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Abstract
Archaeology has been linked to colonialist attitudes and scientific imperialism. But what are the perspectives of Indigenous groups concerning the practice of archaeology? Numerous organizations recognize the distinctive needs of Indigenous communities throughout the world and have adopted agreements and definitions that govern their relationships with those populations. The specific name by which Indigenous groups are known varies from country to country, as local governments are involved in determining the appropriateness of particular definitions to populations within their borders. This paper begins with an examination of the various aspects that have been used to determine whether or not a group of people might be considered “indigenous” under various definitions, and then uses the history of the relationships between North American archaeologists and Indigenous populations as a background for the examination of some of the political aspects of archaeology that have impacted Indigenous populations. It then proceeds to discuss perspectives on archaeology offered by members of various Indigenous populations throughout the World.
INTRODUCTION

Who are the Indigenous people throughout the world whose perspectives on the practice of archaeology are becoming more important? In North America they might be called by general names such as “American Indians,” “Native Americans,” “Native Alaskan corporations” or “Native Hawaiians”; in Canada they may be referred to as “First Nations” or “Métis”; in Australia they might be called “Aboriginals,” “Māori” in New Zealand, or “Sami” in Scandinavia. Despite the fact that each group has a specific name by which it identifies, a particular name by which these people are recognized in particular countries or regions, these “indigenous people” are generally lumped into a category that identifies their relationship with the dominant government that controls the land upon which they live.

WHO IS “INDIGENOUS”?

Although it certainly is beyond the scope of this article to reach any conclusion regarding the definition of “Indigenous” in relation to world populations, it is necessary that the reader understand the myriad of issues that spring from this one word. One can get an encyclopedia’s definition (Wikipedia 2004), but such definitions are less useful in this instance than an anthropological one.

According to the International Labor Organization, Indigenous people are “peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations.” Or, they might be “regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present State boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural, and political institutions” (ILO 1989). Economic organizations maintain their own definitions of who is “Indigenous” (Asian Development Bank 2004), and the World Health Organization has developed a set of ethics for dealing with Indigenous groups (WHO 2004). All of these definitions are related to various aspects of the communities’ involvement with outside organizations or governments.

If we examine these definitions, we can see, as Sylvain (2002, p. 1075) notes, that there are “four broad criteria for identifying indigenous peoples: (a) genealogical heritage (i.e., historical continuity with prior occupants of a region); (b) political, economic, or ‘structural’ marginalization (i.e., nondominance); (c) cultural attributes (i.e., being ‘culturally distinct’); and (d) self-identification.”

Regardless of the criteria that are used, Indigenous populations are often seen as “politically weak, economically marginal, and culturally stigmatized members of the national societies that have overtaken them and their lands” (Dyck 1992, p. 1). The interruption of land tenure by colonizing interlopers, the suppression of native language by a dominant
society that seeks to integrate dissimilar cultures into a singular “homogenous” one, the perception by their “conquerors” that Indigenous people are an inferior race, and the social and economic marginalization of the group as a whole all contribute to the ongoing perception of Indigenous populations as second-class citizens. Commonly known as the “Fourth World,” such Indigenous groups generally are often subsumed within the national heritage that surrounds them. Karlsson (2003, p. 407) points out some of the problems inherent in recognizing Indigenous groups, however defined, through a discussion of the situation on the Indian subcontinent, where subordination of people by ruling groups has led to “internal colonization.” In the Indian situation that Karlsson describes, “cultural difference is thus stressed, whereas the question of being ‘original settlers’ is regarded as less significant.”


In Australia, “Indigenous” is equated with “Aboriginal,” and “Aboriginality” has been the topic of discussion for nearly two decades (Anderson 1985). Special Issue 2 of The Australian Journal of Anthropology (Thiele 1991) provided a series of articles reflecting on the status of “Aboriginal Studies” in Australia. Archer (1991, p. 163) noted that “Aboriginality as a construction for purposes of political action has all the characteristic contradictions of nationalism,” and Lewins (1991, p. 177) noted “it is not possible to keep Aboriginality and politics apart.” Thiele (1991, p. 180) argued Aboriginality involves “descen
t
tism,” based “solely on the grounds of biological parentage.” Roughly (1991, p. 211) wrote that race, nationality, possession, and difference were “the controlling and central terms in the written history of a racial discourse that must be continuously deconstructed,” whereas Sackett (1991, p. 235) detailed the stereotypical belief held by some that “Aboriginal values and practices are somehow or another more ‘ecologically sound’ than those of non-Aborigines.” Finally, Davidson (1991, p. 256) noted that, in the changing relationships between archaeologists and Aborigines, “the motives of the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in the cooperation have not always been the same.” This discussion again chose to recognize that being “Indigenous” carries with it a marked difference.

