

Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World

George P. Nicholas

Thomas D. Andrews

Within the humanities [the] postmodern method (notably deconstruction) is a mode of interpretation which aims to elaborate the multiple relations between culture, class and gender positioning and their effects upon cultural production and consumption, establishing easy and univocal readings of cultural products. A postmodern attitude is characterized by a radical skepticism towards the claims of grand theory, towards totalizing theoretical schemes produced from single and privileged vantage points. Instead an openness to differences and alterity is celebrated, with multivocality, experimentation and the empowerment of marginal political and cultural constituencies (Hodder et al. 1995: 241-2).

These are important times for Indigenous peoples. The lifeways, accomplishments, and artistic traditions of those peoples worldwide who have survived the changes wrought by past and present cultural interaction, diffusion, and colonialism have never been more in fashion or of greater interest and influence than today.¹ They are the stuff of legend in Introductory Anthropology classes and New Age groups; their role as "curators of nature" and "landscape managers" is widely cited by environmental groups today; their ethnopharmaceutical knowledge has directly benefited our lives; and the richness of family life and acceptance of cultural differences provide models for Western society. Traditional societies have featured in cover stories for *Time* magazine,² and been the focus of the acclaimed television series and book *Millennium: Tribal Wisdom and the Modern World* (Maybury-Lewis 1992). There is also growing recognition that these peoples are not living fossils, but societies that have responded to change, often by changing in the process.

Yet this is also a time when their way of life remains under serious threat. Residential schools and reservations have been replaced by television as the primary agents of cultural change, and genocide replaced by the more subtle but no less destructive policies of modernization and enculturation (Miller 1993; Young 1995). Not only is their history still marginalized, but it continues to be written primarily by non-indigenous authors. In the Western world, these peoples have been and continue to remain peripheral. They remain exotic peoples in lands that are no longer distant. After more than a century of interaction and inattention, the Natives are getting restless again, according to some, or finally receiving justice, according to others. In Canada, it has been the time of armed confrontations at Oka and Gustafson Lake. In British Columbia, where land treaties were never signed, more territory is currently under claim by various tribes than there is land due to overlapping claims. The establishment of Nunavut in 1999 as Canada's newest territory reflects the efforts of many to create political boundaries that more accurately reflect its constituents. However, as the general population reacts to newspaper headlines citing roadblocks, land claims, and salmon shortages, and to large-scale conservative political trends, there is a move towards cautious optimism, and some political and financial support for Native organizations may decline. Even with such a shift in public awareness, Aboriginal rights and issues in Canada have never before received the attention, tolerance, and respect they are presently enjoying. Consequently, Canada seems a step ahead of other nation-states, particularly in South Africa and central Europe, where violence has won the day; Oka and Gustafson Lake are anomalies (contravening even the Assembly of First Nations' position on non-violence). Nonetheless, in terms of relations with its indigenous population, the situation in Canada remains similar to that in other parts of the world—southeast Asia, south-central Africa, northern Norway, central and south America, or Australia, among other places—where the struggle to regain or maintain the right of ethnic self-identity continues.

¹ The emergence/resurgence of the Native has, of course, been a long time in coming and precedes postmodern wisdom, although the present social milieu provides it with greater weight than previously allowed.

² "Tribal Wisdom," *Time* (Sept. 23, 1991).

2 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

In the postmodern world, the status quo has been under threat for some time now. The familiar forms of colonialism are gone. Balkanization is rampant, and world atlases continue to be redrawn. The potential, legitimacy, and fate of "nation-states" remains a subject of much debate. Political correctness is seen by some as the new McCarthyism. Within the realm of multiple realities, "objectivity" has become epistemologically suspect. The new literature (e.g., Bukatman 1993; Parker and Starkey 1995); the way histories are written, interpreted, manipulated, or rejected (e.g., Schneider and Rapp 1995); the rapid influx and dissemination of ideas worldwide (i.e., the widely noted Internet "explosion" or "revolution"; and, in fact, the increasingly self-reflexive nature of our society (e.g., Grossberg et al. 1992; Jameson 1991)—all are manifestations of a world changing more rapidly than we can follow. In these circumstances, we are constantly redefining ourselves or being redefined by others.

At the interface of anthropology and Indigenous peoples may be found the central dilemma of postmodernism that we face today. As anthropologists in this setting, we risk schizophrenia in our dual role of champions for a universe that is a knowable entity, on the one hand, and for the recognition that the "realities" that frame the cultures we study are indeed different but equally valid, on the other. This is an uncomfortable place to be, and difficult questions are being asked of us. For example, in celebrating cultural differences (or "alterity" or "multivocality"), and in wielding a deconstructive hammer on the world around us, can we maintain a privileged observation point on human affairs, or is this position no more or less valid than that of "New Age" savants. Likewise, are all "knowledges" (e.g., oral history, folk medicine, science) of equal value? Such questions as these are currently being widely and often hotly discussed in conferences, academic journals, and other settings (e.g., McGrath 1995; Swain 1993) and reflected in an increasingly reflexive anthropological literature (e.g., Hastrup 1995; Miller 1995; Nader 1996; Nash 1995; Potter 1991, 1994; Ramos 1995; Strathern 1995; Taussig 1986; Thomas 1994; Trinh 1989; Webster 1995; Wylie 1992).

This is also a time when some think that the way we do archaeology is under threat as well. The reactions among archaeologists to recent changes, potential or realized, has in some cases polarized the discipline. In the United States, this is illustrated by the response to such recent legislation as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (e.g., Meighan 1992; Powell et al. 1994), and in Canada by the efforts by the Canadian Archaeological Association to develop and pass a Code of Ethics (Nicholson et al. 1996; Mason 1994). Some archaeologists will no longer work in situations where they have to deal with band politics, while others have moved on to other professions entirely.

DOING ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE POSTMODERN WORLD

The postmodern condition is characterized as fragmented, dislocated, interested in style, eclectically pillaging the past and other cultures without regard for traditional forms of authenticity, building on the demise of the certainties of old class cultures and institutional forms of the nation state (Hodder et al. 1995: 241)

A window is a window, but there is looking out and looking in. The native you glimpsed, disappearing behind the curtain, or into the bushes, or down the manhole in the mainstreet—my people are shy—may have been only your reflection in the glass.

Margaret Atwood, "Homelanding"

What role does archaeology have in the postmodern world? As the world becomes a series of texts of equal validity, where does the authority of scholarship fit in? Does the incorporation of oral history into archaeological reports represent compromise or (a source of) revelation? Have we, in the bewilderment of these times of rapid change, lost sight of the forest for the trees in terms of how and why we explore cultural diversity? How much of ourselves appears in our reconstructions of the past or in our interpretations of the world around us?

The development of new archaeological approaches continues to add yet more dimensions to what we know about the past and, no less importantly, to *how* we know it. As McGuire (1992a: 217) notes, "...multiple stories of the past will always exist, and ...these stories will

change as the concerns and realities of the present change. The dialectic of the past and present is a complex mix, a tangled skein of observation, intention, interest, bias, and belief." In both the sociopolitics and epistemologies of archaeology, it has long been clear that we can not and should not avoid the self-reflexive glance³ that has served ethnographic anthropology so well (e.g., Clifford and Marcus 1986; Heider 1988; Marcus and Fischer 1986; also see Kohl and Fawcett 1996). Yet we may feel the threat or frustration of fragmentation as one paradigm usurps the next—processual archaeology, postprocessual archaeology, poststructural archaeology, marxist archaeology, feminist archaeology, and so on—and terminology from other disciplines (e.g., hermeneutics, narratives and metanarratives, archaeological poetics) appears in our literature. Which of these approaches and terms is in/out of vogue today?

