

## Education and Empowerment: Archaeology With, For, and By the Shuswap Nation, British Columbia

George P. Nicholas

As an archaeologist and anthropologist, I have long had an interest in Indigenous peoples, particularly those peoples we characterize as hunter-gatherers, past and present. Part of this interest is obviously professional as most of the world's archaeological record was produced by hunter-gatherers; those traditional societies like the Gagadju, !Kung, and Netsilik that have survived to this century more or less intact provide valuable clues to interpreting the past. But this interest in these peoples and their way of life need not have any practical applications—just an appreciation of the “wonderful diversity of life [that] is the true legacy of humankind” (Nicholas 1991: 6).

Unfortunately, few Indigenous peoples remain untouched by westernization today: the Kayapo are under threat of multinational corporations building dams on the Xingu River; television has reached into Arctic communities; there are tourists at (and sometimes on) Uluru (Ayers Rock); and there is golf course construction on burial grounds across North America. We are all saddened by the increasingly rapid loss of the traditional lifeways of those societies that Julian Berger (1990) has eloquently referred to as First Peoples. Each issue of *Survival* or *Cultural Survival Quarterly* brings reports of new threats and new problems facing these people.

How can we learn from this rapidly escalating situation and act to preserve the cultural diversity that is such an important part of our global human heritage? As anthropologists, we are in a position both to help these people make their own voices be heard, and to help them develop the ability to retain or regain control over their own lives and land—two basic human rights. There is a number of avenues available through applied anthropology (Chambers 1989; van Willigen 1993); in fact, the Fall 1991 issue of *Cultural Survival Quarterly* was devoted to what can be done to help Indigenous peoples. Education is one powerful tool of empowerment available to indigenous peoples worldwide; archaeology is ultimately another. This chapter addresses the interface between them,

The first part of this chapter concerns the evolving role that education and research have as potentially important components of cultural resource management on First Nations lands, and focuses on the First Nations-oriented educational program (Figure 1) that I have been involved with in Kamloops, British Columbia. The second part examines the growing role that archaeology has within the context of applied anthropology, and identifies certain problems confronting First Nations' understanding and application of archaeology. The chapter concludes with commentary on how archaeology and education may serve as tools of empowerment.

### EDUCATION AND RESEARCH AS CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

To many people, cultural resource management (CRM) remains synonymous with such terms as *consulting or contract archaeology* and sometimes even *rescue archaeology*. At one time or another, many of us have been employed doing just this through management studies for highway projects, gas lines, or housing developments, on a contractual or full-time basis. And occasionally we have even found ourselves at the wrong end of a bulldozer.

There is much more to cultural resource management than this, however, and archaeology represents only one approach. Cultural resource management is currently very broad in scope, and rightly so, given its general mandate. Today the task of resource managers ranges from developing and implementing heritage legislation to predictive modeling to determining resource significance to developing Geographic Information Systems applications. In addition, resource managers now are concerned not only with identifying and protecting archaeological sites but with identifying and protecting traditional use sites that may have no archaeological signature.



Figure 1. Es re tsíq-le7cw es e sxepqenwéns le tseuwet.-s le q'es te qelmeucw. "Digging around in the ground to find out the activity of the old people" (Shuswap with English translation by Dwight Gardiner and Mona Jules (pers. comm. 1995). (Photo: G. Nicholas)

Finally, they are charged with managing resources that are deemed significant (see Cleere 1989; Kerber 1994; Smith and Ehrenhard 1991 for examples), and also with identifying those sites representative of past cultural behavior (Thomas 1989: 426-429; also Nicholas 1994: 39).

Regardless of the strategy, the identification, evaluation, interpretation, and protection of archaeological and other cultural resources is most effectively done before specific projects are off the drawing board. Education is an important area of CRM often overlooked, yet it addresses many of long-term problems that resource managers face, particularly those relating to site preservation and evaluation of site significance. Too often sites are destroyed simply because no one knew of them. A more pervasive problem is that members of the public in general, and specifically those in government agencies, land-use commissions, and development, remain unaware of site values or unconcerned about their preservation; alternately, they define significance in a relatively restrictive manner. In North America, this problem is exacerbated by the fact that most archaeological resources are not associated with the dominant society. The result is that federal, state, and provincial resource managers have had not only to act as guardians of the past on behalf of First Nations peoples and the rest of us, but increasingly had to contend with problems arising from different definitions of significance, and who determines it. "Who owns the past" is no longer merely a rhetorical question, but one with profound scientific, political, and nationalistic implications (see Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990; McBryde 1985).

Public education is a topic that, until recently, has not received much attention from the archaeological community. The current intensifying and expanding focus on education should exemplify the Indian Residential School policy in reverse—if you want to change how people behave, the most effective means is through the children. Much has been accomplished in terms of conferences and workshops (e.g., the 1995 Chacmool Conference), edited volumes (e.g., Green 1984; Layton 1989a; Smith and Ehrenhard 1991; Stone and MacKenzie 1990), teaching guides (Boutlier et al. 1992; Metcalf 1991; Morgan 1989; Moyar 1993; Rogge and Bell 1989),



Figure 2. View of the Chief Louis Centre, Kamloops Indian Reserve. Much of the work of the SCES-SFU Archaeology Field School has taken place on the high glaciolacustrine terraces visible in the background. (Photo: G. Nicholas)

and other reviews (e.g., Auel 1991; Emmott 1989; Feder 1990). The Public Education Committee of the Society for American Archaeology even publishes a quarterly publication, *Archaeology and Public Education*. Similar publications are the National Museum of Natural History's bulletin for teachers, *Anthro Notes*, and St. Mary's University's *Teaching Anthropology*.

When linked to archaeology, education is also an important tool for indigenous peoples in general (Gawe and Meli 1990; Blancke and Slow Turtle 1990; Deloria 1992; Layton 1989b; O'Reagan 1980). Former archaeologist Stephen Lawhead (pers. comm. 1994) observed that almost one-third of his first year law school class at the University of British Columbia were Aboriginal. In archaeology, we are seeing something similar, albeit at a much smaller scale. As the first Native in Canada to hold a Master's Degree in Archaeology (Simon Fraser University, 1994), Eldon Yellowhorn, a member of the Piegan Nation, has not only become a local celebrity, but a role model for Native *and* non-Native students.

Adaptation is a predominantly local phenomenon—a tenet widely cited in evolutionary studies. This is true for the discipline of archaeology as it responds to the various challenges it now faces. In the same way that people respond to changing circumstances by intensifying production or moving to new areas, so too must archaeologists, cultural resource managers, and both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous publics respond to the new circumstances relating to community politics, to existing heritage policies, and to the values and perceptions of legislators and voters. One example of how the discipline is responding to First Peoples needs is revealed in those educational programs, research projects, and resource management strategies through which archaeology is being done with, for, and by the Secwepemc people in British Columbia. It has been within this context that I, as archeologist and anthropologist, have been able to make a contribution to Indigenous peoples and, in turn, have benefitted in many ways.

