

## Cultural Interpretation in Times of Change

Kimberley L. Lawson

Perhaps the most significant result of the workshops was expression of surprise on the part of many archaeologists that they were perceived to be a threat to Aboriginal Culture. On the other hand, it was no little surprise to many Aboriginal participants that individual archaeologists were both understanding and supportive of the general Aboriginal point of view (Dunn 1991: 16).

There is in British Columbia today conflict and mistrust between First Nations<sup>1</sup> and the archaeological community. There are fundamental (though not irresolvable) intellectual and ethical differences between archaeology and Indigenous history, which many individuals and projects have attempted to bridge. The potential for good working relationships is affected by a host of factors not related to the methods and theory of archaeology, but which are nonetheless relevant to its current practice.

In British Columbia, archaeology is directly affected by two broad concerns: the balancing of many values (e.g., economic, heritage, cultural, spiritual, social, environmental, recreational, and aesthetic) in land and resource management decisions; and the relationship between Aboriginal people and governments with the rest of the province and Canada. The historic development of each has also been influenced by various academic theories about culture and by archaeological research. There is thus a need for Indigenous cultural leaders, decision makers, and other resource managers to have an understanding of archaeology. Similarly, archaeologists are being called upon to fill many roles, and to draw upon diverse skills, many of which were not part of their formal training; increasingly, archaeologists' clients assume that their research and reports will address all cultural concerns within the study area. There is much at stake, including the promise of better understanding of the past and of the cultural concerns and rights of Aboriginal peoples, and the attainment of better protection of places that hold archaeological information; there is also fear of greater conflict.

Archaeologists and Aboriginal people appreciate many of the same things, but place dramatically different values on them. Additionally, the use of knowledge of Aboriginal culture and ancient history may have a different impacts upon Indigenous people than it may on archaeologists:

First Americans are the subject of public fascination and scholarly research; that research including the development of models of past human adaptation to changing world climates and ecosystems (Knudson and Keel 1995: 1).

Tribes seek to preserve their cultural heritage as a living part of contemporary life. This means preserving not only historic properties but languages, traditions, and lifeways (Parker 1990: 1).

Archeological sites present a unique opportunity for managers to learn about the long-term functioning of ecosystems. The archeological record reveals how prehistoric human populations and their environments interact over extended spans of time—with both changing as a result (McManamon 1995: 2).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As there is no term or definition universally accepted, I use *Aboriginal*, *First Nations*, *First Peoples*, *Native*, and *Indigenous* interchangeably. When I uses these terms, unless qualified by a phrase such as "defined by" or "as recognized by the federal government," I mean them to include Inuit and Métis. My apologies to anyone who finds this awkward or distracting.

<sup>2</sup> Here McManamon is advocating the use of archaeological research in the service of managing natural resources, rather than describing a prevalent practice

A second argument for protecting [archaeological sites] is that most of human history is preserved only in archaeological sites. Written accounts of human activities are rare and recent when viewed against the entire time span of human evolution. ... the major means by which human beings have adapted to this planet, in chronological terms, left behind only archaeological sites as with most tangible legacy for the modern world. This is the fishing-gathering-hunting way of life, described by one archaeologist as one of the most remarkable success stories in the natural world. The hunting and gathering strategy exclusively characterized human life arguable for close to two million years and is now all but extinct. To my mind, there is no better reason to study this unique and enduring slice of the human experience (Weisman 1993: 1).

This volume [*The Public Trust and the First Americans*] focuses on the concept that the archaeological [sites] of the First Americans are part of a public trust to be protected and used to the benefit of all people: the general public, avocational archaeologists, Native Americans and professional archaeologists alike (Stanford 1995: vii).

A lot of academic anthropologists miss the boat ... and they don't get to understand the deeper ways and means of a people's techniques of survival under trying conditions (Ignace et al. 1993: 169).

Actually, my involvement [in repatriation] came about in a couple of ways, I went to the traditional leaders and said, "My juvenile court isn't working any more. The juveniles have no respect for me and they don't seem to have respect for any of the tribe infrastructure. Maybe there is something you guys can do, as traditionals, to help me out" "And they took me aside and said, "Well, we have this stack of summaries and inventories. You take care of this for us and ... (laughter) ... we will help you out." And I looked at them suspiciously and said, "Wait a second, is this a tradeoff?" And they didn't even bat an eye. It was like, "No, we don't exactly know how to help you until you get all this other stuff in order" (Vincenti 1995: 23)

## BUILDING BRIDGES

The basis for resolution of most of the specific priority issues was seen to lie in bridge building between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures (Dunn 1991: 8).

First Nations remain very concerned about the interpretation of their past, and of changes to places that have important connections to their past. Because many of their concerns are shared with non-Aboriginal people, there is good potential for partnerships, which would be greatly strengthened with an awareness of the differences between Aboriginal cultural concerns and archaeological values. Neither needs to replace the other, but both should be respected. Many Aboriginal people believe that a strong culture is essential for a healthy future for First Nations; it is not unreasonable for them to expect people who wish to interpret Aboriginal culture to earn their trust, rather than be granted it automatically.

Awareness that archaeological work has profound implications for Aboriginal people is being recognized by the profession of archaeology. The Canadian Archaeological Association, particularly its Committee on Aboriginal Heritage, should be commended for their work in this area (Nicholson et al. 1996; also see Hanna, Ch. 5; Sievert 1994; Webster and Bennett, Ch. 18; Wylie 1994; and publications of the World Archaeological Congress [e.g., Layton (ed.) 1989a, b]).

Bridge building requires not only a long-term commitment to finding solutions, but cross-cultural communication skills, and awareness of other world views. I use the term *cultural interpretation*<sup>3</sup> to refer to communication that encourages meaningful dialogue between two or more

<sup>3</sup> The term *cultural brokerage* is more common, but I am not fond of the (intentional or not) analogy with commodities, and feel that "interpretation" is more accurate.

cultural groups. Cross-cultural communication has not always been considered an essential skill of archaeology,<sup>4</sup> but it is expected of archaeologists more and more, and at an increasing level of complexity. Developing a broader understanding of culture, of the potential information to be learned through the methods of archaeology, and of clear and honest communications about and across cultures are absolutely essential. Obviously, communication between First Nations leaders and archaeologists is important, but so too is communication with the “general public” (both Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal) and resource managers (for First Nations and other governments). Real solutions can only come through long-term relationships based on mutual respect and understanding. The knowledge that could result from good working relationships promises to be rich and wonderfully complex: “this is the kind of history that we are being challenged to create” (Hanna, Ch. 5).

My primary concerns in this chapter are thus to identify important cultural factors that contribute to different views of, and approaches to, the past by both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cultures; to discuss some of the problems that limit effective cross-cultural communication concerning these issues; and to provide some suggestions for improving the effectiveness of cultural interpretation in times of change.

## WORLD VIEWS

The very concepts of past, present, future and the relationship of all living things is profoundly different in each culture. Many speakers, and particularly elders, placed [extraordinary emphasis] on the differences in cultural perception of archaeological issues (Dunn 1991: 8, 11).

The term *world view* (or *lifeview*) refers to a cluster of interrelated concepts and values, developed through shared historic events, that shape the way that a culture looks at the world. All world views have value systems that affirm what is important and why. There are many Aboriginal world views, and important differences exist between them; for example, despite some similarities, Nuuchahnulth, Cree, Salish, Sto:lo, Secwepemc, and Heiltsuk world views have significant differences. The differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous world views are more dramatic.<sup>5</sup>

Concepts of spirituality, knowledge, science, ethnicity, sacredness, jurisdiction, law, progress, balance, land stewardship, land ownership, time, and change are difficult to communicate across cultures. These concepts reflect the way that people perceive reality and are fundamental to intellectual traditions—to the ways in which knowledge and information are acquired, shared, cared for, and carried into the future.