The shaking of the theoretical trees continues unabated, as well it should, and the debate on past and future directions for archaeology remains vigorous.⁴ A point too often missed in all of this, but stated explicitly by Preucel (1991: xii; and accompanying volume) is that processual and postprocessual archaeologies (and, we would add, other current and future dimensions of the discipline) should be viewed in a "complimentary rather than an antagonistic light." Such complementarity is really a direction archaeology needs to recognize as being critical to what we do: archaeology needs to be the *sum* of the knowledge, methods, and theories available to us, in the same sense that the "truth" in Kurosawa's film *Rashoman* is the sum of the four stories of the same events it contains. Moreso, the tensions that are exposed by such "multivocality" may frame productive arenas of fresh thought; working at the interface of "opposing" theoretical premises may be challenging, frustrating, and seemingly counterproductive, but, when successful, the results may be innovative and illuminating (e.g., Handsman and Richmond 1995, Spector 1993). The same can be said for the tensions that exist between archaeology and anthropology and the world of Indigenous peoples (McGuire 1992a, b; Trigger 1980, 1986, 1988).

Instead of representing a collapse of the discipline, what we may really see emerging from these tensions are growing pains that are being experienced by both anthropologists and Indigenous peoples. In North America, as First Nations regain control over traditional lands or voice their opinions or act on issues that directly affect their lives, value systems, history, and identity, archaeologists and anthropologists are having to respond in ways that are sensitive to these cultural differences. We are also beginning to seek greater relevance in our work and to make the effort to present it in a meaningful manner to the Native community. At the same time, First Peoples themselves will hopefully see the promise that archaeology offers, and that they become involved in whatever ways they find appropriate and also work with non-Native archaeologists to seek and develop areas of common interest and need. The papers in this volume represent only a few examples of what has and is being accomplished in this area. The complimentary approaches that are now being developed worldwide will add immeasurably to both the expansion and maturation of the field, and to the increasing utility of the knowledge that will follow. It is appropriate that we approach the end of this millennium with an emerging understanding of cultural differences and a desire to develop mutual trust. This is especially the case for archaeologists and anthropologists who, more than any others, should recognize and promote the many voices that comprise both the past and the present, and which help to define the future.

Canadian Perspectives

This volume is about indigenous archaeology⁵ and about the changing nature of doing archaeology in Canada today. The variety of perspectives represented here reflect as much the different research agenda and geographic areas covered as it does the diverse ethnic backgrounds of the contributors; many different presentation styles are also found here, ranging from traditional oration (e.g., Blondin-Andrew; Harris) to more standard academic accounts. The topics

³ While such recursive study is often illuminating (e.g., Potter 1991), many are frightened or embarrassed by the excesses of postprocessualism. Shanks (1992), for example, is so self-reflexive as to appear unintelligible to some.

⁴ For an example of this, see papers by Trigger, Tilley, and Nencel in the *Critique of Anthropology* 15(4).

⁵ We define indigenous archaeology here as archaeology done with, for, and by Indigenous peoples; currently there is no clear theoretical framework within which this operates although it is strongly but not entirely postprocessual. Russell Handsman, Ian Hodder, Randall McGuire, and Bruce Trigger have been working to illuminate some of the theoretical premises operating here.

4 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

addressed reflect much of the current scope of Canadian archaeology and its various applications: land claims; museum studies; self-government; federal and provincial programs; public education; and many others. This collection does not attempt to be comprehensive and several topics, especially those relating to reburial and sacred places, are notably absent here but treated in detail elsewhere (Bray and Killion 1994; Carmichael et al. 1993; Reeves and Kennedy 1993). There are common themes here, many of which relate to the need to do more at ground level, including better incorporation of emic approaches in archaeology; establishment of bi-cultural knowledge brokers; developing trust; and learning to do archaeology with living cultures. Our intentions with this book are to underline the importance of what has already been accomplished, provide examples of what has or hasn't worked, and encourage new ways of thinking about indigenous archaeology.

Above all else this is very much a personal volume; it is as much an academic text as personal narrative about doing cross-cultural archaeology. In the quest for objectivity in anthropology, important dimensions of human affairs have sometimes been ignored.⁶ Certainly a postprocessual tone permeates much of this volume, but we leave it to others to describe its theoretical placement. The personal tone invoked also reveals something about the process of doing archaeology; we hope that what some of us are struggling to articulate is viewed as honest efforts to describe what goes on at the personal level being involved with indigenous archaeology; if there is political correctness here, it is fortuitous, not planned.

This volume also offers a challenge to the stigma of intellectual colonialism—a charge that has dogged anthropologists for decades. In “On the Political Relevance of Anthropology,” Magubane and Faris (1985: 99), taking their lead from Eric Wolf's *Europe and the People Without History*, note that: “The most specific contribution of anthropology to the colonial enterprise is ethnography. The micro-investigation of cultural entities to emphasize their uniqueness provided a vital basis for the politics of divide and rule.” More recently, however, Kelly and Williamson (1996: 16) have observed that within the context of Canadian archaeology, the “vacant core” within cultural anthropology is now being filled through ethnoarchaeological research:

...archaeologists are now in contact with aboriginal peoples in ways approximating earlier ethnographic contexts. It is important to realize that the social and political context of these archaeological-aboriginal contacts are different from the interaction between ethnographers and aboriginal peoples a few decades ago. Not only has the context changed in social, economic, and political terms, but the topics of conversation are likely to be radically different.... Perhaps the widespread perception that the politically weak must be heard has in a sense led some archaeologists to accept First Nations history from the First Nations people themselves—a kind of applied yet politically correct anthropology.

This book falls within the “vacant core,” and, along with other efforts in other contexts, may help to rectify the colonial nature of ethnography such as the growing literature on the anthropology of cultural and/or sacred landscapes (e.g. Carmichael et al. 1994).

The remainder of this essay explores four general but very interrelated themes that are important in the context of doing indigenous archaeology in the postmodern world: What is the role of non-Western world view in contemporary archaeology? Is there only one shared past or many different pasts? What are some of the indigenous issues that frame the preservation and presentations of the past? What are some of the other issues associated with doing indigenous archaeology?

DIFFERENT WORLD VIEWS

You people keep talking about preserving the past. Can't you see that there is no past. Can't you see that the past is today and the past is tomorrow? It's all the same! Can't you see that! (anonymous Native American woman, cited in Pullar 1994: 19).

⁶ Apropos Trigger's commentary on the post-Boasian anthropology of living cultures, it is difficult to study these cultures because, as O'Regan put it (1990: 98), “the carcass is still alive. In its present state of dynamic adaptation [the Maori] vigorously resent being treated as carrion for scholarly inquiry.”

