5

We Can Go A Long Way Together, Hand-In-Hand

Margaret G. Hanna

In 1975, a young Cree man from Sweetgrass Reserve near the Battlefords, Saskatchewan, asked David Mandelbaum, who had conducted anthropological research on the reserve in the 1930s, the following question: "What good have all your efforts among us and your writings about us done for my children and my people?" (Mandelbaum 1979: xv). Mandelbaum recognized that "the question was partly a request for information and partly a statement about relations between Indians and Whites" (Mandelbaum 1979: xv). He wasn't sure if his answer satisfied his questioner.

Things haven't changed much. First Nations people are still asking that question, and the fact that they are still asking it suggests that they have not been satisfied with the answers we have been giving them. Indeed, their anger, resentment, and distrust of us and our research stems from a perceived lack of respect by archaeologists for Aboriginal concerns and interpretations, and a sense of being on the lower step of a hierarchical "We-They" relationship.

We are now being challenged not merely to give an answer that satisfies but also to change the way we conduct our profession. How do we respond? If we ignore these challenges or entrench our current practices, we do so at our own peril, for the broader social and political environment in which we work is already changing. First Nations are demanding self-government and the right to make independent decisions about all issues, including cultural and heritage issues, that are of importance to them. The land that reserves are regaining under the treaty land entitlement settlements includes not only agricultural land but also unbroken and Crown land, much of which contains, or has the potential to contain, archaeological sites. The legal power of heritage legislation alone will not win the day against moral outrage, especially when that is bolstered by claims of Euro-Canadian imperialism and programs of cultural genocide, self-seeking and self-centred interests of the archaeological profession, or inherent rights to self-determination[1] And, as Canadians, we watch what is happening in the United States since the passing of the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act there, wondering if that will be our future, too. To those of us who are accustomed to doing what we want to do, unencumbered by outside opinion or interference, these challenges are equivalent to having a door slammed shut in our faces.

We have another option, that of viewing these challenges as a door being opened to us. Accepting this option means that we must be concerned with more than mere self-preservation; we must challenge ourselves to reconsider fundamental issues of why and for whom we do archaeology. This is not an issue of theory and methodology; it is an issue of philosophy.

Archaeologists are beginning to accept this challenge, to view the pursuit of their profession within a larger cultural context (see, for examples, the work of Albright 1992; Allen 1992; McDonald 1992; Scribe 1993; Spector 1993). The Saskatchewan Association of Professional Archaeologists (SAPA), too, has accepted this challenge. Since 1991, SAPA has organized two workshops which brought together First Nations elders and archaeologists. These workshops were intended to begin the process of developing an atmosphere of mutual respect in which Aboriginal people and archaeologists could discuss issues of mutual concern.

The rest of this paper discusses the SAPA workshops and some of the issues that arose out of them. I also discuss the implications of these issues for the future of archaeology. Although this section is grounded in the results of the SAPA workshops, much of it arises out of personal experience with the development of the First Nations Gallery at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum. I close with a brief discussion of what could be the potential role of the Canadian Archaeological Association's (CAA) Code of Ethics.

---

[1] I do not intend to explore either the validity of these claims or how these claims have been used to manipulate public opinion.

THE SAPA WORKSHOPS

SAPA is a provincial association of professional archaeologists, including graduate students, that provides a forum in which archaeologists can discuss and resolve issues of mutual concern. It also acts as a lobbying body and attempts to set professional standards. In striving to achieve the latter goal, SAPA has developed a provincial research strategy and a Code of Ethics. The workshops with First Nations elders grew, via a rather circuitous route, out of that latter document.

The development of the Code of Ethics began in 1985. It was inspired, in part by a desire to make SAPA a more professional organization, and in part by the controversy surrounding the accidental discovery of an unmarked cemetery containing 25 burials of First Nations people in the middle of the town of Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan (Finnigan 1989; Spurling and Walker 1987). Its development took five years. When SAPA finally adopted its Code of Ethics in 1990, it included statements about appropriate behaviour and attitudes with regard to the public, the profession, the employer, and colleagues. The Code also recognized the special responsibility of archaeologists to show respect for First Nations' concerns about the past by consulting with them and by making the results of archaeological research accessible to First Nations communities (SAPA 1990: 1, 2).

It was not immediately obvious how members would be able to follow these articles because, at the time, SAPA did not have any links, either formal or informal, with First Nations communities or individuals. We were unable to answer the question: "Whom do we talk to?" That means was provided in 1991 when SAPA was organizing the Annual Meeting of the Saskatchewan Archaeological Society. Sid Fiddler, who is Head of Social Work at the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College campus in Saskatoon, approached Terry Gibson, then SAPA president, and suggested that archaeologists should meet with elders to discuss topics of mutual concern. He offered to assist with organizing this workshop, and SAPA accepted the offer.

The first workshop was held May 1-3, 1992, with seven Cree elders. It was meant simply to be a familiarization process, an opportunity for archaeologists and elders to meet and to learn how to talk with each other. It included both ceremonies and discussion circles. The topics were far-ranging; however, the general issue of respect underlay the more particular issues of handling artifacts, using tobacco, consulting with elders, and dealing with burials (Hanna and Gibson 1994).

SAPA members met immediately following the workshop to discuss its benefits and its future. Members had realized, with great relief, that meetings with First Nations need not necessarily be antagonistic and confrontational. They had also learned some of the protocol that attends approaching elders, which they admitted would relieve some of the tension and uncertainty if they had to approach elders in the future.[2] The workshop had also revealed that the elders, and First Nations in general, knew as little about archaeology as archaeologists knew about First Nations. Indeed, for most of the first session, one of the elders thought he was talking to teachers and nurses. However, once they understood something about archaeology, they were more than willing to help and to advise. Members agreed that this process needed to continue, and they agreed unanimously to hold regular gatherings with other elders to talk about heritage matters.

The second workshop was organized with assistance from Vance McNabb of Wanuskewin Heritage Park, Saskatoon, and held there on March 26, 1994 (Ramsay 1994). Elders and representatives of cultural organizations from the Cree, Saulteaux, Lakota, Assiniboin, and Métis nations attended. Its focus was quite different from that of the first workshop. It was intended to "provide more information about the different aspects of archaeology to help the elders better understand what archaeologists are asking of them" (Ramsay 1994: 4). To this end, archaeologists working in different segments of the profession (university, resource management, consulting, museum, and avocational) presented brief summaries of what they did and the issues and problems they faced. Discussion followed each presentation.

