Indigenous North Americans and Archaeology[1]

George Nicholas, Dorothy Lippert, and Stephen Loring

(March 2018 Final Draft)

Native Americans' relationship with the discipline of archaeology has been shaped by centuries of historical circumstances, political engagement, and changing research agendas, in connection with Indigenous efforts to maintain or regain control over their affairs. At different times, archaeologists were seen (and often acted) as agents of colonialism or grave robbers, but also as allies or even employees of tribes. With the increasing number of Native American archaeologists, the terms "archaeologist" and "Indigenous" are no longer mutually exclusive.

There is no one attitude toward archaeology among Indigenous people. While some do not find it a meaningful way of relating to the past, others have embraced it as a tool that can be reconstructed and used in culturally appropriate ways. Nonetheless, professional archaeology still presents an artificial boundary that has often served to separate peoples and communities from their heritage and history.

This chapter focuses on Indigenous North Americans' engagement with archaeology—its historical development, contemporary practice, and future prospects and challenges. A rich, sometimes contentious discourse has developed since the 1970s on Indigeneity, ethnicity, and ethnogenesis; alternative modes of stewardship and heritage management; the protection of sacred places and cultural landscapes; bioarchaeology and genetics; intellectual property and intangible heritage; the role of oral history and traditional knowledge; and social justice and human rights. These reflect new opportunities for archaeology in response to technological advancements, changing theoretical regimes and interpretive methods, or political issues and ethical concerns relating to issues of sovereignty, repatriation, tribal recognition, and decolonization.

The term "Native American" is used in this chapter in its most inclusive form, to refer to the many distinct Indigenous nations, including Native American tribes and tribal communities in the United States; First Nations, Métis, and Inuit in Canada, and *los indios* in Mexico. The terms "Indigenous," "Aboriginal," and "Native" are considered synonymous.

HISTORICAL RELATIONS

The historical relationship between Native Americans and the discipline of archaeology from its earliest manifestation to the present has developed along distinct trajectories in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. It has been shaped by colonialism and the long, often complex history of White exploration and settlement, by the interpretation of Indigenous peoples as

---

[1] To appear in *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 1, Introduction*, edited by Igor Krupnik. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. *forthcoming*.

scientific specimens, by loss of land and language, and by the imposition of unilateral heritage policies. Yet Indigenous peoples within each of the North American nation-states share similar concerns over issues of sovereignty, self-determination, and repatriation. The broader history of relations between Native peoples and anthropologists is reviewed in Lurie (1988) and reflected in the Native-authored papers in Swidler et al. (1997) and elsewhere (e.g., Ferguson 1996; Trigger 1980).

Native Americans as Research Subjects

During the 18th and 19th centuries, interest in the Native American past was oriented primarily toward describing the antiquities and "rude monuments" (that is, earthworks) found across the eastern part of the North American continent. Most antiquarians held that Native Americans were incapable of such accomplishments, and attributed them to ancient Atlanteans, Welsh, Phoenicians, and others. The *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*, the first volume in the Smithsonian's Contributions to Knowledge series (Squire and Davis 1848), helped perpetuate the idea of a separate race of "Moundbuilders." This position was so widely held that it was taught in schools (Guernsey 1848).

By the late 19th century, archaeology came to play an important role first in setting the record straight by refuting the Moundbuilder myth, through the Bureau of American Ethnography's Mound Survey (Thomas 1894), and then in challenging the still-dominant unilinear evolutionary scheme promoted by Edward Tylor (1871) and Lewis Henry Morgan (1877) that positioned Native Americans at the lowest rung. Daniel Wilson (1865) disputing popular perceptions of Native Americans by using archaeology and ethnography (including direct observations and likely some interaction) to reveal the long and complex history of Native communities in the Great Lakes region. In Mexico, antiquarian interests focused initially on the Maya lowlands, as popularized in numerous drawings by Frederick Catherwood (b. 1799, d. 1854) and writings of John Stephens, and focused later on Teotihuacan and other upland sites. Rejecting the dominant view of the time, Stephens (1868) attributed those sites to the ancestors of the modern Maya.

As the fields of archaeology and anthropology developed, tribal members sometimes participated in field projects conducted on their traditional lands, primarily as guides or crew members (for example, Navajo workers at Pueblo Bonito, Hyde Expedition, 1897 [Schroeder 1979]). Anthropologists working with Native communities included Franz Boas (with Kwakwaka'wakw), Harlan Smith (with Secwepemc, Nlaka'pamux, and St'atimc), Jesse Fewkes (with Hopi and Zuni), Frank Cushing (with Zuni), Alanson Skinner (with Menomini), Arthur C. Parker (himself Seneca), and others. Rarely were the names of their "informants" known, yet they were essential in locating or interpreting artifacts and sites, providing translations and community access, and otherwise enabling archaeological research. Exceptions include George Hunt (b. 1854, d. 1933, who was half-Tlingit and raised among the Kwakwaka'wakw), Louis Shotridge (Stoowukháa, b. 1882, d. 1937), and Paul Silook (St. Lawrence Island Yupik, b. 1892,

d. 1949), who arguably did much of the fieldwork and data gathering that their non-Indigenous partners are credited with.

In a few notable (but problematic) instances, Indigenous individuals were also employed in museum settings. George Tsaroff (Aleut, b. circa 1858) was brought to the Smithsonian in 1878 and worked as an exhibit assistant and guide before dying of tuberculosis in 1880. In 1912, after the last members of his band of Yahi were killed, Ishi (b. circa 1861, d. 1916) was taken to the University of California, Berkeley, where he was studied by anthropologists and worked as a research assistant, demonstrating tool manufacture and use.

A fuller and more accurate rendering of Native American societies emerged in part through Boas's historical particularism, which incorporated archaeological, ethnographic, linguistic, and biological data to examine the unique nature and history of each culture investigated. Indeed, the Jessup North Pacific Expedition (1897–1902) sought to study culture history and change on a massive scale, involving Indigenous peoples from both northern North America and Asia (Kendall and Krupnik 2003). Another significant development that encouraged collaboration by archaeologists was the use of the direct historical approach, as evidenced in the work of Dorothy Keur and other female archaeologists, who integrated ethnographic research and archaeology (Kehoe 1998:187–189).

With some exceptions, these projects and those that followed saw Native Americans as research subjects. The purpose and benefits of archaeology were directed toward either archaeologists themselves or the broader public. In addition, archaeologists' relations with Indigenous communities reflected the prevailing unequal distribution of power. Official policies contributed to major challenges in preserving cultural identity. The redistribution of tribal territory through allotment, forced relocation, widespread poverty on reservations, and the termination of federal recognition all facilitated the breakdown of cultural practices and had the effect of supporting archaeologists' role as legitimate collectors and saviors of Native culture. The myth of the "vanishing Indian" allowed archaeologists to view Native cultures as in decline and in need of preservation. Many collections made during this time were the direct result of military conquest, imprisonment of tribal members, and confiscation of ceremonial objects and cultural patrimony (see, for example, Jacknis 2000). Archaeologists, as agents of the government or, at the very least, beneficiaries of government policies, were recognized as authorities on what constituted Indian "cultures."

By the late 19th and early 20th centuries, procurement of all things Aboriginal for both private collectors and museums was occurring at an unprecedented pace on the Northwest Coast (Cole 1995; Fienup-Riordan 1996; Freed 2012) and elsewhere (see, for examplee, Hamilton 2006; Kelley et al. 2011). Many objects were purchased from community members, but looting of shrines and burial grounds in pursuit of scientific specimens and human remains for study was also widespread (Bieder 1986). In British Columbia, such actions by Franz Boas and Harlan Smith left a legacy that often equated archaeology with thievery and grave robbing (Carlson 2005), an attitude that has continued to the present in some cases. In Mexico and the United

States, skeletal remains were taken with impunity from battlegrounds and burial places (McGuire 2017; Mihesuah 2000), nominally in support of building "scientific" collections.

Dissatisfaction and Reaction

By the 1960s, social movements brought attention to the long-standing grievances of Native Americans. In step with the civil rights movement, activists in the United States pushed for greater rights, social justice, and restitution for minority groups. Demands for recognition of treaty rights, alleviation of poverty in Native communities, access to education, and children's welfare were accompanied by concerns about traditional lands and cultural heritage issues (Deloria 2008). The Red Power movement and the American Indian Movement highlighted social issues of concern to Native peoples, including archaeological research, which was often conflated with actions showing disrespect for the dead. Although Indigenous perspectives on archaeology and anthropology had been voiced for decades, they were often ignored or dismissed. With biting wit, some of these complaints were summarized in the influential work *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (Deloria 1969).

These initiatives not only brought such concerns to national attention but also launched actions to stop the desecration of ancestral remains. Increasing Native political clout facilitated passage of such U.S. federal legislation as the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (1975) and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978; see "Cultural Heritage Laws," *this volume*). However, these laws had limited effect against the legislative severing of Native Americans from their ancestral dead that began with the Antiquities Act of 1906 and was later perpetuated by cultural resource management legislation (Watkins 2005). Significant federal legislation or rulings on indigenous rights passed in Canada include the Constitution Act of 1982 and *Delgamuukw v. Regina* in 1997. Throughout the 1970s, Native activists also engaged with museums to object to the curation and exhibit of human remains and funerary objects (Fine Dare 2002:76–80). The Longest Walk of 1978 was designed to focus public attention on treaty rights, but it also resulted in the formation of American Indians Against Desecration, a group focused on repatriation (Hammil and Cruz 1989).