Although not anthropological, legal analyses of Indigenous rights and issues provided by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC 2004), the Australasian Legal Information Institute (Pritchard 2001), and the Indigenous Peoples’ Human Rights Project of the University of Minnesota Human Rights Center (2003) also are important to consider regarding the description of
“Indigenous.” These documents carry with them the international recognition of aspects above and beyond those of professional organizations, and also carry with them the appearance of some sort of “governmental sanction.”

Comparative (cross-cultural) articles on international aspects of Indigenous communities have been developed as well, including Dow and Gardiner-Garden’s 1998 “Indigenous Affairs in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, United States of America, Norway and Sweden,” Morse’s “Comparative Assessments of Indigenous Peoples in Australasia, Scandinavia, and North America” (1997), and Cohen’s (2003) comparison of Australian “Indigeneity” with those of Latin America.

But, beyond the vagaries of definition, what has been archaeology’s relationship and perspective on Indigenous populations?

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL HISTORY

Native groups have struggled to obtain, tell, or protect their past. In the United States, numerous authors such as Bray (1996), Downer (1997), Ferguson (1996), Kelly (1998), Klesert & Downer (1990), McGuire (1992), Pullar (1994), Swidler et al. (1997), and Trigger (1980, 1986, 1989) have documented that struggle. In Canada, Friesen (1998), Gotthardt (2000), Gotthardt & Hare (1994), Hare & Gotthardt (1996), and Hare & Greer (1994) have presented archaeological perspectives on Indigenous archaeologies, whereas Nicholas & Andrews (1997) described more the future relationships between First Nations and archaeologists. In Australia, Anderson (1985), Mulvaney (1991), and Pardoe (1992) have been at the forefront of the discussions that have taken place within the anthropological literature. Yet, although these present a history of the relationships between Indigenous populations and archaeology, these discussions generally center around the situation as it appears in one particular country or another. Hubert (1994) and Lowenthal (1994) offer good overviews of the conflicts in the United States and Australia, and Watkins’ (2001) comparison of the conflict between archaeologists and native peoples in the United States and Australia regarding the disposition of cultural materials from founder populations (which may be considered ancestral to entire continental populations) suggests that the concerns of native peoples in these two industrialized countries are quite similar.

But how has archaeology, as a discipline, dealt with Indigenous people and their perspectives on the field? Throughout its development, archaeology generally has operated as if it exists apart from and outside of the people whose past it studies—whether those people are the descendants of the actual people who created the archaeological sites (such as the survivors from Pecos Pueblo who now reside at Jemez Pueblo in the Southwestern United States), or whether those people are a more generalized group of descendants (such as American Indian tribes that share general relationships with an archaeological culture). Many archaeologists continue to operate as if the body of science operating within the political structure of the dominant government is a harmless entity to nondominant groups. In North America, for example, a number of anthropologists (Bettinger 1991; Downer 1997; Ferguson 1996; Kehoe 1998; Lurie 1988; McGuire 1992, 1997; Meltzer 1983; Nicholas & Andrews 1997; Trigger 1980, 1986, 1989; Watkins 2000a, Zimmerman 1997) have traced the history of anthropology and its relationships with American Indians and Canadian First Nations.

Anthropologist Bruce Trigger was one of the first anthropologists to force American archaeologists to come to terms with the idea that science exists as a part of the social structure in which it operates. He writes: “problems social scientists choose to research and (hopefully less often) the conclusions that they reach are influenced in various ways... (among them)... the attitudes and opinions that are prevalent in the societies in which
they live” (1980, p. 662). He argued that, in the United States during the one hundred years between the 1770s and the 1870s, the view that American Indians were inferior to “civilized” people was used to rationalize the seizure of Indian lands and the violation of their treaty rights. Going beyond the historical record and writing about contemporary issues, Trigger (1986, p. 206) suggested that “archeologists have turned from using their discipline to rationalize Euro-American prejudices against native people, as they did in the nineteenth century, to simply ignoring native people as an end of study in themselves.” In a more critical history of archaeology, Kehoe (1998) argues that archaeologists continue to treat American Indians as belonging outside of science and act as if only they (the archaeologists) have the ability to present and understand the processes that led to the development of American Indian culture and prehistory.