The first workshop was funded by the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation and by the Department of Canadian Heritage Access to Archaeology Program. The second workshop received funding from the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation.

---

[2] The expectation to follow protocol was demonstrated most dramatically when one of the elders reproached Mr. Fiddler for not giving them tobacco before he asked them to speak. In a way, it reassured the archaeologists to realize that even people who are supposedly in the know can get it wrong sometimes.

FUTURE TRENDS IN THE PRACTICE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

The discussions at the SAPA workshops focused on sites and artifacts. These discussions suggested, but never directly addressed, a more serious and fundamental issue, namely that concerned with the values and principles that underlie both archaeologists' and First Nations' views of the past, with how to study the past, and with the relationship of the past to the present and the future. Addressing the superstructure without addressing the values and principles that underlie these far more obvious questions will not help us to resolve differences.

In summarizing the discussions at the Aboriginal Archaeological Heritage Symposium held in Ottawa in 1991, Dunn (1991: 6) described the interests, goals, and aspirations of archaeologists and Aboriginal people as being "different...but rarely competitive." The discussions at the SAPA workshops support that view. Elders and archaeologists alike were concerned about the preservation of sites and the accurate interpretation and use of sites and artifacts. Differences arose when we began to discuss the "why" and the "how" of heritage preservation.

Unfortunately, the "how" and the "why" still separate us. Past attitudes and actions have so alienated some First Nations people that they view any attempt by non-Aboriginal professions and institutions to work with First Nations as yet another attempt to homogenize their knowledge within a Euro-Canadian system rather than to recognize First Nations' knowledge as distinctive. They think that any form of working together (collaboration) is merely appropriation in disguise (see Ames 1994).

Nevertheless, at the SAPA workshop, all agreed that only by working together would First Nations and archaeologists be able to protect and preserve these sites, as expressed in the statements of some of the participants below and elsewhere in this paper.

> You know, I've said this before a lot of times, I've said this: A Native person and a White person are two people standing side by side like this, and we've got to understand each other (Lawrence Tobacco, Cree Elder).

> Today, we're at the threshold of being able to work together (Senator Ernest Mike, Cree Elder).

> Hopefully, we can come out with some really good working relationships. By having these kinds of meetings, we open the door to developing these kinds of relationships (Darlene Speidel, Lakota, traditional person)

> We're not out here to hurt each other but to work together, to begin to understand one another and talk about the things that bother us (Pauline Pelly, Saulteaux Elder).

Talk alone will not change the strong and deep feelings of anger, resentment, and suspicion that exist. The old ways of doing archaeology are no longer sufficient or satisfactory. We now have to prove that we can act in a respectful manner. Working together will require a renegotiating, a reallocating, and a sharing of authority and responsibility among the various parties. Respect will be the foundation on which this new working relationship is built, the importance of which was stressed many times in both workshops.

> There is one value that we respect at all times, and that word is "respect" (Lawrence Tobacco, Cree Elder).

> The elders told me: "As elders, we don't want you to walk behind us or to walk in front of us, but we want you to walk hand-in-hand beside us" (Brian Scribe, Saulteaux, Archaeologist).

> We take things for granted and forget to show respect...It's good to show respect in the first place (Neil Putt, Archaeologist).

> If we are to demonstrate respect for each other in the future, we will have to change how we

do and think about archaeology. There are, as I see it, three changes that we will have to make in order to accomplish this:

1. archaeologists must become more aware of the political implications of their work;
2. archaeologists must reclaim the humanist origin of the discipline if they are to make archaeology relevant to First Nations; and
3. archaeologists and First Nations alike must learn to write history contrapuntally.

ARCHAEOLOGY AS SOCIAL ACTION:
THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF SCIENCE AND OBJECTIVITY

We archaeologists claim to be scientists and therefore objective and non-biased in our research. Objectivity and the rationalist, empiricist approach are integral to scientific process. Both have played significant roles in the development of the archaeological discipline, transforming it from one in which interpretation was "haphazard or capricious" (Kluckhohn 1939; quoted in Sullivan 1978: 183) to a discipline that queries the nature of evidence, the relationship between theory/methodology and evidence, and the process of substantiating statements about the past (Sullivan 1978: 183).

However, the claim of objectivity may be used to disguise other cultural ideologies (see Wickwire and M'Gonigle 1991: 111). We may be confusing scientific objectivity, which permits us to evaluate the relevance and appropriateness of evidence, method, theory, and interpretation, with a pseudo-objectivity, which assumes that whatever we do, including science, is value-free.

The systems that produce knowledge can never be value-free (Trigger 1980, 1989; Warren 1989; Wylie 1993), for knowledge arises from experience followed by reflection upon that experience. Ultimately, this process of reflection is guided by the values of one's culture (Hoare et al. 1993: 45). Truth, therefore, is never amoral, and facts are never autonomous of cultural values. We who deal with human cultures must balance objectivity as we understand it within the scientific approach with an awareness of our own culture and how it influences everything we do, what we perceive as appropriate problems, appropriate methods of investigation, appropriate data, and appropriate interpretation of the data. Furthermore, we must be aware that the pursuit of our discipline has political ramifications, not just scientific ones. We do not, as Rhodd (1993: 55) reminded us, work in a "moral vacuum." By becoming aware of both our own cultural biases and the biases of other segments of our society, we can begin to explore ways that archaeology can help serve the purpose of those segments which, until now, it has not served or to which it has done a disservice.