Repatriation as a Motivating Factor

Although relatively few archaeologists work directly with human remains, many have had their work affected by repatriation and the call for greater involvement of Native Americans in archaeological work. In the 1980s, the "reburial dispute," as it was then called, emerged as a major conflict between Native Americans and archaeologists (Heizer 1978:13) and, more broadly, between science and religion. Although contentious, the debates led many archaeologists to start to listen to Native perspectives and to begin to understand the source of Native people's acrimony (see Colwell 2017; Zimmerman 1994). The formation of the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) in 1986 provided an opportunity for Native activists from North America to connect with like-minded activists from Australia and New Zealand, as well as with archaeologists who empathized with Indigenous views (Ucko 1987). In 1988, at the WAC's

First Indigenous Inter-Congress, the Vermillion Accord on Human Remains was signed. WAC continues its focus on Indigenous rights: an Indigenous Council is incorporated as part of its governing body.

In 1989, the National Museum of the American Indian Act was signed into law, directing repatriation practices for the Smithsonian Institution (see "A New Dream Museum," *this volume*). In 1990, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was signed, directing repatriation practices for institutions in the United States that receive federal funding. Both laws require consultation with tribes as part of the process of identifying cultural affiliation of human remains and associated funerary objects. In this way, repatriation began to contribute to an increase in consultation, as evidenced in the case of the small Alutiiq community of Larsen Bay, Kodiak Island, Alaska, where the remains of 1,000 individuals were returned from the Smithsonian Institution in 1991 (Bray and Killion 1994).

In the wake of NAGPRA, national consultations in Canada led to a case-specific approach to repatriation as published in the report *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples* (Hill and Nicks 1992). Additional guidance has come from the Canadian Archaeological Association's Statement of Principles Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples (1996), the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996), and the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). Along with provincial legislation (such as Alberta's First Nations Sacred Ceremonial Objects Repatriation Act of 2000), these reports guide the development of individual institutional policies to structure internal repatriation processes (for example, the Canadian Museum of History's 2001 repatriation policy). Major repatriations in Canada have included the return of 400 ancestors to the Haida in the late 1990s (Krmpotich 2014) and the reburial of more than 1,700 Huron-Wendat ancestors in Ontario (Pfeiffer and Lesage 2014).

In the 1990s, archaeologists and Native American activists negotiated a new status quo in which repatriation was the law of the land. Some publications about repatriation continued to disparage Native perspectives on archaeology as "unscientific" (for example, Meighan 1999), but others have described the new relationships built as part of repatriation activity (see "Cultural Heritage Laws," *this volume*). The first decade of the 21st century largely saw a renegotiation of the positions. While some archaeologists continued to see tribal peoples as anti-archaeology (for example, McGhee 2008), others considered repatriation an opportunity to grow the discipline. The activism that resulted in repatriation laws also challenged mainstream archaeology to acknowledge that multiple perspectives on the past existed. The transition between treating human remains as objects of scientific inquiry and treating them as objects of cultural concern has resulted in the emergence of a new set of practices and ethics policies, as reflected in the 2007 repatriation in Sonora, Mexico, of remains from the Yaqui Massacre collected by Ales Hrdlicka in 1902 (McGuire 2017).

Attitudes toward study of the dead are not uniform among Indigenous peoples. Some contend that any disturbance of ancestral remains is desecration, whereas others believe that the ancestors have let themselves be found to teach the youth about their past (for example, Syms

2014). Natives' involvement with the study of human remains is dependent on their equal participation in the research process rather than service only as source material. An early example of such a relationship was the 1983 collaboration between the Tohono O'odham and archaeologists in Arizona regarding human remains and mortuary items (McGuire 2008:155). Despite the long-standing controversy over Kennewick Man ("the Ancient One"), many Indigenous groups have collaborated on research to reveal the life histories of their very ancient ancestors, such as the Anzick child (Callaway 2014) and Kwä̀dąy Dän Ts'ìnchį (Hebda et al. 2017). A hallmark of the latter study was the authority exercised by the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations in developing the research design and overseeing the distribution of the resulting data. Many Indigenous communities are now involved in community-informed scientific study of both ancestral human remains and DNA (see, for example, Schaepe et al. 2015; Walker et al. 2016).

Emergence and Development of Indigenous Archaeology

The first tribally run archaeology programs date to the 1970s. Both the Zuni Archaeology Program and the Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department are directed toward meeting heritage management needs and training community members (see Ferguson 1980; Klesert and Downer 1990; "Southwest," *this volume*). Also during the 1970s, many non-Native archaeologists worked with, and in some cases *for*, Native communities or otherwise tried to reconcile traditional archaeology with tribal opinion. Larry Zimmerman (1994) wrote about his experiences working on the Crow Creek massacre site and described a struggle to balance tribal needs with professional responsibilities.

In the American Southwest, archaeologists Roger Anyon, T. J. Ferguson, Kurt Dongoske, Barbara Mills, and others who worked closely with Puebloan communities wrote that this approach did not lessen the quality of the work they produced but rather elevated their understanding of the past (also see Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010). In the Northeast, Russell Handsman and Ann McMullen at the American Indian Archaeological Institute privileged tribal perspectives in museum and archaeological contexts. By the 1980s in northern Mexico, a small number of archaeologists were working with communities, including Jane Kelley (with the Yaqui), Elisa Villalpando, Randall McGuire (with the Tohono O'odham), and more recently Peter Jiminez in El Teúl, Zacatecas. In Canada, community-oriented projects were developed by Stephen Loring (with the Innu), David Denton (with the Cree), George Nicholas (with the Secwepemc), and Tom Andrews and John Zoe (with the Tłı̨chǫ)—not in aid of archaeological research per se but to introduce archaeology as a tool to complement other ways of knowing and to provide employment and educational opportunities. Farther north in Nunavik, Canada, Inuit interest in archaeology was championed by a young Inuk hunter, Daniel Weetaluktuk, who encouraged local participation in the management of heritage resources. Many of these initiatives sought to have archaeological knowledge and collections reside in the community rather than outside of it (for example, Dongoske et al. 2000; Knecht 2014; Loring 2009; Nicholas and Andrews 1997a; Swidler et al. 1997).

In the 1990s, a new program of heritage-related research and preservation emerged that has become known as "Indigenous archaeology." In the past 25 years, it has come to comprise a broad set of ideas, methods, and strategies applied to the discovery and interpretation of the human past that are informed by the values, concerns, and goals of Indigenous peoples. First defined as "archaeology done by, with, and for, Indigenous people" (Nicholas and Andrews 1997b: 3, n. 5), Indigenous archaeology has since been characterized as "an expression of archaeological theory and practice in which the discipline intersects with Indigenous values, knowledge, practices, ethics, and sensibilities, and through collaborative and community-originated or -directed projects, and related critical perspectives" (Nicholas 2008:1660). Indigenous archaeology acknowledges and challenges differences between Indigenous and Western epistemologies; inequalities in representation, decision making, and benefit flows; and issues relating to Indigeneity and racialism. It assumes different forms and strategies in a variety of circumstances, as discussed below.

The development of Indigenous archaeology was influenced by factors that include the repatriation movement, grassroots initiatives, and academic enlightenment (Watkins and Nicholas 2014). Its methods and goals are multiple and flexible, defying compartmentalization (Nicholas 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005). Yet the question remains: Is Indigenous archaeology conducted by Indigenous practitioners to the best of the Western scientific tradition, or is it something uniquely Indigenous, with roots in different language, teachings, and social compacts (Loring 1999)?

Relations between indigenous Mexicans and archaeologists have followed a different trajectory from that in Canada and the United States. Mexican archaeology has long been dominated by either a U.S. imperialist agenda or a local nationalist one that employed the concept of *indigenismo* to "glorify[y] mestizos (people of mixed Indian and European ancestry) as the people of the nation" (McGuire 2008:152; also Bueno 2016). As a result, there have been far fewer opportunities for indigenous engagement with archaeology in northern Mexico, and sometimes greater political liability. Although this situation is changing in northern Mexico (Alstshul et al. 2014), collaboration still lags well behind the advances made in Maya archaeology elsewhere in Mexico (see, for example, Gnecco and Ayala 2011; McAnany and Rowe 2016; Zborover and Kroefges 2015).

Indigenous archaeology reflects a postcolonial orientation and is constructed according to specific Indigenous and tribal sensibilities. It attempts to increase the relevance of archaeology to tribes and Indigenous communities and remind the discipline of its responsibilities to Indigenous peoples. The methods employed are directed by community beliefs, oral records, traditional knowledge, and religious practices and worldviews, coupled with archaeology, ethnography, ethnohistory, and participatory action research, often in a collaborative framework. Indigenous archaeology has become a familiar entity in the professional archaeological network, resulting in a plurality of goals, methods, and outcomes distinct to each community project and in a diverse range and increasing number of tribal members practicing archaeology (Bruchac et al. 2010; Nicholas 2010). As of 2017, at least 21 Indigenous North Americans had completed PhD degrees

in archaeology. An unknown, but likely larger, number without doctorates also work as archaeologists.