The relationship between First Nations and anthropology is very much caught up in differing world views. Indeed, the idea that there are so many different world views is at the very foundation of anthropology. It is often a revelation for students in Introductory Anthropology courses to realize that there are radically different ways of defining reality, a recognition that brings with it greater respect to non-Western societies. The popular perception of the culture of the Mardudjara of the Western Desert of Australia, for example, is that based as much on the harsh environment as the sparse material culture, it is one of the most primitive cultures anywhere. This characterization must be completely revised, however, with the revelation of the complex nature of their world view—the Dreaming;⁷ they are, according to Lévi-Strauss, “intellectual aristocrats.” In North America, we assume that the Indigenous peoples have become so Westernized as to share their world view. It is not until we encounter statements such as cited above, or are reminded that many Navajo still sing the world into existence every morning, that we realize that the basic beliefs have outlasted changes in language, dress, and socioeconomic system.

Western world view is based on particular notions of time, space, causality, classification, and relations (see Kearney 1983: 65) that can be characterized, in part, as a series of separations or binary oppositions—between the “real” and “supernatural” realms, between past and present; between people and nature; between body and mind. In many traditional societies, however, these separations do not exist, and this has important implications for us (see McGuire 1992a: 215-216). Once the “real” and “supernatural” worlds are recognized as being inseparable and time viewed as non-linear, then we have no problem in understanding how and why ancestor spirits and other beings and powers are part of the contemporary landscape. An appreciation of such aspects of world view also has implications for archaeological resource management and cultural resource management.⁸

In this setting then, we must not only recognize that archaeological sites represent something that bridges the millennia,⁹ but respect the role they continue to have in other contemporary world views (e.g., Hamilton et al. 1995). Many adherents to a non-Western world view feel apprehensive about what archaeologists do. They maintain that ancestral sites should be left completely alone: if the incorporation of bones and other remains into the earth through decay is viewed as part of the natural order, then their removal interrupts this vital process. This is one reason why the issues of reburial and repatriation remain so contentious. At the same time, however, some Native peoples feel much more positive about archaeology: as representatives of the Nelson House First Nation told David Riddle (Syms, Ch. 4, this volume), “the old ones” had allowed themselves to be exposed by archaeologists in order to teach Cree youth who are in danger of losing their traditional culture. A similar example is reported by Stephen Webb (1995:xi): “An elder of the Mutti Mutti people of New South Wales once told me that she believed that research was important because the fossil humans that emerged from the sand dunes in her country were coming back to tell us something. They tell us who they were, where and how they lived, and provide proof to both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people of how long the first Australians have been living here.”

Another aspect of non-Western world view places people within nature, and requires a broader perspective on the role of people therein. Archaeologists have, of course, long been concerned with the dynamic relationship between people and the diverse landscapes they have occu-

⁷ The Dreaming, or the Dreamtime, however, is not just concerned with origins and the contemporary sacred landscape, but also is manifested as The Law; the relation of Aboriginal peoples to the land is intimately linked to kinship systems, political organization, ownership and curation of the landscape, and virtually all other aspects of their lives. Swain's (1993) radical reinterpretation offers that it is *place*, not time, that is the defining parameter of the Aboriginal world view, a perspective that strengthens the need to consider the landscape as the organizing principle in interpreting some non-Western cultures.

⁸ The terms themselves are viewed with alacrity by some because each contains the word *resource*; whatever is a resource is, by definition, something to be exploited, so that considering burials and sacred sites as resources is demeaning. This argument, which is by no means groundless, views archaeological resource management of Native heritage then as something less than innocent. However, if this terminology is flawed, what do we use in its place?

⁹ However, as Lewis Binford and others have noted, archaeological sites themselves are contemporary phenomena. In addition, Phil Hobler (pers. comm. 1995) has observed that archaeological sites *are* traditional use sites, something not widely recognized.

6 Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World

ped and modified over time. In fact, archaeologists have been in a privileged position to view human ecosystems over long periods of time, as well as to discover adaptive strategies that may have no modern analog. What has been more difficult to identify is the cultural geography of past landscapes: i.e., how did people perceive of and organize the space around them? A broad sampling of knowledge of aboriginal geography has been obtained by anthropologists, through observation and interview, much but not all of which relates to land use (e.g., Binford 1983; Brody 1981). Another source of information, however, that is only now coming into its own is traditional or indigenous knowledge¹⁰ (see Part 2, this volume). Oral histories reveal a dimension of past land use that is normally missing in the archaeological record; they personalize the landscape and illuminate the histories and sacred places that are present there. Certainly this source of knowledge must be used with care and used appropriately, but it cannot be ignored for it is the only source of information on what parts of the traditional landscape meant (or still mean). Even when it is scientifically inaccurate, traditional knowledge provides insights into aboriginal world view, self-perception, and knowledge systems.

In the context of land claims, the nonmaterial value of land professed by Indigenous peoples is often ignored or at least seen as secondary to its monetary worth (see Young 1995). When access to traditional lands is denied or lost, so too are the important spiritual places and beings they contain. The impact of such loss is difficult for non-Aboriginal people in North America to realize as their system of belief is not grounded in the same way, although it certainly has precedent in the Middle East where holy sites have long been fought over.

One final dimension relating to world view of interest here concerns origins. Presenting current theories of the peopling of the New World to an audience containing Native Americans may be as provocative as teaching the tenets of evolution in a class containing Christian fundamentalists: where there is a reaction, it is because deeply held religious convictions are seen as contradictory to scientific knowledge. While this issue has been long acknowledged as a sensitive topic by archaeologists (e.g. McGhee 1989), it continues to be at the center of Aboriginal-archaeological relations; in fact, as more Native peoples are exposed to archaeology, concern with this issue will increase at the personal level. In addition to threatening their belief of *in situ* creation, Beringian colonization models are seen to weaken Native claim to their traditional lands, making them simply the first of a long list of immigrants. Regardless of whether archaeologists tackle this problem by noting that science and religion represent different systems of knowledge or through other means, they should make it clear that archaeology supports the fact that Native Americans have occupied this continent *for as long as it matters*.

ONE PAST/MANY PASTS/WHOSE PAST?

On the one hand if we accept that contemporary [Australian] Aboriginal people are the inheritors of a living culture some 50,000 years old, then we cannot deny them the right to protect the remains of their ancestors. On the other hand, the argument for cultural continuity is largely one of assertion, and if taken seriously could entail the enforced reburial of all skeletal material from the Australopithecines onwards simply because a group of individuals felt that their cultural prohibitions against the disturbance of mortal remains were being flouted (Murray 1993: 111).

“Can we know the past or know anything about it?” (Moore 1995: 50). The tone of this question may have shifted in recent years from the past is/isn't knowable based on epistemological arguments to “its not your past to know because its mine.” However, in an essay commenting on museum exhibits and the changing portrayal of the European Cro-Magnon past, Stephen Jay Gould (1988: 20) exhorts us to recognize and relish the shared accomplishments of the human past:

¹⁰ The term *indigenous knowledge* is preferred in scholarly literature and *traditional knowledge* in vernacular use. While archaeology is often defined as reliant on material culture, some contend that the incorporation of oral histories or related issues falls outside of the scope of the discipline. At the same time, however, as one dimension of the broader field of anthropology, we cannot lose sight of the people and must resolve not to be constrained by arbitrary distinctions.

