DECOLONIZING ARCHIVAL METHODOLOGY

Combating hegemony and moving towards a collaborative archival environment

*Taylor R. Genovese**

Abstract

The foundation of archival methodology is influenced by colonialism and imperialism. This paternalistic system has created a hegemonic environment that has directly influenced archivists working with Indigenous materials. While positive steps have been made, such as the enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990) and the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* (2006), severe limitations exist due to a difference in worldview and cultural beliefs. In order to reverse the effects of hegemony and decolonize archival methodology, an exerted effort must be made to increase collaboration between archives and Indigenous communities. Furthermore, higher education must attract Indigenous students to information science programs in order to create a more diverse workforce. However, in order to enact lasting change in methodology, the archival profession must receive an injection of activist principles. These principles will help advance decolonizing initiatives and ensure the end of paternalism and colonialism in archival science.

Keywords

The field of library and information science has recently started to realize that some of its practices in relation to Indigenous peoples and their representation are flawed. While it has

*   MA Candidate, Department of Anthropology, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona. Email: trgenovese@nau.edu

been known that gaps within the archival record exist when it comes to non-Western knowledge, the recognition that we must decolonize our institutions is of paramount importance. Archival repositories must allow for the input of Indigenous communities during the archival process in order to expedite repatriation, create a holistic learning environment, and make archival methodology a more ethical practice.

This paper will first present a general background on decolonization theory in order to orient the reader to the existing literature and theory that I utilize in my arguments. I will then discuss what happens when conceptual differences occur between Western and Indigenous thought—using the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601; NAGPRA) as an example of this contention—in order to illustrate the importance of cultural relativistic thinking. I will provide a brief introduction to the aim of the *Protocols for Native American Archival Materials* as well as present some of the heated—yet crucial—conversations that have occurred while attempting to shift established archival methodology to one that is more inclusive of Indigenous communities. Finally, I will argue for the decolonization of existing archival methodology—especially within the context of non-Indigenous archival institutions that house Indigenous cultural materials and expressions. In order to accomplish this, I will suggest multiple practical approaches that could be adopted by current archival institutions and higher education programs. However, it is important to note that this paper will remain theoretical in nature and its primary purpose is to generate discussion within the field of library and information science by compiling existing theories and suggestions introduced by scholars whom I refer to endearingly as "archival decolonists."

Finally, while archival decolonization can be applied to many different peoples and struggles around the world—such as the African American Civil Rights Movement and combating the effects of apartheid in South Africa

(Jimerson, 2007)—this paper will focus mainly on Indigenous groups, particularly within the United States.

Decolonizing methodologies

Prior to discussing how information professionals can enact change within archival methodology, one needs to have a knowledgeable foundation of decolonization theory. While the concept of decolonization existed prior to the publishing of her book, Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999) was a catalyst for academic thought and discussion on the topic.

According to Smith (1999), the basic principles of research (and by extension, archival methodology) are inexorably influenced by colonialism and imperialism. As stated in her introduction, the fact that "research is implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world's colonized peoples" (Smith, 1999, p. 1). The concept that research and colonialism are explicitly connected within Indigenous collective memory is an important notion to consider, especially when examining the proposition that Indigenous populations should take on an active role within archival methodology. Furthermore, this interconnection between research and colonialist expansion has created a significant gap within the archival record when it comes to traditional Indigenous knowledge, creating a cultural bias toward Western thought (Trouillot, 1995). As noted by Jimerson (2007), "the problem for colonial peoples is not that their history under foreign control has been forgotten, but that it 'was never recorded, therefore not remembered officially'" (p. 267). Perhaps related to this phenomenon is the fact that early colonial efforts, according to Trouillot (1995), provided a powerful "impetus for the transformation of European ethnocentrism into scientific racism" (p. 77).