### The Secwepemc and Secwepemc Archaeology

The Secwepemc,<sup>1</sup> more commonly known as the Shuswap, are an Interior Salish people of south-central British Columbia (Ignace 1995). The Secwepemc territory is centered on the Fraser River and the North and South Thompson Rivers. Of the 17 extant bands that comprise the Secwepemc, the largest in both population and land base is the Kamloops Band, whose reserve is located adjacent to the municipality of Kamloops. The Kamloops Reserve has been a center for Secwepemc activity for thousands of years; today it includes both the Kamloops Indian Band and Shuswap Nation Tribal Council offices, as well as numerous agencies and programs (Figure 2). This reserve was also the location of a residential School in which traditional cultural and language was replaced with a Catholic/Euro-Canadian equivalent (Haig-Brown 1988). In 1982, as an expression of Secwepemc cultural renewal and commitment, all 17 member bands signed the Shuswap Cultural Declaration, whose mandate included the preservation and perpetuation of the Shuswap language, culture, and history, and which led directly to the formation of the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society [SCES] the following year.

Anthropologists have been involved with the Secwepemc for more than a century through some of its earliest practitioners in the region (Boas 1890; Dawson 1891; Teit 1909). Archaeology has also had a long history on the Kamloops Indian Reserve. At the turn of the century, Harlan Smith (1909) was there doing some of the earliest archaeology in the province as part of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition. What characterizes this and more recent work in the region is that it has essentially been archaeology of the Shuswap primarily for a non-Shuswap audience. Much of the archaeology done on the Kamloops Reserve proper in the past two decades, however, has been done with the cooperation of, and to the direct benefit of, the Kamloops Indian Band, which has not only been supportive of archaeology in general, but notably has funded both inventory and mitigative archaeology projects for a variety of Band-initiated projects on the reserve (e.g., Richards and Rousseau 1982; Rousseau and Richards 1991). The Kamloops Band has also turned to archaeology in their successful attempt to regain Scheidam Flats, a small parcel of land located near the center of the reserve, where perhaps more archaeology has been done by more archaeologists (often at the same time) than most other parts of British Columbia as the result of litigation. All of this is in sharp contrast to the City of Kamloops, which appears to have little interest in the preservation of even its own historic period resources beyond such superficial activities as "Rangeland Days."

The Secwepemc Museum, as one facet of SCES, has been involved with archaeology in the context of public education. The Secwepemc Archaeological Heritage Park, which incorporates a large prehistoric pithouse village, was planned in consultation with archaeologist Mike Rousseau, for example. This innovative park includes full-scale reconstructions of the different pithouse types known (Figure 3) and a walkway that provides access to the archaeological house pits (Figure 4). As part of current and future Secwepemc Museum programs, this park has an important role in making both school children and adult visitors aware of what the past holds for them. The Museum serves as a cultural repository for all Secwepemc people, with photographic archives, audio recordings of elders, extensive ethnobotanical collections, and archaeological materials. The Museum also maintains the archaeological site inventory for the Reserve.

Collaborative projects between archaeologists and such institutions as this provide a solution to a serious problem facing us. One reason why archaeologists have problems with site protection is that, as a profession, we often neglect to translate our research goals and results into a format accessible and understandable to the public. Collectively we do too little in the way of education, primarily because there's no time or energy left after we have completed the fieldwork, analysis, and report writing. However, by developing a working relationship with a museum—by definition oriented to the public—we may be able to do our work and have it presented to the public by individuals trained to do just that.

### The Secwepemc Cultural Education Society/Simon Fraser University Program

In 1989, a collaborative educational program was initiated between the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society and Simon Fraser University [SCES-SFU] to establish a Native-administered, Native-run, post-secondary educational institute on the Kamloops Indian Reserve in Kamloops.

<sup>1</sup> As used here, *Secwepemc* refers to this interior Salishan people both today and in the past, while *Shuswap* refers only to the modern society.

The program was designed to:

- enhance the quality of life of Native people;
- preserve, protect, interpret and promote their history, language, and culture; and
- provide research and developmental opportunities to enable Native people to control their own affairs and destiny.

Since 1991, this institution has become increasingly involved with archaeology and cultural resource management as means to meet these goals.

Ironically, the SCES-SFU<sup>2</sup> program was initially housed in the formal residential school building where Shuswap culture was once being erased. Currently, the program offers a Bachelor of General Studies and Bachelor of Arts degrees, with a majors in Anthropology, Sociology, and Archaeology; minors in First Nations Studies, linguistics; archaeology, business administration, and criminology; and several certificate programs. Over 100 lower and upper-level university courses are offered each year, as well as several graduate courses. The program continues to expand and now has over 250 registered students. In 1993, the program was awarded the Canadian Association of University's Continuing Education's Award for Excellence. In 1994 we hosted the 4th B.C. Archaeology Forum where archaeologists, academics, and provincial and First Nations representatives gathered to discuss current events and issues affecting archaeology in the province (Fedema 1994).

Over the past seven years I have been privileged to be part of this program, teaching archaeology and anthropology to Native students in the classroom and in the field. My involvement has proved to be a valuable experience at both personal and professional levels. Prior to moving to British Columbia, I had been associated with the American Indian Archaeological Institute, an education and research center in Connecticut strongly oriented to illuminating Native American cultures in contemporary, historic, and prehistoric contexts (e.g., Handsman 1988, 1989; Handsman and Williamson 1989; McMullen and Handsman 1987). Native communities in New England are relatively small, widely dispersed, and to a large part, invisible; we worked to make them visible. Ironically, my own work as an archaeologist investigating early postglacial archaeology limited my interaction with the native communities. It was not until moving to British Columbia that I finally came into close contact with the people I had long been interested in. Learning to interact with members of another culture, however, which anthropologists are supposed to be good at, is something that most archaeologists have had little first-hand experience with (see below).

Virtually from the start, archaeology has been an important component of the SCES-SFU program. Degree-related options include a Major, Minor, and Extended Minor in Archaeology. Fourteen different archaeology courses are offered, most on a regular basis, ranging from introductory courses on method and theory, to regional overviews, to advanced courses in Lithic Technology, Prehistoric Human Ecology, and Archaeological Theory. In addition, we try to customize standard courses or develop new ones pertinent to our students and the larger Native community.