At the awesome exhibit of Ice Age art mounted at the American Museum of Natural History in 1986, I was pleased to note the beginnings of a new age in captions.....I can guarantee that twenty-five years ago, the thrust of the signs would have proclaimed: 'See what primitive man could do.' But this time, the exhibit stated with devastating accuracy: 'See what *we* did in our infancy.' Time is a matrix for all forms of change or for stability. Time is not a motor of progress. Old does not mean less advanced "Look at wonderful things that *we* accomplished in *our* past."

Clearly Gould's message is that the past contains a record of shared human accomplishments that all of us should be aware of and take pride in; this is one justification that archaeologists present for the importance of archaeology. Certainly as members of the same species, the argument for a shared global cultural heritage does carry weight. However, it has become clear that not everyone feels included in this heritage or even wants to be included (see McGuire 1992a: 215). The One World Archaeology conference and resultant publications nominally support the notion of a shared cultural heritage but, not surprisingly, a one world archaeology composed of many separate voices.

Does the plethora of voices needing to speak about the past mean that everything that we know about the past is relative. This is arguably the central problem of postmodern/postprocessual archaeology. People of different gender, class, experience, and world view *do* see the world around them in more than one way.¹¹ To paraphrase Sahlins (1995: 14), one cannot do good archaeology, not even recent archaeology, without regard for ideas, actions, and ontologies that are not and never were their own.¹² This is the dilemma faced by Western anthropologists today, where anthropology has sometimes been viewed as a form of intellectual colonialism (see Magubane and Faris 1985; Said 1993). Can Western anthropologists ever really understand and speak for non-Western cultures, particularly those who have left to written record?

Because of their interaction with living peoples, cultural anthropologists have been far ahead of archaeologists in responding to such a challenge, and indeed have been grappling with these issues for sometime now (see Fardon 1995; Fox 1991; Gartrell 1986; Sahlins 1993; Stocking 1991; Turner 1993). Debate over questions of "authority" and privileged voice here (e.g., Sahlins 1995 and Obeyesekere 1992) anticipate their appearance in archaeology. Can "White" archaeologists, for example, produce interpretations of someone else's past that are (a) scientifically accurate *and* (b) acceptable to a non-Western audience? Likewise, can Indigenous peoples write their own history (or critique of history [e.g., Deloria 1995]) and do their own archaeology that meets the rigorous standards of a non-Native audience? The answers to both may be unclear until we can ask such complimentary questions as, can a male archaeologists address the concerns emerging from feminist archaeology? It can and should be done, harking back to comments on complementarity above; the results of such endeavors will be different, but no less valid. At the same time, unless a critical approach is taken, the type of alternative histories of the Native Amer-

11 As Kohl (1993: 15) succinctly notes: "Since there were nearly as many important social divisions in the past as there are in the present, we must be open to and explore all sorts of possibilities. A homosexual's archaeology? A worker's archaeology? An archaeology for and about the elderly? Why not? Name a cause which any fair, liberal, open-minded folk would support, and we should be able to devise a material culture reading of the past addressing its concerns. This is not an unhealthy development."

12 Sahlins' (1995: 119) commentary is appropriate here: "There is a kind of academic defense of the cultural integrity of indigenous peoples that, though well-intentioned, winds up delivering them intellectually to the imperialism that has been afflicting them economically and politically. I mean the paradox entailed in defending their mode of existence by endowing them with the highest cultural values of Western societies. So the Cree or the Maori or the Kayapó are supposed to be paragons of ecological knowledge." Recent studies by archaeologists (Dincauze 1993) and geographers (Butzer 1992) identifying the impact of Native Americans on their landscape may not be popular because they counter this image with ecological realism.

8 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

ican past proposed by Deloria (1995) will remain not only unsuccessful but dangerous.¹³ Unfortunately, his latest manifesto is based on outdated and very selective references, and Deloria totally ignores many recent developments in the discipline including collaborative projects between archaeologists and Native Americans. Furthermore, as Kohl (1993: 15) notes, "Diversity is a strength, but we cannot abandon tests of adequacy or those approaches to the past which are more satisfying, which may also mean more explanatory, than others" (also see Murray 1993).

Collaboration between Native and non-Native archaeologists may overcome some of the more common problems of cross-cultural interpretation and also provide new insights that cut both ways (e.g., Majnep and Bulmer 1977; McDonald et al. 1991; Turner et al. 1990), and they will undoubtedly become more common. However, the issue of inequality and the "privileged academic voice" persists. In 1990, an article on rape in the Australian Aboriginal community by anthropologist Diane Bell and her Aboriginal collaborator Topsy Napurrula Nelson in *Women's Studies International Forum* was countered by a letter of outrage by some Aboriginal women and by other respondents: "In her critique of the affair, Jan Larbalestier argued that despite Bell's assertions of cross-cultural collaboration, Bell as the privileged white academic was the one who located Nelson's voice in the text. Her voice was the authoritative white voice, the active voice, which she also placed in opposition to other 'hostile' Aboriginal women who she accused of not speaking out. By setting up the 'traditional' credentials of Nelson and positioning her as the 'authentic Aboriginal' voice, she thus invited the anger of black women" (McGrath 1995: 388). Such charges of intellectual colonialism may eventually be directed against collaborative archaeology programs in North America.

As more Aboriginal people are being trained in archaeology, it is interesting to ponder what Native and non-Native-produced archaeologies of the same archaeological record will be like? How much overlap will there be? What new areas of dialogue and contention will arise. Certainly the inclusion of gender-related concerns in archaeology has revitalized aspects of the discipline; the impact of Native voices should be even more pronounced.

Aboriginal Control of the Past

The issue of who has the right to speak for whom, and of what, may be related to control of power. The resistance that many Native Americans have expressed towards anthropologists and archaeologists is certainly related to the degree of control they have over their affairs (Paynter and McGuire 1991; Trigger, Foreword), which has varied considerably in the past century. As noted previously, issues of reburial and repatriation are intimately tied to world view, but they are also related to a social and political revitalization. The ability to control what happens to one's ancestors, one's artifacts, one's land are also expressions of cultural identity and control, as is the right to write one's own history. Who controls the past is also linked to issues of cultural identity. In terms of heritage preservation, this includes the ability to define what is significant (Schaafsma 1989). Archaeologists should recognize as important the many issues relating to the gaining and losing of control over cultural heritage, knowledge, and language (see Lynott and Wylie 1995). In our capacity as anthropologists, we should also be able to recognize the social posturing that may be the public exhibition of this control.

There is already much commentary on the reaction that archaeologists have had toward both the way they must now "do business" and the way others (i.e., Native people) feel toward them (e.g., Deloria 1992; Layton 1989; McGuire 1992b; Robinson 1994; Wylie 1992). Some archaeologists may resent having to consult with Native governments about working in their traditional (but not currently occupied) territory, while others see it as merely what is expected of being an anthropologist. It is with the issue of reburial and repatriation, however, that there is the strongest reaction. Amid the surprise, indignation, and bewilderment to this changing situation are serious attempts to make sense of what is happening and why (Bray and Killion 1994; Merrill et al. 1993; Powell et al. 1994; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Swidler et al. 1997; Zimmerman 1989).