Fowler (1987) also examined the role of archaeology in the United States, noting that it (as a discipline) might have been at least partially complicit in the removal of American Indians from their lands. Its failure to accept (or to prove) the American Indian’s relationship with the archaeological cultures within their lands served to disconnect them from their past and strengthened the government’s “arguments for moving the ‘savage’ Indians out of the way of white ‘civilization’” (1987, p. 230). The extermination of American Indians by westward moving settlements of the United States was made morally easier by the apparent primitiveness of the natives, and the controversy over the originators of the archaeological cultures encountered by the Europeans served well as a justification for exterminating the Indian groups that were viewed as having destroyed North America’s only “civilized” culture (Trigger 1980, p. 665). The political aspects of archaeology and identity are still being debated and discussed on a worldwide scale (Brothwell 2004, Meskell 2002, Ratnagar 2004, Smith 2004, Zimmerman 2001).

INDIGENOUS PERSPECTIVES ON ARCHAEOLOGY

North America

As can be recognized based on the previous discussion, archaeologists in North America and Australia, two continents with large numbers of Indigenous people, began examining the relationships they maintained with the Indigenous populations of their area more than two decades ago. Whereas archaeologists have written of those relationships, few Indigenous people have offered written comments on the discipline of archaeology or their relationships with archaeologists. An early attempt at including the Native voice and Native perspectives on archaeology was the Preservation on the Reservation volume edited by Klesert & Downer (1990), where Native Americans participated in group discussions that followed formal presentations about various aspects of the archaeological enterprise. These discussions were published in the final volume and offer intriguing snippets of the relationships as they were perceived at that time.


Although there is a general paucity of comments concerning archaeology, some academic-based American Indians have offered acerbic perspectives on archaeology. Historian James Riding In (1992, p. 12), a member of the Pawnee tribe of Oklahoma,
wrote, “Individuals who violate the sanctity of the grave outside of the law are viewed as criminals, Satan worshippers, or imbalanced. When caught, tried, and convicted, the guilty are usually incarcerated, fined, or placed in mental institutions. Yet public opinion and legal loopholes have until recently enabled white society to loot and pillage with impunity American Indian cemeteries. Archaeology, a branch of anthropology that still attempts to sanctify this tradition of exploiting dead Indians, arose as an honorable profession from this sacrilege.” Another historian, Devon Mihesuah (1996, p. 233), a Choctaw Indian from Oklahoma, offered, “[to American Indians] the only difference between an illegal ransacking of a burial ground and a scientific one is the time element, sunscreen, little whisk brooms, and the neatness of the area when finished.” Even organizational statements, such as those offered by American Indians Against Desecration before the World Archaeological Congress (Hammil & Cruz 1994) provided much needed information concerning the perspectives of American Indians about American archaeology.

There are, of course, many other American Indian perspectives on archaeology, and not all of them are “antiarchaeology.” Don Sampson, a former Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, stated in a position paper that “[w]e want the public and scientists to understand that we do not reject science. In fact, we have anthropologists and other scientists on staff, and we use science every day to help in protecting our people and the land.” His views are probably shared by many American Indian groups participating in the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer program of the United States Department of the Interior’s National Park Service, or those running tribal archaeology programs (TwoBears 2000). His views, however, do not accept the notion that science should replace traditional worldviews: “we do reject the notion that science is the answer to everything and therefore it should take precedence over the religious rights and beliefs of American citizens” (Sampson 1997).

North American archaeologists have been active in seeking out the views of American Indians, First Nations, and other “Indigenous” people as part of procedures required during projects under cultural (or heritage) resources management legislation, often making an effort to integrate the minimum requirements of the appropriate laws to make the projects meaningful to local groups (Ferguson & Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2004). In the United States, laws such as the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 all require some level of interaction between archaeologists and American Indian tribes that are recognized by the federal government, Alaska Native corporations, and Native Hawaiians.

Canada does not have such far-reaching laws because cultural resources management programs operate primarily through two organizations—Parks Canada, a Federal Crown Corporation responsible for administering all aspects of Canada’s 29 national parks and more than 100 monuments and forts, and the Archaeological Survey of Canada, a branch of the National Museum of Man, which operates an archaeological salvage program to minimize the loss of archaeological resources and information caused by construction projects.