## Intellectual Traditions

Many projects designed to build and strengthen working relationships between archaeologists and First Nations focus on bridging intellectual traditions, which are an expression of world view. Projects such as the World Archaeological Congress conferences examine these differences explicitly. Other conferences, forums, or gatherings have focused more on principles, standards, or ethics (Echo-Hawk 1993; Nicholson et al. 1996; Hanna, Ch. 5; Webster and Bennett, Ch. 18). There are also research projects that work to apply both intellectual traditions in a meaningful way (Hanks and Winter 1983, 1986; Harris, Ch. 12; Knecht 1994; Marshall 1993). Echo-Hawk (1993) discusses both the need to bridge these traditions and his experiences in doing so.

Discussion about differences in intellectual traditions may help to identify certain sources of misunderstanding. Intellectual traditions of industrialized societies are scientific, written, externalized, and empirical. The scientific study of the physical world is founded upon empirical observation—upon tangible things and events that can be studied, and experiments that can be repeated. In contrast, Indigenous intellectual traditions are generally unwritten, internalized, and

<sup>4</sup> The discipline of archaeology would benefit greatly from the discussions taking place in other cultural disciplines concerning cross-cultural communication, applied anthropological ethics, and intellectual copyright.

<sup>5</sup> An understanding of these differences should not be used as a measure of how “traditional” or “authentic” an Aboriginal person or community is.

integrated with spirituality; Indigenous knowledge is also more holistic than Western academic disciplines. Indigenous lifeviews are based upon the physical world reflecting spiritual relationships and realities.<sup>6</sup>

Aboriginal religions have values and ethics, and include the belief that the spirit has a powerful and physical effect upon living people's daily lives:

For us, *pule* [prayer] is reality, for through *pule* spiritual help is requested to affect the physical world. And so the relationship between ancestors and descendants is one of interdependence—the living have a duty to care for the dead. In turn, the ancestors respond by protecting us on the spiritual side. One cannot completely exist without the other. ... The point is that science is not the only means to define man's existence. Spirituality is the necessary balance (Ayau 1995: 32-33).

Many of the divisions within Western academic traditions (e.g., between philosophy/theosophy and sciences, between nature and culture, between animate and inanimate things) do not correlate with divisions in traditional Aboriginal thinking:

Many traditional cultural properties are considered sacred by American Indians. The entire earth is sacred—or an entire mountain range is sacred, or the entire landscape, including spaces invisible to most, but visible to the knowledgeable. A tribal elder once told me, "you are talking about preserving the environment and the plants and animals that we see. I am worried about preserving the environment that we do not see—the places where the spirits live" (Parker 1993: 4-5).

One thing that has stuck me is how differently [traditional Native Americans and non-tribal people] define relationships. Traditional Native Americans believe that everyone and everything exist in an integrated and pervasive system of relationships. One resident of Santa Clara Pueblo puts it this way: "We are part of an organic world in which interrelationships at all levels are honored." ... Traditional Native Americans see an essential relationship between humans and the objects they create. A pot is not just a pot. In our community, the pots we create are seen as vital, breathing entities that must be respected as all other living beings. ... This is why we honor our ancestors and the objects they created. This honoring allows us to remember our past and the natural process of transformation—of breathing, living, dying and becoming one with the natural world. Not even in death are we unrelated (Naranjo 1995: 16).

In Aboriginal traditions, knowledge, like all other things needed by people, is a gift from the creator—not the result of luck, random accumulation, or cultural evolution: "If he was supposed to know about those bones, the Great Mystery would have told him" (Stolpe 1995: 59).

### Oral History

Another fundamental difference between Indigenous and Western world views is the way in which information is kept—oral-based traditions vs. written traditions. There is not only a difference in media (e.g., paper, clay tablets, and computer disks in contrast to living memory), but in the social context of knowledge:

The scientific way is an externalized process. It can be seen, it can be touched and it can be counted. The knowledge of "it" is documented and depending on what "it" is, may be important enough to register. "It" may not even be considered within its overall significance in the First Nations culture or within the boundaries of its landscape. The value of a site or object is determined usually in terms of scientific and not cultural historical value of the tribe. With an internalized process of value placement, the terms of conservation and preservation are different than those of the externalized process. With the internalized process there is attachment; with the externalized process there is detachment. When we

<sup>6</sup> This is not to say that indigenous knowledge does not draw heavily upon empirical observation as well.

internalize our culture we are more apt to consider using “it” until it is no longer usable; when we externalize our culture it is easier to isolate sites or objects in glass cases or make monuments (J. Harris, pers. comm. 1993).

Central to oral history as an intellectual tradition is the concept that one does not merely possess information or knowledge, but accepts responsibility for it:

The oral history, the crests, and the songs of a House are evidence, however, of something more than even its history, title, and authority. They represent also its spirit power, its *daxgyet* (DelgamUukw and GisdayWa 1989: 26).

Native Americans and archaeologists are likely to have different standards of evidence. An archeologist, or National Register historian, will look for scientific or historical evidence to document the significance of a place. However, in traditional communities the elders or traditional leaders are the culture bearers whose words are historical truth. A group member does not ask a traditional leader to “prove it” (Parker 1993: 5).

The name *ittarnisalirijit*... could be translated as: those who deal with the distant past, the time of legends. It refers to the very essence of Inuit culture and implies an obligation to protect it (Webster and Bennett, Ch. 18).

Both oral history and written knowledge are important today in mainstream Western (First World) and Indigenous (Fourth World) cultures. Oral history—the transmission of knowledge and cultural values from person to person—is incorporated into traditional First Nations public records of census, political leadership, and history, and into professional training and personal history.<sup>7</sup> In industrialized societies, the oral tradition is still essential, especially in professional training, such as teachers practicums and doctors internships. In Canada today, writing is a vital part of governance and academia—it is essential to identification (e.g., signatures); it facilitates communication over long distances and long periods of time; and it is a way to record knowledge. It also makes knowledge and information accessible to large numbers of people. Writing externalizes information; it entrusts it to inanimate objects, such as paper, books, and computer disks. Writing systems are not just *used* by industrial societies, but are incorporated into the very fabric of that social system, central to administration, legal systems, governance, and public records. These social systems have developed sets of checks and balance for accuracy in written records.

Oral history in indigenous traditions is as integral to governance as writing is to industrialized societies, and also incorporates a system of checks and balances to establish and safeguard accuracy over long periods of time. Oral history does not externalize information, but entrusts it to people who internalize it. In Indigenous cultures, the listener or “witness” also has an important role; there are strict laws for witnessing at potlatches. Much knowledge in traditional Aboriginal oral history is considered to “belong” to the people who are responsible for taking care of it. It is not common property:

Clan history is ritual knowledge, rarely shared legitimately with other clans, and much less so with non-Indians (Ferguson et al. 1995: 12).

We make sure, when it comes to this kind of information, that the rights of dissemination and access remain with the families and remain with the elders. Our elders are not afraid of death. What they are afraid of is having their words and their things used wrong later on (Ann Renker, Makah Nation, cited in Parker 1990: 55).

---

<sup>7</sup> The way that these oral traditions have continued in post-contact times, as “First Peoples have become Fourth Worlds”—nations within colonial states—is a complex topic, part of “the boat” that academic anthropology is missing (Ignace et al. 1993).

In Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en society the Chiefs are responsible for their part of the society's history and for knowledge of their particular territory. However, Chiefs are reluctant to answer questions about histories or places that properly belong to someone else. It is as if to speak of another's territory were to constitute a trespass. ... Each Chief tells his history in the living context of the knowledge in others' minds (DelgamUukw and GisdayWa 1989: 39).

Within the Western intellectual tradition, science is viewed as both a means and an end; knowledge is acquired in trust for humanity and for the betterment of humanity. Archaeologists consider the information and knowledge learned through its study of the past to be of value to all people, for it speaks of the richness of human diversity and promotes a better understanding of how culture works (e.g., documenting the effects of change on different aspects of a cultural system). In general, knowledge and information are considered to be common property.