Emerging out of this shift from theoretical

ethnocentrism to the pseudoscience of cultural evolution, modern archival methodology took on the role of bureaucratizing history in order to establish superiority over the colonized. This can be seen in the way that European colonizers described the "discovery" of the "New World," going so far as to lump Indigenous peoples in with the flora and fauna of the landscape (Smith, 1999). This classification of the Indigenous population as subhuman not only gave colonizers and settlers justification to carry out genocidal acts; it also provided early archival institutions with the justification to house items that were—particularly in the late 19th century—stolen from Indigenous land (O'Neal, 2015). These stolen artifacts and expressions were then used in concert with a Western historical bias to shape the narrative of those in power. As Jimerson (2007) notes, "from ancient times to the present, disquieting use has been made of archival records to establish, document, and perpetuate the influence of power elites" (p. 254). Derrida (1996) goes so far as to say that "there is no political power without control of the archive" (p. 4). It is undeniable that the spread of colonialism—as well as the establishment and perpetuation of Western hierarchical models of power—went hand in hand with the development of archival methodology.

The connection between colonialism and the development of archival methodology was further refined by theorists and philosophers such as Edward Said and Michel Foucault. Said (1978) proposed that imperial powers were able to secure and maintain power by controlling the information that was recorded, essentially deliberately creating an archival gap by omitting—either explicitly or implicitly—the ideas of the conquered. Foucault (as cited in Paisley & Reid, 2013) suggested that power was derived from the meticulous collection of data about the colonized and that new kinds of power could be attained simply by observing and keeping records about the "other". It could be argued that this pillar of the colonial process—that

is, meticulous record keeping—developed into the modern science of archaeology and archival methodology. Smith (1999) calls this Western obsession "culture collecting," which can be justified by colonial powers by utilizing the argument that they are "rescuing artifacts from decay and destruction" (p. 61). However, Smith (1999) also argues that due to Western hegemony, many archivists are entrenched in a system that believes that archival institutions are also protecting artifacts "from Indigenous people themselves" (p. 61).

The development of this paternalistic way of thinking has shaped modern archival theory into a hegemonic system that has been perpetuated in the past by a lack of activism within the field, as discussed by many scholars (Anderson, 2005; Christen, 2011; Cook, 1997; Jimerson, 2007; Kakaliouras, 2012; Nakata, 2012; O'Neal, 2015; Paisley & Reid, 2013). This is partially due to the fact that archival institutions have dodged public scrutiny more than other institutions concerned with collective memory such as museums, monuments, galleries, and libraries (Cook, 1997; Gilliland, 2011). A paternalistic outlook, whether intentional or not, has remained active, and "many [archival institutions] have played central roles in promoting particular historical narratives and sustaining dominant power structures" (Gilliland, 2011, p. 195). According to Ridener (2009), "philosophers and critics [have begun] to ask specific questions regarding archives and the creation of social and cultural memory" (p. 152). The time has come for the archivist to see activism as part of their job description in order to reform a former catalyst of colonialism: the archive.

NAGPRA and its limitations

The passage of NAGPRA in the United States in 1990 was an Indigenous victory after more than 25 years of engaging and lobbying for the protective care and preservation of Native

American cultural heritage (O'Neal, 2015). However, despite some of the protections that NAGPRA provides, there are also many shortcomings, including the failure to protect important parts of the Indigenous experience such as traditional cultural expressions (TCEs). When I refer to TCEs in this paper, I mean

> any forms [of expression], whether tangible and intangible, in which traditional culture and knowledge are expressed, appear or are manifested, and comprise the following forms of expressions or combinations thereof: verbal expressions . . . musical expressions . . . dances, plays, ceremonies, performances . . . [and] art. (Janke & Iacovino, 2011, p. 155)

The discussion over NAGPRA's inability to protect TCEs—as well as all Indigenous material in archival institutions—is an important conversation to have because this oversight demonstrates a lack of cultural understanding within Western governments—particularly that of the United States—when it comes to Indigenous worldviews.