¹³ In *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact*, Vine Deloria, Jr., prefaces a revisionist history of North America with the following statement: "This volume will deal with some of the problems created for American Indians by science. We will encounter a number of amazing inconsistencies in the manner in which science describes the world we live in and the role it has chosen for American Indians to play in a largely fictional scenario describing prehistoric North America" (1995: 35). This follows his earlier statement (1992: 597) that "Unpleasant though it may be to some Indians, we need to know the truth about North American prehistory..."

Worldwide, Aboriginal human remains are being returned (Morell 1995). In the United States, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was enacted to comply with the increased political power of the Native community, and with growing popular support for the return of those remains.¹⁴ In Canada, where comparable national legislation is absent, the remains are being returned in response to pressure from both the Native community and the public at large. What many Native people are essentially saying is "We don't need burials to answer the types of questions we want answered." To archaeology, the loss of knowledge on dietary composition, health, population movements, social status, and such is inestimable. Will Aboriginal people eventually come to regret this loss of knowledge resulting from reburial before adequate study? Undoubtedly yes to some degree. But perhaps the more important question we also need to ask at this time is, are they willing to pay this price for regaining control over their lives today? Again, the answer is undoubtedly yes.

There are lessons to be learned on both sides. Archaeologists for their part have often been insensitive to the strength of feeling expressed by Natives for human remains and for their world view. As a profession, we have also been surprisingly naive regarding the historic circumstances of their collection and curation. Pioneer anthropologists like Ales Hrdlicka have been seen as "cultural ghouls" seeking scientific knowledge at the expense of local values (Loring and Prokopec 1994). Aboriginal peoples, on the other hand, need to make the attempt to understand that archaeologists have contributed much to Aboriginal history, and that to some degree their current "robustness" is based on anthropologically derived and preserved knowledge. Major contributions have, in fact, been made through their study of human remains and grave goods; much of the information on past social and political hierarchies that has directly countered ideas of "simple" pre-contact Aboriginal societies this century has come from burials (e.g., Peebles and Kus 1977). Ironically, Native peoples themselves have sometimes been involved with digging artifacts for monetary reward (Loring and Prokopec 1994: 32; Staley 1993).

There is also much to look forward to as the lessons of the past are taken to heart, and new relationships and collaborations develop between archaeologists and Aboriginal peoples. Writing of the evolving situation in New Zealand, Stephen O'Regan (1990: 100) notes: "Archaeologists have long been felt to endanger the dead. Increasingly, though, the scholar is seen as 'the good guy' and Maori ire 'focuses on fossickers who loot the dead for artefacts.' An important agency in this change is the New Zealand Historic Places Trust, which has influential Maori representatives on its Maori Advisory and Archaeological committees. Possessing *mana* [traditionally derived authority] in their own tribal areas, these Maori mediate between the archaeologists and the Maori community."

Establishing protocols with First Nations is currently an important agenda item for many today (e.g., Nicholson et al. 1996), and archaeologists in Canada are now beginning to communicate routinely with bands over issues of access and procedure. Of no less importance is the process of developing trust, which we think will be at the core of doing indigenous archaeology in the very near future. One striking example here concerns the recent reburial in Australia of Mungo Lady (Lake Mungo I). When the remains were returned to Aboriginal custodianship at the place where she was excavated, and placed in a locked vault, one of the tribal elders said to archaeologist Alan Thorne that "they wanted a new start, and that there were to be two keys to the vault, an Aboriginal one and one for scientists; so their leader kept one key and I was given the other in what was a very moving and dignified ceremony" (Alan Thorne, pers. comm. 1996).

As McGuire (1994: 18) notes, the most difficult part about doing the right thing is knowing what the right thing to do actually is. This is something we must learn together.

¹⁴ The range of responses by Aboriginal groups to the scientific study of human remains is illustrated by two recent cases, both widely reported, that have resulted in heated discussion within the archaeological community. The remains of a 9,300 year old individual found in Kennewick, Washington, were claimed by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation under the provisions of NAGPRA, who stated that no additional studies are to be done on this skeleton. In contrast, the study of 9,730 year old remains from the Prince of Wales Island in Alaska has been supported by the Klawock and Craig tribal governments, who decided that the potential to gain knowledge about some of their earliest ancestors was overwhelming (Fifield 1996: 5).

PRESERVATION AND PRESENTATIONS OF THE PAST

Maori commentaries and points of view have often been forgotten when popular tradition and histories have cast their narrative nets. The tapu-laden talk of tribal elders have been concealed or is inaccessible, while stories based on European documents have "floated light, like the wood of the *whau* tree, and always remain to be seen" (Salmond 1991: 11).

For many traditional peoples, the past doesn't need to be made accessible through archaeological excavations or museum displays because it is part of the contemporary world. More generally, public education has a critical role concerning Aboriginal people today. Sharing with them what we can know about their past through archaeology at the very least augments oral histories; no less important, educating Euro-North Americans about the Aboriginal past illuminates cultural diversity and encourages respect. Much of what is important about that past has often been concealed/obscured by the more dominant histories of the European colonizers of the continent. One could say that compared to the "floating" stories of European history (above), Aboriginal history is so dense because there is so much of it.

Museums serve an important means of public education, and provide a place in the community where different aspects of the past are presented and interpreted. The role of museums continues to evolve, as much to meet the changing needs of the public as to respond to changing social and political circumstances (*vide* the public outcry over funding for exhibiting Robert Mapplethorpe's work [Steiner 1995] and also over the historical revisionism attributed to the Smithsonian Institution's *Enola Gay* exhibit). In Canada, the relationship between museums and Native People also continues to develop and mature (Ames 1992; Canadian Museum of Civilization 1996: Karp and Levine 1991; Nicks 1992; Stone and Molyneux 1994; Trigger 1988).

Museums, however, may be increasingly susceptible to criticism from First Nations organizations, whether actual or perceived, because of the sources of their funding, as well as their highly visible nature. In fact, pressure on museums to be politically correct is more likely to increase than decrease in coming years, as attested to by recent events at the Vancouver city museum where the director ordered all Native displays dismantled and the highly successful educational programs closed, despite protests from a broad segment of the public and *including* many First Nations groups.

People who have donated objects to museums are always disappointed when they later visit the museum and find their donations not on display, but relegated to storage. Native peoples are similarly disappointed when denied the results of research on their land. Archaeologists have been the object of much criticism in recent years for not making the results of their studies accessible to the people on whose lands they work. While copies of technical archaeological reports are often submitted to tribal councils at the end of a project, they are usually in a format inappropriate for the nonprofessional. Given the limited time and budgets already encountered by practicing archaeologists, they are seldom in a position to produce more public-oriented reports; it may be here that provincial or territorial agencies can perform a valuable service, and do so consistently and appropriately (e.g., Hare and Greer 1994; Gotthardt and Hare 1994).