Although there are no nationwide heritage laws that govern the practice of archaeology in Canada, the relationships between First Nations and archaeologists are relatively strong. Laws relating to heritage are implemented primarily on provincial, municipal, and corporate levels. Additionally, the absence of a Canadian national law means that “there is no leverage to hold the province accountable for bilaterally funded projects, no precedents for the provincial politicians to become used to funding large scale mitigation projects, and no heritage legislation for federal lands,
including reserves” (Syms 1997, p. 54). In British Columbia, for example, the relationship between Simon Fraser University and the Secwepemc (Shuswap) Nation has led to a strong collaborative program (Nicholas 2000); in the Yukon, the Yukon Heritage Branch has worked collaboratively with First Nations such as the Carcross/Tagish (Hare & Greer 1994), the Inuvialuit (Friesen 1998), and the Kwanlin Dan (Gotthardt & Hare 1994). In spite of the absence of a nationwide perspective on heritage issues, Canadian relationships with First Nations are seen to be strong, primarily the result of archaeologists taking into consideration the wishes of the Indigenous populations in the research arena rather than through a regulatory or legal framework. Nicholas (2000, p. 163), in British Columbia, notes that “consultation with the appropriate First Nation is now a prerequisite for obtaining an archaeological permit. This requirement occurred in response to demands for greater Aboriginal representation, and overall, has had a positive impact on the discipline as it makes archaeologists more responsive to contemporary needs and their work more relevant.”

Yellowhorn (2000, p. 137), a Canadian First Nation man, presents a summary discussion of the “impact that Indians are likely to have on archaeology” beyond their roles as mere technicians or “resource managers.” His doctoral dissertation through McGill University was aimed at awakening what he terms “Internalist Archaeology”—what may be defined as an archaeology developed by and for the benefit of particular Indigenous groups by “articulating a theoretical foundation that eminates from the Indian’s sense of the past” (2002, p. 27). This archaeology, he notes, might be used by “Indian researchers guided by Fourth World ideology” to “embrace resistance to an establishment that seeks to appropriate their heritage for its own purposes” (2002, p. 31). Yellowhorn eloquently states his perspective on the uses of archaeology for Indigenous groups: “Internalist archaeology scouts the two paths that Native people must make into one by seeking the common landmarks of a global antiquity common to humanity and the local customs that respect a unique sense of the past” (2002, p. 346).

The discovery of a 600-year-old human body in a glacier in August of 1999 demonstrates some of the attitudes of the elders of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations of Canada toward archaeology. When three people hunting sheep in a remote corner of British Columbia discovered the frozen remains of a human in a melting glacier in Wilderness Park on August 14, 1999, tribal elders favored obtaining scientific information from the find prior to its reburial. Ron Chambers, a tribal member of the park management board, is quoted as saying “The elders did say that they felt it was as important to get as much information as possible from this person—that's kind of an endorsement of scientific study” (Brooke 1999).

The framework for the study of the adult male called Kwáday Dán Ts’ínchi, meaning “long-ago person found” in Tutchone, was announced in September 1999. The Canadian government and tribal groups set up a scientific advisory panel to evaluate research proposals for scientific studies, and then turned the remains over to descendants for burial (Beattie et al. 2000).

In spite of the agreement to allow the studies, Diane Strand, a heritage resource officer for the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, said the agreement was not unanimously endorsed: “You have one-third of the people saying ‘Bury him,’ one-third of the people saying ‘You’re doing the right thing,’ and the other one-third saying ‘We don’t know.’ But the goal is learning and educating” (Sorenson 1999).

Bob Charlie, chief of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations, noted that the archaeologists were respectful to the Nations’ wishes: “Their willingness to cooperate has been quite pleasing to us. They have been very patient, because I’m sure they would have liked to jump ahead and plow ahead with it” (Brooke 1999). Thus, First Nation
perspectives on archaeology have been positively influenced by the actions of the archaeologists involved in this study.

In addition, other projects undertaken by archaeologists in conjunction with First Nations in Canada (Charlie & Clark 2003, Friesen 1998, Gotthardt 2000, Gotthardt & Hare 1994, Hare & Gotthardt 1996, Hare & Greer 1994) have led not only to increased involvement of the First Nations in archaeology, but also to better relationships between the archaeologists and the people who are the subject of their studies as both parties understand the issues that arise from each group’s perspectives.