An example of one course modified to meet the needs of our program is ARCH 386—Archaeological Resource Management. Our version introduces students to an in-depth and *globally oriented* examination of the problems of, and solutions to, the management of archaeological and cultural resources, particularly from the perspective of Indigenous peoples. Case studies on the management of archaeological resources in Australia, for example, or on such culturally sensitive issues as reburial and repatriation elsewhere can provide new ways of looking at problems here. Seminar guest speakers have included Chief Manny Jules (Kamloops Indian Band) and Brian Apland (B.C. Provincial Archaeologist). A related course developed specifically for this program, ARCH 334—Archaeology for Educators, is oriented to those students in our program who have a strong interest in archaeology, but plan to pursue a career as teachers at all grade levels. The earlier the value of the past is passed on to children, the stronger and more flexible cultural resource protection strategies will become. This course thus represents a type of cultural resource management that will prove very effective in the long run, providing it can be offered widely and regularly.

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1996 the Simon Fraser University program became a component of the Secwepemc Education Institute, which is one arm of the Secwepemc Cultural Education Institute. I retain the use of the SCES-SFU association for this paper.



Figure 3. Secwepemc Archaeological Heritage Park: Reconstructed pithouses. (Photo: G. Nicholas)

#### The SCES-SFU Archaeology Field School

In addition to course work, additional training in archaeology is available through our archaeology field school, which recently completed its seventh consecutive year. The field school has focused on site survey, testing, and evaluation—skills clearly important to First Nations as they become increasingly involved in resource management. The field school has also had a strong research orientation. Research is an important component of both education and cultural resource management since it is concerned foremost with finding out about things, not just passing on knowledge. To some degree, it is as important to know *how* you know what you do, as it is *what* you know. Students need become both proficient in archaeological method and theory *and* more critical thinkers.

With the field school, our work has been directed in part by my own research on long-term land use and human ecology (see Nicholas 1988), with its focus on the early Holocene period. Much of our field work has thus been directed to three important areas of research that complement and extend previous archaeological research in the region:

- Systematic survey and testing for early postglacial prehistoric sites, dating to between about 10,500 and 6000 years ago, on high glacial lake terraces along the Thompson River valley—work that will contribute to a better understanding of the poorly known Early Period in the southern interior of British Columbia;
- Investigation of long-term patterns of land use to determine how prehistoric peoples utilized the different landscapes that developed within the Thompson River Valley in different ways over the last 10,000 years; and
- Examination of non-pithouse archaeological sites. The archaeology of the southern interior is dominated by the pithouse villages of the late Holocene. Fieldwork directed to other types of sites will provide a more representative view of the range of lifeways once present.

In addition to the above research goals, our field studies have been integrated into a three-year interdisciplinary study funded by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council project on Traditional and Prehistoric Secwepemc Plant Use and Ecology. The project investigators, Dr.

Nancy Turner, Dr. Marianne Ignace, Dr. Harriet Kuhnlein, Chief Ron Ignace, and myself, are examining:

- traditional ecological knowledge and its influences on sustainable plant harvesting and processing;
- nutritional and pharmacological properties of traditional Secwepemc plant foods and medicines;
- botanical and linguistic evidence for the origins of prehistoric movements of Secwepemc peoples; and
- the archaeological evidence of the antiquity of these sustainable practices and the role of plant resources in the development of the Plateau culture.

In addition to its interdisciplinary format, this project also involves many Secwepemc elders and community members. Their involvement may help to define types of resource areas poorly represented by archaeological sites (where certain types of traditional use are invisible). Projects such as this represent an important link between cultural and natural resource management.

Along with its research orientation, the SCES-SFU Archaeology Field School has also been involved with cultural heritage projects on behalf of the Shuswap people. Our participation in the projects described below, done entirely on a goodwill basis, provides us with the means to help the Shuswap meet their land-use needs, as well as to introduce our students to the very real demands of mitigative archaeology and to the rewards and frustrations that are part of cultural resource management.

### Archaeological Problems and Prospects

The SCES-SFU Program and others like it have accomplished much in terms of meeting the educational needs of First Nations. For our part, we are confident that our graduates, whether they go on to careers as farmers, educators, or Band councilors, carry with them knowledge that will someday be used as tools by their home communities. This is especially so for those involved in the archaeology program, many of whom have gone on to full or part-time employment for such organizations as the Kamloops Indian Band, the Kwanlin Dün First Nation, and the B.C. Ministry of Small Business, Tourism, and Culture and for consulting archaeology companies. SCES-SFU alumni are also pursuing graduate studies in archaeology and anthropology.

Naturally, there are growing pains associated not only with new institutions but also relationships, such as between First Nations peoples and archaeology. Some relate to cultural differences that we, as educators, need to be sensitive to. Certain problems stem from the fact that First Nations peoples historically have been educationally disadvantaged,<sup>3</sup> a problem only seriously addressed in recent years. Despite the apparent degree of acculturation in many Native communities, there remain some important distinctions. For example, occasional student absences in the SCES-SFU program due to family crises are more common than I've encountered elsewhere. In most academic settings, students invariably miss classes or exams due to family crises, such as a death in the immediate family. In contrast, Native students may miss classes not only when there is a death in their immediate (or more distant) family, but also when a relative is ill and needs their care, or when they need to spend time with the family of a recently deceased relative. The death of a community elder means that many students will be absent.

In terms of issues relating to archaeology, we would like to see an integrated approach to CRM develop between SCES-SFU, the Kamloops Indian Band, the Secwepemc Museum, and the Shuswap Nation. Many of the components *are* in place, and there is much interaction between them, but we still lack a formal structure to pull everything together in a on-going, consistent manner. There are still too many gaps for sites to fall into, as illustrated in 1994 when a newly discovered site on the Kamloops Indian Reserve was threatened and later destroyed by road-widening work. To address such problems and other issues relating to heritage preservation, the Kamloops Band, working with several archaeologists, has recently developed a comprehensive

---

<sup>3</sup> I mean this within the context of Euro-Canadian, classroom-based teaching; traditional forms of education are no less important. Teaching Native students within their own community often requires a more informal, seminar-style approach: as many instructors discover, a lecture style successful in large college or university classes may fail with smaller classes.



Figure 4. Secwepemc Archaeological Heritage Park: Walkway around pithouse village. (Photo: G. Nicholas)

archaeological resource policy.<sup>4</sup>

There are also potential problems for cultural resource management programs as the result of band politics. This has not proved a noticeable problem on the Kamloops Indian Reserve. While there is naturally some dissension over certain issues within the community, the archaeology program continues to receive strong support from the Band Council and the Shuswap people. There are, however, those people who remain wary of archaeologists, and unconvinced of their contributions. Also, some Native interest groups are openly opposed to any archaeology that is perceived to threaten their interests, as exemplified by the recent correspondence between the Shuswap Nation Tribal Council and the Canadian Archaeological Association concerning archaeologists working for forestry companies (Matthew 1995; David Pokotylo, pers. comm. 1995).

