University of Pennsylvania

ScholarlyCommons

Department of Anthropology Papers   Department of Anthropology

2014

Decolonization in Archaeological Theory

Margaret Bruchac

Recommended Citation (OVERRIDE)

Decolonization in Archaeological Theory

Abstract

Decolonizing approaches in archaeology emerged as a means to counter the dominance of colonial ideologies and improve the accuracy of Indigenous representations. Historically, the routines of mainstream archaeological practices have been shaped by Western (primarily elite Euro-American) beliefs and categories. Although Indigenous people have long been used as informants, Western scientists have exerted control over Indigenous property, and Indigenous knowledges and concerns have been pushed to the margins. Decolonizing has both political and practical effects; it alters power relations among scientists and subjects, while also expanding the volume and accuracy of available Indigenous data.

Disciplines

Anthropology | Archaeological Anthropology | Indigenous Studies | Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Margaret M. Bruchac
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
United States
mbruchac@sas.upenn.edu

Introduction

Decolonizing approaches in archaeology emerged as a means to counter the dominance of colonial ideologies and improve the accuracy of Indigenous representations. Historically, the routines of mainstream archaeological practice have been shaped by Western (primarily elite Euro-American) beliefs and categories. Although Indigenous people have long been used as informants, Western scientists have exerted control over Indigenous property, and Indigenous knowledges and concerns have been pushed to the margins. Decolonizing has both political and practical effects; it alters power relations among scientists and subjects, while also expanding the volume and accuracy of available Indigenous data.

Decolonization as archaeological theory has been influenced by other critical research approaches, including feminist theory, critical race theory, post-colonial political theory, and gender studies (e.g., Denzin, Lincoln & Smith 2008; Messenger & Smith 2010). Although Indigenous people have been the most visible proponents and beneficiaries of decolonization, decolonizing methods can be applied to virtually any research population. One might, for example, examine ethnic minorities, homeless people, diasporic groups, or others whose perspectives and histories have been imperfectly represented by mainstream archaeology. Increased communication with knowledge-bearers from formerly colonized communities improves the ethical component of archaeological practice. It can also improve the identification of collections, the educational content of exhibitions, and the relevance of archaeology to Indigenous and ethnic minorities (Merryman 2006; Nicholas 2010).

Definition

Decolonizing archaeologists seek to untangle colonial influences by encouraging greater collaboration with Indigenous peoples, reconsidering foundational knowledges, and paying closer attention to the ethics of handling other peoples' heritage. Decolonizing approaches are explicitly intended to recover materials and knowledges that were lost or made invisible during generations of living under colonial domination. In political contexts, decolonizing efforts have enabled formerly dependent or colonized Indigenous peoples, ethnic communities, and small nations gain independence and local control (Maybury-Lewis 2002; Smith 1999). In archaeological contexts, decolonizing similarly shifts the power balance by liberating collections and interpretations from the presumed exclusivity of colonial control (Wobst 2005). This is accomplished, in part, by encouraging better collaborations with communities impacted by colonization (e.g., Bruchac et al. 2010; Nicholas 2010; Smith & Wobst 2005). Key strategies for decolonizing include: critical analysis of social and political relations; collaborative consultation and research design; reclamation of cultural property; restoration of cultural landscapes and heritage sites; repatriation of human remains; co-curation of archaeological

collections; and devising more culturally accurate museum representations. For examples of decolonizing projects and practitioners in different regions of the world, see Atalay (2012), Bruchac et al. (2010), Nicholas (2010), and Smith & Wobst (2005).

Research pursued from a decolonizing perspective typically focuses, not only on potentially important scientific finds, but also on the power dynamics and impact of practicing science among a particular research population. The emphasis on collaboration makes this an inherently activist and applied approach to practicing science. Members of descent communities and local stakeholders can be enlisted as partners in collecting material and data concerning the past, and in crafting visions for the sustainable use of significant heritage sites in the future (Atalay 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008). Community members can provide diverse streams of evidence that cross-cut disciplines, using such techniques as ethnographic interviews and linguistic analysis. Archaeological data is also typically embedded in oral traditions, ritual activities, and place names that evoke evidence of older human interactions with the landscape over time (Schmidt & Patterson 1995, Watkins 2000). Decolonizing archaeologists can build collaboration directly into their research plans via a process identified as community based participatory research (CBPR). The working principles of CBPR emphasize a participatory, "community-based, partnership process" that builds "community capacity," encourages "a spirit of reciprocity," and recognizes contributions from "multiple knowledge systems" (Atalay 2012:63).