It is ironic then that, as archaeologists make their work more accessible, they can expect increased criticism aimed at the archaeological community for attempting to redefine or revise the history of First Nations, echoing some of the issues noted above. This is especially so if being Native allows special privileges of interpretation: "Along with the [Australian] Aboriginal historians, I accept that Aboriginal people 'are the guardians and custodians of our history and culture, and it is our responsibility to pass onto future generations our set of truths.' If, however, those guardians and custodians also act as gaolers, while claiming infallibility in interpreting their source of materials, based upon race, totalitarianism is just down the line" (Mulvaney 1986: 56, cited in Murray 1991: 111). Protocol between archaeologists and the Aboriginal communities associated with their research area may require the submission of reports prior to their publication. Fear of censorship is deeply ingrained in the academic community, however, and most scholars are understandably hesitant to relinquish any control over their work.

Whether through oral means, museum exhibits, or archaeological publications, the dissemination of knowledge about the past enriches everyone's lives today. From the perspective of Indigenous peoples, however, not all objects or knowledge may be considered freely accessible to

all. In Australia, there are clear prohibitions concerning secret/sacred knowledge, and access to certain places and objects is denied to the uninitiated, to members of the opposite sex, or to the non-Aboriginal public. In North America, locations of sacred places may be kept secret (see Reeves et al. 1993). Museums are also now agreeing to Native requests that certain categories of artifacts, such as grave goods, not be placed on public display; in some cases, replicas of those same objects are displayable. Such concerns should be understandable to archaeologists who have their own category of secret-sacred knowledge—site locations—that are guarded carefully and kept from the uninitiated.

Increasingly, anthropologists and archaeologists have been in a position to use their expertise and authority to work with or on behalf of indigenous peoples (Bodley 1988; van Willigen 1993). In Canada, their role as cultural brokers, expert witness in court, and community development, among others reflects the promise of what applied anthropology has to offer First Peoples (Dyck and Waldram 1993; Elias 1993; Hedican 1995; Kew 1995; Warry 1990). There are limitations to what anthropologists can or should do, however (Dyck 1993; Ray 1990; also Monet and Skanu'u 1992). In addition, archaeologists must listen to the Aboriginal community to learn what is needed and whether their help is, in fact, desired (Ignace et al. 1993; Waldram 1993).

Within the Aboriginal community, dissemination of information may not always be equitable due to access to education, for example, or political maneuvering between politically dominant families. There may also be the fear by Aboriginal people that aspects of their Indigenous heritage will be co-opted by the dominant society:

Access to knowledge about Maori language, history, and art is increasingly confined to those whose education and economic position enable them to take advantage of it...As access to the Maori heritage is increasingly mediated through mainstream culture, that heritage is seen to be passing inexorably into Pakeha [non-Maori] hands.

Few Maoris who are actually disadvantaged in terms of wealth, education, and employment are conscious of their disinheritance, however, or realize their distance from their Maori heritage. They are aware only of a general sense of resentment. The articulation of resentment on their behalf is undertaken by a small number of younger educated Maori. It is they who react with hostility to being taught Maori language by Pakeha who rail against Pakeha authors on Maori topics. It is they who talk of Maori sovereignty and Maori command over Maori culture and would limited Pakeha participation in things Maori. They give voice to the wider sense of dispossession and loss of control over what should be part of oneself (O'Regan (1999: 96).

This statement could easily apply to the Indigenous peoples of the Americas, Australia, and beyond.

DOING ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE REAL WORLD

We need to rethink how archaeology students are trained, and train them more as anthropologists who can engage in archaeology as a human endeavor and not simply the study of material culture (McGuire 1992a: 243).

Archaeology is just a small part of a big world; its relevance is taken for granted by us. In fact, it is often seen as inconsequential or peripheral in the eyes of most Indigenous peoples. Both on and off the reserve, higher priority is justifiably given to solving problems of health, education, treaty negotiations, and other concerns than to archaeology. In such circumstances archaeologists cannot use the familiar refrain: "if you don't save the sites, they will be gone for future generations," for the response from the Native community would be, "if we don't address our social and economic problems, then there will be no future generations."

As archaeologists, we can make changes in the way we work that will not compromise our goals, but will facilitate working with Indigenous peoples. We must, for example, begin to identify and address the needs that Aboriginal people have. This isn't restricted to land claims, but includes the broad goals of education, reestablishing world view, and keeping a Native "spin" on

12 Nicholas and Andrews — *Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

their relations with the non-Aboriginal world. The revival of traditional ecological knowledge based on both archaeology and ethnography provides a further area of productive research (e.g., Ericson 1992; Inglis 1993), for example. The contributions that archaeology and anthropology can make to Aboriginal communities, and vice versa, can be substantial:

Ethnologists who have documented the subsistence patterns of the Cree hunter-gatherers of northern Quebec in the 1970s documented the vast and detailed knowledge that these people had acquired of their environment. This knowledge clearly exceeded that possessed by Euro-Canadian scientists. Most of the information had been encoded in terms of a belief system that conceptualized relations between hunters and game animals in terms of spiritual relations between humans and spirits....Yet the Crees belief system did not suffice to answer the question that was most important to them in the 1970s: how much land would they have to continue to ensure that all Crees who wished to go on being hunter-gatherers in the foreseeable future could do so. Answering that question required translating Cree knowledge into the conceptual framework of modern ecology which dispensed with the Cree's belief about animal spirits (Trigger 1995: 348).

We must earn the trust of Aboriginal peoples by being honest with them, by respecting their views and traditions, and by taking the time and care to explain to them why we do archaeology in the first place. We must also be honest about our own motivations and realize that we often gain more from the Native community than we return. As archaeologists and anthropologists from a dominant society, we have an obligation to contribute to the well-being of First Peoples. We achieve this primarily through working cooperatively with Native organizations, recognizing their ownership of the resource, and working ethically. However, in doing so, we also benefit in many ways: employment, the ability to celebrate "the wonderful diversity of life" firsthand, gaining respect in societies, gaining respect and status in our own society, among other things.

There are many complex issues and apparently contradictory behaviors that will be encountered. Working with Band councils can be, to many non-Natives, a slow and often frustrating business. Again the need to comprehend priorities is essential, as is a respect for a different set of cultural values where *relationships* may be more important than *things*. We must also be careful in our generalizations about Aboriginal societies because they are so diverse; conversely, Native people should not generalize about archaeologists and their motives.

Indigenous archaeology is now emerging worldwide in response to both the needs and the social milieu that frame the end of the millennium. At this time, archaeology must, as a discipline already composed of many different perspectives, remain flexible enough to accommodate more, particularly Aboriginal voices and perspectives. Canadian archaeology will remain incomplete until this missing dimension has been added, and this can only be done by working together.

Acknowledgments

The major portion of this chapter was written by George Nicholas while on sabbatical at the University of Auckland in 1996; he thanks Doug Sutton and Geoff Irwin for the invitation, and Harry Allen and (especially) Mere Roberts for stimulating discussion. He also acknowledges the contributions of Mark Skinner and Alan Thorne regarding the Lake Mungo reburial. Catherine Carlson, Ingrid Kritsch, and Madonna Moss commented on an earlier version of this paper.