INDIGENOUS ONTOLOGY, EPISTEMOLOGY, AND HERITAGE VALUES

Indigenous engagement with "the past" is defined or influenced by Indigenous epistemology, language, and ontology; by religious beliefs and practices; and by traditional knowledge systems and empirical observations of the world. Conceptions of law, sovereignty, property, identity, time, and well-being all converge to define heritage values. Without reference to these, it is not possible to understand Native concerns about, and responsibilities to, artifacts ("belongings"), ancestral sites ("homes"), or human remains ("ancestors"). Significant differences exist not only between Western and Indigenous worldviews, but also between Native American societies. Yet there are broad commonalities relating to worldview, ecological relations, modes of explanation, conceptions of time, and relations with objects and places.

Understanding "the Past"

Many traditional Native American lifeways and worldviews tend to be fundamentally different from those associated with the Western or Judeo-Christian traditions. They often are oriented to the premise that "the universe [and everything in it] is alive, has power, will and intelligence" (Harris 2005:35). The landscape may contain other-than-human beings, as well as places and water bodies filled with power or special features. Familiar Western dichotomies (such as natural/supernatural) may be absent, and distinctions between "past," "present," and "future" different or nonexistent. Ancestral beings may thus be part of *this* existence; a Transformer rock marks not only where an event happened but also where that being *still* resides.

Indigenous belief systems promote active rather than passive engagement with the world; proper behavior and adherence to obligations are needed to maintain the world (see for examples, Bastien 2004; Fogelson 2012; Harris 2005; Schaepe et al. 2017). These beliefs are expressed in a variety of ways. Conceptions of death and responsibilities for caring for the deceased translate into how physical remains should be treated. There may be no difference between the part and the whole, between a bone (or hair) and the person it represents. "Ownership" of objects, songs or stories, and even places may be communal. There may be no practical distinction between tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and restrictions may exist on who has access to or can share some forms of knowledge. Relations with each other (including past and future generations), with the land, with animals, and with non-human beings are based on responsibility, respect, and community well-being.

Ways of Knowing

Knowledge of the world is continuously obtained through empirical observations, supplemented by information shared by others, and then interpreted through whatever body of traditional knowledge, belief, and history grounds every society. Native American epistemology is a process by which individuals and groups collect information from experiences and explanations

of the world, which are verified and interpreted by elders, religious specialists, and others, and then conveyed through and preserved by oral traditions and other forms of record keeping (Cajete 1999; Nicholas and Markey 2014).

Traditional (or Indigenous) knowledge generally refers to the entirety of a society's collective relationship with and explanation of the world and all it contains. From a Native perspective (Bruchac 2014:3814), "indigenous knowledges are conveyed formally and informally among kin groups and communities through social encounters, oral traditions, ritual practices, and other activities. They include oral narratives that recount human histories, cosmological observations and modes of reckoning time, symbolic and decorative modes of communication, techniques for planting and harvesting, hunting and gathering skills, specialized understandings of local ecosystems, and the manufacture of specialized tools and technologies."

Western knowledge tends toward a reductionist, hierarchical model of description and classification, coupled with a Cartesian sense of order and a search for universalist explanation. Indigenous epistemology is more particularistic and situational, composed of different bodies of knowledge (such as *Qaujimajatuqangit* ["Inuit traditional knowledge"]). Native experts often argue that "[t]he fact that Native science is not fragmented into specialized compartments does not mean that it is not based on rational thinking, but that it is based on the belief that all things are connected and must be considered within the context of the interrelationship" (Augustine 1997:1).

Such relationships and responsibilities are evident in the concept of Indigenous Knowledge or, more commonly, Traditional Ecological Knowledge. This refers to the integrated principles, practices, and beliefs that reveal and perpetuate the connections and interdependence of people, animals, plants, natural objects, supernatural entities, and environments (Berkes 1999). This body of knowledge, reflecting a deep understanding of the environment, may be manifested by sustainable resource harvesting practices (such as clam gardens), use of fire to attract game or maintain berry-picking areas, caribou hunting practices, medicinal and technological uses of plants, and place names (see, for example, Basso 1996; Fienup-Riordan 2007; Stapp and Burney 2002; Turner 2014). Such practices have contributed to the historical ecology of particular areas—which reveals how Native American practices have shaped local and regional environments over the course of thousands of years—and they are integral to contemporary stewardship goals and practices (Ross et al. 2011). They are also represented in the archaeological record.

Both Native and Western knowledge systems incorporate experiential observations, require verification of results, employ recognition of patterns, and use both prediction and inference. Nonetheless, there has long been an uneasy relationship between Western science (including archaeology) and Native American oral histories and traditional knowledge (Echo-Hawk 2000). Many archaeologists have found some degree of congruence between the archaeological record and Native historical accounts—relating to, for example, landscape management practices, fire ecology, lithic sourcing, tsunamis and other catastrophic events, and migrations. Others question the reliability of such accounts (for example, Mason 2006; McGhee

2008). More generally, archaeologists, climate scientists, and others are often highly selective when accepting oral histories: they are viewed as valuable when they support scientific analysis, but problematic when they do not (Nicholas and Markey 2014). Indigenous archaeology seeks to reveal and challenge such issues.

Indigenous Research Methods

Much of the work done by North American anthropologists before the 20th century was concerned with documenting what were held to be "vanishing Indian cultures." In extreme cases, ancestral groups were thought to have become extinct, with archaeologists favoring replacement models rather than in situ evolution (for example, the Newfoundland Beothuk, North Slope Birnirk/Thule, St. Lawrence Valley Iroquoians). Not surprisingly, Native Americans did not vanish, and throughout the 20th century they demanded a rightful say in decisions about their lives, their lands, and their heritage (Rossen 2015). Archaeologists, seeing that tribal cultures had shifted alongside that of the rest of North America, began to view themselves as the proper stewards of ancient Indian cultures and saw tribes as less "authentic." Archaeologists and anthropologists benefited from the expertise of Indigenous informants in tribal identity, culture, and materiality but generally failed to publicly recognize these contributions. In fact, some of the rhetoric surrounding disputes over repatriation highlighted the archaeologists' perceived roles as the saviors of and sole authorities on Indian culture.

Native Americans have worked to reassert themselves in the wake of loss of land, language, and control over their own affairs (Lydon and Rizvi 2010; Smith 1999). Indigenous archaeology confronts the legacy of scientific colonialism by incorporating Native worldviews, values, and epistemology (Guindon 2015). This requires developing respect and trust through meaningful community interaction, consultation, negotiation, and collaboration; culturally appropriate behavior; and long-term commitments to communities.

Research methods in Indigenous archaeology are directed by local needs, emphasize ethical and culturally appropriate behavior, recognize the subjectivity of scientific objectivity, ensure that the tribes are the primary beneficiaries of the research, and stress community participation. In addition to traditional site surveys, testing, and excavation techniques, ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological methods include walking the land to identify traditional cultural properties, and the use of focus groups, place name research, interviewing, and participant observation, which may be used to discuss customary law or to identify local concerns about, or perceptions of, what constitutes heritage sites. This orientation recognizes the problematic nature of some terms (such as "abandoned," "ruins," "prehistory" [Zimmerman 2010]) and may employ more respectful terms such as "belongings" (versus "artifacts") and "person" (versus "skeletal remains"). Dissolving the standard "historic" and "prehistoric" division removes an offensive separation of contemporary Aboriginal peoples from their past (Lightfoot 1995).

Indigenous research ethics are based on a recognition of responsibility—not to archaeology or whatever other discipline is involved but to both the living community and the

ancestors. When this is adopted as a guiding principle, practices such as repatriation that some archaeologists have seen as destructive are instead understood as culturally appropriate. Reorienting cultural heritage management in this way helps ensure that scientific goals do not ignore other values. Furthermore, the integration of community values can have significant implications for appropriate cultural resource management strategies, such as by helping identify and interpret heritage sites and objects while ensuring respect for those that have no associated material record and thus might be missed in site evaluations or mitigation plans. In some projects, researchers address community concerns by using non-invasive or minimally invasive methods that allow for scientific research while avoiding damaging or disturbing ancestral sites (e.g., Glencross et al. 2017).

Research projects are designed to take account of community needs and values, which are often prioritized over the recovery of scientific data (an approach that can sometimes lead to conflict with government permitting agencies). These community interests include heritage preservation, education, community history and traditional knowledge, sociocultural well-being (health), cultural revitalization, and repatriation of knowledge and objects of cultural patrimony (see, for example, Bernard et al. 2011; Loring et al. 2003). Taking a larger view than the usual site-specific or artifact-focused studies of traditional archaeology, an Indigenous research orientation prioritizes both tangible and intangible expressions of heritage. For some, field projects may thus include ceremonial activities, storytelling, drumming, singing, and offerings to honor the ancestors, as well as smudging or ocher face paint to protect crew members. These types of practices may be challenging for non-Native students but overall contribute to the well-being of all participants (Gonzalez et al. 2006).