Decolonization is an essential aspect of Indigenous archaeology, broadly defined as archaeological practice directed by, in collaboration with, representative of, and relevant to Indigenous people and Indigenous goals (Nicholas 2010:11). The term Indigenous is used here, not just as a descriptive, but as a proper noun, to emphasize the sovereignty and agency of Indigenous peoples vis-à-vis the colonial states that have long attempted to dominate them (e.g., Nicholas 2010; Watkins 2000; Wobst 2005). Indigenous groups largely trace their identities and attachments to land through historical continuities with societies that pre-date colonization; they often maintain unique systems of cultural and political organization. Historically, Indigenous knowledge-bearers have long participated as scientific informants, gatekeepers, and field workers. These site monitors and informants have improved the identification of material in the field and inspired new modes of curation and interpretation in the museum (Oland et al. 2012). More recently, some Indigenous people have become professional archaeologists (see examples in Nicholas 2010); their inclusion in the discipline has stimulated more culturally complex understandings of material and ephemeral relations over time (Smith & Wobst 2005).

Indigenous communities living in the aftermath of (or still influenced by) colonization are sometimes hesitant, if not opposed, to the conduct of scientific research in ancestral sites. Applied sciences are never neutral; scientific discoveries can provoke or complicate understandings of the complex intersections among identity, nationalism, and social justice. Archaeologists may be placed in positions where they are expected to construct and interpret Indigenous identities and relationships, with or without the presence and consent of those communities (Bruchac et al. 2010:55). Decolonizing archaeologists, regardless of their personal origins, have thus found it necessary to consider the political impacts of their own social relations, in the discipline and in the field. They pay particularly close attention to the relations between present and past populations, and to the impacts of their research. By carefully weighing ethics and relations with the communities they study, they hope to replace colonial habits of appropriating knowledge with more culturally sensitive means of recovering knowledge. Indigenous people who choose to practice archaeology typically express a double consciousness that recognizes their unique (and sometimes fraught) positions as both scientific archaeologists and Indigenous activists (see, for example, the individual contributors to Nicholas 2010).

Historical Background

Colonialism---which can be defined as the forced occupation by large nation-states of lands belonging to smaller state and non-state societies---has constituted a relatively limited but influential era within the long stream of human history. Colonialism is not a single process, but a "series of policies, processes, and relations that exploited people and resources in diverse ways and locales," for widely varying reasons and lengths of

time (Oland et al. 2012:2). Indigenous peoples have been particularly hard-hit by colonization; they are routinely defined as being "dominated by the states that claim jurisdiction over them (Maybury-Lewis 2002:7). In North and South America, colonization by multiple European nations resulted in steadily increasing losses of Indigenous land and sovereignty over the course of 500 years. In Australia and New Zealand, English colonial dominance over aboriginal territory was effected within only a few generations (Smith 1999). In many regions of the world, Indigenous communities are still colonized, and still struggling to re-assert control over their lands and histories (Bruchac et al. 2010; Maybury-Lewis 2002). Many of the peoples impacted by colonization have been in existence for millennia; colonial occupation is only a small part of their history.

Colonialist thought and nationalist ideologies have long been intertwined with the politics and practice of scientific archaeology (Schmidt & Patterson 1999). During the emergence of the discipline, anthropologists exerted almost unquestioned power over the ownership of sites and collections, without regard for the cultural concerns and property rights of Indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, or other marginalized groups; archaeology was often a "strategy in support of the state" (Wobst 2005:28). Since the seminal proponents and practitioners of anthropology were privileged white male scientists with roots in white settler populations, inequities of gender and class were also in play. Until quite recently, few Indigenous people benefitted directly from archaeological research conducted in their midst (Nicholas 2010; Smith & Wobst 2005).