Prior to talking about NAGPRA's inception, however, it is important to realize why so much Indigenous material culture is stored outside of tribal repositories. While many factors contributed to this situation—such as the fact that history and tradition is predominantly passed down orally in many North American Indigenous communities as well as the development of the field of anthropology, resulting in many Indigenous artifacts and TCEs being relocated to United States (US) governmental or academic institutions—the most striking reason was the misguided Western belief that Indigenous communities were simply disappearing as a people and a culture (O'Neal, 2015). Ironically, this belief was due to the genocidal expansion of colonialism as well as the forced relocations of Indigenous peoples onto reservations by order of the US government. This practice was further exacerbated by the boarding school movement—under the motto "kill the Indian, save the man"—in which children were forcibly removed from their families and enculturated into Western values, language, and dress (O'Neal, 2014). However, the budding field of anthropology saw it necessary to practice salvage ethnography and archaeology in order to preserve the Indigenous "way of life."

As a response to the increase in Indigenous activism during the 1960s and 1970s, the United States passed NAGPRA in 1990 to help facilitate the repatriation of Indigenous "cultural items" and human remains to living descendants (Kakaliouras, 2012). However, this law has been received with frustration and hostility from both scientists—especially archaeologists—and Indigenous communities. Some American archaeologists find NAGPRA to be detrimental to modern science, since repatriation voluntarily gives away material culture, which can compromise archaeological provenance (Meighan, 1993). Indigenous communities find conceptual limitations with NAGPRA due to differing ideas about what is considered "cultural patrimony" (Farrer, 1994; Fine-Dare, 2002; Kuprecht, 2014), as well as the lack of legislation pertaining to both tangible and intangible archival materials (O'Neal, 2015).

The language within NAGPRA that is most worrisome "when viewed from the perspective of Native Americans rather than from that of mainstream American culture" (Farrer, 1994, p. 317) is within Section 2(D):

> "cultural patrimony" which shall mean an object having ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to the Native American group or culture . . . shall have been considered inalienable by such Native American group at the time the object was separated from such group. (NAGRA, 1990)

To many Americans, and much of the West, this law seems to be discussing the definition of a physical, tangible object. However, to many Native Americans this definition "can as easily

apply to intangible property such as words, songs [and, more importantly] the words in songs, that are considered to be tantamount to objects that are necessary to certain cultural practices" (Farrer, 1994, para. 4). This vast conceptual difference illuminates an expansive lack of collaboration between American institutions and Indigenous communities.

It should be noted that while NAGPRA was not created for, and does not cover, archival collections and items, the ethical considerations that surround repatriation, privacy, social injustice, and item classification do pertain to archival science (Jimerson, 2007; Morphy, 2014). This is especially true if Indigenous communities are part of the repository's research focus. Although conversations have started regarding whether or not laws related to NAGPRA should extend into the world of archives, "archivists were slow to join the discussions since archive repositories were not part of the official process" (O'Neal, 2015, p. 13). If the majority of those in the archival profession do not realize that NAGPRA's shortcomings are unjust—even if they may not apply legally to archival institutions specifically—then positive change will remain elusive and hegemonic practices will thrive. I will expand upon these ideas below.

Farrer (1994) offers an excellent case study illustrating the shortcomings of NAGPRA pertaining to TCEs. Farrer describes her work with the Mescalero Apache people who were then attempting to have wax cylinders transferred to their possession from a museum in New Mexico. To the Mescalero Apache, words (especially words within sacred songs) are considered physical objects that have owners. No one is allowed to sing a song belonging to another member of the community without the express permission of the song's owner; this kind of direct ownership of words can be thought of within the construct of copyright law in the United States. The performances of sacred songs, such as the ones on the wax cylinders, were never supposed to be recorded and,

according to the Mescalero Apache, belonged to the Creator. Hearing these songs without tribal authorization is akin to playing God and the Mescalero Apache believe that doing so brings incredible danger to the tribe and whoever listens to the songs (Farrer, 1994).