It is also important to expose archaeology students to many different value systems. In both 1993 and 1995, the SCES-SFU field school was run as a joint venture with the University College of the Cariboo, with Dr. Catherine Carlson. This cooperative approach was designed both to allow Native and non-Native students to work together (Figure 5), and to rotate them through two very different projects. Dr. Carlson has been investigating the Contact period Native settlement associated with one of the first Hudson's Bay trading posts in the area to explore Native accommodation or resistance to Euro-Canadian influences (Carlson 1995), while my work has focused on past human ecosystems, as outlined above. Two teams were formed to work on these projects, each containing students from both institutions; halfway through the field season, the students changed sites.

What is important about involving First Nations people in archaeology is that they will provide different perspectives about the past and the role of archaeology. We encourage students in the SCES-SFU Program to think about issues such as these from the perspective of archaeological goals, resource management strategies, and Native cultural values. And we look forward to their innovative responses to this challenge. Non-Native archaeologists must also learn to look at the past in different ways as well. Continuing a tradition begun by Eldon Yellowhorn, my Teaching

<sup>4</sup> John Jules, an SCES-SFU Program alumnus and archaeology field school graduate, now works for the Kamloops Indian Band and has been involved in drafting the policy.



Assistant in 1992, each year we leave a tobacco offering before backfilling a site. Although my world view is different from that of the Secwepemc, the offering is given as an expression of respect for these people, both past and present, and of a continuing commitment to their heritage.

## ARCHAEOLOGY AS APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

Archaeology has often been portrayed as essentially an esoteric discipline, one apparently focused on finding artifacts and filling museum shelves. The endeavors of archaeologists are seen to satisfy the interest of the public at large, and to provide the academic world with grist for debating the details of life in the past, but, as its critics may argue, archaeology makes little or no real contribution to the present.

If archaeology were only about finding antiquities or providing glimpses of what life was like in the past, then its contributions would indeed be limited. But archaeology as a discipline long ago transcended the antiquarianism of the 19th century, and has achieved an understanding of cultural processes in the past, and of the social and natural factors that influence our interpretations of that past, through material culture, all of which is well respected by other disciplines. Archaeology also has great relevance today, and indeed represents a burgeoning area of applied anthropology, considered by many the fifth subdiscipline of anthropology. Applied anthropology has become an important means of identifying problems and offering solutions (e.g., Bodley 1988; Hansen 1993; Little et al. 1990), and thus is very relevant to Indigenous peoples worldwide, whether in terms of economic sustainability using traditional resources (DeWalt 1994; Halmo et al. 1993); restoring land rights and a land base (Elias 1993; Layton 1985), or improving the effectiveness of health care systems (Clark 1993).

In archaeology today, this trend is reflected by projects that use the past to the benefit of modern and future populations. Examples of these range from re-introducing traditional subsistence practices to increase food production today (Erickson 1992), to rethinking the factors influencing modern garbage discard and the effectiveness of landfills (Rathje and Murphy 1992), to challenging the notion that the Atlantic Salmon fishery can be restored to the productivity it had in the past (Carlson 1994). Projects such as these make a significant contribution to reducing population pressures; provide a more accurate understanding of the reality and future of urban waste problems; and can save taxpayers from funding expensive restoration projects that cannot succeed.

Archaeology is also becoming one of the most common forms of applied anthropology within the context of First Nations lands. Here we see that archaeology is serving a number of vital roles in such important areas of concern as:

- Nation (re-)building and self-discovery;
- Pursuit of land claims (e.g., by demonstrating cultural continuity and precedence);
- Discovery, preservation, and presentation of heritage sites significant to local communities;
- Evaluating site significance and mitigating the impact of current and future land use upon those sites;
- Employment opportunities (e.g., through fieldwork; interpretive centers; tourism);
- "Verification" or legitimization<sup>5</sup> of oral tradition within the Western legal system (although even this may not suffice, as in the Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en case);
- The writing of histories of Canada and other countries by First Nations historians, both academic and traditional;
- Demonstrating innovative responses of past populations to changing environmental and social circumstances in the past; and
- Providing First Nations peoples with vital skills and experience in doing archaeology themselves.

<sup>5</sup> Many Native people do not see this a necessary, as Tom Andrews notes (pers. comm., 1995): "The oral tradition does not need to be legitimized from the perspective of another culture. Indeed, the oral tradition cannot be 'verified' in many cases (see Denton, Ch. 7) as it is a metaphor. However archaeology and anthropology facilitate cross-cultural awareness and appreciation, and help translate Native culture into a form where it can be understood and appreciated more readily by our society."

Much of the work that we have done through the SCES-SFU Archaeology Program on the Kamloops Reserve integrates a research orientation with the immediate and future needs of the First Nations community and serves to address some of the roles noted above. The examples that follow involve Shuswap students working on their own ancestral sites; there are other notable approaches and projects elsewhere in Canada, the United States, and Mexico (e.g., Brumfiel 1994; Cinq-Mars and Pilon 1991; Nicks 1992; Pilon 1994; Spector 1994; TwoBears 1995).

#### **Examples of Applied Archaeology on the Kamloops Indian Reserve**

*Research as Applied Archaeology.* One application of our work is in defining and expanding the archaeological record on the Kamloops Indian Reserve. It thus augments earlier studies and addresses gaps in current knowledge by seeking a more representative view of site types, potential site locations, and a longer time frame. We have focused on identifying non-riverine sites and those of the early postglacial period, both of which are significantly underrepresented in the region. Our field studies have been conducted entirely within the reserve on glaciolacustrine terraces along the North Thompson River. Over 60 new archaeological sites have been identified, ranging from small, single-component sites to deeply stratified ones to large palimpsests representing millennia of intermittent occupation. Most of these relate to late Holocene occupations, but Middle Holocene sites are present, as are indications of earlier sites. A large number and variety of features have been identified, including presumed root roasting areas and bark-lined cache pits. Our work has also recovered extensive faunal and paleoethnobotanical remains, through excavation and flotation, to provide information on long-term cultural ecology and greater resolution in the local archaeological record. This work thus contributes to a better understanding of the earliest history of the Kamloops area, of direct interest to the First Nations community since it is Secwepemc history.

*Archaeology Field School-Kamloops Indian Band Applications.* In 1991, at the request of the Kamloops Indian Band, we investigated two non-pithouse sites located within the proposed Chief Louis Cultural and Governmental Centre, both of which would be adversely impacted by development. Testing adjacent to a former channel of the Thompson River revealed a large mussel shell midden and occupation zone under approximately one meter of historic fill, providing information on a riverine-oriented lifeway perhaps 3000-4000 years old. Work at an adjacent flood plain site (EeRb 77) revealed it to be deeply stratified, with cultural material found to a depth of over 3 meters in one unit: charcoal at 2.5 meters provided a radiocarbon date of 5600 BP. This site appears to be potentially significant in the southern Interior for resolving issues of local and regional chronology and landform development.