Although it intersects with Native epistemologies and values, Indigenous archaeology is often still grounded in traditional anthropological and archaeological methods. Theoretically it resonates strongly with interpretive, feminist, Marxist, and critical archaeological theory and methods (Nicholas 2008). The combination of Native sensibilities, robust theory, and scientific methods should enhance, not limit, the production of knowledge. As Trigger (2003:183) notes, "By contradicting accepted interpretations of the past, these ideas stimulated research that tested both old and new ideas. . . . The greatest obstacle to making process in archaeology is intellectual complacency. Without the ability to imagine alternative explanations, archaeology languishes."

INDIGENOUS HERITAGE STEWARDSHIP AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

Recognizing the nature of Indigenous worldviews, heritage values, and knowledge systems is essential to understanding Native American attitudes toward archaeology, cultural resource management, and museum practices. Achieving such an understanding, however, can be challenging because of fundamentally different conceptions of heritage that may exist. Here "heritage" is defined as the objects, places, knowledge, customs, practices, plants, stories, songs, designs, and relationships, conveyed between generations, that define or contribute to a person's or group's identity, history, worldview, and well-being (Nicholas 2017:214). When coupled with Native ontology and belief systems, such a conception of heritage results in a view of the world

in which objects may be alive and the “real” and “supernatural” may be part of the same dimension. Rock art images may embody ancestral beings as well as provide important teachings (Atalay et al. 2016) (FIG X). Ancient objects are often touchstones of history, including family heirlooms that connect generations. These concepts affect tribal decisions regarding landscape preservation, repatriation, and reburial and have substantial implications for cultural and heritage management.

Preserving and Protecting Heritage Values

Native Americans are greatly concerned by threats to sacred sites, burial grounds and cemeteries, and other places of religious or historical significance (Guilliford 2000). Actions undertaken as part of economic development and heritage management practices that do not involve sufficient tribal consultation threaten tribal efforts to maintain the historical continuity, identity, and well-being of Native interests and communities.

In 2016, the Standing Rock Sioux tribe led resistance to the installation of the Dakota Access Pipeline **[FIG. X]**, an underground oil pipeline, not only because of authorities’ lack of adequate consultation but also because of their failure to recognize the impact of the pipeline on the cultural, spiritual, and environmental dimensions of the land and water (Standing Rock Tribe et al. 2017**]**. Equally concerning was that the pipeline was relocated closer to the Native community and farther from a non-Native community. In cases like this, Indigenous heritage values combine with desires for economic equity to produce resistance to outside actions.

The Aya:huda (effigies of twin War Gods) are an example of what non-Natives consider inanimate objects that are appropriately preserved in climate-controlled settings. In sharp contrast, the Zuni identify them as living beings who must be returned to the environment from which they were created, maintaining their innate identity as sacred, even though their physical structure decays as a consequence (Colwell 2017; Merrill et al. 1993). Another example is more durable in form: the Stó:lō of British Columbia consider a seated stone bowl figurine, T’Xwelátse, to be “a man who was turned to stone but is still alive” (Stó:lō Nation 2012).

For many Native Americans, maintaining and preserving religious practices and traditional values cannot be separated from the landscape and everything it contains, including heritage sites, all of which are vital to their identity, worldview, and well-being. The protection of archaeological sites and places of historic or spiritual importance to Native Americans intersects incompletely with federal, state, or provincial heritage policies. Direct participation in heritage management or stewardship practices, the protection of ancestral sites and burial grounds, and policy development and revision are all considered important goals for Indigenous Native Americans.

Developing Indigenous Heritage Management

Changes to the political landscape across North America are beginning to support, at least in principle, the shifting of greater responsibility for Native heritage toward Native Americans themselves. Some Native American tribes in the United States and Canada (such as Zuni, Hopi, Pequot, Makah, and Stó:lō) have long inventoried and managed their own cultural resources.

Many have established heritage policies, bylaws, guidelines, and permit systems, as well as new protocols for archaeological and heritage resources (Bell and Napoleon 2008; Welch et al. 2009). These initiatives mark a significant development, establishing Aboriginal peoples as heritage managers, not just collaborators in provincial management schemes (Kuwanwisiwma et al. 2018).

In many places, however, Indigenous heritage continues to be managed by and through national and provincial or state governments. Legislation has often been enacted in reaction to public outcry over highly visible heritage loss (the looting at Slack Farm, Kentucky, for example, arguably paved the way for NAGPRA), yet such laws remain difficult to enforce (see Kelley et al. 2011 on looting in Chihuahua). Without adequate consultation or collaboration, even well-intended laws and policies may be ineffective and fail to protect Native American heritage.

In the United States, Native American heritage sites and practices are protected (and affected) by legislation such as the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 (1966), the National Museum of the American Indian Act (1989), and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990; see "Cultural Heritage Laws," *this volume*). In Canada, federal legislation (such as the 2013 Cultural Resource Management Policy and the 2006 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act) offers only limited protection of heritage sites (Warrick 2017). Instead, the management and protection of archaeological sites are enacted largely at the provincial level (for example, the Heritage Conservation Act in British Columbia). In Mexico, heritage protection has largely been part of a nationalist agenda that promotes an indivisible mixed (mestizo) identity (Altschul and Ferguson 2014). This agenda favors centralized heritage management and public education but affords no special rights to *los indios* (Native Mexicans).

Tribal peoples have often asked how outsiders can make decisions about someone else's heritage when they are unaware of, or do not understand, local values, needs, and consequences. Starting in the 1990s, there has been a growing number of initiatives in which Native Americans have taken an equal or lead role in heritage management. One widely cited example of effective collaborative heritage management has been the protection of Kashaya Pomo heritage sites in California (Dowdall and Parrish 2003). A hybrid approach was developed that respected the Kashaya Pomo worldview and incorporated local knowledge to mitigate impacts. Archaeologists were then asked to follow tribal observances and precautions on how the landscape should be treated and what constituted appropriate behavior at a site.

Another example is a community-based heritage management plan in British Columbia that established a partnership between the Wet'suwet'en First Nation and major forestry operation licensees. In this case, the Wet'suwet'en provided the necessary archaeological services through a joint venture partnership between their Land and Resources Department and a local archaeological consulting company. Their goal was "not to preserve *all* Wet'suwet'en cultural heritage resources, but rather to preserve what was primarily important to the Wet'suwet'en" (Budwha 2005: 29). The First Nation assumed a central role in the entire

archaeological management process—maintaining high archaeological and industry standards, while being informed by Wet'suwet'en cultural values.

Significant national and international political developments in recent years have supported the move toward increased Indigenous management of their heritage. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) has garnered much attention, in part because Canada and the United States initially voted against it. However, there remains uncertainty about how it will affect policy development at the national level. Similarly, the ramifications of the landmark *Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia* decision (2014) in Canada have yet to be seen. When the Supreme Court of Canada established Aboriginal land title in the decision, it precipitated a shift from "consultation" to "consent" on negotiations with government and industry over resources, land use and heritage. Little direction has been given, however, on how to shift practice toward the latter.

ADDRESSING COMMUNITY NEEDS AND CHALLENGES

Contemporary archaeological initiatives with, for, and by Native Americans and First Nations peoples that incorporate Indigenous values and epistemologies, traditional knowledge, community goals, or scientific objectives take many forms (e.g., Leliévre 2017; Lepofsky et al. 2017Supernant 2017). They often include educational programs that involve field training, networking, information management, and community engagement and outreach, while also promoting local values (e.g., Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007; Leliévre 2017; Martinez 2012).

Archaeology with and for Communities

Community-oriented archaeology was introduced to many by pioneering work with a Dakota community at Little Rapids, Wisconsin (Spector 1993), and by contributors to the first overview of archaeology's relations with the First Peoples in Canada (Nicholas and Andrews 1997a) and in the United States (Swidler et al. 1997). Atalay (2012) and Lyons (2013) are later exemplars of research that foregrounds "community" in some fashion, whether directing the research or benefiting from it.

In New York State, archaeologists collaborated with the Cayuga tribe to support it in the face of racial hostility directed at the tribe's land claims. The public anthropology initiative led to the development of the SHARE initiative (Strengthening Haudenosaunee American Relations through Education) in 2001 (Hansen and Rossen 2007). Informed by local knowledge and archaeology, SHARE helped the Cayuga reestablish a presence in their ancestral homeland.

In 1971, the Makah tribe of Neah Bay, Washington, hired University of Washington archaeologists to excavate the remains of the ancient village of Ozette, which was buried in a mudslide around A.D. 1750. The excavation of the site, famous for the preservation of wooden artifacts, included tribal youth on the archaeological crew, "bringing a sense of historical continuity to the excavation" (Bowechop and Erickson 2005:266). The excavation confirmed Makah oral tradition about a "great slide" that had covered the village. The tribe later created the

Makah Cultural and Research Center to house the recovered objects and tell the Makah story of the village. Curation reflects Makah concepts of ownership and property by dividing the objects into households based on the excavation records and labeling them in the Makah language, a practice that supports language preservation and linguistic analysis. The Makah adapted the museum concept to fit tribal needs. Their language program develops curricula and teaches Makah at the local elementary and high schools. The center also curates photographs and assists tribal members with preserving cultural items.

The Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut used profits derived from the tribe's casino to develop the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center. The museum uses oral history and mythology coupled with archaeological, ethnohistorical, and paleoenvironmental data to create a storyline of Pequot occupation and ancestry in New England, which serves as the intellectual bedrock of Indian identity in eastern North America. Other examples of Native tribes using archaeology to assert a moral and intellectual connection to the past include the Mi'kmaq development and stewardship of the Debert Paleoindian site in Nova Scotia (Bernard et al. 2011), the Reciprocal Research Network based at the University of British Columbia (Rowley 2013; see "Native American Communities, Museums, and Emerging Digital Networks, *this volume*), and the Ziibiwing Cultural Center of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan.

Archaeological Field Schools and Training Programs

Indigenous field schools explicitly connect heritage sites to a living tribal community (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2010; Silliman 2008). Some of the earliest training programs were sponsored by the Zuni and Hopi Nations in the U.S. Southwest in the late 1970s and were directed to building capacity while also addressing heritage preservation needs. In Canada, First Nations community members received training in archaeology, albeit informally, while participating in field projects directed by archaeologists Leigh Syms, David Denton, Stephen Loring, and others beginning in the late 1980s. The first archaeology program explicitly for First Nations was developed and run by archaeologist George Nicholas on the Kamloops Indian Reserve in British Columbia (1991–2005).

Today there are archaeology field schools that are ongoing or occasional collaborations between tribes and universities (see, for examples, Silliman 2008). The University of Washington and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde have a field program in tribal historic preservation and archaeological field methods on the tribes' reservation in Oregon. In the Northeast, the Mohegan Tribe partnered with the Connecticut College for a field school that focuses on the needs of the Mohegan Tribe while conducting rigorous archaeological research on colonial history and Mohegan history and heritage. A similar partnership exists beween the Eastern Pequot and the University of Massachusetts Boston.

Past and ongoing archaeological field schools at northern village sites (like those headed by archaeologist Richard Knecht in the Aleutians and the Kuskokwim River in Alaska), camping places (Avataq Cultural Institute in Nunavut, Canada), and places of seasonal abundance (led by

archaeologists Richard Jordan at the Uyak site and Aron Crowell at Kenai Peninsula in Alaska) create experiential opportunities for Native youth to learn about their heritage and culture. Such programs also create opportunities for knowledgeable elders to participate in the construction and conveyance of cultural knowledge, bridge generational gaps, and provide an alternative to educational systems often at odds with the socioeconomic realities of northern village life.

In California, the Pimu Catalina Island Field School is "a collaborative project with members of the Tongva community [that] conducts research to dispel the imagined cultural history of Santa Catalina Island in particular, and Tongva territory generally" (Martinez and Teeter 2015:25). Tongva leaders, cultural experts, and elders provide instruction and challenge the common belief that California Indians, and the Tongva in particular, "vanished." Students are instructed that the Tongva view the sites, artifacts, and natural environment as ancestors who must be respected and protected, not just as heritage sites in need of management. A separate Native Cultural Resources Practitioners' Training program is offered for tribal heritage managers.

In Mexico, training opportunities were provided in the early 2000s through the Tincheras Tradition Project with the Tohono O'odham in Sonora, Mexico, directed by archaeologists Elisa Villalpando and Randall McGuire (McGuire 2008:167–177), and by the El Teúl archaeological project in Zacatecas, led by Peter Jimenez. Natalia Martínez-Tagüeña's (2015) collaboration with members of the Comcaac (Seri Indians) community of the central coast of Sonora, Mexico, integrated oral historical evidence with archaeological, ethnographic, and documentary data to generate a better understanding of the Comcaac past and its continuity.

Building Capacities

Increasingly, Native American tribes and First Nations have full- or part-time archaeologists on staff, including those who are themselves community members. Native community monitors are a routine part of cultural resource management projects, but Native Americans also serve as crew members and supervisors. Some tribes require that companies engaged in cultural resource management provide training and employment opportunities when a project takes place on their traditional territory. In Canada, various First Nations have established dedicated archaeology or heritage departments to address their own needs and to offer services to others (Connaughton and Herbert 2017). In the United States, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) assume some or all of the functions of state historic preservation officers on tribal lands (Backhouse et al. 2017). However, funding for the THPO program lags behind that for state historic preservation offices because there are more tribes than states, and the number of tribes initiating a THPO program increases yearly.

Few archaeology programs are designed specifically for tribal members. It is often difficult for Native Americans to attend postsecondary educational institutions that require them to leave their community. The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) offers undergraduate and graduate scholarships for Native Americans, as do some regional organizations. Native Studies (and like-titled) departments or programs are now widespread in both the United States

and Canada, providing courses and training in many relevant areas, though archaeology tends to be limited to anthropology departments. Examples of training programs include the White Mountain Apache partnership with the University of Arizona for training in ethnographic field research and GIS tools (Hoering et al. 2015), the Summer Internship for Native Americans in Genomics at the University of Illinois, and the Tribal Historic Preservation Associates Degree offered by Salish Kootenai College, Montana.

Informal networks of support and communication have proven important in connecting Native Americans seeking careers or opportunities in archaeology both with their peers and with non-Aboriginal allies. The 1999 Chacmool "Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology" conference (Peck et al. 2003) was the first full event devoted to this theme. No less important were the 1988 "Preservation on the Reservation" conference organized by the Navajo Nation (Klesert and Downer 1990) and the 1990 "Kunaitupii: Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites" conference (Reeves and Kennedy 1993) organized by the Archaeological Society of Alberta and the Montana Archaeological Society. A 2001 conference called "Native American and Archaeologists Relations in the 21st Century" at Dartmouth College was important not just for the topics discussed, but also for connecting Native Americans who had similar experiences and perspectives. Members of this group have since supported each other through a listserv (Watkins and Nichols 2013) and have sought to bring about change within the SAA and other organizations, with some success. Native American participation is now a regular element of meetings sponsored by the SAA, WAC, and regional archaeological societies, among others.

DECOLONIZING ARCHAEOLOGY?

The issues, agendas, and goals that shape Native Americans' evolving relationship with archaeology in North America are connected as much to developments within the discipline as they are to the social, economic, and political circumstances Native Americans face. For their part, Native Americans now use archaeology as one of many tools that they employ to address their historical, political, and heritage needs. There are new opportunities for Aboriginal peoples to become involved in archaeology today, especially in the realm of heritage management, as well as educational and training programs. At the same time, new challenges have emerged relating to policy development and implementation, intellectual property, human rights, DNA, repatriation, and the politics of identity. Addressing the concerns raised about such topics helps to move archaeology out from under the shadow of scientific colonialism.

Ongoing issues and needs

Native Americans have historically had little control over research on their heritage, often viewed as in the public domain, and they have suffered cultural harm and economic loss as a result. Collaborative projects developed jointly by archaeologists and community members (see, for example, Atalay et al. 2016; Kerber 2006; Martindale and Lyons 2014) avoid many of the problems of projects in which decisions were made by outside researchers. Nonetheless, concerns about control over, and access to, research persist. This situation has prompted efforts

to develop policies and protocols that ensure the rights of the communities involved while acknowledging the contributions of the researchers. Considerable attention to ethics in archaeology in the past two decades has had a positive effect. Nonetheless, community-oriented archaeology has the potential to cause harm or exacerbate existing tensions when some Aboriginal interests are privileged over others (Supernant and Warrick 2014) with regard to identity, land rights, and self-determination.

Human rights issues remain largely unresolved for many Native Americans. Access to and control over one's own heritage is a basic human right essential to identity, well-being, and worldview. The United Nations has set a broad mandate for acknowledging and protecting Indigenous peoples through the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, stating that "Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures" (Article 31). A key principle here is "free, prior, and informed consent." Putting this into practice will require significant changes to heritage preservation laws and policies (see, for example, King 2003; Warrick 2017). While the North American archaeological record is dominated by the legacy of ancestral Indigenous peoples, most heritage legislation continues to prioritize scientific evidence over culture-based values. In some cases, there is unequal protection under the law for Indigenous compared with settler heritage, as demonstrated when ancestral burials are viewed as archaeological sites while White graves are viewed as cemeteries. Additionally, heritage policies in North America and elsewhere are strongly influenced by economic pressures (Welch and Ferris 2014).

Another topic of considerable importance is that of Indigeneity and identity. Archaeologists have long sought to understand past population movements and to discern ethnicity, whether through material culture (for example, Gaudreau and Lesage 2016) or, more recently, through genetics (Rasmussen et al. 2014). DNA is increasingly perceived as able to substantiate claims to land and other identity-based rights, or to adjudicate the repatriation of ancestral remains to descendant communities, as seen in the case of Kennewick Man. Many tribes and First Nations thus support DNA research. However, scientific claims about identity based on genetic research may also have profound social, cultural, political, and economic consequences for Indigenous peoples. Important reviews and case studies pertaining to the bioarchaeological and genetic issues and opportunities are found in Pullman (2018), TallBear (2013), and Walker et al. (2016).