**Mesoamerica**

The tension between cultural properties and the groups that relate to them has become increasingly obvious in Latin America. Coggins (2003) writes about the inherent conflict in the economic progress sought by Latin American countries toward “globalization of the economy and the internationalization of culture to create a global patrimony” while struggling toward “the reestablishment of separate national languages and cultures” within those countries. In Mexico, for example, political rulers appropriated great heritage items from the social and cultural “peripheries” of the country to construct a national identity that suited their needs, yet Indigenous people were given little opportunity to be involved in the nation that was constructed. And although the politics of archaeology in Mexico are currently moving away from centralization toward regionalization as regional museums such as the one at Oaxaca’s Monte Alban spring up to highlight regional accomplishments rather than national ones, Indigenous people are seen “not as things of equal value with the present, but as ‘tourist attractions’” (Ames 2000, p. 23).

In Mexico, one circumstance from 2002 drew attention to a local perspective on archaeology. A story posted on the Mesoweb on October 9, 2002, entitled “Protest Leads to Discovery Announcement” (http://www.mesoweb.com/reports/discovery.html), painted a murky picture of the involvement of the local, Indigenous community with the archaeology (and archaeologists) in the area. Moises Morales, described in the story as a “renowned Palenque guide,” established a protest at the entrance to the Cross Group site at Palenque to draw attention to a new monument from Temple XXI—described as a “throne-altar-platform”—discovered by archaeologists of the Instituto National de Antropología e Historia (the National Institute of Anthropology and History). The newspaper *La Republica en Chiapas* reported that pressure from the people of Palenque had led to the public announcement of a discovery that had been kept secret since August 27, 2002. Morales protested the silence concerning the discovery of the “throne-altar-platform” through a placard posted at the site’s entrance. The sign began, “In view of the event of August 27, 2002, and as an energetic protest against your indifference to the people of Palenque, particularly the youth, permit me to ask you . . . .” It then went on to imply that the archaeologists displayed disregard for the city of Palenque, its authorities, and the governor of Chiapas by failing to report the discovery when it was made, by moving the platform “in order to protect it,” and by having a banquet in an elegant restaurant. Morales asked: “Who is paying for your career? Is this how you repay us? Can you prove me wrong?”

In this situation, the local population viewed the site of Palenque as belonging to them in as much of an economic sense as a proprietary one. That is, the situation that was brought under scrutiny was not the intellectual or social impact of the archaeological interpretations on the local population, but rather the economic impact of the archaeological enterprise on those people.

In November 2002, a conference entitled “Toward a More Ethical Mayan Archeology” held at the University of British Columbia offered some Mayan people the opportunity to offer their views on archaeology and its impact.
on local Indigenous groups. The conference, organized by Cohodas (2002), brought together Indigenous people and professional archaeologists who offered their opinions not only on the economic impacts of archaeology, but also on some of the philosophical aspects of archaeology as it is practiced in Mesoamerica. The conference attendees examined the use of such terms as the “Mayan collapse” and the psychological and political implications such terminology has on local Indigenous groups. Presentations by members of Indigenous Mayan groups (Castañeda 2002, Cocom 2002, Cojtí 2002, R Cojtí 2002, Lopez 2002) drew attention to some aspect of the political implications between archaeology and Mayan groups, and offered individual Mayan perspectives on the ways that archaeology could be more beneficial to local Indigenous groups.

The majority of these presenters were academics or students pursuing a degree in archaeology, and their perspectives on archaeology are derived not from interaction with archaeologists as an outsider, but primarily from interaction with the discipline through internal relationships. In the rest of Mesoamerica, few nonprofessionals are given the opportunity to offer their perspectives. The situation is mirrored in certain areas of South America as well.

The “Southern Cone”

In South America, a situation similar to that in Mexico and Mesoamerica seems to exist. Peruvian archaeologist Garth Bawden (personal communication 2004) noted that there is a lack of “indigenous” populations (i.e., “original settlers”) due to social factors such as population decimation due to health problems, migration, or other social aspects resulting from colonization. This absence of “original settlers” might be viewed as the reason that biological or genealogical differentiation factors have come to be replaced by economic or social ones. Alejandro Haber, for example, equates social class with biological or genealogical ones in his research, basically equating “peasants” with “Indigenous” (Haber 2005), whereas another Argentinean archaeologist, Endere (2002), looks at the relationships between social groups (subordinated and dominant social and governmental groups) in much the same way that American archaeologists examine relationships between dominant and Indigenous groups.