We are presently working with the Kamloops Indian Band to mitigate the impact of a proposed very large housing development and golf course on and around Government Hill, and to help them address the need to balance current land use plans with heritage preservation. Government Hill is a prominent landform on the reserve where the Archaeology Field School has worked intermittently the last five years, locating there 30 sites that span the Holocene. In addition, Harlan Smith excavated several burials on Government Hill itself (1909), and there is potential for additional human remains. Clearly this location was a frequent, if not major focus of past Secwepemc activities and retains special significance for some band members.

To address the proposed development, we began more intensive work here in 1995, on a middle to late Holocene site on the terrace edge, and in the sand dune area on top of Government Hill, an area covered with massive amounts of debitage, fire-cracked rock, and bone fragments. Investigations at the latter revealed a deflation surface with several collapsed cultural horizons, underlain by intact ones. Given the location and prominence of this landform, we expect significantly early archaeological occupations to be represented, as well as special-use indicators (e.g., burials). A third phase of the project was relocating the burial site excavated by Smith.

While the recent passage of a comprehensive archaeological resource policy by the Kamloops Band membership strengthens archaeological site protection, the Band now faces difficult decisions. The Government Hill development, for example, will allow the Band to increase its tax base to support the very expensive process of reclamation of traditional lands—but this will come at the expense of some archaeological resources. Likewise, in terms of burial sites, does a burial



Figure 5. SCES-SFU Archaeology Field School, 1995. As in 1993, a joint field school was offered with the University College of the Cariboo. (Photo: G. Nicholas)

site without human remains (as in that excavated by Smith) still retain special significance and thus exclude it from development? Such decisions can *only* be made by the Kamloops Band.<sup>6</sup>

*Archaeology Field School-SCES Applications.* In 1993, we located and tested several sites in a proposed SCES student housing complex. Unfortunately, we also had a confrontation with a road project that directly threatened one site. A two-day salvage project at this site produced evidence of intensive tool production and material of middle Holocene age. A major portion of the site was subsequently destroyed. This regrettable set of circumstances resulted from poor communication between the different agencies involved and the lack of a clear archaeological heritage policy at that time on the reserve.

*Archaeology Field School-Secwepemc Museum Applications.* Since 1993, the SCES-SFU Archaeology Program has provided short-term field training for Secwepemc Museum trainees to familiarize them with basic archaeological techniques and research methodology. This is in addition to presentations made to staff to familiarize them with local cultural history. Such a training/orientation program should be formalized since museum guides having a basic understanding of archaeology will be more effective in educating the public about the past than those who don't.

### Training First Nations Archaeologists

Many issues need to be considered within the context of First Nations involvement in archaeology and cultural resource management, including mutual cooperation, advocacy, and presentation of the past (e.g., Bockoff 1994; Bruseth et al. 1994; Knecht 1994; Kushner 1994; Tough 1990). Archaeologists, for their part, need to recognize that they are dealing with members of a different culture, and be flexible accordingly; there are different ways of perceiving the past and different world views to consider. *How we discuss the peopling of the New World with Native students is one example from the classroom where we need to balance scientific evidence with*

<sup>6</sup> Archaeologists also face hard decisions. Regarding the proposed Government Hill development, both the developers and the Kamloops Indian Band know that I am opposed to it. Yet I recognize that the Kamloops Band has the right to use its land as it sees fit, and so I will continue to work with them to mitigate the impacts of development on cultural resources.

beliefs of an *in situ* creation.

Problems also arise in the field. During the 1991 field school, for example, several of the more traditional students would not touch any bone they found during site survey, even if it was obviously animal, although they would bring it to our attention. Such issues as the discovery of human remains and reburial (e.g., Hubert 1989; Rhodd 1989; Zimmerman 1989) and the preservation of sacred sites (e.g., Carmichael et al. 1994; Reeves and Kennedy 1993) will always be sensitive ones.<sup>7</sup> But even here there is much potential for innovative approaches. For example, Dr. Mark Skinner (Simon Fraser University) and I have discussed the idea of offering training in forensic anthropology to students in the SCES-SFU program. Certainly Native students with training in archaeology and physical anthropology, and experience in different value systems, would serve an important role as cultural brokers (van Willigen 1993), working between archaeologists and Native communities to resolve problems relating to human remains and sacred sites.

As Native archaeologists increase in number, they will confront a variety of moral and religious issues relating to animal and human bone and to spiritual or secret-sacred sites, especially within the context of archaeological heritage management, and will have to make decisions on their own or in consultation with elders and community members. In this context, non-Native archaeologists may be able to offer little advice, since they may not be sensitive to or knowledgeable about belief systems and perceptions of the landscape different from their own. With the SCES-SFU program, we encourage our students to think about and discuss how they would approach such problems as these.

#### Observations By an Outsider

As a newcomer to the northwestern archaeology scene, I have been in a position to look in as an outsider. The following observations may be relevant to some of the difficulties arising from non-Native archaeologists confronting or integrating Native perspectives.

At a social function attended by large gathering of B.C. archaeologists several years ago, a well-meaning remark—"... before Gordon Mohs went Native"—was made by one speaker. The comment was not meant unkindly, but used only as a chronological marker, and did draw much laughter from the audience because it was humorous in the context. Mohs (1995) is an archaeologist who has not only been working with the Sto:lo Band for a number of years, but has also been adopted into the band. He is known for his outspoken sympathy for traditional Native values, and is sometimes highly critical of archaeologists who aren't. His comments may draw discomfort from some archaeologists because the perspective he brings, as an articulate and knowledgeable speaker for the Sto:lo, may reveal issues or viewpoints previously not considered. For example, during the 1993 B.C. Archaeology Forum, he noted that the illustration of a carved stone anthropomorphic bowl (Winter and Henry, Ch 14) appearing on the conference program was inappropriate since it was considered still a sacred object by the Sto:lo.

I think that the reaction of both audiences may reveal a difference between archaeologists and anthropologists today. Indeed, the first case above represented a social function dominated by members of an Archaeology department. Cultural anthropologists, especially those with an ethnographic focus, have traditionally been trained to articulate with the peoples they live with and study; seeking out and understanding emic values is thus vitally important. Ethnographic fieldwork must be sensitive to the members of the community; one learns and respects local customs. Archaeologists, on the other hand, even those working in anthropological archaeology, never really expect to work with living representatives of the cultures they study. For the majority of archaeologists working in North America, this is not an issue because few of them will ever come into contact with Native peoples. In British Columbia, however, where there is a large Native population, and certainly elsewhere throughout the world, archaeologists are going to have to become more sensitive both to the needs of these communities and to their cultural values.

As a discipline we must therefore learn to be less self-centered in the pursuit of our research. There are difficult decisions to be made by all involved parties; protocol between various governments, agencies, and individuals needs to be established, and all of us have to realize that the *status quo* may no longer be maintained. At the same time, anthropologists and archaeologists have long been at the forefront of defending the interests of Indigenous peoples; as one knowledgeable person noted, "Who's been looking out for First Nations peoples? It hasn't been the lawyers, the

<sup>7</sup> Interestingly, these same students showed no compunction against handling burned bone fragments from hearths.

politicians, the historians. It has been anthropologists and archaeologists!" Nonetheless we will continue to draw criticism from First Nations. Some of this is undoubtedly deserved as we have been insensitive or haven't responded quickly or fully enough to changing conditions. Sometimes, however, we serve as scapegoats for problems not our responsibility simply because we are visible in the Native community (Brizinski 1993; Cruikshank 1993).