The information that can be learned through archaeology is also of great value to First Nations. Archaeology and oral history are based on very different kinds of information, and because each has very different strengths, they can be complementary. Archaeology, for example, is based upon objective, empirical observation of material culture—those things made or modified by people—that represents an “unintentional record” of past human behavior. This information does reflect people's lives, but was never meant to represent them. Oral tradition, on the other hand, is an intentional record; it is a record of the knowledge and information that is considered important. Names, songs, and language, which are central to oral history, cannot be found in an archaeological site. Conversely, knowledge of what meals were eaten at a certain place over a period of time may not be important enough to be kept in oral history, but may leave a trace in the archaeological record—written in soil, bones, pollen and seeds.

#### BRIDGING INTELLECTUAL TRADITIONS

Elder presentations made it very clear that the root cause of Aboriginal dissatisfaction was disrespect, intentional or otherwise, for Aboriginal culture (Dunn 1991: 6).

Historically, the intellectual traditions of First Nations were dismissed because they did not meet Western standards of empirical proof, objectivity, reliability, and academic standards. In the Western world view, the oral history of all cultures (including its own) is considered personal accounts, or as “folklore” or “mythology.” Oral history is considered a subjective and ephemeral form of knowledge: “Archaeologists have regarded traditional explanations as ‘ignorant’, thereby discrediting not just the explanation but also the entire world view in which it is entrenched. ‘Ignorance’ in this context connotes more than simply a lack of training in archaeological methods and theory; it connotes, rather, that the underlying assumptions about the nature of reality are false” (Hanna, Ch. 5). This attitude is still shared by the general public, who have long viewed ancient Aboriginal history a great mystery, a puzzle reachable only through the science of archaeology:

The term “prehistory” conveys to all people the deliberate impression that Indian historians have failed to create and hand down any form of legitimate record about human events dating back more than three or four centuries. From the perspective of popular attitudes, this has contributed to the devaluation of Native American intellectual traditions, and archaeologists have happily displaced Indian historians as experts on the ancient past (Echo-Hawk's (1993: 5).

However, this situation has not gone unchallenged by archaeologists (e.g., Hanna, Ch. 5). Indeed, Moss and Erlandson (1995: 35), speaking in terms of their own research area, see “collaborations between archaeologists and Native Americans as an imperative, a natural outgrowth of mutual interests and concerns, and a research avenue that may result in a variety of new views of Pacific Coast prehistory.”

### The Reliability and Objectivity of Oral History

The absence of this sky lore in historical records of the American Indian of the Plains tells us how fragile is learning without the written word, and how quickly it can be lost forever (Eddy 1977: 146).<sup>8</sup>

In our view, there should be no epistemological division between the study of prehistoric and historic societies. Instead, this “boundary” should be regarded as a continuous transition that leads to the living descendants of pre-contact groups. The combined effects of epidemic diseases and territorial dispossession wrought a devastation on Pacific Coast groups that can be described as an “American Holocaust” ... Archaeologists owe it to the survivors to help rewrite the history of the contact period (Moss and Erlandson 1995: 35).

The permanence of oral history is not dependent upon the survival of individual people, but on the process of succession of culture bearers. Tragedies of epidemics, environmental disasters, and assimilation policies have disrupted the succession for many Indigenous nations, resulting in the loss of traditional knowledge. This does not make oral history<sup>9</sup> any more fragile than written history. However, written history is dependent upon many things as well: who has writing skills; what records are considered important enough to store and protect; the will of dispassionate editors; the whims of revisionist historians; and upon succeeding generations being able to read and write, and upon the written media such as books, paper and computer disks surviving in legible forms.<sup>10</sup>

Traditional Aboriginal histories and intellectual traditions have also been marginalized by the perception of Western academic disciplines that history and anthropology are more objective. This assertion is related to the ideas that writing is more objective and reliable than oral accounts, and that someone within the study culture will be somehow more biased than an observer from another culture: “People will also say that Native American should not or cannot study their own culture because it’s not objective or scientific, but no one is really objective” (TwoBears 1995: 5).

The degree of objectivity that history and archaeology can provide is ultimately very limited.<sup>11</sup> We can objectively determine that a set of words was written onto a piece of paper, and perhaps determine with reasonable confidence who wrote them and when, but the interpretation beyond that (i.e., of motives, truthfulness, accuracy) becomes subjective. We can also determine objectively that, on a certain day, an individual found and recorded an object of stone at a certain depth in a certain unit at a certain site; however, transferring these archaeological observations into knowledge about Aboriginal history is subjective:<sup>12</sup>

Key concepts freely used in scholarly research, far from being objective tools of nomenclature and classification, are largely derived from a cultural tradition which uses an ethnocentric rather than objective or scientific conceptual framework for analyzing temporally-distant and/or cultural-distinct cultures (Konrad 1975: 177-178).

---

<sup>8</sup> This area of research recognizes the complexity of traditional intellectual knowledge, but ascribes its loss to inherent weakness, without reference to epidemics and forced assimilation.

<sup>9</sup> Indigenous lifeviews view the link between the spiritual world and that of the living as capable of overcoming “lost knowledge”—that it is not necessarily “lost forever” (see Stolpe 1995: 59).

<sup>10</sup> This is an interesting area of discussion, with practical implications for First Nations cultural centres and education programs, but the assertion that written history is “better” and more reliable than oral history is a “red herring” and not a useful foundation for building working relationships.

<sup>11</sup> See Hanna, Ch. 5; also Layton ([ed.] 1989a, b) for more extensive discussion about objectivity and bridging intellectual traditions.

<sup>12</sup> Which is not to say that it is not useful, but it is very shaky ground upon which to assert superiority over oral history. [Many practitioners of the discipline not only recognize this problem, but are actively working to bypass it through postprocessual and other approaches—Editors]

Archaeologists themselves have been influenced in their interpretation by the received wisdom of their times, both in the sort of classificatory schemes which they consider appropriate to their subject, and in the way that their dating of materials is affected by their assumptions about the capabilities of the humans concerned (Ucko 1989b: xii).

The interpretation of negative data (e.g., the absence of sites in an area or the absence of a certain type of data at a site or a certain level of a site), which is liable to conjecture, is another form of subjective interpretation. Another oft-neglected factor is the subjective choice of research goals, which generally reflect Western perspectives and cultural theory. The "reconstruction" or construction" of the past is strongly influenced by the research goals, perhaps even more so than by the actual material recovered:

Much of the evidence that archaeologists use to reconstruct the past is the product of cultures whose values differ from those of the West, but it is through those [Western] values that the significance of much archaeological evidence is constituted (Layton 1989a: 18).

Perhaps the most pervasive theme of this book [*Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*] is the extent to which outsiders research interests fail to match the concerns of Indigenous communities (Layton 1989a: 12).

Historical documents are very useful, but the notion that they are automatically objective records of culture is tenuous. First Nations people are likely to see oral history as being a more accurate reflection of their history than the diary of someone who stepped off a boat in their neighbourhood for a few days, no matter how extraordinary an accomplishment it was that he got there.

The concepts and data upon which archaeological research is silent have as great an effect on public perception of Aboriginal culture as the information that it provides. For example, archaeological theory regarding people's relationship to land often focuses upon subsistence technology and resource use, but tends to be silent about other equally important topics, such as spirituality, links of family and name, conservation practices, as well as on stewardship, ownership, or resource management jurisdiction. Such a pattern is generally due to the limitations of archaeological data as archaeological methods are not well-suited to studying Native spirituality and other ideologies and behaviors that are poorly represented or absent in the archaeological record. Despite these limitations, archaeologists need to address all aspects of past Native culture, including those that are not well-preserved, and to recognize that many dimensions of aboriginal life have not been adequately addressed.