REFERENCES CITED

- Bodley, J.
1988 *Victims of Progress*. Mayfield, Palo Alto.
- Bray, T.L., and T. W. Killion (editors)
1994 *Reckoning with the Dead: The Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

- Binford, L.R.
1983 Long Term Land Use Patterns: Some Implications for Archaeology. In Lulu Linear Punctated: Essays in Honor of George Irving Quimby, edited by R.C. Dunnell and D.K. Grayson, pp. 27-54. *Anthropological Papers* 72, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Brody, H.
1981 *Maps and Dreams: Indians and the British Columbia Frontier*. Douglas and Macintyre, Vancouver.
- Bukatman, S.
1993 *Terminal Identity: The Virtual Subject in Postmodern Science Fiction*. Duke University Press, Durham.
- Butzer, K.
1992 The Americas Before and After 1492: An Introduction to Current Geographical Research. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 82(3): 345-368.
Canadian Museum of Civilization
1996 *Curatorship: Indigenous Perspectives in Post-Colonial Societies*. Mercury Series, Directorate Paper No. 8, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, Quebec.
- Carmichael, D.L., J. Hubert, B.K.O. Reeves, and A. Schanche (editors)
1994 *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*. One World Archaeology series. Routledge, New York.
- Clifford, J., and G.E. Marcus
1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and the Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Deloria, V., Jr.
1992 Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future. *American Antiquity* 57: 595-598.
1995 *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact*. Scribners, New York.
- Dincauze, D.F.
1993 The Gardeners of Eden. In *Ela' Qua: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Woodbury*, edited by D. S. Krass, J. B. Thomas, and J.W. Cole, pp. 43-60. Department of Anthropology Research Report 28, University of Massachusetts-Amherst.
- Dyck, N.
1993 "Telling it like it is": Some Dilemmas of Fourth World Ethnography and Advocacy. In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram, pp. 192-212. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Dyck, N., and J.B. Waldram (editors)
1993 *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*. McGill-Queen's University Press Montreal.
- Elias, P.
1993 Anthropology and Aboriginal Claims Research. In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram, pp. 233-270. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Ericson, C.L.
1992 Applied Archaeology and Rural Development: Archaeology's Potential Contribution to the Future. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 20: 1-16.
- Fardon, R. (editor)
1995 *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*. Routledge, London.
- Fox, R.G. (editor)
1991 *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Fifield, T.E.
1996 Human Remains Found in Alaska Reported to be 9,730 Years Old. *SAA Bulletin* 14(5): 5.
- Gartrell, B.
1986 'Colonialism' and The Fourth World: Notes on Variations in Colonial Situations. *Culture* VI(1): 3-17.
- Gotthardt, R. and G. Hare
1994 *£u Zul Män—Fish Lake: Uncovering the Past*. Kwanlin Dün First Nation.

14 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

- Gould, S.J.
1988 Honorable Men and Women. *Natural History* 3/88: 16-20.
- Grossberg, L., C. Nelson, and P.A. Treichler
1992 *Cultural Studies*. Routledge, New York.
- Hamilton, S., R. Morrisseau, and Chief T. McCrady
1995 New Solitudes: Conflicting World Views in the Context of Contemporary Northern Resource Development. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 19: 3-18.
- Handsman, R.G., and T.L. Richmond
1995 Confronting Colonialism: The Mahican and Schaghticoke Peoples and Us. In *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, edited by P.R. Schmidt and T.C. Patterson, pp. 87-118. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Hare, G., and S. Greer
1994 *Désdélé Méne': The Archaeology of Annie Lake*. Carcross/Tagish First Nation, Whitehorse, NWT
- Hare, G., and R. Gotthardt
1996 *A Look Back in Time: The Archaeology of Fort Selkirk*. Selkirk First Nation, Whitehorse, NWT.
- Hastrup, K.
1995 *A Passage to Anthropology: Between Experience and Theory*. Routledge. London.
- Hedican, E.J.
1995 *Applied Anthropology in Canada: Understanding Aboriginal Issues*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Heider, K.
1988 When Ethnographers Disagree. *American Anthropologist* 90(1): 73-81.
- Hodder, I., M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last, and G. Lucas
1995 *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*. Routledge, New York.
- 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.
- Inglis, J.T. (editor)
1993 *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Concepts and Cases*. International Program on Traditional Ecological Knowledge. Canadian Museum of Nature, Ottawa.
- Jameson, F.
1991 *Postmodernism of the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Verso, London.
- Kearney, M.
1983 *World View*. Chandler and Sharp, Publishers, Novato, CA.
- Kelly, J.H., and R.F. Williams
1996 The Positioning of Archaeology within Anthropology: A Canadian Historical Perspective. *American Antiquity* 61(1): 5-20.
- Kew, M.
1995 Anthropology and First Nations in British Columbia. *BC Studies* X 78-105.
- Kohl, P.L.
1993 Limits to a Post-Processual Archaeology (or, The Dangers of a New Scholasticism). In *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda*, edited by N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt, p. 13-19. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kohl, P.L., and C. Fawcett (editors)
1996 *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Layton, R.
1989 *Who Needs the Past?: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Levine, S.D., and I. Karp (editors)
1991 *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

- Loring, S., and M. Prokopec
1994 A Most Peculiar Man: The Life and Times of Ales Hrdlicka. In *Reckoning with the Dead: the Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution*, edited by T.L. Bray and T.W. Killion, pp. 26-40. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Lynott, M.J., and A. Wylie (editors)
1995 *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- McDonald, J.D., L.J. Zimmerman, A.L. McDonald, W. Tall Bull, and T. Rising Sun
1991 The Northern Cheyenne Outbreak of 1879: Using Oral History and Archaeology as Tools of Resistance. In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by R.H. McGuire and R. Paynter, pp. 64-78. Basil Blackwell, London.
- McGhee, R.
1989 "Who Owns the Past?" *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 13: 13-20.
- McGuire, R.H.
1992a *A Marxist Archaeology*. Academic Press, San Diego.
1992b Archaeology and the First Americans. *American Anthropologist* 94(4): 816-836.
1994 Do the Right Thing. In *Reckoning with the Dead: The Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution*, edited by T.L. Bray and T. W. Killion, pp. 180-183. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- McGrath, A.
1995 Contested Ground: What is 'Aboriginal History'? In *Contested Ground: Australian Aborigines under the British Crown*, edited by A. McGrath, pp. 359-397. Allen and Unwin, St. Leonards.
- Majnep, I. S., and Ralph Bulmer
1977 *Birds of Kalam Country*. University of Auckland Press, Auckland.
- Magubane, B., and J.C. Faris
1985 On the Political Relevance of Anthropology. *Dialectical Anthropology* 9: 91-104.
- Marcus, G.E., and M.M.J. Fischer
1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Mason, R.J.
1994 Letter to Executive Secretary and members of the Aboriginal Heritage Committee of the Canadian Archaeological Association (Sept. 9, 1994).
- Maybury-Lewis, D.
1992 *Millennium: Tribal Wisdom and the Modern World*. Viking, New York.
- Meighan, C.W.
1992 Some Scholar's Views on Reburial. *American Antiquity* 57(4): 704-710.
- Merrill, W., E. Ladd, and T.J. Ferguson
1993 The Return of the *Ahayu:da*: Lessons for Repatriation from Zuni Pueblo and the Smithsonian Institution. *Current Anthropology* 34(5): 523-567.
- Miller, D.
1995 *Worlds Apart: Modernity through the Prism of the Local*. Routledge.
- Miller, M.
1993 *State of the Peoples: A Global Human Rights Report on Societies in Danger*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Monet, D., and Skanu'u (A. Wilson)
1992 *Colonialism on Trial: Indigenous Land Rights and the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en Sovereignty Case*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, B.C.
- Moore, H.
1995 The Problems of Origins: Poststructuralism and Beyond. In *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, edited by I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last, and G. Lucas, pp. 51-53. Routledge, London.
- Morell, V.
1995 Who Owns the Past? *Science* 268: 1424-1426.