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, salvage archaeologists engaged in the widespread collection of material objects, cultural heritage, and human remains belonging to colonized subjects, operating under the assumption that many of these populations were near extinction (Mihesuah 2000; Swidler et al. 1997). Scientists from Euro-American nations (predominantly England and America) mounted grand expeditions seeking evidence of past civilizations and collecting materials for museums. They routinely disturbed and destroyed heritage sites, and collected thousands of human remains and items of cultural patrimony for scientific study, display, and sale (Merryman 2006). This research inspired the production of classifications, typologies, exhibitions, and educational materials that supported the historical dominance of European social classes and belief systems and the political marginalization of Indigenous people (Smith 1999; Wobst 2005). In museums and in print, the archaeological records of state societies were promoted as evidence of successful development, and the records of non-state societies were distorted to stand as failures (Wobst 2005:28).

Mainstream archaeologists promoted these distortions by theoretically dividing time and geography, with colonial nations located at the "core" and Indigenous nations located at the "periphery" of knowledge and development (Habu et al. 2008; Smith 1999). Western academics also mined Indigenous knowledges and claimed possession of Indigenous property, while conceptualizing modern Indigenous peoples as philosophically disconnected from their pre-modern forebears (Smith 1999). Scientific research conducted from a universalist and positivist perspective can, even inadvertently, tend to legitimize and reinforce these misrepresentations.

During the mid-twentieth century, as the cannibalistic nature of the salvage enterprise became increasingly apparent, Indigenous people demanded the recovery of sacred objects, communal property, and human remains disturbed by archaeologists (Mihesuah 2000). The emerging repatriation movement provoked serious contests over the ownership and appropriate disposition of archaeological collections and Indigenous cultural material. As regional and ethnic communities around the world have increasingly asserted their distinct identities in resistance to forces of colonialism and globalization (Maybury-Lewis 2002), they have also sought control over the archaeological sites and materials that locate and validate these identities (Bruchac et al. 2010). Around the world, nation-states have been forced to contend with Indigenous peoples who demand, "tribal recognition, national sovereignty, cultural revitalization, economic independence, and control over heritage matters" (Nicholas 2010:11).

Key Issues/Current Debates

Professional archaeologists have long claimed nearly exclusive ownership of materials from the past. During the twentieth century, they moved to police the profession by implementing guidelines (e.g, the American Antiquities Act of 1906, and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979) that prohibited illicit looting and trading by amateurs. During this same era, ancient heritage sites located in regions claimed by colonial states were set aside for protection and preservation under the control of the state (e.g., the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966). The ethos of preservation embodied in these actions did not essentially change conceptions of privileged ownership by scientists. State control is, in essence, a paternalistic extension of colonial control. For Indigenous and ethnic communities around the world, the reclamation of Indigenous rights to property and culture is key to recovering from colonial domination. Assertions of claims to ancestral remains in archaeological collections have, however, provoked fierce debates (e.g., Merryman 2006; Mihesuah 2000). Some of the most heated of these are rooted in differing constructions of property rights.

Decolonizing archaeologists have been especially influential in encouraging the repatriation of human remains and items of cultural patrimony to affiliated communities and descendants (Mihesuah 2000; Smith & Wobst 2005). Claims have also been lodged for the recovery of archaeological and artistic items removed from classical European sites (Merryman 2006). Opponents to repatriation have argued that repatriation threatens the integrity of significant museum collections. Arguments like these are losing ground in light of increasing protections for Indigenous intellectual and cultural property, and increasing world recognition of the nationalist dimensions of cultural heritage (Merryman 2006; Mihesuah 2000). Archaeologists and museums can no longer claim undisputed ownership of their collections, and they have been compelled by state laws and statutes (such as the United States' Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990) to recognize the validity of many of these claims. As a result, museums of anthropology, natural history, art and science around the world now routinely engage in decolonizing activities that include: consulting with descent communities; inventorying Indigenous remains and artifacts housed in museum collections; supporting protection for heritage landscapes; establishing cultural affiliations and tribal identities; and otherwise contextualizing material and ephemeral relations in the past. Given the sheer volume of archaeological materials resting in museum collections, and the number of Indigenous sites under exploration, these debates are likely to continue for some time.