Critiques of Indigenous Archaeology

Indigenous archaeology is today a recognized approach within the discipline, but it continues to be met with resistance for a variety of reasons. Mason (2006) charged that oral histories, often an important element of the Native interpretation of history, are unreliable. One of the most common criticisms of Indigenous archaeology is that it is unscientific, highly subjective, and often overtly political in its goals (for example, McGhee 2008). In response, Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. (2010), Wilcox (2010), and others argued that Indigenous archaeology is as

scientific as any archaeological practice can be but that it does not privilege the authority of scientists to identify and describe the Indigenous past. Some interpretations or explanations may fall outside the realm of Western notions of science and history, with modes of interpretation informed by Indigenous epistemology, ontology, and worldview. Often, however, it uses traditional archaeological methods conducted with, for, or by communities to fulfill heritage management needs, to pursue land claims, or to supplement or validate traditional histories.

Some archaeologists have decried the loss of scientific knowledge that occurs when human skeletal remains and heritage objects are repatriated or otherwise removed from museums and other repositories (Weiss 2008). Charges of political correctness have been raised that repatriation comes at the expense of knowledge of human history, which is lost when human skeletal remains and artifacts are reburied or become inaccessible to scientific study. In some situations, both policy makers and private citizens have blamed Native Americans for the use of public funds to resolve land claims or to purchase land containing sacred sites and cemeteries to protect them from development, even though development interests usually win out.

Finally, Indigenous archaeology has often been included with other approaches—Marxist, feminist, critical—that challenge ideologically influenced norms, practices, and interpretations. Of these, Indigenous archaeology has faced the most resistance. This may be due not only, at least in part, to its sometimes political orientation (that is, its challenge to existing power structures), but also to the challenge it may raise regarding the primacy of Western epistemology and modes of interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

The evolving relationship between Native Americans and the discipline of archaeology has followed a winding path. Once highly resistant to relinquishing sole authority to speak about the Native American past, the discipline has, in many ways, been transformed. Indigenous archaeology acknowledges the political nature of defining the past, foregrounds local knowledge, recognizes the responsibilities that a community has to its ancestors, and distinguishes scientific information about the past from the cultural meanings inherent in that heritage.

Archaeology has become a tool used by Native Americans to supplement oral histories, support land claims, demonstrate continuity of occupation, and much more, while also providing the kind of material evidence needed by outside parties. This situation has, in turn, benefited archaeology, both theoretically and methodologically, by contributing to the suite of ideas and approaches associated with post-processual archaeology, community-based participatory research, and ethno-museological practices. Indigenous archaeology has become a familiar part of archaeological practice and theory.

Indigenous North Americans knew their past prior to the creation of archaeology. Now some use archaeology to learn different aspects of their history and to supplement knowledge lost through conquest, colonialism and acculturation. A small but growing number of Native Americans are pursuing training and graduate degrees in archaeology, including in programs in which their instructors and professors are themselves Native. Some have full-time positions in

heritage management or, in the United States, serve as tribal historic preservation officers. Such careers, in addition to being interesting, are a way for tribal people to protect and maintain access to sacred sites and cultural objects. Community members also now regularly participate in archaeological projects, whether developed with, by, or for tribes and communities or within the larger context of heritage management. Still, the comparatively small number of Native people participating in archaeology may reflect cultural protocols that prevent tribal members from choosing archaeology as a full-time profession or some lingering resistance by the discipline.

Some have suggested that Indigenous research methods and perspectives should be integrated into mainstream archaeology, lest such efforts remain at the margin, but there is also an argument for keeping them separate (Nicholas 2010). The ability of practitioners to influence the discipline is limited because much of the literature that reports on research using an explicit Indigenous approach is in the form of conference or workshop presentations. The scarcity of full-length books written by Native scholars (such as Atalay 2012; Watkins 2000; Wilcox 2009) likely reflects their career paths, which can be difficult, given the challenge that Indigenous archaeology can represent to university anthropology departments. In addition, Indigenous scholars seeking to publish may be limited by reviewers who do not appreciate the integration of Native worldviews.

The realm of archaeological research and heritage management has changed in response to the Native American refrain "Nothing about us, without us." Much work remains to move from talk to action in decolonization (Tuck and Yang 2012), but there is already ample evidence that Indigenous North Americans and non-Indigenous archaeologists can work together in a mutually beneficial way. What is clear, as Native American archaeologist Robert Hall's work so aptly demonstrated (1997, is that the integration of traditional knowledge and archaeology enhances, rather than limits, knowledge and understanding of Native American lifeways and beliefs.

Acknowledgments
We thank Igor Krupnik, Joe Watkins, Nelly Robles Garcia, Randy McGuire, T. J. Ferguson, Chelsea Meloche, and the Closet Chickens for their contributions, guidance, and support, and three anonymous reviewers. **Additional names to come for photo use.**

REFERENCES CITED

Altschul, Jeffrey H., and T.J. Ferguson. 2014. Heritage Management in Mexico and the United States. In *Building Transnational Archaeologies,* edited by Altshul, Jeffrey H., Elisa Villalpando and Randall H. McGuire. Arizona State Museum Archaeological Series, Tucson: University of Arizona.

Altshul, Jeffrey, Elisa Villalapando, and Randall McGuire (editors). 2014. *Building Transnational Archaeologies: The 11th Southwest Symposium, Hermosillo, Sonora.* Tucson: Arizona State Museum.

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

Atalay, Sonya, Shannon Martin, and William Johnson. 2016. *Education, Protection and Management of ezhibiigaadek asin (Sanilac Petroglyph Site)*. Ziibiwing Center of Anishinabe Culture & Lifeways, Mt. Pleasant, MI, and IPInCH Project. http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/sites/default/files/resources/reports/ezhibiigaadek_asin_finalreport_2016.pdf (Accessed June 17, 2017)

Augustine, Stephen. 1997. Traditional Aboriginal knowledge and Science versus Occidental Science. Paper prepared for the Biodiversity Convention Office of Environment Canada.

Backhouse, Paul N., Brent R. Weisman, and Mary Beth Rosebrough (editors). 2017. *We Come for Good. Archaeology and Tribal Historic Preservation at the Seminole Tribe of Florida*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Basso, Keith. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bastien, Betty. 2004. *Blackfoot Ways of Knowing: The Worldview of the Siksikaitsitapi*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Bell, Catherine, and Val Napoleon (editors). 2008. *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Berkes, Fikret. 1999. *Sacred Ecology. Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management.* Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.

Bernard, Tim, Leah Morine Rosenmeier, and Sharon Farrell (editors). 2011. *Ta'n Wetapeksi'k: Understanding from Where We Come*. Truro, Nova Scotia: The Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq.

Bieder, Robert E. 1986. *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Bowechop, Janine, and Patricia P. Erikson. 2005. Forging Indigenous Methodologies on Cape Flattery: The Makah Museum as a Center of Collaborative Research. *The American Indian Quarterly* 29(1):263-273.

Bray, Tamara L., and Thomas W. Killion. (editors). 1994. *Reckoning with the Dead: the Larsen Bay Repatriation and the Smithsonian Institution*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Bruchac, Margaret M. 2014. Indigenous Knowledge and Traditional Knowledge. *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by Claire Smith, pp. 3814-3824. New York: Springer.

Bruchac, Margaret M., Siobhan M. Hart, and H. Martin Wobst (editors). 2010. *Indigenous Archaeologies: A Reader on Decolonization*. Walnut Creek, CA., Left Coast Press.

Budwha, Rick. 2005. An Alternate Model for First Nations Involvement in Resource Management Archaeology. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 29: 20–45.

Bueno, Christina. 2016. *The Pursuit of Ruins: Archaeology, History, and the Making of Modern Mexico.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Cajete, Gregory. 1999. *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence,* Santa Fe: Clear Light Books.

Callaway, Evan 2014. Ancient Genome stirs Ethics Debate. *Nature* 506: 142–143.

Carlson, Catherine C. 2005. Letters from the Field: Reflections on the Nineteenth-Century Archaeology of Harlan I. Smith in the Southern Interior of British Columbia, Canada. In *Decolonizing Archaeological Theory and Practice*, edited by Claire Smith and Martin Wobst, pp. 134–169. New York: Routledge.

Colwell, Chip. 2017. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ 2010. *Living Histories: Native Americans and Southwestern Archaeology*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C., and T. J. Ferguson (editors). 2007. *The Collaborative Continuum: Archaeological Engagements with Descendant Communities.* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T.J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randal H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman. 2010. The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2): 228-238.

Cole, Douglas. 1995. *Captured Heritage: The Scramble for Northwest Coast Artifacts.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Connaughton and Herbert. 2017. Engagement Within: An Anthropological Exploration of First Nations Engagement and Consulting Archaeology within a Transnational Corporation. *Archaeologies* 13(2): 306-343.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto.* Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

———. 2008. Activism, 1950-1980. In *Handbook of North American Indians*. William C. Sturtevant, general editor. Vol. 2, *Indians in Contemporary Society*. Garrick Bailey, ed. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution. Pages 38–44.