According to the US court system, the wax cylinders themselves did not qualify as items that would need to be repatriated because they do not fit under the definition of "cultural patrimony." More specifically, the point of contention lies in the differing definitions of the word "object." This case study brings to light not only the collaborative shortfalls between broader Western society and Indigenous communities but also the paternalistic arrogance of American thought. After all, the concept of intangible property is not a foreign one in the United States. Take, for example, the ideas of intellectual or artistic property. Despite the fact that digital files are not tangible objects, the US court system erupted into quite the commotion when the online file-sharing service Napster allowed anyone to download practically any popular song for free (Fine-Dare, 2002). According to Kakaliouras (2012), this arrogance of exclusively deciding what is or is not considered "cultural patrimony" is due to judgments that demean cultural differences by reducing misunderstood dogmas to disparaging terms like "fetishisms" (p. S213). Furthermore, this line of thinking takes us back to "how Indigenous people see [TCEs and artifacts], not as a recorded culture but a living culture" (Janke & Iacovino, 2011, p. 163). This trivialization of another community's cultural identity is not the fault of an individual lawmaker or archivist, but rather an institutionalized hegemony resulting from years of segregation.

The Protocols for Native American Archival Materials

In 2006, 19 archivists (15 of whom were from Indigenous communities from around the world) met in Flagstaff, Arizona, to come up with a

set of principles "to encourage non-Native American collecting institutions small and large to engage in consultation with relevant Native American communities and pueblos on [their] collections" (Underhill, 2006, p. 441). What came out of this meeting was a paper entitled the "Protocols for Native American Archival Materials" (Underhill, 2006).

These *Protocols* suggest increased collaboration between Indigenous communities and institutions that hold Indigenous material. Furthermore, they acknowledge that each Indigenous community is unique and call on archivists to utilize the *Protocols* when initiating communication and collaboration with those communities (Christen, 2011; Underhill, 2006). The *Protocols* also aim to build respect and reciprocity between non-Indigenous archival institutions and Indigenous communities that will lead to "collaboration and shared stewardship of collections" (O'Neal, 2014). More importantly, however, is the fact that the *Protocols* call for all researchers to adhere to Indigenous belief systems when work is being done within those communities. This principle is especially important within an academic or governmental archival setting, as it would allow for Indigenous communities to contribute to the decision-making process by utilizing their individual worldviews. From an activist standpoint, these *Protocols* were an incredible step forward.

Although Indigenous-based community archival projects existed prior to the *Protocols*—such as the establishment of Tribally Controlled Community Colleges in the 1960s (O'Neal, 2015)—many of these community archives have found funding and/or increased public visibility following the publishing of the *Protocols*, such as the Mukurtu Project (Withey, 2015). Organizations such as the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Studies, the National Museum of the American Indian, the Association of Tribal Libraries, Archives, and Museums, and many tribal colleges throughout the United States and Canada have shown that Indigenous-run archival institutions can flourish successfully. Furthermore, recent studies have demonstrated that these community archival projects—especially those that are run by Indigenous patrons—tend to serve the needs of Indigenous communities better than some traditional archives (Caswell, 2014; Flinn, Stevens, & Shepherd, 2009). Further afield, Morphy (2014) has described the success of Indigenous groups in Australia in regaining some material culture virtually, by means of repatriation of digital images and recordings. It should be noted that I am not claiming that the *Protocols* themselves—which are highly specific to the United States—have inspired Indigenous action around the world. However, it remains a possibility that discourse at the international conference to draft the *Protocols* may have inspired some of these more recent initiatives in the United States and abroad.