Other circumstances are beginning to signal an end to the silence regarding Indigenous perspectives on archaeology in South America, however. For example, the July 2003 issue of the South American publication Chungará, a publication of the Department of Archaeology and Museology of the Faculty of Social, Administrative, and Economics Sciences of the University of Tarapaca, Chile, contains a number of articles that are relevant to the discussion of Indigenous perspectives on archaeology. Ayala et al. (2003, pp. 275–285) address the experiences arising from a project titled “Links between Social Archaeology and the Ollagüe Indigenous Community,” one of whose main objectives was to improve working relationships between the Leandro Bravo V. Museum, the Indigenous community (self-identified as Quechua) and researchers. Another paper in the same issue by Jofré Poblete (2003, pp. 327–335) used an ethnoarchaeological approach that incorporated ethnographic information into archaeological interpretation. Bravo González (2003, pp. 287–293) writes of work in the native communities of Coyo and Quitor in the Province of El Loa in northern Chile sponsored by the communities themselves, where the main idea of the work is to allow the communities to manage their own patrimony. Romero’s paper on his work in northern Chile (2003, pp. 337–346) argues that there has been little interaction between scientific archaeology and the Indigenous population in the provinces of Arica and Parinacota in Northern Chile. However, Romero notes that, with the initiation of more effective political policies toward the protection of cultural patrimony and Indigenous rights, archaeologists
and Indigenous populations have begun to interact more openly. Uribe Rodríguez & Adan Alfaro (2003, pp. 295–304) address the debate on the ways that societies construct and reconstruct their historic memories, particularly in Third World nations like Chile. They begin by describing their scientific and professional experience with Indigenous and local communities from the Atacama Desert and discuss the particular cultural contingency of the Chilean State regarding these issues, ultimately arguing that the archaeological community must take a position concerning the role of science and, particularly, archaeology, in the society of which it is a part.

These are a few instances whereby archaeologists in South America are actively examining Indigenous perspectives on the discipline of archaeology. Interestingly enough, the current editor of Chungará, Vickie Cassman of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is a North American anthropologist in a North American university. Unfortunately, these articles are written by archaeologists beginning to undertake projects that actively work with Indigenous populations (however defined) rather than articles written by Indigenous people that give documentation of their perspectives on the utility, value, or even the practice of archaeology. It is hoped that as more articles of this sort are published, more Indigenous voices will be heard within South America.

**Scandinavia**

The Sami are an Indigenous people who live in four separate countries—Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Russia. Formerly called “Lapplanders,” the population estimates in 1990 were 17,000 in Sweden, 5700 in Finland, and over 30,000 in Norway (Morse 1997, p. 310). Valid population estimates for the Sami in the former Soviet Union are not currently available.

The Sami are thought to have originated somewhere in what is now northeastern Russia, although there does remain some points of contention as to the location of their origin (Olsson & Lewis 1995, p. 148). Increased movement into the upper Scandinavian countries began following contact with the Vikings in the eighth or ninth century as the Sami were forced from their more favored area into lands further northward. Olsson & Lewis (1995, p. 249) note that the efforts by Denmark and Sweden to control the Sami resulted in three major responses: the emergence of a coast-Sami culture based mainly on fishing and supplemented by agriculture; the emergence of an inland-Sami culture where agriculture was supplemented by hunting, fishing, and some reindeer herding; and a nomadic Sami culture drawn from both the coastal and inland-Sami groups mainly occupied with taming, tending, and herding reindeer.

Marjut & Pekka Aikio document the paucity of Sami archaeology and the desire by some Sami archaeology students in Norway to halt archaeological excavations until “the Sami archaeologists themselves can take over and perform this invaluable work” (Aikio & Aikio 1994, p. 128). As part of an attempt to involve the Sami of Sweden more in the archaeological process, a Program of Sami Studies has been set up under the Department of Archaeology at the University of Umeå. This program is intended to encourage the Sami to develop a new curriculum and graduate program integrating theory, method, and practice in archaeology using a Sami cultural perspective.

Mulk (1997, p. 123) an archaeologist of Sami extraction, notes that traces of Sami cultures usually are “hunting pits, hearths, hut foundations, graves, and sacrificial places,” with a great number of these sacrificial places investigated by various authors. Perhaps because there have been few archaeological excavations on Sami cultural sites, Sami perspectives (with few exceptions) have not made their way into print, other than in relation to repatriation and reburial of human remains (Schanche 2002, Sellevold 2002). If Mulk is true in her belief that “to this very day there are Sami who have a knowledge...
of old Sami popular beliefs, some of them practicing as medicine-men” (1997, p. 130) then perhaps there will be more discussion of issues concerning archaeology on the horizon.

Africa

In southern Africa the “concern to distinguish Indigenous Africans from other Africans has resulted in an overdrawn distinction between ‘cultural’ features of Indigeneity and the political economic features that Indigenous peoples share with marginalized minorities” (Sylvain 2002, p. 1075). As in other portions of the industrialized world, the voices of Indigenous populations are rarely given a forum for the presentation of their ideas. Although researchers such as Engelbrecht (2002) and Smith & Ouzman (2004) recognize the relationships between the Indigenous groups and archaeological materials, the people themselves are given few opportunities to speak about the material. This large continent with its many separate countries and complex ethnic identity issues remains relatively quiet concerning Indigenous perspectives on archaeology, but those perspectives should become more known as the researchers begin increasing their involvement with local populations and as local populations are given the political, economic, and academic opportunities to participate.

Australia and New Zealand

Jones & Harris (1998, p. 255) note, “Archaeologists and anthropologists in New Zealand are facing the same ethical issues as have arisen in Australia, Britain, and the United States.” As noted earlier, Hubert (1994) offered an interesting comparison between situations in Australia and the United States concerning the issue of the reburial of the dead, in particular, and perspectives of Indigenous populations in general. Turnbull (2002) and Aird (2002) also examine the concerns of Indigenous Australian people with the protection of their dead, the use of archaeology to strengthen native title claims, and the repatriation of cultural items. Other heritage management archaeologists (Thorley 2002) are also involved in working with Aboriginal communities to use archaeology to strengthen land rights claims.

Archaeologists in Australia are more likely to take Indigenous perspectives on archaeology into consideration as part of their research. Researchers such as Greer et al. (2002) and Smith & Burke (2003) use community-based archaeology to make the discipline more useful to the people whose heritage is being studied by involving the local community in all aspects of the research. Additionally, research such as that conducted by the University of New England with the Yarrawarra in New South Wales (Beck et al. 2000, Brown et al. 2000, Murphy et al. 2000, Smith et al. 2000, Somerville et al. 2000) provides not only much-needed training for archaeologists and anthropologists in working with Indigenous groups, it also gives the community the opportunity to provide their perspectives on the utility of the enterprise.

But perhaps the most encouraging actions in relation to Indigenous perspectives on archaeology are those taken by students who have pointedly asked Indigenous people their perspectives. Amy Roberts, as part of her doctoral research through Flinders University, pointedly asked Indigenous South Australians for their perspectives on archaeology (Roberts 2003). Hubbs, in her thesis through the University of South Australia, compared Indigenous Australian and Hopi (a North American Indian group) perspectives on archaeology (Hubbs 2002). As these dissertations get more widespread notice, more students will make use of similar investigations to obtain and publish Indigenous perspectives on the discipline.

Isaacson, an Australian Aboriginal man from Mount Isa, Northern Territory, writes about his perspective on archaeology and Indigenous groups in relation to the World Archaeological Congress in Washington,
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

Indigenous peoples worldwide are facing problems on numerous levels and issues. In May 1971, the United Nations Economic and Social Council authorized the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to study the problem of discrimination against Indigenous populations. In August 1971, the Sub-Commission appointed José R. Martinez Cobo as rapporteur to oversee the study. Before the study was completed, the Sub-Commission was authorized to establish a working group on indigenous populations to study developments pertaining to the human rights of Indigenous populations and to give attention to the evolution of standards concerning the rights of such populations. The Working Group on Indigenous Populations held its first session in Geneva in August 1982 and submitted the text of the Draft Declaration to the Sub-Commission in 1994. In August 1994, the Sub-Commission adopted the text of the Draft Declaration and submitted it to the Commission on Human Rights in 1995. Since its submission to the Commission on Human Rights Working Group (CHRWG) on the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, few state delegations have been prepared to accept all articles of the Declaration. Most argue that at least some require modification, clarification, or correction, with many commenting that particular provisions are at variance with national legislation and policy and are therefore unacceptable.