## ARCHAEOLOGY AS EMPOWERMENT

In the past, archaeology was characterized as a rich man's hobby, and rich has generally meant upper class, white, Judaeo-Christian, European or American males—a combination of traits that gives even the most thick-skinned postprocessualists the heebie-jeebies. Archaeology has also been termed "the handmaiden of colonialism." Although this image has changed substantially in recent decades, it hasn't changed enough in some respects (Trigger 1980, 1989: 315), and there is still a strong Native voice that does not accept archaeology as necessary or capable of preserving their culture. To them, the past is, and always has been, a part of the present. Likewise, ancestral sites and human remains may be expected to decay and return to their previous state—archaeology interrupts this important process. So what then does archaeology contribute to First Nations? And can First Nations and other traditional peoples employ it as a means of empowerment? I answer both questions positively, as the following examples indicate.

Archaeology helps to correct false images of the past. The first European explorers in northeastern North America viewed the absence of plowed fields and fences as evidence of undeveloped land and wasted opportunity, a view that justified their occupancy of those lands. In fact, Aboriginal land clearance for horticultural purposes and food resource management was both extensive and deliberate, as revealed there by ethnohistoric sources and archaeological data (Sassaman and Patterson 1988). Some interpretive biases may also be eliminated through archaeology, as recent investigations at Little Big Horn reveal, calling for significant revision of the history of the battle (Fox 1993). In Madagascar, archaeology helps to restore the cultural legacy deliberately obscured by colonialism (Rakotoarisoa 1989).

Archaeology can also be used to address questions about the past concerned with processes and patterns of change, and at temporal and spatial scales beyond the scope of ethnographic observation and oral tradition. It provides an objective etic perspective that, when combined with emic views, produces new insights into past cultural systems. Archaeology thus provides hunter-gatherers and other Indigenous peoples with a sense of history (Ingold et al. 1991; Bettinger 1991) to reveal them not as living fossils, but rather peoples who have changed as they exploited opportunities and coped with their problems, often in innovative ways.

Archaeology can illuminate cultural diversity in the past. Hunter-gatherers of the historic period have survived to the present only by occupying marginal lands no one else wanted until recently. Before the spread of horticulture, however, they would have occupied the most attractive places on the landscape (Nicholas 1988), and the lifestyles of these hunter-gatherers may have been substantially different from those of their contemporary counterparts (Koyama and Thomas 1981; Price and Brown 1985).

Archaeology may provide an important avenue to cultural unity and nation building. For example, regional prehistory is now being used to establish a common base for the hundreds of distinct societies now incorporated as Papua New Guinea (Mangi 1989). In Norway, the Sami are taking an active interest in demonstrating their ethnicity within the regional prehistoric record (Akio and Akio 1989). Through archaeology and oral tradition, strengthening ties with the past provides a common ground for First Nations communities today (also see Layton 1989a) and pride for the members of those communities. Several tribal elders visiting our excavations in 1991 told us that when they were boys at the Kamloops Residential School, the priests would buy arrowheads, nephrite adzes, and other artifacts from them for a quarter. These visitors regretted their earlier naiveté, and were fascinated by the exposed features and genuinely interested to learn what this site had to tell us: here, one elder offered, was a clear statement of Shuswap claim to this land, and a source of great pride. There are, however, clear dangers in the misuse of archaeology in nation building (Dietler 1994; Fowler 1987; Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990) that Native peoples in the Americas should be aware of.

Archaeology is also a very powerful tool for addressing issues relating to land claims. The single greatest threat to the livelihood of Indigenous peoples has been the loss of land rights. Land has both economic and non-material value to traditional peoples. Loss of land disturbs the sacredness of certain places; breaks the long-term continuity between the land and the people, and between past and present; and results in the displacement of people and the erosion of traditional culture. The Kamloops Indian Band has used archaeology in its successful reclamation of Scheidam Flats. In *Delgamuukw vs the Queen*, however, a preponderance of supportive archaeological data was not enough to convince the court of the Gitksan and the Wet'suwet'en's ownership (see Asch, Ch. 20 and Harris, Ch. 12)).

In each of these areas, the potential for archaeology as a means of empowerment is apparent. There are still other ways of utilizing archaeology yet to be recognized, and these will benefit all of us. Empowerment is not something that can be given, however. As archaeologists, we cannot empower anyone. What we can do is present the means of empowerment through education (Figure 6). For this reason the results of archaeological field studies and research need to be disseminated as widely and as quickly as possible, especially to First Nations communities who have a special affinity for the past (e.g., Gotthardt and Hare 1994). If they choose to use it as such, archaeology is indeed a powerful tool of empowerment. But the choice is theirs alone.



Figure 6. Lea McNabb, Field School Teaching Assistant, explaining Munsell color chart to student Louise Harry. (Photo: G. Nicholas)

## CONCLUSIONS

In this paper I have discussed my role as an archaeologist teaching, and being taught by, First Nations students, and as an anthropologist concerned with the plight of Indigenous peoples worldwide. The research-directed survey, mitigative site testing, and excavation program conducted by the ongoing SCES-SFU Archaeology Field school has been successful by all accounts. The collaboration between Simon Fraser University and the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society, the Kamloops Indian Band, and the Shuswap Nation that has made this archaeology program a reality is clearly a successful one and may serve as a model for similar programs elsewhere.

The Shuswap people are calling for an increased role in the definition, identification, and management of cultural resources. The eventual integration of a First Nation community, a public oriented museum, and a university program is a potentially powerful one, where education, research, and dialogue may be the foundation for a strong cultural resource management strategy on First Nations lands. It is also the means by which archaeological resources may be made more accessible to the public.

More generally, we must keep in mind that it is not simply enough to teach Indigenous peoples to do *our* version of archaeology. We also need to recognize that cultural diversity does not apply only to lifeways and languages. There are other stories to hear about the past, told in voices that we may be unfamiliar with, largely because these people have not spoken before. There are other ways of knowing the past, other ways of interpreting the archaeological record, that we may be very uncomfortable with because they stem from different cultural traditions. The archaeologies that will emerge as Indigenous peoples become archaeologists themselves will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the discipline. These potentially different views of the past represent another type of cultural diversity—one that we, as anthropologists, have much to learn from. And if we can do this, then we have truly helped the First Peoples empower themselves.