Finally, it must be recognized that archaeology can never be a totally "objective" study of culture, being "biased" by the limitations of the data and theories that frame the research questions. When non-archaeologists perceive archaeological research to be objective and comprehensive, their use of the research results can lead to misunderstanding about Aboriginal culture.

### **Ethics**

Additional differences between Western and Aboriginal cultures are reflected in the ethics and practice of their intellectual traditions. These are important factors in the discussions between archaeologists and Aboriginal culture-bearers: "Indigenous people "belabored" the general concept of respect in the [World Archaeological Congress, Vermillion] accord whereas the archaeologists tended to do likewise with the detail of each statement. We do not know exactly what this means except that the groups are still communicating on different levels about issues. This should cue both groups to significant problems that may remain unresolved' (Zimmerman and Bruguier 1994: 7). Both intellectual traditions believe that knowledge is a trust—that they are responsible for the protection of the knowledge itself, and that they have a responsibility to prevent its misuse. The specific ethical principles relating to the protection of knowledge are very different in Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal lifeways because of the social differences stemming from externalized knowledge and internalized knowledge. For example, Western intellectual traditions believe that the body of all human knowledge should be the property of all humanity, and that there are specific ethical beliefs relating to responsibility to the data itself: e.g., do not fictionalize

data; do not be influenced by what one wants to find but accurately report what one does find; work to disseminate the research as widely as possible; do not plagiarize or take credit for others' work. Archaeologists must also recognize an ethical responsibility for the unanticipated consequences of their work. As Layton (1989a: 8) notes, "Wherever archaeological theories become used to justify policy, it is equally essential to look again at the assumptions that underpin them and ask whether they are used to promote injustice."

Conversely, the ethics of indigenous knowledge include ensuring that knowledge is remembered accurately, spoken at the appropriate times and places, and entrusted to a successor who accepts responsibility for all it relates to. Greaves (1994: ix) observes that, "The most urgent reason to establish that control [over cultural knowledge] is to preserve meaning and due honor for elements of cultural knowledge and to insure that these traditional universes, and their peoples, maintain their vitality."

### Words, Words, Words

Cross-cultural communication requires specialized skills. Words convey a society's world view, making communication about Aboriginal culture in a Non-Aboriginal language problematic. Just as there may be no Aboriginal concepts to match such English words as "ownership" or "resource," there are often Aboriginal concepts without English equivalents. English words can carry connotations contrary to the meaning of the Aboriginal concept they may be discussing. For example, Aboriginal people can speak of *resources*, meaning the plants and animals and land and air and everything on and in them, but without meaning that their purpose in existing is to be used or exploited. Likewise, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people may know that they are talking about the same thing, while their *relationship to it* can be very different. The distinction between *cultural* and *natural resources* may thus be meaningless in an Aboriginal world view: the terms "traditional cultural properties and historic properties [are] also offensive to some American Indians who dislike the implication that places of cultural, historic, ancestral, and spiritual value are "property," presumably to be bought and sold" (Parker 1993: 3).

Categorizing cultures by "subsistence base" (e.g., hunter-gatherer, horticulturist) may also imply that resource use is the main relationship of people and land or environment. Words carry connotations of theories and stereotypes, emphasize the different values and perspectives on the past, and may be very emotive. The choice of words can imply causation or blame. There is, for example, a significant difference between describing the loss of knowledge from oral tradition as a result of a *population decline* or an "*American Holocaust*" (Stannard 1992; Thornton 1987, both as referenced by Moss and Erlandson 1995: 35).

Many English words about culture and knowledge are clearly value-laden—*primitive, simple, prehistoric, civilized, barbaric, band, tribe, literate, illiterate, preliterate-adapted, evolved, developed, ritual, folklore, myth, legend, and custom*. Such terms often carry connotations of "cultural evolution," the superiority of writing systems, the values of technological progress (e.g., savage is the opposite of civilized, which means cities, writing, agriculture, etc.) and the "white man's burden." Likewise, while the term *prehistory* has a technical meaning, referring to time periods for which there are no written records (which would be all times before European contact for most Aboriginal cultures), it resonates with many negative connotations. It carries the rejection of Aboriginal oral histories by Western academic traditions; the difficulties in having Aboriginal oral histories accepted by Canadian society and its court system; and the dismissal of post-contact history as "tainted"—no longer authentic and traditional, and therefore not a valid area of study. The emotive connotations of such terms (and especially of jargon) may be invisible to an archaeologist. Many words given a "technical" meaning, separate from the emotive connotations of "common English," may still carry assumptions and stereotypes, and can be perceived by many Aboriginal people as disrespectful. This can make communicating across cultures about culture very emotive. It is difficult but essential to work past the connotations and value judgments implicit in many words to build a constructive and shared vocabulary about culture. This can be very frustrating—communicating can seem hopeless when it's hard to agree even on definitions. However, talking about words and definitions is itself important communication.

Beyond the words themselves, discourse varies between languages and world views. Bridges must be found between oral history, professional archaeological reports, and academic writing. In verbal communication, protocol and the pace of talking (including "meaningful pauses") can

easily be misunderstood. In the context of archaeological resource management, the various protocols of the business world and of the provincial and First Nations bureaucracies are included in the discourse.

#### ARCHAEOLOGY AND ABORIGINAL/NON-ABORIGINAL RELATIONS

Archaeology and anthropology are, and have historically been, part of the relationship between Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal people in British Columbia, and have influenced both the development of public policy that affects First Nations and the public perception of Aboriginal cultures and history. Certainly many policies have been developed without reference to anthropological theory, but some of the assumptions used by decision-makers have been shared by social sciences: "...until very recent times, archaeology, anthropology, and most government policies fostered the assumption that Aboriginal people were, or soon would be, extinct by virtue of natural death of assimilation" (Dunn 1991: 10).

Generally, anthropology makes ethnographic or archaeological information about indigenous cultures available to non-Indigenous peoples. In addition, anthropologists and archaeologists may have limited control over the impacts of their work. Such factors may result in the misuse or inappropriate application of anthropological information. As Young Man (1992: 91) notes,

Anthropological theories may be compared to the automobiles of a car salesman—with one major difference. When a car salesman sells you a new vehicle and the car turns out to be faulty, the written warranty guarantees a quick, worry-free recall and settlement of the grievance. Anthropological theories, on the other hand, have no warranties and they cannot be recalled, ever, if they are not true. Once they are unleashed upon an unsuspecting public they take on a life of their own and cannot be called back for readjustment when or if they turn out to be lemons.

Misunderstanding of culture in general, and of specific aspects of the many different Aboriginal cultures in British Columbia and Canada, has led to inappropriate and discriminatory public policy, which has caused suffering and great hardship for First Nations people and communities. Some of the serious grievances that remain between Aboriginal people and the social sciences relate to the legacy of such concepts as *cultural evolution*, *unilinear evolution*, *pure cultures*, and *unidirectional cultural change* (e.g., European cultures changed Indigenous cultures dramatically, but were themselves unaffected in any substantial way by the contact). These theories were subjective—based largely on the "received wisdom of their times" (Ucko 1989: xii) and less on objective empirical data and scientific study—and have left a lasting impression.

Ethnographic and archaeological information, as well as theories about how and why cultures change, continue to influence public perception of contemporary Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations. Theories and assumptions relating to cultural evolution, in particular, have made a strong impression on people's perception of "how we got to where we are today," which affects their willingness to address outstanding issues. The values associated with these assumptions are still very strongly held:

...my friend was essentially blaming the Indians themselves for what befell them. They failed to adapt their lifestyle and belief systems to keep up with changing times. Most importantly, they failed to keep up with technological change, they were not competitive. This statement reflects a Darwinist, capitalist outlook of survival of the fittest, with fitness now defined in terms of technological capability. If you can use the machine better than the next fellow or the next culture, you survive and they die. This may be sad, the reasoning goes, but that's the way it is in today's world (Mander 1991: 209).