16 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

- Murray, T.
1993 Communication and the Importance of Disciplinary Communities: Who Owns the Past? In *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda*, edited by N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt, pp. 105-116. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Nader, L. (editor)
1996 *Naked Science: Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge*. Routledge, New York.
- Nash, R.J.
1995 Deconstructing Archaeology. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 19: 19-28.
- 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 Society and Department of Communications, Ottawa.
- Nicks, T.
1992 Partnerships in Developing Cultural Resources: Lessons from the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. *Culture* XII(1): 87-94.
- Obeyesekere, G.
1992 *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- O'Regan, S.
1990 Maori Control of the Maori Heritage. In *The Politics of the Past*, edited by P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, pp. 95-106. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Parker, M., and R. Starkey (editors)
1995 *Postcolonial Literatures: Achebe, Ngugi, Desai, and Walcott*. Macmillan Press, London.
- Paynter, R., and R.H. McGuire
1991 The Archaeology of Inequality: Material Culture, Domination and Resistance. In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by R.H. McGuire and R. Paynter, pp. 127. Basil Blackwell, London.
- Peebles, C., and S. Kus
1977 Some Archaeological Correlates of Ranked Societies. *American Antiquity* 42:421-448.
- Potter, P.B.
1991 Self-Reflection in Archaeology. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, edited by R.W. Preucel, pp. 225-234. Occasional Paper, No. 10. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
1994 Postprocessual Approaches and Public Archaeology: Putting Critical Archaeology to Work for the Public. In *Cultural Resource Management: Archaeological Research, Preservation Planning, and Public Education in the Northeastern United States*, edited by J. Kerber, pp. 65-86. Bergin and Garvey, Westport (CT).
- Powell, S., C.E. Garza, and A. Henricks
1994 Ethics and Ownership of the Past: The Reburial and Repatriation Controversy. In *Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 5, edited by M.B. Schiffer, pp. 1-42. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Preucel, R.W. (editor)
1991 *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper, No. 10. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Pullar, G.L.
1994 The Qikertarmiut and the Scientist: Fifty Years of Clashing World Views. In *Reckoning with the Dead: The Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution*, edited by T.L. Bray and T. W. Killion, pp. 15-25. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Ramos, A.R.
1995 *Sanumá Memories: Yanomami Ethnography in Times of Crisis*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

- Ray, A.J.
1990 Creating the Image of the Savage in Defence of the Crown: The Ethnohistorian in Court. *Native Studies Review* 6(2): 13-29.
- Reeves, B.O.K., and M.A. Kennedy (editors)
1993 *Kunaitupii. Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*. Archaeological Society of Alberta, Calgary.
- Robinson, P.A.
1994 Archaeology, History, and Native Americans: Preserving the Richness of the Past. In *Cultural Resource Management: Archaeological Research, Preservation Planning, and Public Education in the Northeastern United States*, edited by J. Kerber, pp. 87-98. Bergin and Garvey, Westport (CT).
- Sahlins, M.
1993 Goodbye to Triste Tropics: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History. *The Journal of Modern History* 65: 1-25.
1995 *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, For Example*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Said, E.W.
1993 *Culture and Imperialism*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Salmond, A.
1991 *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans 1642-1772*. Viking, Auckland.
- Schaafsma, C.F.
1989 Significant Until Proven Otherwise: Problems vs. Representative Samples. In *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, edited by H.F. Cleere, pp. 38-51. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Schmidt, P.R., and T.C. Patterson (editors)
1995 *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Schneider, J., and R. Rapp
1995 *Articulating Hidden Histories: Exploring the Influence of Eric R. Wolf*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Shanks, M.
1992 *Experiencing the Past: On the Character of Archaeology*. Routledge, London.
- Shanks, M., and R.H. McGuire
1996 The Craft of Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 61(1): 75-88.
- Spector, J.
1993 *What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at Wahpeton Dakota Village*. Minnesota Historical Society Press, St. Paul, Minneapolis.
- Staley, D.P.
1993 St. Lawrence Island's Subsistence Diggers: A New Perspective on Human Effects on Archaeological Sites. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 20(3): 347-355.
- Steiner, W.
1995 *The Scandal of Pleasure: Art in an Age of Fundamentalism*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Stocking, G.W., Jr. (editor)
1991 *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- Strathern, M.
1995 *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge*. Routledge.
- Swain, T.
1993 *A Place for Strangers: Towards a History of Australian Aboriginal Being*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Swidler, N., R. Anyon, K. Dongoske, and A. Downer (editors)
1997 *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to a Common Ground*. Altamira Press, Walnut Grove, CA.

18 *Nicholas and Andrews — Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World*

- Taussis, M.T.
1986 *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Thomas, N.
1994 *Colonialism's Other: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Trigger, B.
1980 Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45: 662-676.
1986 Evolutionism, Relativism and Putting Native People into Historical Context. *Culture* VI(2): 65-79.
1988 A Present of their Past? Anthropologists, Native People, and their Heritage. *Culture* VIII (1): 71-79.
1995 A Reply to Tilley and Nencel. *Critique of Anthropology* 15(4): 347-350.
- Tringh, T.M.
1989 *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. University of Indiana Press, Bloomington.
- Turner, N.J., L.C. Thompson, and A.Z. York
1990 *Thompson Ethnobotany. Knowledge and Usage of Plants by the Thompson Indians of British Columbia*. Royal British Columbia Museum, Memoir No. 3. Victoria, B.C.
- Turner, T.
1993 Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology that Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It? *Cultural Anthropology* 8: 411-425.
- Van Willigen, J.
1993 *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Mayfield, Palo Alto.
- Waldram, J.B.
1993 Some Limits to Advocacy in the Native Canadian Context. In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram, pp. 292-310. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Warry, W.
1990 Doing Unto Others: Applied Anthropology, Collaborative Research and Native Self-determination. *Culture X*: 61-73.
- Webb, S.
1995 *Palaeopathology of Aboriginal Australians: Health and Disease Across a Hunter-Gatherer Landscape*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Webster, S.
1995 Escaping Post-cultural Tribes. *Critique of Anthropology* 15(4): 361-414.
- Wylie, A.
1992 Rethinking the Quincentennial: Consequences for Past and Present. *American Antiquity* 57: 591-594.
1993 A Proliferation of New Archaeologies: "Beyond Objectivism and Relativism." In *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda*, edited by N. Yoffee and A. Sherratt, pp. 20-26. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Young, E.
1995 *Third World in the First: Development and Indigenous Peoples*. Routledge, New York.
- Zimmerman, L.
1989 Human Bones as Symbols of Power: Native American Views of "Grave robbing" Archaeologists. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 211-216. Unwin Hyman, London.