ETHICS, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND INDIGENOUS ISSUES

Ethics statements promulgated by the world’s major archaeological or anthropological organizations—the American Anthropological Association (1998), the Australian Archaeological Association (2004), the Canadian Archaeological Association (1996), the European Association of Archaeologists (1998), the New Zealand Archaeological Association (1999), the Register of Professional Archaeologists (2002), the Society for American Archaeology (1996), and the World Archaeological Congress (1989)—recognize anthropology’s or archaeology’s relationship with and responsibilities to the Indigenous populations with which it works. The processes that led to the formulation of these ethics statements are as important as the final codes themselves. There is not enough room to examine the processes in detail here, but Lynott & Wylie (2000) discuss the Society for American Archaeology’s Principles of Archaeological Ethics; Nicholson et al. (1996) discuss the Canadian Archaeological Association’s Statement of Principles for Ethical Conduct Pertaining to Aboriginal Peoples; and Zimmerman & Bruguier (1994) discuss the World Archaeological Code of Ethics as it relates to Indigenous people. The New Zealand Archaeological Association adopted the Society for American Archaeology’s Principles of Archaeological Ethics with only minor adaptation, whereas the Australian Archaeological Association’s Code of Ethics mirrors the World Archaeological Congress’ Code of Ethics.

These Codes, although necessary steps toward integrating the perspectives of nonanthropologists in the discipline and examining anthropology’s impact (both intentional and unintentional) on local communities worldwide, have little meaning if they are believed to take the place of meaningful ongoing communication with Indigenous groups. And such statements may have no meaning to people who are not members of the organizations and associations and who do not agree to be bound...
by the statements. As the discipline of archaeology questions its relative value and place in the contemporary world, it becomes necessary for individual archaeologists to continually re-examine the impact of their relationships with the nonarchaeologists that surround them as well as the utility that Indigenous groups can make of our discipline.

**DOES “UNspoken” MEAN “UNPROBLEMATIC”?**

When one looks at the archaeological literature, one can interpret the relative quiet of the Indigenous voice concerning archaeology in different ways. Does the paucity of published comment mean Indigenous groups have no issues with the way archaeology is practiced or the way archaeology impacts them, or does that quietude mean only that no one has asked their opinion? Perhaps the air is silent only because Indigenous people are unable to get their opinions published, or maybe the Indigenous group is afraid to draw attention to their situation for one reason or another.

Regardless of the real reason, there is no real way of knowing the basis for the relative silence of the Indigenous communities throughout the world in relation to the discipline of archaeology. But the more we invite Indigenous groups to be involved in our discipline and make them equal partners in the enterprise, the more we should begin hearing those voices. If we listen, we can hear them now, as soft as they may be. If we give them the opportunity to speak, they may shout at first, but perhaps, with time, we can all converse in normal tones.

**SUMMARY POINTS**

1. Indigenous peoples have an unequal place in the international political and social structure.
2. Archaeology is viewed by Indigenous peoples as a colonialist enterprise with continuing political undertones.
3. Relations between archaeologists and Indigenous groups in the United States are generally cool, although some tribal groups use archaeology and its methods to meet legal standards concerning cultural resources management.
4. In Canada, the lack of a national law regarding cultural (heritage) resources management has generally allowed provinces to establish varying degrees of relationships with First Nations.
5. In Mesoamerica and South America, the study and awareness of the formal relationship between archaeologists are in their nascent stage, with the relationships only now being examined openly.
6. In Scandinavia, the Indigenous peoples (the Sami) have only recently become involved in discussing the archaeological material from the Sami perspective.
7. In Australia and New Zealand, the Aboriginal peoples (the Australian Aboriginals and the Maori) are more involved with using archaeology as a means of re-establishing land tenure.
8. The ethics statements of most of the world’s major archaeological and anthropological associations recognize the responsibilities to the Indigenous peoples whom they study or with whom they work.
UNRESOLVED ISSUES/FUTURE DIRECTIONS

1. Indigenous peoples need to gain equal footing on the world’s social and political stage.
2. Archaeology needs to continue to examine its relationship with Indigenous peoples and recognize that stewardship should be shared.
3. Indigenous peoples and archaeologists have much to learn from each other, and open communication will help ensure that active learning takes place.
4. Indigenous archaeology—archaeology done by and for Indigenous people—is providing an Indigenous voice in the practice of archaeology as a means of allowing alternative interpretations of the archaeological record.
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