From a practical level, colonial perspectives can cloak on-the-ground data; Indigenous perspectives may be visible, but overlooked, in site contexts (Watkins 2000). For example, archaeologists have long used standardized types and categories to suggest that human society and materiality can be separated into clear-cut divisions. The same evidence, however, when considered from a decolonizing perspective, suggests that human geographies, relationships, and materialities are far more fluid and flexible than popular boundaries and categories imply (Wobst 2005). By shifting Indigenous knowledges from the periphery to the center, one can better recognize and envision alternatives to colonialist constructions of time, place, and narrative (Smith 1999).

At the most basic level of analysis, decolonizing questions the relevance of binary choices that have long been used to categorize and classify archaeological finds. Eurocentric constructions of societal development have employed paired terms like savage/civilized, and primitive/developed to located Indigenous peoples in a state of imagined opposition to European nations and modernity (Schmidt & Patterson 1995; Wobst 2005). Archaeological dichotomies have typically judged non-state sites and societies as prehistoric (compared to historic), and undeveloped (compared to European models of development). Yet, archaeological evidence is rarely this clear-cut. A more effective way of envisioning past lives would be the use of conceptual "transitions" that suggest both continuity and change (Oland et al. 2012:3). The post-modern concept of multivocality, a visioning process that devises multiple possible narratives for underrepresented groups, can also be a useful method for exploring alternative interpretations (Habu et al. 2008).

Collaborations among Indigenous scholars and archaeologists have inspired reconsideration of many of the routine assumptions that underlie archaeological practices (Nicholas 2010; Smith & Wobst 2005).

Decolonizing archaeologists (e.g., Wobst 2005) have called attention to the historical distortions caused by extending modern and colonialist theories into the distant pasts of pre-colonial societies (see case studies from multiple venues in Schmidt & Patterson 1995). They suggest that colonial approaches to scientific study should be recast as a body of situational theory and practice emerging from colonial expansion, rather than as a universal framework for interpreting all human societies over time. Feminist theorists have leveled similar critiques, arguing that positivist research, which aims to predict outcomes based on scientific thoughts and evidence, is, in itself, a form of colonialism (Mihesuah 2000; Smith 1999). Post-positivist research, which recognizes the importance of phenomenological, naturalistic, relational, and praxis-oriented perspectives and values, can enable intellectual emancipation from colonization (Smith 1999:167).

By questioning the notion of a universal science, and drawing attention to human rights issues, decolonizing archaeologists trend toward social activism. They consider how world-views, nationalist agendas, conceptions of social justice, human rights, and territorial boundaries are likely to be affected by scientific research. Efforts to include multiple voices and perspectives can reveal deep philosophical differences over the relative veracity of different modes for recording knowledge. For example, mainstream archaeologists may consider traditional Indigenous beliefs and modern scientific opinions to be polar opposites, as though one is unverifiable folklore, and one is unquestionable hard data. Yet, oral traditions and written traditions both constitute strategies for recording and transmitting narratives and knowledges. When revisited from a decolonizing perspective, these strategies can be employed and interwoven in multiple ways to generate increased understanding. More holistic interpretations can allow for greater variability and flexibility in reconstructing past populations, and can inspire more accurate representations of the past (Smith 1999; Smith & Wobst 2005; Wobst 2005).

International Perspectives

During the salvage era of archaeology, scientists collected and transported materials into museums around the world, with little regard for Indigenous property rights, but the ethics of the practice have shifted. Scientists can no longer assume exclusive control of their collections, and some foundational assumptions---most notably, that scientific excavation is a service to the common good, and that archaeological sites around the world are common property---have been called into question (Merryman 2006; Smith & Wobst 2005). Indigenous and ethnic communities have asserted their rights to lands, to history, and to archaeological finds housed in museums around the world. Contests over the ownership of cultural property, the repatriation of human remains, and the protection of cultural landscapes now have national and international implications (Merryman 2006).

Decolonizing efforts in various parts of the world reflect the particular histories of colonization and the complexities of defining indigeneity. In Africa, for example, although Indigenous peoples constitute the dominant populations, there are serious struggles over control of ancestral territories, and some Indigenous groups are subjugated or marginalized by others (Maybury-Lewis 2002). Archaeological research in Africa has also been influenced by the search for ancient evidence of human origins, conducted by Western scientists who have treated the entire continent as a research site (Bruchac et al 2010:241). These inequities of access and representation can be addressed through decolonizing methods that make archaeology more representative of, and relevant to, local concerns.