Dongoske, Kurt E., Mark Aldenderfer, and Karen Doehner (editors). 2000. *Working Together: Native Americans & Archaeologists*. Washington, DC: Society for American Archaeology.

Dowdall, Katherine, and Otis Parrish. 2003. A Meaningful Disturbance of the Earth. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(1): 99–133.

Echo-Hawk, Roger. C. 2000. Ancient History in the New World: Integrating Oral Traditions and the Archaeological Record in Deep Time. *American Antiquity* 65(2): 267-290.

Ferguson, T.J. 1980. Cultural Resource Management at the Pueblo of Zuni: The Zuni Archaeology Program. *Quarterly of the Southwest Association on Indian* Arts 15(4): 6-10.

——1996. Native Americans and the Practice of Anthropology. Annual Review of Anthropology 25:63-79.

Ferguson, T. J., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh. 2006. *History is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Fienup-Riordan, Ann. 1996. *The Living Tradition of Yup'ik Masks: Agayuliyararput (Our Way of Making Prayer).* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Fienup-Riordan, Ann. 2007. Yuungnaqpiallerput/*The Way We Genuinely Live: Masterworks of Yup'ik Science and Survival*, with translations by Alice Rearden and Marie Meade. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Fine-Dare, Kathleen. 2002. *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fogelson, Raymond. 2012. Native American Religion. In *The Cambridge History of Religions in America, Vo. 1. Pre-Columbian Times to 1790*, edited by Stephen Stein, pp. 1-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freed, Stanley A. 2012. *Anthropology Unmasked: Museums, Science, and Politics in New York City.* Vols. I and II. Willmington, OH: Orange Frazer Press.

Gaudreau, Mariane, and Louis Lesage. 2016. Understanding Ethnicity and Cultural Affiliation: Huron-Wendat and Anthropological Perspectives. *Ontario Archaeology* 96: 6-16.

Glencross, Bonnie, Gary Warrick, Edward Eastlaugh, Alicia Hawkins, Lisa Hodgetts, and Louis Lesage. 2017. Minimally Invasive Research Strategies in Huron-Wendat Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5(2): 147-158.

Gnecco, Cristobal, and P. Ayala (editors). 2011. *Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology in Latin America*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Gonzalez, Sarah, Darren Modzelewski, Lee M. Panich and Tsim D. Schneider. 2006. Archaeology for the Seventh Generation. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3/4):388-415.

Guernsey, Ephraim. 1848. *Guerney's History of the United States: Designed for Schools*. New York: Cady and Burgess.

Gulliford, Andrew. 2000. *Sacred Objects and Sacred Places: Preserving Tribal Traditions.* Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Guindon, François (in collaboration with the Neeposh family). 2015. Technology, Material Culture and the Well-Being of Aboriginal Peoples of Canada. *Journal of Material Culture* 20(1): 77–97.

Hall, Robert L. 1997. *An Archaeology of the Soul: North American Belief and Ritual.* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hamilton, Michell A. 2006 Iroquoian Archaeology, the Public, and Native Communities in Victorian Ontario. In *Historicizing Canadian Anthropology*, edited by Julia Harrison and Regna Darnell, pp. 65-74. UBC Press, Vancouver.

Hammil, Jan and Cruz, Robert 1989. Statement of American Indians Against Desecration. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions,* edited by Robert Layton, pp. 195-200. London: Routledge.

Hansen, Brooke, and Jack Rossen. 2007. Building Bridges through Public Anthropology in the Haudenosaunee Homeland. In *Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups*, edited by John H. Jameson and Sherene Baugher, pp. 127-148. New York: Springer.

Harris, Heather. 2005. Indigenous Worldviews and Ways of Knowing as Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for Archaeological Research. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice,* edited by Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, pp. 33–41. New York: Routledge.

Hebda, Richard J., Sheila Greer, and Alexander P. Mackie. 2017 *Kwädąy Dän Ts'ìnchį: Teachings from Long Ago Person Found.* Victoria: Royal BC Museum.

Heizer, Robert. 1978. History of Research. *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8, California*, pp. 6-15. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian.

Hill, Tom, and Trudy Nicks. 1992. *Turning the Page: Forging New Partnerships Between Museums and First Peoples*. Task Force Report on Museums and First Peoples, Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations. Canadian Museums Association and the Assembly of First Nations, Ottawa.

Hoering, Karl A., John R. Welch, T.J. Ferguson, and Gabriella Soto. 2015. Expanding Toolkits for Heritage Perpetuation: The Western Apache Ethnography and Geographic Information Science Research Experience for Undergraduates. *International Journal of Applied Geospatial Research* 6(1): 59-75.

Jacknis, Ira. 2000. Repatriation as Social Drama: The Kwakiutl Indians of British Columbia, 1922-1980. In *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?*, edited by Devon A. Mihesuah, pp. 266–281. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kehoe, Alice Beck. 1998. *The Land of Prehistory: A Critical History of American Archaeology*. New York: Routledge.

Kelley, Jane H. 1978 *Yaqui Women: Contemporary Life Histories*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Kelley, Jane H., David A. Phillips Jr., A.C. MacWilliams, and Rafael Cruz Antillon. 2011. Land Use, Looting, and Archaeology in Chihuahua, Mexico: A Speculative History. *Journal of the Southwest* 53(2): 177-224.

Kendall, Laurel, and Igor Krupnik (editors). 2003. *Constructing Cultures Then and Now: Celebrating Franz Boas and the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*. Arctic Studies Center, Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Kerber, Jordan E. (editor). 2006. *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

King, Thomas F. 2003. *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Klesert, A. L., and A. S. Downer (editors). 1990. *Preservation on the Reservation: Native Americans, Native American Lands and Archaeology*. Navajo Nation Papers in Anthropology 26.

Knecht, Rick. 2014. Nunalleq: Rescuing an Eskimo Village from the Sea. *British Archaeology* 136:42-49.

Krmpotich, Cara. 2014. *The Force of Family: Repatriation, Kinship, and Memory on Haida Gwaii*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh J., T. J. Ferguson, and Chip Colwell (eds.). 2018. *Footprints of Hopi History: Hopihiniwtiput Kukveni'at.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Leliévre, Michelle A. 2017. *Unsettling Mobility Mediating Mi'kmaw Sovereignty in Post-contact Nova Scotia.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Lepofsky, Dana, Chelsey Armstrong, Spencer Greening, Julia Jackley, Jennifer Carpenter, Brenda Guernsey, Darcy Matthews, and Nancy Turner. 2017. Historical Ecology of Cultural Keystone Places of the Northwest Coast. *American Anthropologist* 119(3): 448-463.

Lightfoot, Kent. 1995. Culture Contact Studies: Redefining the Relationship between Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 60(2): 199-217.

Loring, Stephen. 1999. Gathering Voices: Negotiating the Construction of the Past in the Future. 32nd Chacmool Conference, "Indigenous People and Archaeology," Calgary, Alberta.

_____ . 2009. From Tent to Trading Post and Back Again: Smithsonian Anthropology in Nunavut, Nunavik, Nitassinan, and Nunatsiavut— The Changing IPY Agenda, 1882–2007. In *Smithsonian at the Poles: Contributions to International Polar Year Science*, edited by *Igor Krupnik, Michael A. Lang, and Scott E. Miller*, pp. 115-127. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Loring, Stephen, Moira T. McCaffrey, Peter Armitage, and Daniel Ashini. 2003. The Archaeology and Ethnohistory of a Drowned Land: Innu Nation Research along the Former Michikamats Lake Shore in Nitassinan (Interior Labrador). *Archaeology of Eastern North America* 31:45-72.

Lurie, Nancy Oestreich. 1988. Relations Between Indians and Anthropologists. In *Handbook of North American Indianism, Vol. 4. History of Indian-White Relations,* edited by Wilcomb E. Washburn, pp. 548-556. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Lydon, Jane, and Uzma Rizvi (editors). 2010. *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Lyons, Natasha. 2013. *Where the Wind Blows Us: Practicing Critical Community Archaeology in the Canadian North.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

McAnany, Patricia, and Sarah M. Rowe. 2016. *Archaeology in Society: Maya Cultural Heritage: How Archaeologists and Indigenous Communities Engage the Past.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

McGuire, Randall H. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

______2017. Expiación: La masacre de la Sierra Mazatán y la Arqueología Indígena en Sonora, México. *Anales de Arqueología y Etnología* 72(1): 51-66.

McGhee. Robert. 2008. Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73(4): 579-597.

Martindale, Andrew, and Natasha Lyons (guest editors). 2014. Community-Oriented Archaeology. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38: 425-591.

Martindale, Andrew R. C., and Susan Marsden. 2003. Defining the Middle Period: (3500 BP to 1500 BP) in Tsimshian History through a Comparison of Archaeological and Oral Records. *BC Studies;* Summer 2003; 138/139: 13-50.