This reasoning minimizes the complexity of colonization and post-contact history to a simple question of "technological capacity," ignoring the dynamics of epidemics, war, displacement, loss of resources, economic marginalization, and policies of forced assimilation.

In this context, any differences between anthropological and indigenous intellectual traditions will be magnified. Anthropologists are facing a legacy of mistrust in Indigenous communities resulting from misuse of anthropological interpretation and anthropological research which is distasteful to Native people. As Echo-Hawk (1993: 5) notes, "Physical anthropologists—close colleagues of archaeologists—have exacerbated this situation by devoting great energy (up to World War II) in an embarrassing quest to develop scientific proof for Indian intellectual inferiority. This racist history cannot be ignored by Native Americans."

Anthropologists who chose racist research questions do not represent the discipline of anthropology or physical anthropology; there have been individual anthropologists, *including* physical anthropologists, who have devoted much of their energies to challenging racist theories and to developing culturally appropriate solutions. However, the discipline's reputation may rest upon its efforts to address past issues:

Nineteenth century cultural evolutionism provides the intellectual justification for the existing rationale regarding the legitimate disposition of underlying title in law. In this sense, it is 19th century evolutionism that lies behind how the law [today] designates the ultimate authority over cultural property. As we now reject 19th century unilinear evolutionism in our own practice, it is useful to ask what contemporary theory might say about underlying title and hence about how to determine the legitimate ownership of cultural property (Asch, Ch. 20).

The working relationship between archaeologists and First Nations is strained because anthropological theories and archaeological interpretation have been used as evidence in court against First Nations communities. The development and implementation of policy to determine contemporary Aboriginal rights, on the basis of what is accepted as authentic traditional practices or activities, will draw upon archaeological interpretation. Since this policy area will greatly affect First Nations, it will also influence the development of working relationships between archaeologists and First Nations

Because cultural evolution was long seen as unilinear, and European culture assumed to be the end product of progress, First Nations' contact with European culture was believed to lead inevitably to assimilation. In addition, because assimilation was seen as inevitable, post-contact cultures were not considered "authentic," and therefore not worthy of academic study. Public perceptions of what constitutes legitimate Aboriginal rights are influenced by the perceived end of authentic Aboriginal culture at the time of contact. The division between prehistoric and historic research has fed this perception. Moss and Erlandson (1995: 35) challenge this notion:

In our view, there should be no epistemological division between the study of prehistoric and historic societies. Instead, this "boundary" should be regarded as a continuous transition that leads to the living descendants of the pre-contact groups. The combined effects of epidemic diseases and territorial dispossession wrought a devastation on Pacific Coast groups that can be described as an "American Holocaust" (Thornton 1987; Stannard 1992). Archaeologists owe it to the survivors to help rewrite the history of the contact period. We view collaboration between archaeologists and Native Americans as an imperative, a natural outgrowth of mutual interests and concerns, and a research avenue that may result in a variety of new views of Pacific Coast prehistory.

Anthropologists and archaeologists testified at the landmark case of *Delgamuukw vs. the Attorney General* (British Columbia Supreme Court 1991) and its subsequent appeal (British Columbia Court of Appeal 1993). In the trial decision (British Columbia Supreme Court 1991: ix), Judge McEachern decided that any Aboriginal rights that may have existed before contact were extinguished by the British colonial government. In the appeal decision (British Columbia Court of Appeal 1993: 17), Judge McFarlane decided that Aboriginal rights were not completely extinguished, and now enjoy constitutional protection, but "could be impaired, diminished or extinguished by a valid exercise of governmental power." While Aboriginal rights are not yet legally defined, a key question is whether contemporary activities were in practice at the time of contact.

Many of the ideas about culture applied in the *Delgamuukw* trial decision are very different

from currently accepted anthropological principles (Asch 1991). Looking at the same case, the opening statement shows the influence of archaeological theory upon public perceptions of First Nations' history:

1. The last Great Ice Age, which lasted many thousands of years, covered nearly all of British Columbia. It ended about 10,000 years ago.
2. The origins of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en and other Aboriginal peoples of the northwest part of the province are unknown. It is generally believed they migrated here from Asia.
3. There is archaeological evidence of human habitation in the territory as long as 3,000 to 6,000 years ago. This is limited to village sites both at the coast at Prince Rupert Harbour and at a few locations alongside the Skeena and Bulkley Rivers. The evidence does not establish who those early inhabitants (or visitors) were (British Columbia Supreme Court 1991: vii).

Today, archaeologists may find themselves placed into the role of experts on ancient Indigenous cultures (and therefore authorities on authentic contemporary traditional cultural practices) by mainstream Canadian society. Statements by archaeologists, such as "Most of human history is preserved only in archaeological sites. Written accounts of human activities are rare and recent when viewed against the entire time span of human evolution" (Weisman 1993: 1) or "If the archaeology is not done, the ancient people remain without a history" (Meighan 1994: 64, 66), discount indigenous knowledge and reinforce certain perceptions. Certainly, anthropology and archaeology do not enjoy unquestioned acceptance (British Columbia Supreme Court 1991), but have as academic disciplines more credibility than traditional Indigenous knowledge does.

As archaeologists' skills are based upon interpreting material culture, they have difficulty speaking with any certainty about those aspects of ancient times that do not leave traces in the archaeological record. Some archaeologists may regard with suspicion any ancient knowledge unsubstantiated by the archaeological record. The mutual suspicion of many archaeologists and Indigenous cultural leaders will likely be shared by the public and magnified in the Canadian legal system, which is adversarial in nature and has difficulty in accepting or accommodating multiple perspectives.

The mistrust that permeates Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations in British Columbia sets the tone for relations between archaeologists and First Nations, especially during resource management projects, but also in academic research projects. There is the perception that heritage is a tool that can be used by Aboriginal people for economic and political gain. There are considerable fears that the labeling of places as "archaeological sites," as well as the processes of archaeological resource management, will be used by First Nations and to prevent development. However, the introduction of politics into this is not something Aboriginal people instigated: culture, anthropology, archaeology, and science have all been used as tools against Aboriginal peoples and governments. Political power games, played without respect to any of the people or cultural concerns at stake, will likely continue to complicate matters; conversely, some aspects of the problems we face may only be solvable through political change or pressure.

Archaeological work has the potential for positive changes. It can, for example, help Canadian society and Aboriginal communities discuss the credibility of oral, written, and archaeological history (see Harris, Ch. 12; Ignace et al. 1993: 167); it can provide insight into the cultural and natural history of the province, which can be used to develop more appropriate policies and contribute to more informed resource management decisions. (In the broader context of post-contact history, however, offering the "benefits" of archaeology to First Peoples is reminiscent of other offers of "Western civilization." Such an offer is thus unlikely to be accepted unless *respect* for Aboriginal traditions is practiced, not just spoken of).

#### **Archaeology and Land Management/Resource Management**

Recent changes in the British Columbia government's approach to land and resource management illustrate the larger context within which the relationship between archaeology and First Nations is taking place. There is an increased effort by the provincial government to balance economic and other values, with increased emphasis on attaining sustainability. In response to its own environmental concerns, and to public pressure about environmental issues in general, the

province recently passed new legislation, such as the *Forestry Practices Act* and the *Forestry Practices Code of British Columbia*, and created new planning processes, including the Commission on Resources and the Environment (CORE),<sup>13</sup> and the Land and Resource Management Planning (LRMP) tables. Ministries are also working towards sharing inventories and developing standard formats for information about provincial resources to better integrate resource management.

