area for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

From conversations with PG&E representatives, we understand that Mr. Ruiz is no longer an official spokesperson for the Chumash. In addition, it seems that PG&E has recently conducted additional site visits for the Chumash, and they (PG&E) are currently pursuing removal of "objectionable" portions of their displays at the center.

I hope that this information is useful to you; I look forward to your June report.

Sincerely,

Robert P. Meckler for

George W. Knighton, Chief
Environmental Projects Branch 1
Division of Site Safety and
Environmental Analysis

Enclosure:
As stated

Enviro. 2

GD

cc:	See next page				
OFFICE >		DSE:EP-1	DSE:EP-1		
SURNAME >		JDJackson/1k	GWKnighton		
DATE >		5/19/78	5/ /78		

SECRET
[Faint, illegible text]

SECRET



SECRET

Mr. Garland J. Gordon

- 2 -

MAY 19 1978

cc: Mr. Roger Peters
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, 31st Floor
San Francisco, California 94106

Salvador Ruiz
777 Boysen #5
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
ATTN: Mr. John C. Morrissey
Vice President and General Counsel
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, California 94106

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

1968 v. a 1968

Faint, illegible text in the upper right quadrant of the page.

April 26, 1978

Mr. Roger Peters
Pacific Gas and Electric
77 Beale St. 31st. Floor
San Francisco, CA. 94106

Dear Mr. Peters

I am writing this letter in an attempt to clear up any misunderstandings that may exist regarding my interactions with representatives of P.G.&E.

On January 12th I met with representatives from P.G.&E., NRC, NAHC, SOHP, and SLOCAS to discuss the Diablo artifacts. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reported me as making the following statement: "The Chumash want P.G.&E. to make slides, molds, etc...of the artifacts and then return all (both burial and village related artifacts) to them." This needs clarification. Mr. Dills, who represents San Luis Obispo Archaeological Society, had finished justifying SLOCAS keeping the artifacts on educational grounds. I asked Mr. Dills three questions; why hadn't the society shared the educational value of the artifacts by making slides, molds, pictures, etc; and channeled these into the local educational system? Didn't he feel the Greenwood report held any educational benefit? And why he felt any more educational benefit could be derived from the artifacts. Mr. Dills responded first by stating that the society lacked the funds for such reproduction (I guess no one in the society has a camera or can afford film), secondly, he felt that the Greenwood report did have educational value. Thirdly, Mr. Dill stated, "Who's to say what kind of new technique might be developed in the future that will be able to tell us exactly what time period these artifacts come from."

I responded, "You could have done this and other things long ago, and returned the artifacts to the Indian people." I further stated, "Even now you could be doing this so that you would have your educational thirst satisfied, and the Indians could have their culture back."

I realize now that my statements were worse than mistakes, in fact, they were an open invitation for P.G.&E. and other



same conscience organizations to justify retaining the artifacts, and perpetuate their cultural indifference. As the meeting progressed, I was asked what exactly are burial related and village related artifacts. Instead of stating that all are burial related, I called on Bob Gibson to shed some light on the matter, he named items like whistles, charm stones, etc. From that point a suggestion to review Greenwood's field notes to actually see which artifacts came from where, was introduced. I agreed to take that idea back to the Indian people. That was all I agreed to. "As of this date I don't know how all the Indian people feel about it, but I do know that the majority think:

All artifacts taken from the Diablo cemetery region are burial related and sacred. Thus, they must be returned to the Indian people.

Now I feel a need to address myself to a letter distributed by the NRC which is dated March 9, 1978. In the letter the NRC states that, "It has been reported that Mr. Ruiz had no major objection to the display, most of which was village related rather than burial related; overall he seemed impressed with the exhibit."

The key words in the above statement are, 'it has been reported and seemed'. I went to the Information Center to observe and see, that is what I did, I made no remarks positive or negative. Let me now state what I saw at the Information Center. There were pictures of the grave sites with remains sticking half way out of the Mother Earth. Many sacred objects were on display such as bone whistles, charm stones, bowls and other items. If you believe as I do, then everything in the center is sacred, for the Indian's life was thoroughly sacred day to day. In summary, the display is not acceptable, and solutions are not being reached toward this end.

I think it only just that the people who's culture is being exhibited, written about, capitalized on, and stolen have "ultimate" say about the way in which their culture is presented to this materially mystified society they find themselves in.

One final words before I submit my conclusion. The Indian people believe that the Indian archaeological sites out at Diablo meet National Registrar requirements under criteria 1, 2, and 3, furthermore, Indian involvement is necessary for preservation of the latter mentioned criteria qualities, resurvey is mandatory.

In conclusion, I offer a personal summary. Mr. Sawyer, Chairman of SLOCAS, states that the artifacts are the "only source" of information on the Indians prehistory, showing they "had culture". He justifies the Societies actions by its intent; understanding Central Coast history and protection of the artifacts from "pot hunters"; and by its "legality" through property rights, making the artifacts Society property because they were a gift from P.G.&E. which owns the land, the law



giving to the owner control over the artifacts. As to the artifact being the only source of information, I say, haven't any of you educationally concerned men heard of the Harrington Notes? Have you ever talked to any of the elders? Are you simply rationalizing you need to commit cultural genocide? As to the law being on your side, I say laws are made to benefit those who write the laws, and no Indian has ever written any of the laws pertaining to cultural preservation.

Those who know some of the history of the relations between white and red people, know of the theft of the natives country by the white peoples use of the concept of owning the earth and by using written paper laws. The central coast history of which the Society is so fond, can be written for our history students to show that the Archaeological Society is using and upholding this policy in 1978. Further evidence of the continuation of these racist attitudes is contained in Mr. Sawyer's statement that "if they had a written history, it wouldn't be as essential" for the Society to keep the artifacts. The Central Coast Indians say the artifacts are religious and belong to their former owners. Apparently, if people don't use non-Indian kind of legal and historical record-keeping, they lose their right to property and religious expression. The Society claims the attitude that "Indians were animals to be killed off" is disproved, yet, can it be said that they grant them the respect due humans while simultaneously denying their freedom? He says it is shown that the Indians had a culture (note the past tense). They have a culture now partially based, like your own, on burial ceremonies and sanctity of the grave. Culture, to a large degree, is dependent upon maintainance of tradition and history by its own people. To recognize Indian culture by mouth and deny it by deed-is that the American culture? It appears to be the character of the Archaeological Society! The Society, in its feigned role of "protection" of the artifacts becomes that "pot hunter" it purportedly seeks to resist. P.G.&E. acts as "Mother" to the society by its attitudes and behaviors, for it seeks only to nurture the lack of understanding which the Archaeological Society has implanted in its "fertal mind."

Is our society so absurd that it puts studying artifacts and property rights on higher priority than the rights and religious freedoms of people to preserve part of their culture? I wonder how many white people in this county would allow the country to take their ancestor's headstones and caskets as artifacts of their Christian culture.

In Spirit,

Salvador Ruiz



cc Santa Barbara Indian Center

cc Central Coast Indian Council

cc Red Wind Indian Foundation

cc SLOCAS

cc Santa Ynez Indian Reservation