Martínez-Tagüeña, Natalia. 2015. *And the Giants Keep Singing: Comcaac Anthropology of Meaningful Places*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson.

Martinez, Desireé. 2012 A Land of Many Archaeologists: Archaeology with Native Californians. In *Contemporary Issues in California Archaeology*, edited by Terry L. Jones and Jennifer E. Perry, pp. 355-367. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Martinez, Desireé, and Wendy Teeter. 2015. Ho'eezokre 'eyookuuka'ro "We're Working with Each Other": The Pinu Catalina Island Project. *The SAA Archaeological Record* (January): 28-28.

Mason, Ronald J. 2006. *Inconstant Companions: Archaeology and North American Indian Oral Traditions.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Meighan, Clement W. 1999. Burying American Archaeology. *Archaeology* (February).

Merrill, William L., Edmund J. Ladd, and T. J. Ferguson. 1993. The Return of the *Ahayu: da*: Lessons for Repatriation from Zuni Pueblo and the Smithsonian Institution. *Current Anthropology* 34(5): 523-567.

Mihesuah, Devon A. (editor). 2000. *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains*? Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1877. *Ancient Society.* New York, Henry Holt.

Nicholas, George P. 2008. Native Peoples and Archaeology. In *Encyclopedia of Archaeology*. Vol. 3, edited by D. Pearsall, pp. 1660–1669. New York: Academic Press.

——2010. Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology. In *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century,* edited by H. Allen and C. Phillips, pp. 233–252. Walnut Creek, CA.: Left Coast Press.

——2017. Touching the Intangible: Situating Material Culture in the Realm of Indigenous Heritage Research. In *The Routledge Companion to Cultural Property*, edited by Haidy Geismar and Jane Anderson, pp. 212–231. Routledge, London and New York: Routledge.

Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews (editors). 1997a. *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*. Burnaby: Archaeology Press.

Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews. 1997b. Indigenous Archaeology in a Post-modern World. In *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*, edited by George Nicholas and Thomas Andrews, pp. 1–18. Burnaby: Archaeology Press.

Nicholas, George P. and Nola M. Markey. 2014. Traditional Knowledge, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Ways of Knowing. In *Material Culture as Evidence: Best Practices and Exemplary Cases in Archaeology*, edited by R. Chapman and A. Wylie, pp. 287-307. New York: Routledge Press.

Peck, Trevor, Evelyn Siegfried, and Gerald Oetelaar (editors). 2003. *Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

Pfeiffer, Susan, and Louis Lesage. 2014. The Repatriation of Wendat Ancestors, 2013. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(1):5-26.

Pullman, Daryl. 2018. Bioarchaeology, Bioethics, and the Beothuk. *Current Anthropology* (120(1): 11-23.

Rasmussen, Morten; et al. 2014. The Genome of a Late Pleistocene Human from a Clovis Burial site in Western Montana. *Nature* 506: 225–229.

Reeves, Barney, and Margaret Kennedy (editors). 1993. *Kunaitupii: Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites, their Sacredness, Conservation & Interpretation.* Calgary: Archaeological Society of Alberta.

Ross, Anne, Kathleen Pickering Sherman, Jeffrey G. Snodgrass, Henry D. Delcore, and Richard Sherman. 2011. *Indigenous Peoples and the Collaborative Stewardship of Nature: Knowledge Binds and Institu tional Conflicts.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Rossen, Jack (editor) 2015, *Corey Village and the Cayuga World*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Rowley, Susan. 2013. The Reciprocal Research Network: The Development Process. *Museum Anthropology Review* 7(1-2): 22-43.

Schroeder, Albert H. 1979. History of Archeological Research. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 9, Southwest,* edited by Alfonso Ortiz, pp. 5-13. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Schaepe, David M., Bill Angelbeck, David Snook, and John R. Welch. 2017 Archaeology as Therapy: Connecting Belongings, Knowledge, Time, Place, and Well-Being. Current Anthropology 58(4): 502-533.

2017 Schaepe, David M., Susan Rowley, Stó:lō Xyolhmet S'olhetawtxw Sq'éq'ip (Stó:lō House of Respect Committee) Members, with Darlene Weston, and Mike Richards. 2015. *The Journey Home - Guiding Intangible Knowledge Production in the Analysis of Ancestral Remains.* Final Report.

http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/sites/default/files/resources/reports/the_journey_home_ver2_may2016.pdf (Accessed June 17, 2017)

Silliman, Stephen W. (editor). 2008 *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and learning in Indigenous Archaeology.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst (editors). 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies.* London: Zed Books.

Spector, J. 1993. *What this Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.

Squire, Ephraim, and Edwin Davis. 1848. Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley: Comprising the Results of Extensive Original Surveys and Explorations. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Dakota Access, LLC. Case 1:16-cv-01534-JEB Document 304. United States District Court for the District of Columbia. 2017. Source: https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/Order-re-conditions.pdf

Stapp, Darby, and Michael S. Burney. 2002. *Tribal Cultural Resource Management: The Full Circle to Stewardship.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.

Stephens, John Lloyd. 1868. Incidents of Travel in Yukatan. Vols. 1–2. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Stó:lō Nation. 2012. *Man Turned to Stone: T'swelåtse.* Stó:lō Nation and Stó:lō Research and Resource Management Centre Chilliwack, B.C.

Supernant, Kisha. 2017. Modeling Métis Mobility? Evaluating Least Cost Paths and Indigenous Landscapes in the Canadian West. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 84: 63-73.

Supernant, Kisha, and Gary Warrick. 2014. Challenges to Critical Community-based Archaeological Practice in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:563–591.

Swidler, Nina, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer (editors). 1997. Nat*ive Americans and archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Syms, E. Leigh 2014. *Stories of the Old Ones from the Lee River, Southeastern Manitoba: The Owl Inini, Carver Inini, and Dancer Ikwe*. Winnipeg: The Manitoba Museum.

TallBear, Kimberly. 2013. *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thomas, Cyrus. 1894. *Report on the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 3–730. Twelfth annual report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1890–91. Washington, D.C.

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

____ 2003. *Artifacts and Ideas*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. Decolonization is not a Metaphor. *Decolonization, Indigeneity & Society* 1: 1-40.

Turner, Nancy. 2014. *Ancient Pathways, Ancestral Knowledge: Ethnobotany and Ecological Wisdom of Indigenous Peoples of Northwestern North America*. Toronto: McGill-Queens University Press.

Tylor, Edward B. 1871. *Primitive Cultures*. London, John Murray.

Ucko, Peter. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress,* London: Duckworth.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Walker, Alexa, Brian Egan, and George Nicholas (editors). 2016. DNA and Indigeneity: The Changing Role of Genetics in Indigenous Rights, Tribal Belonging, and Repatriation. Symposium Proceedings. http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/sites/default/files/resources/reports/dna_symposiumproceedings_2016.pdf (Accessed June 17, 2017)

Warrick. Gary. 2017. Control of Indigenous Archaeological Heritage in Ontario, Canada. *Archaeologies* 13(1): 88-109.

Watkins, Joe. 2000. *Indigenous Archaeology.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Watkins, Joe. 2005. Through Wary Eyes: Indigenous Perspectives on Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 429-449.

Watkins, Joe, and Deborah Nichols. 2013. Closet Chickens. *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, pp. 1505-1508. New York: Springer.

Watkins. Joe, and George Nicholas. 2014. Indigenous Archaeologies: North American Perspective, pp. 3794-3803. *Global Encyclopedia of Archaeology.* New York: Springer.

Welch, John R., Mark K. Altaha, Karl A. Hoerig, and Ramon Riley. 2009. Best Cultural Heritage Stewardship Practices by and for the White Mountain Apache Tribe. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 11(2): 148-160.

Welch, John, and Neal Ferris. 2014. "We Have Met the Enemy and It Is Us." Transforming Archaeology through Sustainable Design. In *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, edited by Atalay, Sonya, Lee Clauss, Randall McGuire, and John Welch. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Weiss, Elizabeth. 2008. *Reburying the Past: The Effects of Repatriation and Reburial on Scientific Inquiry*. Nova Science Pub Incorporated.

Wilcox, Michael V. 2009. *The Pueblo Revolt and the Mythology of Conquest: An Indigenous Archaeology of Contact.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wilcox, Michael. 2010. Saving Indigenous Peoples from Ourselves: Separate but Equal Archaeology is not Scientific Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2): 221-228.

Wilson, Daniel. 1865. *Prehistoric Man: Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and New World*. London: MacMillan and Company.

Zimmerman, Larry J. 1994. Made Radical by My Own: An Archaeologist Learns to Accept Reburial. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by Robert Layton, pp. 60-67. London and New York: Routledge.

_____ 2010. "Archaeology Through the Lens of the Local." In *Archaeology in situ: Local Perspectives on Archaeology, Archaeologists, and Sites in Greece*, edited by A. Stroulia and S. Buck Sutton, pp. 473-480. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Zborover, Danny, and Peter Kroefges (eds). 2015. *Bridging the Gaps: Integrating Archaeology and History in Oaxaca, Mexico; A Volume in Memory of Bruce E. Byland*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.