Provincial bureaucracy is not well-suited to addressing First Nations concerns about resources; the basic philosophies guiding resource management are very different from First Nations' world views. Resource management processes in British Columbia, for example, distinguish between the archaeological values and "traditional use" values of places. Many places that are "archaeological sites" also have a multiplicity of other values to First Nations. The provincial government has a legal obligation to consider archaeological values under the *Heritage Conservation Act*.<sup>14</sup> The provincial government also has a legal obligation, arising from the *Delgamuukw Appeal Decision* (British Columbia Court of Appeal 1993) to avoid infringing Aboriginal rights,<sup>15</sup> which are linked to site-specific, on-going, traditional land use (Aboriginal rights are not legally defined). It is these changes in legal obligations that have produced the greatest awareness within the provincial bureaucracy about First Nations' cultural values, as well as the need for cultural interpreters. Treaty Negotiations and the recent signing of the *Nisga'a Agreement in Principle*, as well as the legal recognition of Aboriginal rights and the court's demand that the British Columbia government attempt to avoid infringement of Aboriginal rights, are all having dramatic changes on land and resource management, just as Native claims in the Northwest territories are having (see Andrews et al., Ch 17). Traditional use studies are being recognized as an important tool for avoiding infringement.

Inside and outside of treaty negotiations, several First Nations are demanding more control over the natural and cultural resources in their territories, including jurisdiction of archaeological resources. Within the treaty negotiations, this is legally possible (see Andrews et al., Ch. 17, regarding the *Nunavut Final Agreement*), and many First Nations have or are developing their own heritage permits or protocols (see Yellowhorn, Ch. 19). Many also want control of hiring archaeologists to work in their area.

### The Archaeological Consulting Process

Archaeological Resource Management is a process through which various considerations regarding the value of archaeological information are incorporated into land and resource management decisions.<sup>16</sup> Most archaeological projects in British Columbia are part of a development approval process. The developer hires an archaeologist who must get a permit from the Archaeology Branch in the British Columbia government. Archaeological Impact Assessments (AIAs) are designed to provide information to meet the legal obligations of the *Heritage Conservation Act*. AIAs do not inventory knowledge of past or present land use, and so are inadequate tools for meeting the obligations of the *Delgamuukw Appeal Decision*.

Archaeologists in British Columbia are not required as a condition of their provincial permit to consult with First Nations regarding any of their other concerns, although this is another service that could be offered. The consultation is not a question of asking people, "where do you think the sites are?" but rather one of values and methodology. Archaeologists are not required as a condition of their provincial permit to consult with First Nations regarding other First Nation's concerns, although this is another service they could provide.

Many First Nation representatives articulate their concerns about archaeological data clearly and forcefully. Some have stated that all archaeological sites in their traditional territories are

<sup>13</sup> CORE's results have been extremely controversial.

<sup>14</sup> This act has been recently amended: fines are dramatically increased and legislation is binding on the provincial government.

<sup>15</sup> The appeal decision rejected the "blanket extinguishment" of Aboriginal rights; the determination of continuing Aboriginal rights (to the court's satisfaction where necessary) is a complicated issue that will affect archaeology dramatically.

<sup>16</sup> See Apland (1993) for discussion of Archaeological Resource Management in British Columbia before the 1994 *Heritage Conservation Act* was amended.

highly significant. If a First Nation has not yet determined the research questions that they would like archaeology to help them address, it is difficult for them to be certain that any specific site or site type does not have information that will be essential to answering those questions. The professional discipline of archaeology has had decades to determine what are its important research questions (e.g., establishing regional typologies), and its criteria for significance (e.g., "internal stratification and depth") accordingly. It is unlikely that First Nations, who have a great need for detailed, site-specific information for their traditional territories, will have either the same research questions or the same criteria for determining significance. In light of the extent of archaeological information already lost (particularly in "desirable" and resource-rich locations), they may consider all remaining sites are important.

Given the complexity of Aboriginal cultural concerns and the growing recognition of the need for cultural interpreters in the whole sphere of land and resource management in British Columbia, archaeologists are increasing finding themselves in the difficult position of facing very different or conflicting expectations from bands, tribal councils, developers, and resource management agencies. They may be perceived by non-Native people as the real experts of Aboriginal culture, since oral history is seen as unreliable, and information provided by First Nations is considered biased. They may be seen by others as advocates for First Nations, or as having an "anti-development" bias. They may also be viewed by First Nations as allies of the developer, or as being more interested in payment than in archaeological values (Woodall 1994). Further complicating this situation is the limited control consulting archaeologists have over where work is available, and thus which communities they work in. This limits the ability of individual consultants to be proactive in developing longer-term working relationships with individual communities or First Nations.

There are different perceptions of the role of archaeological consultants. Archaeologists generally consider their expertise is in interpreting culture through the study of material culture, and that their goal as consultants is to provide information required by others to make informed decisions regarding the management of archaeological resources. However, they may also be expected to act as a mediator, intermediary, negotiator, or as a representative of the developer. These expectations are usually beyond the consultant's training and expertise, and often not part of the role that they chose for themselves. In addition, consulting with the First Nations about their archaeological concerns is an integral part of Archaeological Resource Management; in this context, consultants are generally expected to consult on much broader issues beyond those related to archaeological information.

Unfortunately, the consultations required as part of the archaeologists permit may be the only consultation with First Nations planned for the entire project. Particularly in this circumstance, First Nations representatives may expect archaeologists to communicate all these concerns to their client; they may also request these concerns be included in the permit reports for fear that the developer or resource management agency will accord them less weight than if communicated verbally or by letter. If First Nations representatives do not feel that consultants are communicating their cultural concerns to the resource management agency, it may be seen as an indication that archaeologists do not accept these concerns as valid. First Nations often feel that their most important concerns are not addressed by this process. Such different perspectives and expectations can greatly hinder the development of effective working relationships.

There are many consequences of this misunderstanding. If archaeologists are perceived as *the* objective cultural experts, First Nations cultural leaders and cultural concerns may be perceived to be biased and consequently ignored; genuine concerns may be dismissed as political posturing; and political concerns may be pushed in a cultural arena. Mitigation of project impacts for archaeological values is often inappropriate and ineffective for other cultural concerns. People in natural resource management agencies, who have access to archaeological reports but may have not spoken with the archaeologists, may assume that such work addresses more consultation or a broader range of cultural concerns than it was intended to or is capable of. While some provincial agencies are seriously attempting to establish working relationships and consult directly with First Nations, others consider the legal obligations of the *Delgamuukw Appeal Decision* to be much narrower.

Existing Aboriginal rights may not be recognized, particularly if misunderstanding of the role and expertise of consulting archaeologists leads to attempts to use archaeological reports to deter-

mine the Aboriginal rights in the study area. This misuse of archaeological reports would turn them into a factor that could limit people's Aboriginal rights. This possibility exists regardless of the archaeologist's intent. In this context, the interpretation of negative information (i.e., where no sites were found) thus becomes critical. While there may be a variety of reasons why sites were not found, non-archaeologists may easily misinterpret the report as evidence that there never were archaeological sites in those places, therefore there no traditional use of the area, and thus no existing Aboriginal rights. This possibility is an immediate concern for First Nations, and is more likely to happen in situations where relationships between First Nations and resource management agencies or developers are strained. It is less likely to happen if the archaeological reports state clearly that the information provided addresses the obligations of the *Heritage Conservation Act* only and is not sufficient to determine Aboriginal rights.

Consulting with the First Nations about their archaeological concerns, as required by provincial permit, may thus be a difficult process that reflects the complicated relationships between different First Nations, and between First Nations and the provincial and federal governments. The fact that the majority of British Columbia is not covered by treaties affects consultations, as well. Another complication is that there is a great diversity among First Nations in British Columbia, with over 200 federally recognized bands and 30 federally recognized tribal councils. In some communities, there is considerable controversy regarding the representation for the nation or community. In Canada, *bands* and *tribes* are terms that have legal definitions apart from their anthropological ones. Bands and tribal councils are legal creations of the federal government, and defined in the *Indian Act*; they are not automatically the social or political heirs to the pre-contact, self-governing sovereign nations. Nor does the federally controlled system for determining band membership equate to traditional citizenship or ethnicity. Band and tribal councils are elected bodies, legally sanctioned through the *Indian Act*. Hereditary leaders are often also elected councilors. Some Aboriginal people do not consider band councils to be legitimate representatives for their community, as they were created by the *Indian Act*.

In no way can a single protocol or approach be relevant and respectful for the many groups in the province. The cultural leadership and political leadership are not necessarily the same. Political leaders may not have the cultural training nor information for some of the decisions required of them:

...on one level ... you have cultural leaders coming out [on repatriation and reburial]. And then on a separate level you have the contention between the political leaders of the tribe and their desire to move forward on repatriation issues, their hesitance to become the primary force in the repatriation process. ...In other works, that is almost a church and state distinction looming in the background—partly a carryover, I think, from western civilization. And it could blow up in the long run in we don't take into account that the political leadership may differ vastly from the religious leadership (Vincenti 1995: 23).

Although this quotation doesn't refer to British Columbia, similar sentiments have been expressed here.

Since the *Delgamuukw Appeal Decision* was given and the British Columbia government began to develop policy to provide guidance for avoiding infringement of Aboriginal rights, many provincial resource management agencies have been trying to consult with, or elicit comments from, First Nations. As a result, band councils often receive more mail, referrals, and requests than they can address, creating a bottleneck that affects the consultation process.

Finally, First Nation's world views make it difficult to categorize concerns about the loss of or damage to important places into "natural" vs. "cultural" values. Indigenous people often articulate cultural issues more easily than archaeological ones. Since the interpretation of archaeological information, especially negative information, has political implications for First Nations, their concerns may be expressed in reference to political concerns. This does not mean that these concerns are not legitimate or even that they are not cultural. Stating the political implications is not antithetical to holding cultural concerns very strongly.

## BUILDING BETTER RELATIONSHIPS

As there are many people who have been working towards better relationships, there are many ideas for bridge building to explore. Some of these include:

- *Treat each other like people.* This is good advice from Ron Hamilton (1994). In my mind, this includes the people you are consulting with (e.g., archaeologists or First Nations representatives), and the members of one's own community (e.g., other archaeologists, other members of your band).

- *Foster mutual respect and understanding.* We need to listen (and talk) more: Aboriginal participants at the Aboriginal Archaeological Heritage Symposium viewed "mutual understanding and respect as preconditions for any permanent solutions" (Dunn 1991: 8). It is not necessary to invalidate one's own values in order to accept that others are equally valid—the anthropological premise of *cultural relativity*; neither is it necessary to invalidate others for one's own to be valid.

- *Recognize one another.* A simple step would be for First Nations to recognize that archaeologists saw value in Native histories and cultures during times when few non-Natives did, although this does not mean that First Nations see archaeologists as the experts of their cultures. Similarly, archaeologists can recognize oral history and traditional knowledge as valid, without having to figure out beforehand how they relate to archaeological theory.

- *Treat yourself as a person too.* Prepare yourself (mentally, emotionally, spiritually, psychologically—whatever is appropriate for you) for the frustration and emotionally charged nature of the present situation, which could conceivably continue for some time.

- *Look at the strengths of traditional cultural professions from both world views.* Just as Native people are interested in learning to document culture with anthropological and archaeological tools, archaeologists may find valuable understanding and appropriate tools in such traditional Aboriginal roles such as witnesses. Building upon Aboriginal concepts of oral history, it is people who are the carriers and keepers of history, culture, language and world views. When you are told information or entrusted with knowledge, you are expected to accept responsibility for that knowledge, something books and photos cannot do. Accepting responsibility to remember and pass on information is also an essential part of cultural interpretation, just as keeping accurate field notes and submitting permit reports are essential parts of archaeological consulting (see Kritsch and Andre, Ch. 8; Nicholas, Ch. 6).

- *Create places or organizations where First Nations can take concerns regarding archaeological consulting.* The Canadian Archaeological Association Committee on Aboriginal Heritage, the annual British Columbia Archaeology Forums, the Society for American Archaeology, and the World Archaeological Congress have all listened to concerns from First Nations (Hanna, Ch. 5; Nicholas, Ch. 6; Webster and Bennett, Ch. 18; Moss and Erlandson 1995 (Layton [ed.] 1989a, b; Zimmerman and Brugier 1994).

- *Ensure that relevant material is cared for.* An apparent trend in British Columbia archaeology is the reduction in material being collected during archaeological resource management studies. This seems to be a response to ethical concerns raised by First Nations about control of collections and repatriation. While this approach may reduce some of the immediate conflict, in the long run it may be doing a disservice to both First Nations and the discipline of archaeology. First Nations may be better served by more clearly articulating research goals, for which archaeology may provide information; by communicating these goals to archaeologists who work in their territories; and by working towards having these data collected and analyzed when possible. Faunal material (animal bones, shell) has the potential to provide very useful information (see Kritsch and Andre, Ch. 8).

- *Question assumptions that have become the basis for policies.* Concepts such as the validity of oral history, post-contact cultural continuity, and the depth of traditional ecological knowledge all challenge assumptions underlying the past relationship between the province of British Columbia and Aboriginal people. Many other professions, (e.g., educators, museum staff, land surveyors, health care professionals, social workers) are being asked (and some are asking themselves) to do the same thing (Asch, Ch 20; Dyck and Waldram 1993; Task Force on Museums and First Peoples 1992).

- *Develop better cross-cultural communications skills; listen better.* Respect is essential. So is patience. Since English is inadequate for many concepts in First Nations' world views, it may be difficult for non-Native language speakers to learn these concepts. Archaeologists should be aware of the value-laden words which they use, and sometimes Aboriginal people need to look beyond the connotations of some words to hear what people are trying to communicate. Communicate to Aboriginal community members, as well as community leaders. Communicate to non-archaeologists clearly. Be very clear about what are data and what is theory.

- *Clarify the role of archaeological consultant to First Nations and to clients.* Consulting archaeologists may encourage clients and resource management agencies to be aware of the First Nations' concerns, and to have a consultation process in place aside from the one required by the archaeologist's permit. While archaeologists are not legally or even ethically responsible if their client is negligent in this area, they could be "tarred by the same brush." Be aware of the possibility of misuse of reports. Consider steps to dissuade that misuse. Understand the potential impact on Aboriginal people today of the interpretation of archaeological record. Archaeologists are now asked to be responsible to both academic discipline and to the First Nations and Aboriginal people whom their work affects.

## CONCLUSIONS

The number of dramatic changes to provincial land and resource management approaches recently has led to high levels of frustration, and a sense of urgency. The potential for archaeological resource management projects to become ensnared in frustration and mistrust is very high. Mistrust and frustration make communication much more difficult. Massive changes are required, and some have already begun. Many problems are currently lacking clear solutions. However, improved communication and relationships between Aboriginal people and communities with archaeologists holds promise for a greater understanding of culture and history for everyone. Long-term protection of archaeological sites requires better cross-cultural communication about culture, time, and values, not only between Aboriginal people and archaeologists, but also with the general public and with those who make decisions regarding the use of land and resources.

It is important to be visionary—to look beyond the current circumstances and processes—when developing working relationships. It is also crucial to be flexible, as it is very difficult to predict the direction of change over a long time. Change is driven, in part, by outside events, such as court decisions or changing provincial government or band governments. It is people, nonetheless, who are the touchstones of change, not institutions.