Archaeological research in Mesoamerica and South America, conducted in the wake of Spanish colonization, has been shaped by an emphasis on monumental architecture, high-value objects, and pre-Columbian state formation. Decolonizing efforts in this region have focused on the reclamation and re-appropriation of Indigenous heritage sites, materials, and histories subsumed by colonialist interpretations (Bruchac et al. 2010:201).

Across Asia, in the region stretching from Palestine to Japan, archaeology has been a largely nationalist endeavor serving the interests of powerful nation-states (e.g., China and Israel). Here, as in Africa, some Indigenous populations dominate others. Disempowered nations (e.g., Tibet and Palestine) have been

physically forced out of their traditional territories. Decolonizing approaches in this region must grapple with questions of power, privilege, and resources, in the effort to secure protections for the cultural heritage of these disenfranchised populations (Bruchac et al. 2010:290).

Europe is an interesting locale for decolonizing archaeology, given its history of driving colonizing research among Indigenous peoples around the world. Decolonizing archaeologies in Europe are being shaped by the resurgence of Indigenous identities (e.g., Basque, Saami, Scots), and by efforts to reclaim representations of cultural heritage in museums (Bruchac et al 2010:323). The British Museum, for example, currently holds the Elgin Marbles taken from Greece, antiquities from Babylon and Assyria, and the Pergamon Altar from Turkey (Merryman 2006:1). Some museums have resisted returning these great works of antiquity, arguing that they are safest and most accessible to an international public in the museum (Merryman 2006:13). Each of these cases requires international negotiations and re-examinations of older archaeological practices.

In Australia and New Zealand, Aboriginal people have been imagined as outliers in the production of human history, and have struggled to overcome colonial European perceptions that identified their traditional territory as "terra nullius" (an uninhabited "no-man's land") (Bruchac et al. 2010:109). In recent years, some Aboriginal communities in Oceania have embraced archaeology as a tool that can support self-determination by providing "a material basis for the reclaiming of Indigenous cultural identity" (Smith & Wobst 2005:13). The Australian Archaeological Association's Code of Ethics requires archaeologists to protect community claims to cultural heritage, recognize the importance of repatriation, and "acknowledge the special importance to Indigenous peoples of ancestral remains and objects and sites associated with such remains" (Australian Archaeological Association 1994). The 1995 ICOMOS New Zealand charter for the conservation of cultural heritage (called, in Maori, *Te Pumanawa o ICOMOS o Aotearoa Hei Tiaki I Nga Taonga Whenua Heke Iho o Nehe*), takes a similar approach by encouraging the identification, preservation, maintenance, and restoration of Indigenous cultural heritage places. The ICOMOS guidelines have been adopted by the Historic Places Trust/*Pouhere Taonga*, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, and the Department of Conservation, and have also been used in reckoning deeds that restore traditional lands (ICOMOS New Zealand 1995).

Around the world, state and institutional regulations and protocols have emerged that explicitly address the rights of Indigenous peoples vis-à-vis archaeologists. In 1991, for example, the World Archaeological Congress disseminated a new code of ethics that acknowledges Indigenous peoples as stakeholders by unambiguously stating that, "indigenous cultural heritage rightfully belongs to the descendants of that heritage" (World Archaeological Congress 1991). Articles in the United Nations' *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, adopted by the General Assembly on September 13, 2007, similarly and explicitly assert Indigenous rights to identity, culture and property.

Future Directions

Decolonizing approaches have already proven influential in world archaeology, by encouraging collaboration with Indigenous and local communities to improve the identification and understanding of significant traditional heritage sites. Legal protections for cultural heritage and resource management policies have evolved to address the practical protocols and the social dimensions of practicing Indigenous archaeology; as a result, heritage organizations are producing less colonial and more culturally nuanced interpretations of the past (Messenger & Smith 2010). Decolonizing archaeologists have also worked to avoid reproducing the inequities inherent in colonial practices in the field. In Australia and New Zealand, for example, archaeologists are increasingly expected to negotiate with Indigenous communities before, during, and after excavating cultural heritage sites (Australian Archaeological Association 1994). In some regions, these negotiations have recovered evidence of older cultural practices that can be re-purposed to ensure the conservation and regeneration of local flora and fauna over time (e.g., Atalay 2012; Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2008). Meetings facilitated by the World Archaeological Congress and other organizations have brought together archaeologists from disparate locales to share common cause and form global alliances focused on decolonizing (Smith & Wobst 2005:13).