### Acknowledgments

The trauma of moving from New England to British Columbia has been lessened by the opportunity to work with the Native community, especially my students who represent First Nations people from across Canada. They have been the integral component of the SCES-SFU Archaeology program, and I have learned much from them, especially the 1991 Field School: Gladys Baptiste, Diane Biin, Dean Billy, Percy Casper, Donna Dillman, Debbie Jules, John Jules, Laurie Kennedy, Petrina Schooner, and Mel Seymour. The 1991 field school was partially funded by the Access to Archaeology program. I also thank Marianne Boelsher Ignace, Catherine Carlson, Robert Kelley, Madonna Moss, Randall McGuire, Maureen Carlson, Linda Jules, Steve Lawhead, Eldon Yellowhorn, and Lea McNabb for their contributions. The development of the SCES-SFU Archaeology Program was facilitated by colleagues in the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University-Burnaby, notably Jack Nance, Jon Driver, Phil Hobler, and Roy Carlson. The support and encouragement of Chief Manny Jules and Councilors of the Kamloops Indian Band, the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society, and the SCES-SFU faculty, staff, and student body is gratefully acknowledged.

Funding for 1994 CAA conference participation was provided by SCES-SFU. Sheila Greer and Ray Le Blanc facilitated my organization of the session in which this paper was presented. Part of this article is derived from "Archaeology as Empowerment: The SCES/SFU Archaeology Field School," presented at the 45th Northwest Anthropology Conference Burnaby, B.C., in 1992.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Akio, M., and P. Akio  
 1989 A Chapter in the History of the Colonization of Sámi Lands: The Forced Migration of Norwegian Reindeer Sámi to Finland in the 1800s. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 116-130. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Auel, J.M.  
 1991 Romancing the Public. In *Protecting the Past*, edited by G.S. Smith and J.E. Ehrenhard, pp. 123-128. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

- Bettinger, R.L.  
1991 *Hunter-Gatherers: Archaeological and Evolutionary Theory*. Plenum Press, New York.
- Berger, J.  
1990 *The Gaia Atlas of First Peoples: A Future for the Indigenous World*. Anchor Books/Doubleday, New York.
- Blancke, S., and C.J.P. Slow Turtle  
1990 The Teaching of the Past of the Native Peoples of North America in US Schools. In *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*, edited by P. Stone and R. MacKenzie, pp. 109-133. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Boas, F.  
1890 The Shuswap. Part IV, *Sixteenth Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*. Leeds.
- Bockoff, E.  
1994 Working with an Urban American Indian Community—The Cleveland Experience. *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 12(2): 8-9.
- Bodley, J.  
1988 *Victims of Progress*. Mayfield, Mountain View, CA.
- Boutilier, B., P. Erickson, D. Hansen, D. Williamson, and E. Moffatt  
1992 *Discovering Archaeology: An Activity Book for Young Nova Scotians*. Nova Scotia Archaeological Society, Halifax.
- Brizinski, P.M.  
1993 The Summer Meddler: The Image of the Anthropologist as Tool for Indigenous Formulations of Culture. In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram, pp. 146-165. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Brumfiel, E.M.  
1994 Making History in Xaltocan. *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 12(3):4-6.
- Bruseth, J.E., J.E. Corbi, C.E. Carter, and B. McKee  
1994 Involving the Caddo Tribe during Archaeological Field Schools in Texas: A Cross-Cultural Sharing. *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 12(4): 9-10.
- Carlson, C.C.  
1994 The (In)-Significance of Atlantic Salmon. In *Federal Archaeology Fall/Winter* pp. 22-30.  
1995 Archaeology of a Contact Period Plateau Salishan Village at Thompson's River Post, Kamloops, British Columbia. Paper presented at the American Society for Ethnohistory annual meeting, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
- Carmichael, D.L., J. Hubert, B. Reeves, and A. Schanche (editors)  
1994 *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*. Routledge, New York.
- Chambers, E.  
1989 *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide*. Westview Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois.
- Cinq-Mars, J., and J-L. Pilon  
1991 *NOGAP Archaeology Project: An Integrated Archaeological Research and Management Approach*. Canadian Archaeological Association Occasional Papers, No. 1.
- Clarke, M.M.  
1993 Medical Anthropology and the Redefining of Human Nature. *Human Organization* 52(3): 233-242.
- Cleere, J.  
1989 *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Cruikshank, J.  
1993 The Politics of Ethnography in the Canadian North. In *Anthropology, Public Policy, and Native Peoples in Canada*, edited by N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram, pp. 3-38. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Dawson, G.M.  
1891 Notes on the Shuswap People of British Columbia. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Section II, Part 1: 3-44.



- Deloria, V., Jr.  
1992 Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future. *American Antiquity* 57: 595-598.
- DeWalt, B.R.  
1994 Using Indigenous Knowledge to Improve Agriculture and Natural Resource Management. *Human Organization* 53(2): 123-131.
- Dietler, M.  
1994 "Our Ancestors the Gauls": Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalisms, and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe. *American Anthropologist* 96(3): 584-605.
- Elias, P.D.  
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.
- Emmott, K.  
1989 A Child's Perception of the Past: Influences of Home, Media and School. In *Who Needs the Past?: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 21-44. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Erickson, C.L.  
1992 Applied Archaeology and Rural Development: Archaeology's Potential Contribution to the Future. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 20(1-2): 1-16.
- Fedema, V.  
1994 A Winter Village in Winter: B.C. Archaeology Forum, Kamloops 1994. *The Midden* 26(5): 3-4.
- Feder, K.L.  
1990 *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries: Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology*. Mayfield Publishing Company, Mountain View, CA.
- Fowler, D.D.  
1987 Uses of the Past: Archaeology in the Service of the State. *American Antiquity* 52(2): 229-248.
- Fox, R.A., Jr.  
1993 *Archaeology, History, and Custer's Last Battle*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.
- Gathercole, P., and D. Lowenthal (editors)  
1990 *The Politics of the Past*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Gawe, S., and F. Meli  
1990 The Missing Past in South African History. In *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*, edited by P. Stone and R. MacKenzie, pp. 98-108. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Green, E. L. (editor)  
1984 *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*. Free Press, New York.
- Haig-Brown, C.  
1988 *Resistance and Renewal: Surviving the Indian Residential School*. Tillacum Library Press, Vancouver.
- Halmo, D.V., R.W. Stoffle, and M.J. Evans  
1993 Paitu Nanasuagaindu Pahonupi (Three Sacred Valleys): Cultural Significance of Gosiute, Paiute, and Ute Plants. *Human Organization* 52(2): 142-150.
- Handsman, R.G.  
1988 Against Silence: Listen to the Voices of Native American Women. *Artifacts* 16(3-4): 6. American Indian Archaeological Institute, Washington, CT.  
1989 Algonkian Wigwams: An Invisible Presence, Political Spaces. *Artifacts* 17(4):19-23. American Indian Archaeological Institute, Washington, CT.
- Handsman, R.G., and L. Williamson  
1989 As We Tell Our Stories: Living Traditions and the Algonkian Peoples of Indian New England. *Artifacts* 17(4): 4-11. American Indian Archaeological Institute, Washington, CT.
- Hansen, A.  
1993 The Illusion of Local Sustainability and Self-Sufficiency: Famine in a Border Area of Northwestern Zambia. *Human Organization* 53(1): 11-20.

- Hubert, J.  
1989 A Proper Place for the Dead: A Critical Review of the "Reburial" Issue. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 131-166. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Ignace, M.B.  
1995 The Shuswap (Secwepemc). In *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol 12: The Plateau*, edited by D. Walker. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. In Press.
- Ingold, T., D. Riches, and J. Woodburn (editors)  
1991 *Hunters and Gatherers I: History, Evolution and Social Change* Berg, New York.
- Kerber, J. (editor)  
1994 *Cultural Resource Management: Archaeological Research, Preservation Planning, and Public Education in the Northeastern United States*. Bergin and Garvey, Westport, CT.
- Knecht, R.  
1994 Archaeology and Alutiiq Cultural Identity on Kodiak Island. *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 12(5): 8-10.
- Koyama, S., and D.H. Thomas  
1981 *Affluent Hunter-Gatherers, Pacific Coasts East and West*. Senri Ethnological Series, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka.
- Layton, R.  
1989 a Introduction: Who Needs the Past? In *Who Needs the Past: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 1-20. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Layton, R. (editor)  
1989b *Who Needs the Past?: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. Unwin Hyman, London.  
1989c *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Little, M.A., N. Dyson-Hudson, R. Dyson-Hudson, J.E. Ellis, K.A. Galvin, P.W. Leslie, and D.M. Swift  
1990 Ecosystem Approaches in Human Biology: Their History and a Case Study of the South Turkana Ecosystem Project. In *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology*, edited by E. Moran, pp. 389-434. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- McBryde, I. (editor)  
1985 *Who Owns the Past?* Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- McMullen, A., and R.G. Handsman  
1987 *A Key into the Language of Woodsplint Baskets*. American Indian Archaeological Institute, Washington, CT.
- Mangi, J.  
1989 The Role of Archaeology in Nation Building. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 217-227. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Matthew, Chief Nathan  
1995 Letter from the Shuswap National Tribal Council to the Canadian Archaeological Society, October 30, 1995.
- Metcalf, F.  
1991 *Teaching with Historic Places. Knife River: Early Village Life on the Plains*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Mohs, G.  
1994 Sto:lo Sacred Ground. In *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*, edited by D.L. Carmichael, J. Hubert, B. Reeves, and A. Schanche, pp. 184-20. Routledge, New York.
- Morgan, S. (editor)  
1989 *Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*. American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Moyar, J.T.  
1993 *Archaeologists at Work: A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Archaeology*. Office of Historic Archaeology. City of Alexandria, Virginia.
- Nicks, T.  
1992 Partnerships in Developing Cultural Resources: Lessons from the Task Force on Museums and First Peoples. *Culture* XII(1): 87-94.

- Nicholas, G.P.  
 1988 Ecological Levelling: The Archaeology and Environmental Dynamics of Early Postglacial Land Use. In *Holocene Human Ecology in Northeastern North America*, edited by G.P. Nicholas, pp. 257-296. Plenum Press, New York.  
 1991 Letter to the Editor. *Time Magazine*, October 14: 6.  
 1994 Human Ecology as Cultural Resource Management. In *Cultural Resource Management: Archaeological Research, Preservation Planning, and Public Education in the Northeastern United States*, edited by J. Kerber, pp. 17-50. Bergin and Garvey, Westport, CT.
- O'Reagan, S.  
 1989 Maori Control of the Maori Heritage. In *The Politics of the Past*, edited by P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, pp. 95-106.
- Pilon, J-L.  
 1994 *Bridges Across Time: The NOGAP Archaeology Project*. Canadian Archaeological Association Occasional Papers, No. 2.
- Price, T.D., and J.A. Brown (editors)  
 1985 *Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherers: The Emergence of Cultural Complexity*. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Rakotoarisoa, J-A.  
 1989 The Burden of an Encumbered Inheritance upon the Study of the Past in Madagascar. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 82-87. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Rathje, W.L., and C. Murphy  
 1992 *Rubbish!: The Archaeology of Garbage*. Harper-Collins, New York.
- Reeves, B.O.K., and M.A. Kennedy (editors)  
 1993 *Kunaitupii. Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*. Archaeological Society of Alberta. Calgary, Alberta.
- Rhodd, B.  
 1993 Native American Burials: A Native American Archaeologist's Perspective. In *Kunaitupii. Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*, edited by B.O.K. Reeves and M. Kennedy, pp. 55-57. Archaeological Society of Alberta. Calgary, Alberta.
- Richards, T., and M. Rousseau  
 1982 Archaeological Investigations on Kamloops Indian Reserve Number 1, Kamloops, British Columbia. Final Report to the Kamloops Indian Band, Canada Community Development Projects, and the British Columbia Heritage Trust.
- Rogge, A.E., and P. Bell  
 1989 Archaeology in the Classroom: A Case Study from Arizona. *Archeological Assistance Program, Technical Brief*, No. 4. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Rousseau, M. and R.J. Muir  
 1991 The 1991 Archaeological Shovel Testing Program Conducted within and near Prehistoric Site EeRb 77, Kamloops Indian Reserve No. 1, Kamloops, B.C. Report to the Kamloops Indian Band.
- Sassaman, K.E., and W.B. Patterson  
 1988 Indian Fires in the Prehistory of New England. In *Holocene Human Ecology in Northeastern North America*, edited by G.P. Nicholas, pp.107-136. Plenum, New York.
- Smith, H.I.  
 1909 The Shuswap. *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History*. New York.
- Smith, G.S., and J.E. Ehrenhard (editors)  
 1991 *Protecting the Past*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Spector, J.D.  
 1994 Collaboration at *Inyan Ceyaka Atonwan* (Village at the Rapids). *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 12 (3): 8-10.
- Stone, P., and R. MacKenzie (editors)  
 1990 *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*. Unwin Hyman, London.
- Teit, J.A.  
 1909 The Shuswap. *American Museum of Natural History Memoir* 4(7). New York.

Tough, F.

1990 Introduction: Advocacy Research and Native Studies. *Native Studies Review* 6(2): 1-11.

TwoBears, D.

1995 A Navajo Student's Perception: Anthropology and the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department Student Training Program. *Society for American Archaeology Bulletin* 13(1): 4-6.

Trigger, B.G.

1980 Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45(4):662-676.

1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

van Willigen, J.

1993 *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. Bergin and Garvey, Westport, CT.

Zimmerman, L.J.

1989 Made Radical by my Own: An Archaeologist Learns to Accept Reburial. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 60-67. Unwyn Hyman, London.