### *Acknowledgments*

In addition to the published sources cited, many ideas in the paper have come from informal conversations, formal meetings, forums, archaeology and education conferences, class discussions, coffee breaks, and participation/attendance at events such as the Tribal Journeys canoe voyage to the 1994 Commonwealth Games in Victoria and the 1995 Women and Wellness conference. My thanks to all the people who have provided advice, comments and opinions along the way. I take responsibility for all errors and omissions. Finally, my heartfelt thanks to Sandra Zacharias for her encouragement. The material and opinions contained within this paper are solely those of the author and do not represent in whole or in part the position of the Ministry of Small Business, Tourism and Culture or the Government of British Columbia.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Apland, B.  
1993 The Role of the Provincial Government in British Columbia Archaeology. *BC Studies* 99:7-24.
- Asch, M.  
1991 Errors in the *Delgamuukw* Judgement: An Anthropological Perspective. Paper presented in "Delgamuukw and the Aboriginal Land Question: A Conference," University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.
- Ayau, E. H.  
1995 Rooted in Native Soil. *Federal Archeology* 7:30-33.  
1993 Aboriginal Appeals. Court of Appeal, British Columbia Court of Appeal, Vancouver, B.C.
- British Columbia Supreme Court  
1991 In the Supreme Court of British Columbia between Delgamuukw, also known as Ken Muldoe suing on his own behalf and on behalf of all the members of the House of Delgamuukw, and others, plaintiffs, and Her Majesty the Queen in right of the province of British Columbia and the Attorney General of Canada, defendants: Reasons for judgment of the Honourable Chief Justice Allan McEachern. Smithers Registry, Supreme Court of B.C. Smithers, B.C.
- Delgamuukw and Gisdaywa  
1989 *The Spirit in the Land: The Opening Statement of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs in The Supreme Court of British Columbia*. Reflections, Gabriola Island.
- Dunn, M.  
1991 My Grandfather Is Not an Artifact: A Report on the Aboriginal Archaeological Heritage Symposium February 1991. Prepared for the Department of Communications, Archaeology Heritage Branch, Government of Canada.
- Dyck, N., and J. B. Waldram  
1993 *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal and Kingston.
- Echo-Hawk, R. C.  
1993 Exploring Ancient Worlds. *SAA Bulletin* 11: 5-6.
- Eddy, John A.  
1997 Probing the Mystery of the Medicine Wheels. *National Geographic* 151(1): 140-146.
- Ferguson, T. J., K. Dongoske, M. Yeatts, and L. Jenkins  
1995 Hopi Oral History and Archaeology Part I: The Consultation Process. *SAA Bulletin* 13: 12-15.
- Francis, D.  
1992 *The Imaginary Indian: The Image of the Indian in Canadian Culture*. Arsenal Pulp Press, Vancouver, BC.
- Greaves, T.  
1994 *Intellectual Property Rights For Indigenous Peoples: A Source Book*. Society for Applied Anthropology. Oklahoma City, OK.
- Hamilton, R.  
1994 Cross-Cultural Awareness. Presentation to provincial government employees. Victoria, B.C.
- Hanks, C. C., and B. J. Winter  
1983 Dene Names As an Organizing Principle in Ethnoarchaeological Research. *Muskox* 33: 49-55.  
1986 Local Knowledge and Ethnoarchaeology: An Approach to Dene Settlement Systems. *Current Anthropology* 27: 272-275.
- Ignace, R., G. Speck, and R. Taylor  
1993 Some Native Perspectives on Anthropology and Public Policy. In *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J. B. Waldram, pp. 166-191. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal and Kingston.

- Knecht, R.  
1994 Archaeology and Alutiiq Cultural Identity on Kodiak Island. *SAA Bulletin* 12: 8-10.
- Konrad, H. W.  
1975 Ethnocentrism Versus Science: "Prehistoric and Primitive" Art and Technology. In *Primitive Technology and Art*, edited by J. S. Raymond, pp. 167-181. University of Calgary Archaeological Association, Calgary.
- Knudson, R., and B.C. Keel  
1995 Public Stewardship of First Americans. In *The Public Trust and the First Americans*, edited by R. Knudson and B. C. Keel, p. 1. Oregon State University Press and Center for the Center for the Study of the First Americans, Corvallis, Oregon.
- Layton, R.  
1989a Introduction: Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 1-21. Unwin Hyman, London.  
1989b Introduction: Who Needs the Past? In *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 1-20. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Layton, R. (editor)  
1989a *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. Unwin Hyman, London.  
1989b *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Levy, J. E.  
1994 Archaeology and Ethics. *Public Archaeology Review* 2: 2-4.
- Mander, J.  
1991 *In the Absence of the Sacred: The Failure of Technology and the Survival of the Indian Nations*. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco.
- Marshall, Y. M.  
1993 *A Political History of the Nuu-Chah-Nulth People: A Case Study of the Mowachaht and Muchalaht Tribes*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Archaeology. Simon Fraser University, Burnaby.
- McManamon, F. P.  
1995 Hidden Data: Learning About Ecosystems From Archaeological Sites. *Federal Archaeology* 8: 2.
- Meighan, C. W.  
1994 Burying American Archaeology. *Archaeology* 1994: 64-68.
- Moss, M. L., and J. M. Erlandson  
1995 Reflections on North American Pacific Coast Prehistory. *Journal of World Prehistory* 9: 1-45.
- Naranjo, T.  
1995 Thoughts on Two Worldviews. *Federal Archeology* 7: 16.
- Nicholson, B., D. Pokotylo and R. Williamson  
1996 Statement of Principles For Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples: A Report From the Aboriginal Heritage Committee. Canadian Archaeological Association and the Department of Communications, Ottawa.
- Parker, P. L.  
1990 Keepers of the Treasures: Protecting Historic Properties and Cultural Traditions on Indian Lands, A Report on Tribal Preservation Funding Needs Submitted to Congress By the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.  
1993 What You Do and How We Think. *CRM* 16:1-5.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples  
1992 Public Hearings: Discussion Paper 1: Framing the Issues. Government of Canada.
- Sievert, A. K.  
1994 The Slapped Hand: Reviewing Ethical Dilemmas. *Public Archaeology Review* 2: 1.
- Stanford, D.  
1995 Foreword. In *The Public Trust and the First Americans*, edited by R. Knudson, and B.C. Keel, pp. vii-viii. Oregon State University Press and Center for the Center for the Study of the First Americans, Corvallis, Oregon.

- Stannard, D. E.  
1992 *American Holocaust: Columbus and the Conquest of the New World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Stolpe, D. O.  
1995 A Myth: Coyote Digs For His Bones. *Equinox* 79:59.
- Task Force on Museums and First Peoples  
1992 *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships between Museums and First Peoples = Tourner la page: forger de nouveaux partenariats entre les musees et les Premieres Nations* (2nd ed.). Task Force on Museums and First Peoples, Ottawa.
- Thornton, R.  
1987 *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- TwoBears, D.  
1995 A Navaho Student's Perception: Anthropology and the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department Student Training Program. *SAA Bulletin* 13:4-6.
- Ucko, P. J.  
1989a Foreword. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. x-xvii. Unwin Hyman, London.  
1989b Foreword. In *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*, edited by R. Layton, pp. ix-xv. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Vincenti, C.  
1995 Capital Presence. *Federal Archeology* 7: 20-24.
- Webster, G. C.  
1991 The Contemporary Potlatch. In *Chieftly Feasts: The Enduring Kwakiutl Potlatch*, edited by A. Jonaitis, pp. 227-250. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.
- Weisman, B. R.  
1993 "Why Should We Save Sites?" *Archaeology and Public Education* 4: 1-9.
- Woodall, J. N.  
1994 Comments on Archaeological Ethics: Past, Present, Future. *Public Archaeology Review* 2: 9-10.
- Wylie, A.  
1994 Principles of Archaeological Ethics: A Preliminary Report on the Reno Workshop on "Ethics in Archaeology." *Public Archaeology Review* 2: 11- 13.
- Young Man, A.  
1992 The Metaphysics of North American Indian Art. In *Indigena: Contemporary Native Perspectives*, edited by G. McMaster and L-A. Martin, pp. 81-99. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.
- Zimmerman, L. J.  
1994 Sharing Control of the Past. *Archaeology* 1994: 65-68.
- Zimmerman, L. J., and L. R. Bruguier  
1994 Indigenous Peoples and the World Archaeological Congress Code of Ethics. *Public Archaeology Review* 2: 5-8.