Future students of archaeology can learn from and build upon these strides to uncover new intersections among past and present identities and cultures. They will find that Euro-colonial concepts of race, kin, and identity do not easily mesh with non-Western visions of modernity. Decolonization must be viewed as a "long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic, and psychological divesting of colonial power" (Smith 1999:98). Archaeologists have found it necessary to renegotiate and redefine terms (e.g., post-racial, inter-cultural, trans-national) that attempt to define complex expressions of Indigenous and ethnic identities in the post-colonial, post-modern world (Bruchac et al. 2010; Smith & Wobst 2005). Standardized terms and approaches (e.g, processual and post-processual; distinct temporal eras; social evolution) may no longer be universally applicable. Even the terms "post-modern" and "post-colonial" are problematic, since these perpetuate the illusion that colonial domination of the Indigenous has ended.

Just as there is no single colonial model that encompasses all of colonialism, there is no single Indigenous model and no single decolonizing approach. The inclusion of non-scientists as research partners has revealed cultural and procedural differences that are not always easy to bridge. By engaging with living communities, archaeologists have improved popular understandings of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the present-day, post-colonial modern world. Processes of consultation and collaboration have been transformative, but they have also been difficult, given the inherent power imbalances among scientists (as apparent agents of colonial nation-states) and archaeological subjects (as recovering victims of colonization). Indigenous peoples and other colonized communities have expressed needs that do not always match with archaeological goals, categories and routines. Better attention must be paid to the handling of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, with consideration for the spiritual, ephemeral, and experiential relations of Indigenous peoples with the natural world (Atalay 2012). These interactions will require careful, patient communication.

Future efforts in decolonizing archaeology will require situationally specific, carefully negotiated approaches that attend to social contingencies as well as scientific concerns (Bruchac et al. 2010; Messenger & Smith 2010). Many Indigenous communities (in common with other marginalized peoples) still suffer from the impacts of colonization, including persistent poverty and political marginalization. Teams of stakeholders---including archaeologists, museum staff, descent communities, traditional knowledge-bearers, developers, and representatives of state societies---can decolonize their own social relations and share common cause by coming together to protect locales that house unique histories (Messenger & Smith 2010).

The environmental effects of colonialism are most obvious in patterns of land use and development that resulted in the wholesale extraction of natural resources and destruction of cultural landscapes. Decolonizing projects that explicitly involve and empower Indigenous and local communities are likely to have an impact on long-term land use. Some archaeologists have sought to preserve endangered cultural heritage sites by including both site preservation and social justice as a desired goal (e.g., Bruchac et al. 2010; Oland et al. 2012; Messenger & Smith 2010; Smith & Wobst 2005). Collaborations with Indigenous knowledge-bearers can inspire projects that draw upon traditional knowledges to shape new approaches. Rather than subject their lands and ecosystems to commercial development and resource extraction, formerly colonized communities might explore forms of sustainable development (such as heritage tourism and seasonal hunting) that can generate income and encourage site preservation. Archaeologists can assist in these efforts by conceptualizing and implementing projects that dovetail scientific research with historical preservation and community needs. International organizations (e.g., the United Nations, UNESCO, and the World Archaeological Congress) can support such initiatives by continuing to promote protocols that explicitly link cultural preservation with sustainability.