This broader version of cultural awareness has, by and large, been lacking in archaeology. Aside from a few authors (e.g., Kelley and Hanen 1988; Trigger 1980, 1983, 1984, 1989; Wylie 1991, 1993), mainstream historical overviews of archaeological method and theory do not investigate archaeology's social context.[3] In the same way in which literature reflected, supported, and validated the imperialist experience (Said 1994), archaeology has often reflected, supported, and validated the cultural values and aspirations of societies seeking to expand territories and to validate claims of sovereignty (Trigger 1989: 389). During the 19th century, the explicitly non-evolutionary culture area concept, the disregard for developing chronologies or explicating cultural change and development, and the perceived disjuncture between such phenomena as the large mound complexes of the American Midwest and resident First Nations helped to substantiate a political ideology intent on dispossessing these very people of their lands and cultures, even their lives. Archaeologists began to develop chronologies once First Nations were safely relocated to reservations (or were exterminated), but cultural change was seen as the result of diffusion or migration rather than autochthonous innovation and development.[4]

---

[3] I see little to convince me that either Marxist or feminist approaches are considered by the majority of archaeologists to be "mainstream."

[4] This is, admittedly, an overly simplistic sketch of the relationship between archaeology and its social context. Nonetheless, I hope that it will stimulate thought about the subtle and pervasive ways in which social context can influence what we consider to be the proper pursuit of archaeology and about the ways in which archaeology has (or has not) served groups other than the archaeological community.

Even the very act of setting goals in archaeology has political implications. The New Archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s cast aside history as a desirable goal and focused instead on searching for universal generalizations that could be used to explain the past. Binford argued that history is merely chronology—knowledge of the archaeological record, and does not constitute explanation—knowledge of the past (1972: 118). This attitude toward history helped to entrench the attitude that Aboriginal people are objects-of-study, and that Aboriginal culture is a laboratory crucible in which generalizing laws are developed and refined (see Trigger's comments, 1980, 1983). But we need to ask ourselves what use is knowledge that has become so universalized that "it applies to everywhere and nowhere, everybody and nobody" (Vitebsky 1993: 109).

Binford and the New Archaeologists were not the first to espouse this approach. Willey and Phillips believed that history and science were dichotomous and, therefore, that in the interests of improving the discipline archaeology should become ahistorical; that is, archaeologists should discover "regularities that are in a sense spaceless and timeless" (Willey and Phillips 1958: 2). According to Trigger (1989: 312-319), this was a peculiarly American attitude toward history, one that was not common in the European version of New Archaeology as seen, for example, in the writings of David Clarke (1972, 1977, 1979) and Colin Renfrew (1979). It was also a misunderstanding of the discipline of history itself, even as it was practised in the 1960s.

So what did it matter if we did *explanation* instead of *history*? The New Archaeology developed at approximately the same time as First Nations were becoming more politically active, e.g., the American Indian Movement in the USA, and the response to the Canadian Government's 1969 White Paper on Indian Policy (Cardinal 1969; Deloria 1970; Indian Chiefs of Alberta 1970; Weaver 1981). Thus it happened that academic archaeologists, at least, began producing work that ignored the importance of history at a time when First Nations were beginning to reclaim and promote their history and culture within the larger society. First Nations viewed this ahistorical approach as a denial of the existence of their history, thereby rendering archaeology irrelevant, at the very least, to their concerns. This denial of First Nations' history may have been one of the factors leading to a new reading of the term *prehistory*. Within its original European context, it was used to denote the absence of written records rather than the absence of history (Trigger 1983: 416). Within North America, it assumed the connotation that history did not begin until Europeans arrived and that, therefore, First Nations are people without history.

This debate over the relevancy of history is indeed a political issue because it is a question of power—who will write history. We archaeologists have traditionally, by our attitudes and actions, appropriated this power to ourselves, rationalizing that archaeology is "the only legitimate 'scientific' approach to the past" (Ucko 1990: xi). I think it is possible to go one step further and say that, until recently, we have seen archaeology as the only legitimate approach.

Our actions have reflected this philosophy only too clearly. We have insisted on the right to excavate and analyse burials (seen by many First Nations as desecration); on being the sole guardians of knowledge about the past (thereby discrediting the relevance and validity of traditional knowledge); by limiting access to this knowledge only to professional colleagues or, in limited amounts, to non-professional audiences (thereby implying that non-professional audiences are too ignorant to understand); by insisting on the right to decide what is important to be excavated, analysed, interpreted, and exhibited (thereby denying people the opportunity to decide what is important and relevant to them); and by insisting on the right to decide what constitutes evidence (thereby preventing alternate, possibly conflicting, interpretations of the past).

This attitude is now changing, as community-based participatory research becomes more prevalent and as more First Nations people become part of the discipline (e.g., Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990; Hoare et al. 1993; Pardoe 1991; Spector 1993). This change in attitude has also been encouraged as Marxist, feminist, and postprocessual theories have become more prevalent in archaeology (e.g., Gero and Conkey 1991; Hodder 1987; Shanks and Tilley 1987a, 1987b; Walde and Willows 1991).

THE RELEVANCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY OR, WHO CARES?

> By ignoring its social responsibilities, archaeology may be dooming itself to irrelevance in the opinion of many people who otherwise might be interested in its findings, as well as encouraging needless hostility (Trigger 1989: 379).

Processual archaeology, with its emphasis on discovering general laws of human behaviour rather than on writing history, has created a distance between the objects we study and the people who made the objects and, subsequently, their descendants. It's no wonder, then, that Aboriginal people feel disconnected from archaeology (see Spector [1993: 13-18] for a discussion of responses by Wahpeton Dakota to her attempts to include them in her research). This distance reinforces the view of some that archaeologists exploit sites in order to further their own careers at the expense of the well-being of the community of descendants.

One of the dreams of the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA) is that more First Nations people will become archaeologists as one way of bridging the gap that currently exists between our discipline and First Nations. Yet, despite the increasing enrolment of First Nations students in universities, we are not seeing a corresponding influx of First Nations students into archaeology. The traditional people who spoke at the 1994 workshop recognized this.

> In the field of science, our people haven't adjusted to the idea of getting involved in that (Senator Ernest Mike, Cree Elder).

> Some of it is because of our people's lack of understanding of the sciences (Darlene Speidel, Lakota Traditional Person).

I suspect that a major reason First Nations have not been flocking to archaeology as a profession is that its Eurocentric, scientific attitude has limited its receptivity to other philosophies and world views. Archaeologists have presented their knowledge as totalitarian, as superseding and replacing all other knowledge systems, rather than as co-existing with or supplementing. In fact, 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. It denies the historical, social, and geographical contexts in which that perception and understanding of reality have developed (Vitebsky 1993: 109). It's little wonder then that First Nations see little in archaeology, as it is presently practised, that will entice them to become part of the discipline, and see much that instills grief and anger.

> They wonder why there's so few Native archaeologists. Maybe there would be lots if they knew how to go about it. What they do, they have to be very cautious that they have to be asking for forgiveness before they touch anything, forgiveness from the Creator, that what they are about to do He will protect them, that nothing will go wrong. Perhaps if they did things like that, they would go into it (Pauline Pelly, Saulteaux Elder).

Nevertheless, Elders saw a need for First Nations to become involved in archaeology and a reason for why First Nations people should consider archaeology relevant to their lives. This relevance has nothing to do with discovering general laws of human behaviour and everything to do with a personal search for context and for identity.

> We can help our own people get their identity, their roots of what they are, and once they understand, they'll get to know what kind of people they were, a proud ancestry ...and archaeology can help get that understanding (Senator Ernest Mike, Cree Elder).

Making archaeology relevant to First Nations' concerns does not mean abandoning scientific rigour, nor does it prevent archaeologists from searching for general laws of human behaviour. What it requires is a balance of perspective that acknowledges and maintains responsibility to the

aims of the discipline while simultaneously acknowledging that people outside the discipline have a profound interest in what we do and say, and furthermore that what we say and do has profound impact on how they perceive themselves and on how others perceive them. This realignment of attitudes would provide archaeologists with a means of, and a reason for, making archaeology relevant to those people whose ancestors we study. Recognizing Aboriginal history as a valid goal of archaeology would create a strong sense of relevance. Making archaeology relevant to the needs and concerns of communities would go a long way to dispelling the apathy or antagonism that exists now.

The International Committee of Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM) recommended, "We need to utilize archaeology to illustrate problems of the past and the present, and not attempt to present one standardized version" (McGimsey 1989: 239). By becoming aware of both our own cultural biases and the biases of other segments of our society, we can begin to explore ways that archaeology can help serve the purpose of those segments which, until now, it has not served or to which it has done a disservice.

ARCHAEOLOGY AS CONTRAPUNTAL HISTORY— INTRODUCING OTHER VOICES

During the past several decades, archaeologists have become accustomed to working in an interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary setting. It is not at all unusual for archaeological projects to include geologists, botanists, zoologists, geomorphologists, palynologists, and members of other scientific disciplines whose respective expertise and knowledge are used to create a more comprehensive understanding of the past. Now archaeologists are being challenged to include not only other scientific disciplines but also other knowledge systems that come from outside of the scientific community.

Just as the inclusion of other scientific disciplines required a change in the training of new archaeologists, so too does the inclusion of other voices. Archaeologists must be educated in a new way, so that they learn how to respect First Nations' traditional teachings and perspectives. The CAA Committee on Aboriginal Heritage recognizes the importance of, and need for, a broader vision of education—one that addresses archaeologists' views of themselves as well as First Nations' opinions of the discipline (CAA Committee on Aboriginal Heritage: Prairie Regional Committee 1993: 4).

In considering how to incorporate "history" into the archaeological discipline, we should examine recent trends in historical criticism as both example and challenge (see, for example, Akenson 1990; Rudin 1992). These new approaches no longer talk of *history*, but of *histories*. These histories are no longer lists of *important* men, places, events, and dates, for even those lists are built upon cultural values (see Cruikshank 1990 for an example of how other cultures define what constitutes history). Rather, they are a process of taking apart those lists, of understanding the cultural values which influenced their construction, of examining process and method rather the finished text, and of reconstructing a multi-vocal history that denies active participation to no one (Said 1994: 259). The eders at the first SAPA workshop saw both the need for and the benefit of this type of history, although they may not have used this terminology.

> It's team work. We'd be able to assist you and to interpret alongside in your finding and understanding, and then put this together....because that knowledge ...has to be solid. This way we put a Native understanding and your understanding and we get a better story. Then you make...wiser people (Noah Cardinal, Cree Elder).

In the language of music, counterpoint is a construction whereby various voices interweave to form the musical whole. No one voice carries the melody or defines the harmony. Remove any one voice and the complexity which constitutes the beauty diminishes and collapses. This is the kind of history we are being challenged to write.

Writing contrapuntal history requires us to analyse our values and to be aware of what cultural baggage we bring to our work. It also involves recognizing and acknowledging the participation of other voices in the creation of that history (Cruikshank 1991 provides an excellent

example of how Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal histories can be combined). It requires of us that we extend the same courtesy of re-examination and reanalysis to colleagues (potential or actual) outside our discipline that we extend to colleagues within our discipline. Just as other archaeologists may ask different questions of the same data because their research design is different, so also may First Nations ask their own questions because they, too, have their own research designs (to phrase it in terms we understand as scientists). These alternate research designs should not be immediately construed as contradictory or competitive, nor should they be seen as isolated and segregated. They can be complementary.

Writing contrapuntal history is not the same as co-opting and subsuming alternate voices within our own. It is not treating them as secondary to the scientific perspective. This approach, whereby First Nations' voices are included as interesting anecdotes or footnotes to a primary voice, is the major reason why some First Nations people see any attempt at collaboration as another form of appropriation (Ames 1994).

Initiatives such as SAPA's workshop certainly can assist in this learning process by improving archaeologists' knowledge of traditional Aboriginal beliefs and perspectives and, conversely, First Nations' knowledge of archaeological practices. In order to be effective, however, university programs must emphasize social responsibility and an awareness of the social context of research (see the ICAHM recommendations in McGimsey 1989: 239) as much as archaeological theory and methodology. Training in only the scientific aspects of archaeology can no longer be considered sufficient. This new training must provide archaeologists with a broadened operational and theoretical framework that is predicated on the principle of informed consent and that incorporates the necessity for and validity of the emic perspective. Training must stress that traditional Aboriginal knowledge is as valid and relevant as is archaeological knowledge, and that "there is more than one past" (McGimsey 1989: 239).

THE IDEA OF THE SACRED: HOW TWO VOICES ARE BETTER THAN ONE

Nowhere is the need for a contrapuntal approach to writing history more necessary than with the issue of sacred vs. secular interpretations of the landscape. Traditional archaeological training focuses so intently on empirical evidence, as is only proper in science, that it blinds us to other kinds of evidence (see Dormaar and Reeves [1993] for an example of incorporating other kinds of evidence).   Consequently, when we are confronted with spiritual explanations that defy scientific logic, our first reaction might be to reject these claims as ignorant (even that word is morally loaded, see Vitebsky 1993: 100-101), or politically motivated, or "New Age," and most certainly as unprovable within our empirical tradition. There is, therefore, an unfortunate tendency for each side to view the other as competitive, as constituting a denial of the validity of one's own interpretation. Instead of assuming a traditional confrontational approach of *either-or*, we need to understand the values and principles that underlie the classification of land as either sacred or secular. For purposes of this discussion, I am not impugning *rightness* or *wrongness* to any one value system. I am suggesting merely that we examine them for what they are and for what they represent.

Landscape includes more than the physical expression of hills, plains, valleys, lakes, and rivers. Landscape is also a social construction that reflects and shapes human experience (Cosgrove 1984; Evans 1985; Meinig 1979; Widdis 1993). Be one original inhabitant or newcomer, one's experience with the land is canonized though classification and toponomy (Porteous 1990; Said 1994: 224-226), a process that, in turn, defines one's relationship with the landscape.

For many Indigenous people around the world, classification of the landscape is not a means whereby they possess the landscape. The landscape is the background against which and through which people establish and maintain their relationships both to each other and to the land. In the end, it emphasizes that "people and land are not separate entities" (Barnard and Woodburn 1991: 16). That the landscape is therefore classified as sacred recognizes the land as the place of their origin, as their source of physical and spiritual well-being, and as their identity as a people.

The European classification of land as secular also maps out a relationship with the land, but one that is predicated upon values of objectification and commodification. Land is valued according to its productivity (see Rowe 1990: 16-19 for a revealing discussion of *improved* vs *unimproved* land) rather than according to the way it relates people. It becomes for the scientific world

something to be studied, and for the capitalist world, something to be possessed.

> Clients look at heritage as a thing they must address, and it becomes very much like a commodity, it's a hoop they have to jump through (Terry Gibson, Archaeologist).

> I think it's really interesting, what you're saying here …about the spiritual side of this, because, as archaeologists…we are always examining…the economic aspect of it all. People see a bison kill, and we see that this is food and clothing and shelter, but we don't see the spiritual side…We're really ignorant of the spiritual side (Ben Hjermstad, Archaeologist).

Commodification and objectification are implicit in both the name "resource management" strategy and in the strategies themselves. Sites are "resources," commodities to be managed (we are assuming, of course, that they can be managed). They are ranked according to various criteria, but implicit in the ranking is the idea that some are expendable and some are less so. The resource classification confirms the division of sacred and secular. Material evidence is the basis for this classification and economic potential the basis for assessing the significance or expendability of the site.

> I have concerns about sites of spiritual importance where there's nothing other than the geographical feature that has some significance. How do you deal with that? (Marty Magne, Archaeologist).

> We know what a site is, but we don't know how to define a sacred place if it doesn't have archaeological materials associated with it (Diane Cockle, Archaeologist).

The cultural view of the landscape as being both commodity and object is paramount in Canada. It is the basis on which our dominant political and economic organizations are founded and by which they operate. It does not permit the existence of alternate cultural landscapes. Therein lies the basis of the conflict between Euro-Canadian and traditional First Nations land-use management policies and practices.

> I was just thinking about 1970, when they were damming the Diefenbaker, they had that rock there, the buffalo rock, that they disposed of (Mistassini), and it's an example of a rock that they used for ceremonial purposes. Now we can't use that because it's all under water. I''s been blasted—blown up and it's all under water. But that's an example of kind of the desecration of sacred places because people say, "Well, it's just a goddamn rock, you know. What the hell, you know. We have better use of this place—economic, profitable, and it's going to benefit everybody, including the Indians. And it's going to create jobs, you know." And all this type of rationalization that often override anything else (Sid Fiddler, Cree, SIFC).

Archaeologists, and Euro-Canadians in general, need to understand that the current trend to declare the sacredness of the landscape, to "reclaim, rename, and reinhabit the land" (Said 1994: 226), is an important part of the process whereby Indigenous people around the world are reclaiming their history and their culture. This is not only crass political maneuvering, although some people on both sides will use these arguments to manipulate situations to their own advantage. Rather, it is first and foremost an attempt to reclaim that context in which one's culture and history originally developed and which will be needed to plot the future.

> Today we are trying to go back and ask Elders "What does this site mean?" We have people whom we can take to these sites. They are the ones that the Council of Spirits selects, they can come out here and interpret the sacred…They can tell us precisely without digging or moving a stone what those sites were for, who is even buried there, about when they were buried there (Darlene Speidel, Lakota Traditional Person).

To traditional First Nations people, spiritual explanations are as valid as, if not more valid than, logical empiricist explanations because they are founded within "lifeway, belief and tradition" (Rhodd 1993: 56). It is this grounding within time, place, and practice—this connection with context and situation—that makes these explanations relevant to First Nations even if they are not relevant to archaeologists.

When First Nations proclaim landforms, features, or sites to be sacred in ways that are not obviously relevant to archaeology, they are using these processes of reclaiming, renaming, and reclassifying to assert their priority as original inhabitants of the land. They are validating themselves as people with history and culture. Although there may indeed be some element of political opportunism, against which both sides have to guard, archaeologists should remember that these claims to the sacred are attempts to answer questions and needs that are very different from archaeologists' questions and needs. Archaeologists' secular interpretation need not be seen as a contradiction or denial of First Nations' sacred interpretation, nor should the sacred ascription be seen to violate scientific classifications because they do not serve the same purpose.

In theory, peaceful, even co-operative, co-existence of archaeology and First Nations is possible. In practice, the situation becomes complicated when third parties such as development projects are involved. For these third parties, "sacred" is a liability because it removes their property from the commodity market. At this point, archaeologists find themselves becoming a middle ground, or sometimes a battleground, upon which these conflicting views are played out. It is a situation in which there is no neutral position. But rather than taking one side or the other, archaeology can become one of the players in the development of a consensual process that brings together all these parties. A consensual process is not a quick solution, but it is essential to building a firm foundation of trust and respect that will lead to discussion and resolution of apparently conflicting interests.

In Saskatchewan, we have recently seen the beginning of such a consensual process that will eventually lead to an agreement concerning the management of a region that is sacred to the Cree and that contains extensive oil and gas reserves. The petroleum industry, the Cree, and local heritage associations are involved in this process, and all concerned see advantages and benefits in ensuring that the process is successful.

If we are to make wise decisions in resource management, we need to understand better what First Nations people mean when they speak of the sacred. What nuances of meaning and cultural significance are we losing in the translation of a First Nations language into English/French? Although I cannot claim to have the answer, I am starting to see clues that suggest some of the nuances.

Clue 1: "Secret and sacred knowledge"

At the 1992 SAPA workshop, Tony Sand and Norbert Jabeau consistently used the word "secret" instead of "sacred." I'm not sure if that is a more correct gloss than "sacred" is for what a Cree speaker intends, but it has interesting suggestions for the interconnectedness of object, power, and knowledge.

I have found in my experience in Saskatchewan that there is definitely a protocol for accessing information. Some information may be in the public domain, and may be easily accessed via an appropriate request or gift. But much information must be earned in culturally appropriate ways, and therefore is not generally or widely accessible. I was bluntly instructed in the restricted nature of this information when I attempted to initiate a discussion about repatriation of culturally sensitive objects at a co-management workshop in early 1996. Joe Opwam, an elder from Sweetgrass Reserve, explained that the reason they did not want to discuss this in an open forum was because there were people present who had not earned the right to hear the information they needed to discuss. They would discuss it only amongst themselves and then tell us of their decision.

Anyone used to working in scientific research will feel uncomfortable with this restricted access to information because it appears to contravene one of the unwritten principles of science, namely that everything is subject to study and investigation, that nothing may remain "secret/sacred." It also contravenes one of our cultural values, namely that in the democratization of our culture all things, including knowledge, are available to all people.

Clue 2: "Sacredness is often an intangible aspect of the past"
Sacredness may not be solely a factor of any tangible or empirical aspect, or of any presumed or intended function of the object or site itself; rather, sacredness may arise out of the historical, cultural, or personal associations of the item of place.

> The Elders wanted the spirituality in place before all else. It [Wanuskewin] was a gathering place before treaties, that's why we consider it a very spiritual place (Senator Ernest Mike, Cree Elder).

The sense I get from this is that sacredness is an attribute that an object or place can acquire, not necessarily or solely through intent in its original construction, but also through its use and association (cf. Evans 1985). The object when originally made, or the site when originally occupied, may not have been decreed to be sacred then. For today's First Nations, however, the association of that object or site to ancestors is sacred; therefore, the object or site itself assumes the quality of that association, namely sacredness.

Clue 3: "Sacredness is not a static state of being"
> Any place within this Mother Earth has the potential to become a sacred site. It could be something that happens today. We have to keep an open mind and allow for those thing as well (Darlene Speidel, Lakota Traditional Person).

In theory, this dynamic and fluid state should not be a difficult one for us to understand and to accept. After all, our theoretical, methodological, and evidential training as archaeologists focuses on cultural change through both time and space. In practice, it disturbs because it violates our classification systems and our resource management plans which are the epitome of staticness and rigidity. It challenges our understanding, our world view, and our assumed power to define. Even though the definition and content of a sacred relationship with the land may mean different things to different people, nevertheless it is as real and as much a factor in the lives of traditional First Nations people as technology is in ours. If we can accept technological change as a constant factor in our lives, how can we deny comparable changes in sacred relationships with landscape in the lives of others?

Clue 4: "Sacredness" has as much to do with the future as it does with the past.
> Our young people, the young generation today…a lot of them are in the dark. A whole lot of them are in the dark. We have to teach them, though. We have a lot of values we can share with one another everyday (Lawrence Tobacco, Cree Elder).

Many of today's First Nations youth face a bleak future (see Pelly-Landrie 1993). I have listened to them talk about their experiences as alcoholics, drug users, and prison inmates. Their route back to sobriety and self-esteem has been through the traditional teachings of their people, teachings that have put them in touch with the sacred in themselves and around them.
By proclaiming and reclaiming the sacred in the landscape around them, the elders are providing a physical and conceptual landscape that will help their young people reclaim the sacred within themselves. The sacredness of places and sites reflects not only the elders' perception of the past, but also their understanding of the unity of past, present, and future. We see the connection among past, present, and future as a one-way linear progression—we have to understand the past if we want to understand the present and future. The elders, on the other hand, may see this as a two-way or circular relationship: not only do you lose the future if you lose the past, but also if you do not have a future you soon will not have a past either.
I do not present these four clues as First Nations' teachings. They represent, instead, my attempt to grapple with a concept that is obviously not part of my profession's classification system or world view. It is an attempt to translate a concept I do not yet completely understand into words and concepts that I can understand.
How then do we use this concept of the landscape-as-sacred collaboratively (contrapuntally) with our own concepts of landscape? We must remember that we cannot develop even the strat-

egy in isolation; it must be done collaboratively with First Nations.[5]

A place to begin would be a re-examination our resource management schemes, including both the criteria by which we assess the value of sites and our site classification itself. Economic considerations appear to be paramount, since site preservation usually has to be evaluated in terms of tourism potential or some other economic spin-off that will justify the scientific and cultural significance. We also need to acknowledge a far more diffuse class of culturally significant area, possibly comparable to the U.S. National Park Service category of traditional cultural property. Such land, which is eligible to be included in the National Register, is protected because of its historical and cultural association (Jones 1993: 162) and not because it contains a site, at least as we know sites.

We also need to expand our understanding and awareness of the landscape so that we can become attuned to non-material significance. This does not involve New Age proclivities to read energies or vibes. It requires a familiarity and sensitivity to all aspects of the landscape, not just archaeological manifestations, and a respect for the history of the land and for the people who have lived upon the land. This also requires a certain amount of humility, recognizing that this knowledge of the history of the land is maintained by authorities outside the discipline of archaeology.

Rather than hope for the day when landscape and sites will once again be relegated to categories that suit our resource management agenda, we should seize this opportunity to revise archaeological practice so that it ensures the continuation of the future as well as of the past. It would answer a very real need; it would make archaeology relevant in a way that producing "generalizing laws of human behaviour" never could.

A CODE OF ETHICS AS A PHILOSOPHY OF ACTION

The title of this chapter—"We can go a long way together, hand-in-hand"—is borrowed from Noah Cardinal, one of the elders who participated in the 1992 SAPA workshop. It reflects the spirit of co-operation and accommodation that is required if archaeologists and First Nations are to work together. It also points out to us the benefits of that approach.

The SAPA workshops of 1992 and 1994 demonstrated that archaeologists and First Nations have a common concern for the preservation and interpretation of the past. The difficulty arises in trying to reconcile different attitudes and values, not only about the past and what it comprises but also in how the past is incorporated into the present and the future. The challenge is one of learning how to work together in spite of these differences, something that is incumbent upon both archaeologists and First Nations.

This future course of action will require some radical rethinking of archaeological attitudes, values, and practices. At the same time, it does not mean abandoning the scientific principles upon which archaeological method and theory are currently based. Neither following the ethic of informed consent nor making our research relevant to First Nations limits our ability to pursue the scientific method; rather, it expands our view both of what we do and what its significance is. Writing archaeological history contrapuntally will not limit the history that we write; it will enrich it. SAPA affirmed this process when it adopted its Code of Ethics and began sponsoring workshops with elders. The workshops have begun to have some influence on Saskatchewan archaeologists. Not only do they have more confidence about approaching elders, but also some are beginning to follow First Nations protocols when they request information and assistance. The CAA has also affirmed this process with its Code of Ethics.

I would see few conflicts arising if it were simply a matter of archaeologists and First Nations working out a strategy to implement this new philosophy. The rub is that this course of action will bring us out of the cloistered halls of science and more overtly and explicitly into the political arena where we will have to include the agenda of other parties (developers and governments, for example) as we develop new frameworks for interaction. The rationality and objectivity of science is not necessarily the appropriate philosophical basis for making sound decisions on these matters. This is where a Code of Ethics is so vitally important.

---

[5] This may seem obvious, but sometimes the obvious needs stating.

The Code of Ethics should address more than "how to do" archaeology; it should address why we do it. Archaeologists are not alone in confusing what we do with why we do it (see Weil 1990 for a discussion on function vs. purpose in museums). Why do we discover general laws of human behaviour? What do we do with this knowledge? Who benefits? I think we are beginning to realize that what we desperately need are ethical guidelines that will help us use this knowledge wisely. In fact, this is probably the most important issue that the CAA Code of Ethics could address.

Stan Rowe, who has written extensively on the theme of humans as part of the landscape, believes that knowledge should become the foundation for wise actions "guided by the old-fashioned but indispensable ideal of equality and justice as well as by the new-fashioned insights of ecological harmony, conservation and attention to securing a sustained environment" (1993: 135). For archaeologists, that means our knowledge and our Codes of Ethics should guide the way we work with others to create consensus out of the apparently conflicting cultural paradigms that view archaeological sites and the landscape as resources and commodities on the one hand, and as maps of cultural identity and human-land relationships on the other. The challenge is no longer merely an issue of learning how to work together, or even of developing a common understanding of what is in the best interests of both archaeologists and First Nations. The challenge is to develop an ethic that is in the best interests of the cultural heritage of which all of us are a part. Perhaps then we will be able to provide a satisfactory answer to the question that young man from Sweetgrass posed twenty years ago.

REFERENCES CITED

Albright, S.
    1992 A Working Woman Needs a Good Toolkit. Paper presented at 25th Annual Meeting, Canadian Archaeological Association, London, Ontario.
Akenson, D.
    1990 *At Face Value: The Life and Times of Eliza McCormack/John White*. McGill-Queens University Press.
Allan, P.
    1992 What was Lost? A Response from the Northeastern Sector of the Micmac Culture Area. Paper presented at 25th Annual Meeting, Canadian Archaeological Association, London, Ontario.
Ames, M.
    1994 The Politics of Difference: Other Voices in a Not Yet Post-Colonial World. *Museum Anthropology* 18(3): 9-17.
Barnard, A., and J. Woodburn
    1991 Property, Power, and Ideology in Hunting and Gathering Societies: An Introduction. In *Hunters and Gatherers 2: Property, Power and Ideology*, edited by T. Ingold, D. Riches and J. Woodburn, pp. 4-31. Berg, Providence, RI.

Binford, L. R.
    1972 *An Archaeological Perspective.* Seminar Press, New York.
CAA Committee on Aboriginal Heritage: Prairie Regional Committee
    1993 Minutes of October, 1993, meeting.
Cardinal, H.
    1969 *The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada's Indians.* Hurtig, Edmonton.
Clarke, D. L.
    1972 *Models in Archaeology.* Methuen, London.
    1977 *Spatial Archaeology.* Academic Press, New York.
    1979 *Analytical Archaeology.* Academic Press, New York.
Cosgrove, D.
    1984 *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape.* Croom Helm, London.
Cruikshank, J.
    1991 *Dän Dhá Ts'edenintth'é— Reading Voices: Oral and Written Interpretations of the
    Yukon's Past.* Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.
Cruikshank, J. (with A. Sidney, K. Smith, and A. Ned)
    1990 *Life Lived like a Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Native Elders.* University of British
    Columbia Press.
Deloria, V., Jr.
    1970 *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto.* Avon, New York.
Dormaar, J. and B. O. K. Reeves
    1993 Vision Quest Sites in Southern Alberta and Northern Montana. In *Kunaitupii: Coming
    Together on Native Sacred Sites, Their Sacredness, Conservation and Interpretation*, edited
    by B.O.K. Reeves and M. A. Kennedy, pp. 162-178. Archaeological Society of Alberta.
Dunn, M.
    1991 "My Grandfather is not an Artifact": A Report on the Aboriginal Archaeological
    Heritage Symposium, February 17-18, 1991, Hull, Quebec. Prepared for Archaeology
    Heritage Branch, Department of Communications.
Evans, C.
    1985 Tradition and the Cultural Landscape: An Archaeology of Place. *Archaeological
    Review from Cambridge* 4(1): 80-94
Finnigan, J. T.
    1989 Perceptions, Policy, and the Growth of Professionalism in Saskatchewan Archaeology.
    Journal of Field Archaeology 16: 236-239.
Gathercole, P. And D. Lowenthal (editors)
    1990 *The Politics of the Past.* Unwin Hyman, London.
Gero, J. and M. Conkey (editors)
    1991 *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory.* Basil Blackwood, Oxford.
Hanna, Margaret and Terry Gibson
    1992 Trespassing into the Past: A Report on a Workshop between Cree Elders and
    Archaeologists. Paper presented at 26th Annual Meeting, Canadian Archaeological
    Association, London.
Hoare, T., C. Levy, and M. P. Robinson
    1993 Participatory Action Research in Native Communities: Cultural Opportunities and
    Legal Implications. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 13: 43-68.
Hodder, I.
    1987 *Archaeology as Long-Term History.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Indian Chiefs of Alberta
    1970 Citizens Plus. Indian Association of Alberta.
Jones, T. E.H.
    1993 "The Inland Country of Good Report": Protecting and Preserving Our Land Heritage.
    In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's "Inland Country of Good Report,"* edited by
    H. Epp, pp. 158-172. Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina.
Kelley, J. H. and M. Hanen
    1988 *Archaeology and the Methodology of Science.* University of New Mexico Press,
    Albuquerque.

Mandelbaum, D.
     1979 The Plains Cree: An Ethnographic, Historical, and Comparative Study. *Canadian Plains Studies* No. 9. Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina.
McDonald, E.
     1992 The Application of Oral History Studies to Archaeological Master Plans for First Nations. Paper given at 25th Annual Meeting, Canadian Archaeological Association, London.
McGimsey, C. R., III
     1989 International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 16: 239-241.
Meinig, D. (editor)
     1979 *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays.* Oxford University Press, New York.
Patterson, T. C.
     1990 Some Theoretical Tensions Within and Between the Processual and Post-processual Archaeologies. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9: 189-200.
Pardoe, C.
     1991 Eye of the Storm. *Journal of Indigenous Studies* 2(1): 16-23.
Pelly-Landrie, L.
     1993 First Nations Cultures, Now and In the Future. In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's "Inland Country of Good Report,"* edited by H. Epp, pp. 177-185. Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina.
Porteous, J.D.
     1990 *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense and Metaphor.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Ramsay, C. L.
     1994 Saskatchewan Association of Professional Archaeologists, Aboriginal and Archaeology Workshop, March 26, 1994, Wanuskewin Heritage Park, Saskatoon. Report submitted to Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation, Regina.
Renfrew, C.
     1979 *Problems in European Prehistory.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Rhodd, B. K.
     1993 Native American Burials: A Native American Archaeologist's Perspective. In *Kunaitupii: Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites, Their Sacredness, Conservation and Interpretation*, edited by B.O.K. Reeves and M. A. Kennedy, pp 55-57. Archaeological Society of Alberta.
Rowe, S.
     1990 *Home Place: Essays on Ecology.* NeWest, Edmonton.
Rudin, R.
     1992 Revisionism and the Search for a Normal Society: A Critique of Recent Quebec Historical Writing. *Canadian Historical Review* 73: 30-61.
Said, E.W.
     1994 *Culture and Imperialism.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
Saskatchewan Association of Professional Archaeologists
     1990 Code of Ethics. Saskatoon.
Scribe, B.
     1993 Two Sites on the Big Tiger Geoform: Pinewwatchi and Wapitisakahtaw. Paper presented at 1993 APALA Conference, Saskatoon.
Shanks, M. and C. Tiley
     1987a *Re-constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
     1987b *Social Theory and Archaeology.* Polity Press, Oxford.
Spector, Janet D.
     1993 *What this Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village.* Minnesota Historical Society Press, St. Paul.

Spurling, B. E. and E. G. Walker
    1987 The Fort Qu'Appelle Burial Site: A Canadian Controversy. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 14: 481-486.
Sullivan, A. P.
    1978 Inference and Evidence in Archaeology: A Discussion of the Conceptual Problems. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 1: 183-222. Academic Press.
Trigger, B. G.
    1980 Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45: 662-676.
    1983 American Archaeology as Native History: A Review Essay. *William and Mary Quarterly* (s.3) 40: 413-452.
    1984 Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man* (n.s.) 19: 355-370.
    1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
Ucko, P.J.
    1990 Foreword. In *The Politics of the Past*, edited by P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, pp. ix-xxi. Unwin Hyman, London.
Vitebsky, P.
    1993 Is Death the Same Everywhere? Contexts of Knowing and Doubting. In *An Anthropological Critique of Development: The Growth of Ignorance*, edited by M. Hobart, pp.100-115. Routledge, New York.
Walde, D. and N. D. Willows (editors)
    1991 *The Archaeology of Gender. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference.* The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary.
Warren, K. J.
    1989 A Philosophical Perspective on the Ethics and Resolution of Cultural Property Issues. In *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Culture? Whose Property?*, edited by P.M. Messenger, pp. 1-26. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
Weaver, S. M.
    1981 *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda, 1968-70.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Weil, S. E.
    1990 *Rethinking the Museum and Other Meditations*. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
Wickwire, W. and M. M'Gonigle
    1991 The Queen's People: Ethnography or Appropriation? *Native Studies Review* 7(2): 97-113.
Widdis, R. W.
    1993 Saskatchewan: The Present Cultural Landscape. In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's "Inland Country of Good Report"*, edited by H. Epp, pp.142-157. Canadian Plains Research Centre, Regina.
Willey, G. R. and P. Phillips
    1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
Wylie, A.
    1991 Gender Theory and the Archaeological Record. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by M. W. Conkey and J. M. Gero, pp. 31-54. Blackwell, Oxford.
    1993 Facts and Fictions: Writing Archaeology in a Different Voice. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 17: 5-12.