Unfortunately, there has been a strong critical stance taken against the *Protocols* from within the information science profession as well as throughout the social sciences. Of the 39 comments received by the Society of American Archivists workgroup, 11 favored adopting the protocols and 12 opposed (J. Ceja, personal communication, September 23, 2014). Interestingly, "8 of the 39 comments received were from non-archivists (primarily archaeologists) . . . non-archival commentators were largely negative in their opinions" (Ceja, personal communication, 2014). Archaeologist Clement Meighan (1993) has famously noted that

> reburying bones and artifacts is the equivalent of the historian burning documents after he has studied them. Thus, repatriation is not merely an inconvenience but makes it impossible for scientists to carry out a genuinely scientific study of American Indian prehistory. (p. 16)

This quote is a prime example of a system steeped in hegemonic thought in which US scientific advancement is of paramount importance and

the worldview of Indigenous peoples deserves little or no consideration. It should be mentioned that Meighan's statement is just an example of the repudiation of repatriation; it never represented the views of the majority of information science professionals. However, it does illustrate the fact that some in the archaeological community view Indigenous people as artifacts—an interesting part of material culture to be dug up from the ground—rather than living human beings whose culture and traditions continue into modernity.

However, that is not to say that all discourse on this matter is critical. Many archivists and archaeologists have spoken out in favor of the *Protocols* and other similar initiatives. Archaeologist Larry Zimmerman (1994) makes the following excellent point: "when archaeologists say that the Native American past is gone, extinct, or lost unless archaeology can find it, they send a strong message that Native Americans themselves are extinct" (p. 66). Furthermore, as O'Neal (2015) argues, the *Protocols* do not actually go against established archival theories; rather, they "support archival theory and practices through the theoretical concepts of the post-custodial model for participatory and community archives, with a deep foundation in the model of social justice archiving" (p. 14).

The *Protocols* and similar initiatives are a huge step forward in creating a conversation within the social sciences, which is always the first step in creating positive change. Perhaps Kakaliouras (2012) says it best: "after decades if not centuries of Western institutional ownership, the lives of past peoples have been regaining their power in the present as repatriatables and as Indigenous rather than scientific subjects" (p. S219).

What then must we do?

So what is to be done? While this is certainly a hefty question to ask of anyone, there are positive steps being taken by the information science community. Activist archivists are attempting to create a shift in how non-Indigenous repositories process and store Indigenous materials. Many activist archivists agree on one thing: Indigenous communities should be directly involved in the archival process, making decisions on how the materials are stored and whether they should be stored at all. This ruffles the feathers of many archivists who feel it "challenges the 'bedrock' of American archival practice" (Boles, George-Shongo, & Weideman, 2008, p. 10) or that it "[goes] against 'traditional' archival practices" (O'Neal, 2014, p. 135). Certainly this criticism has some validity but it is also important to recognize that guidelines like the *Protocols* are rooted in postmodern, postcustodial archival theory and also share similarities with community and social justice archival models (O'Neal, 2014). These concepts—while revolutionary within the 20th century—are not without a theoretical basis. Rather, these ideas hope to build upon archival theory while expunging the remnants of colonialist thought from archival methodology. Nakata (2012) calls for a consistent effort in order to be sure that "archives are not just storehouses, but access points for quite valuable Indigenous materials—materials that can make a real difference in [Indigenous] lives" (p. 103).

In order to combat this "storehouse" mentality, there are existing theories that can be expanded and appropriated in order to benefit both non-Indigenous and traditional academic/governmental archival institutions. Archivist Rand Jimerson (2003) proposes a solution for repositories that may be experiencing overcrowding issues or physical space limitations. Jimerson (2003) suggests that these archival institutions begin to "re-examine existing collections to determine whether any current holding no longer meets the selection or appraisal criteria of the repository" (p. 139). After identification of these overflow materials, he suggests a cycle of reappraisal and

deaccessioning. Essentially, archival institutions should reassess their holdings in relation to their research focus (reappraisal) and either give materials away to other institutions with a more complementary research focus or sell duplicate holdings to the public (deaccessioning). If we apply these reappraisal and deaccessioning principles to decolonization theory, it would be possible—and practical—for non-Indigenous archival institutions to deaccession their Indigenous holdings and transfer them to Indigenous-run or community archives. This would ease the overcrowding problem and allow for a fortifying of institutional research focus—while simultaneously returning materials to the descendants of the culture creators, thereby contributing to decolonizing archival methodology and strengthening collaboration between non-Indigenous and Indigenous archival institutions. This would also assist with the promotion of access points catered to Indigenous populations because the materials would be run by Indigenous communities themselves. Of course, this is not without risk since Indigenous populations may decide that keeping certain materials in an accessible archival institution would be inappropriate. However, as Farrer (1994) notes, "making the tribes in question part of the decision-making process concerning archival and museum material . . . is the only ethical course to follow" (p. 317).

When Western archival institutions allow for Indigenous involvement, the benefits are larger than the exclusive purpose of ensuring material culture is archived with sensitivity; doing so also enables a holistic learning environment to be cultivated. Any discourse regarding the meaning of ownership not only benefits archival methodology; it also advances information science ethically and professionally. Western archival practices and ethics tend to base their ideas of responsibility for social "good" on a sense of the individual and of individualized property (Smith, 1999). However, according to Roy and Hogan (2010), "these beliefs are not in agreement with an Indigenous worldview,

which places community rights above those of the individual" (p. 113). With close interaction between Indigenous communities and non-Indigenous archivists, perhaps the Old Guard will begin to see that the Indigenous materials held by non-Indigenous archival institutions do not belong to Anglos—or the archives and museums themselves—and a symbiotic relationship can begin to form (Christen, 2011; Farrer, 1994; Jimerson, 2007). This process of decolonization-centered reappraisal and deaccessioning could begin to heal the colonial wound of archival methodology.

This leads to another issue that exists in the field of archival science: a lack of Indigenous student and faculty representation within information science degree programs. Creating a holistic learning environment with Indigenous communities can, and should, happen from within the information science profession, especially with the recruitment of Indigenous individuals into higher education information science programs. The creation of programs targeting Indigenous and non-white information professionals will create diversity within archival institutions affiliated with universities and allow for an exchange of cultural ideas that would contribute to the creation of a more ethical workspace. However, despite positive steps forward—such as the University of Arizona's Knowledge River program and the University of Wisconsin–Madison's Tribal Libraries, Archives, and Museums (TLAM) project, among others—Native Americans represent only 1.9% of archival professions, according to the Archival Census and Education Needs Survey in the United States (Walch & Yakel, 2006, p. 21). Caucasians, on the other hand, make up 87.7% of archivists, with a majority of the profession being in their 50s (Walch & Yakel, 2006).

Despite programs like Knowledge River and TLAM—and the call for reform and revolutionary change by numerous other activist archivists and scholars (e.g., Anderson, 2005; Caswell, 2014; Cook, 1997; Cook & Schwartz,

2002; Gilliland, 2011; Jimerson, 2003, 2007; Morphy, 2014; O'Neal, 2014, 2015; Withey, 2015)—challenges still *exist* for many potential Indigenous students. Many scholarships targeted to Indigenous students have the stipulation that applicants must be from a federally recognized tribe, which accounts for only a fraction of those who identify as Native American (Patterson, 2000). The lack of Indigenous students is not the only problem with representation; there is also a lack of Indigenous faculty, as noted by Patterson (2000): "the numbers of native people in library school have always been the smallest of all minority groups. The same is true of library school faculty" (p. 185). Furthermore, this lack of Indigenous representation in higher education means that the Western epistemology and curriculum dominates within information science programs. Universities need to establish and embrace a greater variety of worldviews within information science programs, which will allow for archives to "promote respectful and collaborative stewardship and establish multiple cultural heritage perspectives and approaches, rather than perpetuate a one-sided Western approach" (O'Neal, 2014, p. 136).

Efforts need to be made by higher education administrators to attract Indigenous students into doctoral programs and professorships so that a "cultural loneliness" (Patterson, 2000, p. 187) does not steer potential Indigenous students away from library school. In order to do this, there must be a directed measure for library schools to increase recruitment of those who identify as Indigenous or Native American. Furthermore, there should be a lifting of the scholarship and funding restrictions that require an Indigenous student to be a member of a federally recognized tribe. Although there is still a lot to be done, there are significant efforts being made by the information science community to identify and combat colonialism and ethnocentrism within archival methodology.

Conclusion

Much of Western scientific thought, including archival methodology, has developed within a colonialist and imperialist framework. Admitting that fact is the first step towards recovery. Accepting that Indigenous worldviews and cultural principles are equally as valid as Western philosophies will allow for a collaborative environment to foster in both academic research and archival practice. We need to focus our efforts on decolonizing archival methodology while encouraging equality and creating an archival environment that is welcoming to all researchers, including those representing Indigenous communities. Through direct collaboration and incentivizing information science education to Indigenous communities, archival gaps and bias will begin to fade and archival institutions will begin to realize their purpose of providing a true representation of the past through material culture and TCEs.

More specifically, non-Indigenous archival institutions should adopt the proposed decolonized version of Jimerson's (2003) method of reappraisal and deaccessioning. Indigenous material culture should be transferred to Indigenous-run archival institutions or community archives, and outreach and collaborative support structures should be developed between non-Indigenous and Indigenous archival repositories. Furthermore, higher education information science programs need to prioritize the recruitment and retention of Indigenous and non-white students in order to increase diversity in the archival science profession. In order to do this, restrictions on scholarships and funding need to be lifted in order to allow Indigenous individuals—who may not be from a federally recognized tribe—to participate in university education. There must also be a protracted effort to understand and incorporate Indigenous ways of knowing and epistemologies within information science programs in order to combat a Western-dominated approach to archival science.

However, these propositions are not an easy task; in fact, they "invite a rethinking of some basic parameters of and foundations for the field" (Christen, 2011, p. 188). The colonial foundation of archival science will need to be rewritten, especially concerning the acceptance and processing of donations. If we approach current archival methodology—which has been slow to adopt a postmodern, postcustodial theoretical framework—with these propositions in mind, non-Indigenous repositories run the risk of losing many Indigenous collections. However, as Farrer (1994) suggests, Indigenous collections never truly belong to the Western archive. Proper respect needs to be given to the storage, collection, and repatriation of Indigenous collections, depending on the collaborative decisions of the archivists and the Indigenous communities involved.

In order to reach this goal, archivists will need to become active in speaking out for change. Many archivists are drawn to the profession because they are introverted and feel comfortable processing collections with minimal interaction with patrons (Ceja, personal communication, 2014). Furthermore, many archivists deny the fact that they have significant influence, power, and authority over what records will be preserved (Jimerson, 2007). Unfortunately, allowing the status quo to drive the future of archival methodology will not result in an open and respectful view of our most important and treasured cornerstones of culture. Jimerson (2007) says it best: "'The archive *is* politics' . . . [and] archivists should heed this call to activism" (p. 270). O'Neal (2015) expands on this line of thinking by arguing that archivists should be able to balance both aspects of their job: "the traditional work of acquiring, accessioning, and processing records, as well as incorporating aspects of social justice into our daily work" (p. 15). The time has come for the archival profession to receive an injection of activist principles, which will give rise to the voices of individuals who believe in decolonization and unilateral respect.

References

Anderson, J. (2005). Indigenous knowledge, intellectual property, libraries and archives: Crises of access, control and future utility. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *36*(2), 85–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2005.10721250

Boles, F., George-Shongo, D., & Weideman, C. (2008, February 7–10). *Report: Task force to review protocols for Native American archival materials*. Retrieved from http://files.archivists.org/goverance/taskforces/0208-NativeAmProtocols-IIIA.pdf

Caswell, M. (2014). Community-centered collecting: Finding out what communities want from community archives. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Sciences and Technology*, *51*(1), 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/meet.2014.14505101027

Christen, K. (2011). Opening archives: Respectful repatriation. *American Archivist*, *74*, 185–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.17723/aarc.74.1.4233nv6nv6428521

Cook, T. (1997). What is past is prologue: A history of archival ideas since 1898, and the future paradigm shift. *Archivaria*, *43*, 17–63.

Cook, T., & Schwartz, J. M. (2002). Archives, records and power: From (postmodern) theory to (archival) performance. *Archival Science*, *2*(3–4), 171–185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02435620

Derrida, J. (1996). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Farrer, C. R. (1994). Who owns the words? An anthropological perspective on Public Law 101–601. *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society*, *23*(4), 317–326. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10632921.1994.9942943

Fine-Dare, K. S. (2002). *Grave injustice: The American Indian repatriation movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Flinn, A., Stevens, M., & Shepherd, E. (2009). Whose memories, whose archives? Independent community archives, autonomy and the mainstream. *Archival Science*, *9*(1–2), 71–86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-009-9105-2

Gilliland, A. (2011). Neutrality, social justice and the obligations of archival education and educators in the twenty-first century. *Archival Science*, *11*(3–4), 193–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-011-9147-0

Janke, T., & Iacovino, L. (2011). Keeping cultures alive: Archives and indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights. *Archival Science*, *12*(2), 151–171. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-011-9147-0

Jimerson, R. C. (2003). Deciding what to save. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, *19*(4), 135–140. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10650750310508108

Jimerson, R. C. (2007). Archives for all: Professional responsibility and social justice. *American Archivist*, *70*(2), 252–281. http://dx.doi.org/10.17723/aarc.70.2.5n20760751v643m7

Kakaliouras, A. M. (2012). An anthropology of repatriation. *Current Anthropology*, *53*(S5), S210–S221. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/662331

Kuprecht, K. (2014). *Indigenous peoples' cultural property claims: Repatriation and beyond*. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01655-9

Meighan, C. W. (1993). The burial of American archaeology. *Academic Questions*, *6*(3), 9–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02683284

Morphy, H. (2014). Open access versus the culture of protocols. In R. Silverman (Ed.), *Museum as process* (pp. 90–104). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nakata, M. (2012). Indigenous memory, forgetting and the archives. *Archives and Manuscripts*, *40*(2), 98–105. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01576895.2012.687129

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Pub. L. 101-601, 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq., 104 Stat. 3048 (1990).

O'Neal, J. (2014). Respect, recognition, and reciprocity: The protocols for Native American archival materials. In D. Daniel and A. Levi (Eds.), *Identity palimpsests: Archiving ethnicity in the U.S. and Canada* (pp. 125–142). Sacramento, CA: Litwin.

O'Neal, J. (2015). "The right to know": Decolonizing Native American archives. *Journal of Western Archives*, *6*(1), 1–17.

Paisley, F., & Reid, K. (2013). *Critical perspectives on colonialism: Writing the empire from below*. London, England: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203110393

Patterson, L. (2000). History and status of Native Americans in librarianship. *Library Trends*, *49*(1), 182–193.

Ridener, J. (2009). *From Polders to postmodernism: A concise history of archival theory*. Duluth, MN: Litwin.

Roy, L., & Hogan, K. (2010). We collect, organize, preserve and provide access, with respect: Indigenous peoples' cultural life in libraries. In J. B. Edwards & S. P. Edwards (Eds.), *Beyond Article 19: Libraries and social cultural rights* (pp. 113–147). Duluth, MN: Library Juice.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Zed.

Trouillot, M. (1995). Silencing the past: Power and the production of history. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Underhill, K. J. (2006). Protocols for Native American Archival Materials. *International Journal of Cultural Property*, *13*, 441–442. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0940739106060334

Walch, V., & Yakel, E. (2006). The Archival Census and Education Needs Survey in the United States (ACENSUS). *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives*, *22*(1), 15–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10650750610640757

Withey, K. C. (2015). Sovereignty, repatriation, and the archival imagination. *Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals*, *11*(2), 115–138.

Zimmerman, L. J. (1994). Sharing control of the past. *Archaeology*, *47*(6), 65–68.