Cross-References

→ Community Engagement in Archaeological Theory

→ Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights and Issues in Indigenous Archaeology

→ Cultural Property Repatriation and Restitution: Introduction

→ Cultural Property Repatriation in the United States: A Case Study in NAGPRA (US)

→ Ethics and Archaeology: Significance, Stewardship and Values

→ Ethics: Working with Stakeholders

→ Indigenous Archaeologies in Archaeological Theory

→ Indigenous Knowledge and Traditional Knowledge

→ Indigenous Perspectives and Approaches within Historical Archaeology

→ Indigenous Worldviews

→ Legislation and the Management of Indigenous Heritage

→ Multicultural Archaeology

→ Museums and Colonialism: the Politics of Display

→ Post-Colonial Archaeologies

→ Repatriation

→ Sacred Sites in Indigenous Archaeology

→ Stakeholders and Community Participation (World Heritage)

→ United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

→ World Heritage

References

ATALAY, S. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

AUSTRALIAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. 1994. *Australian Archaeological Association Code of Ethics.* http://www.australianarchaeology.com/about-2/code-of-ethics/#indigenous (accessed 15 October 2012).

BRUCHAC, M.M, S.M. HART & H.M. WOBST, eds. 2010. *Indigenous Archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

COLWELL-CHANTHAPHONH, C. & T. J. FERGUSON, eds. 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities.* Lanham, MD: AltaMira.

DENZIN, N.K., Y.S. LINCOLN & L.T. SMITH, eds. 2008. *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DONGOSKE, K. E., M. ALDENDERFER & K. DOEHNER, eds. 2000. *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists.* Washington, D.C.: Society for American Archaeology.

HABU, J., C. FAWCETT & J.M. MATSUNAGA, eds. 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies.* New York, NY: Springer.

ICOMOS New Zealand. 1995. *ICOMOS New Zealand charter for the conservation of places of cultural heritage value.* http://www.icomos.org.nz/nzcharters.htm (accessed 15 October 2012).

MAYBURY-LEWIS, D. 2002. *Indigenous Peoples, Ethnic Groups, and the State.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

MERRYMAN, J.H., ed. 2006. *Imperialism, Art, and Restitution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MESSENGER, P.M. & G.S. SMITH, eds. 2010. *Cultural Heritage Management: A Global Perspective.* Gainesville, FL:

University Press of Florida.

MIHESUAH, D.A. 2000. *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns Native American Indian Remains.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

OLAND, M., S.M. HART & L. FRINK, eds. 2012. *Decolonizing Indigenous Histories: Exploring Prehistoric/Colonial Transitions in Archaeology.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

SCHMIDT, P.R. & T.C. PATTERSON, eds. 1995. *Making alternative histories: The practice of archaeology and history in non-Western settings.* Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

SMITH, C. & WOBST, H.M., eds. 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

SMITH, L.T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books.

SWIDLER, N., K.E. DONGOSKE, R. ANYON & A.S. DOWNER, eds. 1997. *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

WATKINS, J. 2000. *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

WOBST, H. M. 2005. Power to the (indigenous) past and present! Or: The theory and method behind archaeological theory and method, in C. Smith & H.M. Wobst (eds.) *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*: 17-32. London: Routledge.

WORLD ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONGRESS. 1991. *World Archaeological Congress Code of Ethics.* www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org/site/about_ethi.php#code1 (accessed March 30, 2010).

Further Reading

ATALAY, S. 2006. Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice. *The American Indian Quarterly* 30(3&4):280-310.

CASSMAN, V. N. ODEGAARD & J. POWELL, eds. 2007. *Human Remains: Guide for Museums and Academic Institutions.* Oxford: AltaMira Press.

CONKEY, M.W. 2005. Dwelling at the margins, action at the intersection? Feminist and Indigenous archaeologies. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 1(1): 9–59.

FFORDE, C., J. HUBERT & P. TURNBULL, eds. 2002. *The Dead and Their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy, and Practice.* London & New York: Routledge Press.

KERBER, J.E., ed. 2006. *Cross-cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

KOVACH, M. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

LONETREE, A. 2012. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

PYBURN, K.A. 1999. Native American religion versus archaeological science: A pernicious dichotomy revisited. *Journal of Science and Engineering Ethics* 5:355–66.

SULLIVAN, L.E. & A. EDWARDS. 2004. *Stewards of the Sacred.* Washington, DC: American Association of Museums and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions.

WOBST, H. M. & C. SMITH. 2003. "Unothering": Theory and practice in archaeology, in T. Peck & E. Siegfried (eds.) *Indigenous people and archaeology: Proceedings of the 29th annual Chacmool Conference*: 211–25. Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary.