A New Way to Research: The Benefits and Future of Indigenous Archaeologies

Isabella Pipp
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, ilpipp@uwm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes

 Part of the Archaeological Anthropology Commons, Indigenous Studies Commons, and the Native American Studies Commons

A New Way to Research: The Benefits and Future of Indigenous Archaeologies

Isabella L. Pipp

Western Washington University, USA

Abstract: Indigenous archaeologies allow for new methodologies and theoretical approaches into archaeological studies by promoting collaborative research. This paper explores specific approaches, including member-orientated interpretations, language and lifeway advocacy, collaborative workshops, and insertion of intellectual property rights into research. This paper demonstrates that Indigenous and archaeological ontologies do not have to oppose one another and the integration of both reflect a relevant and holistic type of study. It is argued that archaeologists need to rethink their approaches as scientists when working with Indigenous communities and to readily integrate participatory methodologies to create an inclusive, pluralistic, and critical archaeology.

Keywords: Indigenous archaeologies, collaboration, language advocacy, intellectual property rights, critical theory

Introduction

Since the 1970s, public archaeology has been a concern for the anthropological field and those who are impacted by it. Global movements, such as decolonization and Indigenous self-determination, have affected anthropology, along with influential theoretical shifts in archaeology from processual to post-processual thinking. With the introduction of these approaches, there was a realization that "there are multiple ways of seeing, interpreting, and understanding the past, and attempts to grapple with issues of objectivity and subjectivity remain a critical topic of inquiry" (Atalay 2006:291). Archaeology is influenced by present social and political contexts which affects interpretations of the past. Indigenous archaeologies intersect with this as it transforms the field through activism of tribal stakeholders and methodology that directly counteracts inequalities created by past archaeological practices.

There are various meanings of Indigenous archaeologies, yet it remains an elusive term. It is used pan-tribally but is still community specific in methodology and theoretic research. Indigenous archaeologies call for the distinctions between consultation and collaboration. Consultation does not require Indigenous peoples to have an active role in archaeological research, whereas collaboration creates knowledge production through continuous interactions between Indigenous peoples and archaeologists. While anthropologists pride themselves on their humanity in the social sciences, they have standardized the objectification of Native Americans in practice which is a long-term, colonial pattern of 'othering' in the field (Downer 1997:24). Indigenous invisibility in archaeological research is not inherent but created through practice. "Awkward and faddish as it may sound, othering expresses the insight that the other is never simply given, never just found or encountered, but *made"* (Fabian 1990:755, emphasis added). The othering of Native Americans in archaeology has much to do with the distancing of contemporary groups to ancestral material culture, creating an absence of Indigenous agency in research, and presenting Indigenous heritage as a creation of archaeological superiority. A paralleled othering to emphasize this comes from the writing of Edward Said: "I mean to say that in the discussion of the Orient, the Orient is all absence, whereas one feels the Orientalist and what he says as presence; yet we must not forget that the Orientalist's presence is enabled by the Orient's effective absence (Said 1994:146). While there has been an increase in dialogue between archaeologists and Indigenous communities on emic approaches, change is not inherently based in theoretical paradigms but by the representative and un-othering actions that take place.

Before the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), there was no need to include Native Americans in their own heritage management or to acknowledge contemporary tribal ownership of ancestral material within the United States. There has also been a historic conception that if Native Americans could be educated on the importance of archaeological research, problems would disintegrate, which produces an inherent authoritarian and superior stance of the archaeologist (Downer 1997:25). Ontological and legislative shifts in

archaeology have occurred to advance Indigenous agency, however, legal requirements do not inherently create meaningful relationships between archaeologists and descent communities. A goal of archaeology going forward is to expand necessities of law into representative collaboration.

Indigenous archaeologies are a way to deconstruct the othering that takes place in the archaeological field. When applied to the larger scope of decolonization movements, Indigenous archaeologies allow for each community to incorporate relevant needs into research and promote self-determination in heritage management. This paper argues that archaeologists must create sincere relationships with Indigenous communities through methodologies of tribal member orientated material interpretation, promotion of Indigenous language intersections, and long term, Indigenous-sponsored workshops, and collaboration. Archaeologists, as well, need to incorporate intellectual property rights discussions to the practices and products of their research as it relates to identity for many contemporary Indigenous groups.

Background

The rights of Native Americans and their tribes to protect burial remains, and religious and cultural objects came to fruition with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. "Until 1989, the federal government 'had a firm policy which encouraged the acquisition and retention' of Indian skeletons and artifacts by federal agencies and museums" (Pevar 2012:234). Enacted in 1990, NAGPRA had two main focuses: the first was to give tribes the right to "…recover religious and cultural items belonging to them or their members that were held in federally funded institutions," while the second enforced tribal rights over human remains and artifacts "...found or excavated on federal or tribal land in the future" (Pevar 2012:235). Other incorporations into the law included the right to look over, request repatriation, and require notification and consultation of items found or recovered. NAGPRA was a powerful victory for Indigenous communities, but it still possesses limitations in protection including rights not upheld for remains or items found on nonfederal lands nor applied to tribes that are not recognized by the United States federal government (Pevar 2012:236). Monumental steps have taken place in archaeology and law to defend Indigenous rights, yet there are still lands, artifacts, and people being left behind without protection.

Indigenous archaeological methodologies create and explore balancing of motivations between science and Indigenous groups. Indigenous archaeology, as described by Watkins, "…is an expression of archaeological theory and practice in which their discipline intersects with Indigenous values, knowledge, practices, ethics, and sensibilities, and through collaborative and community-orientated or -direct projects, and related critical perspectives" (Watkins 2011:51). While the normative term is widely used in the singular form, the type of language archaeologists use is an important foundation to any paradigm. This paper will use the term 'Indigenous archaeologies' to capture the pluralistic approach that is needed in this type of research, the usefulness of which undercuts the notion of universalism of Indigenous peoples and allows for the recognition of the contextual daily lives and practices of a specific community (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010:229). Indigenous archaeologies are, therefore, a socially, politically, and economically charged expression that resists the disparities created within the archaeological field (Watkins 2011:48).

> "If our goal is to decolonize archaeology, we must then continue to explore ways to create an ethical and socially just practice of archaeological research-- one that is in synch with and contributes to the goals, aims, hopes, and curiosities of the communities who's past and heritage are under study, using methods and practices that are harmonious with their own worldviews, traditional knowledges, and lifeways" (Atalay 2006:284).

Indigenous archaeologies accomplish representation and agency in the research process, the formation and application of responsible archaeological practices, and produces relevance not only to the Indigenous groups but for the study itself. "The inclusion of Native voices offers not only the potential to transform the discipline into a more democratic practice but also the opportunity to reconceptualize notions of time, space, and material culture" (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010:232). Archaeologists need to recognize the displacement of power forged by its colonial history and accept that this subfield can bring with it the need to critique scientific principles. Anthropology isn't losing anything scientific by incorporating Indigenous knowledge into archaeological research. Shifts in approaches will not entirely overthrow what has been done in traditional archaeology but acknowledge the need to further reform the field. With this, Indigenous archaeologies intentionally confronts traditional archaeological paradigms which must go beyond theoretical approaches and be used in practice.

Space Creation and Pluralism in Archaeology

"Practice, as the verb implies, means putting knowledge into motion" (Lyons 2013:49). Indigenous archaeologies promote community voices in research and have changed the overall scope of the anthropological narrative. It is necessary then to have a respectful location for communication and questions between researchers and participants. This sort of multi-vocal approach calls for pluralism and space creation. However, with every practice, different limits of inquiry exist. Projects may not have the exact outcomes that were wanted by those involved, but it is the fact that practices are taking place that changes the overall power matrix (Lyons 2013:58). Communication is a key foundation; a starting point from where archaeologists begin the process of practice.

Different methodologies are going to be used for varying contexts, and the action-orientated methods described in this paper are just one sphere of the decolonization complex within archaeology. These types of actions cannot be independent of one another but part of an interconnected process of liberation. When archeologists rethink their actions and make research plans, they can be derived from Indigenous value systems. These two structures do not have to oppose one another. The gap between them allows, at minimum, room for conversation. "The understanding of research context, and how the anthropologist views his or her role within it, is heavily influenced by the level of dialogue and interaction between research partners, participants, and other interest groups" (Lyons 2013:56). Intersections of archaeology, heritage management, Indigenous lifeways, language, and traditional knowledge help shape Indigenous archaeologies' practices and creates space for future collaboration.

Indigenous Heritage and Land Management in Archaeology

Due to Indigenous archaeologies representing pluralistic approaches, the methodologies should be shaped by the interactions between research goals and the specific group's needs or wants from archaeology. Archaeologists have a history of asserting ownership over Indigenous heritage management instead of forming relationships of mutual respect. It is necessary then to rethink the position of the archaeologist and the claim of academic authority. One way that archaeologists can counter this behavior is by "assist[ing] tribes in identifying grant sources and preparing grant proposals; offer expertise and consultation relative to federal and state laws that affect archaeological and cultural properties of direct interest to tribes; and direct archaeological activity toward establishing definitions of aboriginal territory" (Carter 1997:154). It is essential for archaeologists to directly challenge imbalances produced in the field and create inclusion for Indigenous voices, and control over research. Archaeological inquiry can also be used to conserve sites and tribal authority over land, as it is difficult to protect cultural sites when they may not be fully known or understood. Therefore, Indigenous groups may want to use archaeology as an intersect between protection and research needs.

In 1992, the Seminole Tribe of Florida obtained a grant for a project called the Seminole Heritage Survey, which resulted in 31 prehistoric and historical sites within the reservation (Cypress 1997:157). Not only did some of these sites represent primarily unknown areas which helped bring new information of tribal history, they aided in maintaining sovereignty over land and culture through archaeological research and established a better idea of where their reservation can be managed. The Seminole Tribe also used archaeology to establish a historic cemetery, the location of which was previously unknown. The tribe wanted a small-scale excavation to take place so the cemetery could be acknowledged, protected, and given a proper memorial (Cypress 1997:159). No study would be beyond this. This example demonstrates the role of archaeology as a tool for the Seminole Tribe to establish knowledge and authority over specific land and cultural issues.

In 1992, the Navajo Nation was granted funding to research cultural resources on the Grand Canyon due to an environmental impact of the Glen Canyon Dam (Begay 1997:164). Before this research, it was not thought that the Grand Canyon had any connection to the Navajo people, yet sites of importance were found by following oral history (Begay 1997:164). By specifically incorporating Navajo knowledge into the archaeological process, information that was previously unknown became visibly manifested. The intersection of archaeology and Navajo ontologies asserts control of heritage management and explores forcefully lost history. These examples represent Indigenous groups' utilization of archaeology as a tool for their own research needs. Agency, autonomy, land, and resource management all intersect in these case studies to create a specific typology of Indigenous archaeologies.

Tribal Member Participation and Interpretation

One method that accomplishes Indigenous agency in archaeology is by promoting research within descent communities and encouraging involvement of younger tribal generations. In the late 1980s, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) in Oregon created the CTUIR Cultural Resource Protection Program founded in an Indian system of reality (Van Pelt et al. 1997:167). This allowed tribal members to be educated, trained, and employed as cultural resource managers. It also created dialogue between teachers and elders about the role of anthropology, archaeology, oral tradition, and archival research (Van Pelt et al. 1997:168). The creation of the program enforced tribal self-governance, and the CTUIR actively participate with private, state, and federal entities in decision making. By emphasizing decision making and tribal member involvement in resource management, this concentrated tribal members to collaborate with tribal elders on how to further educate younger members. This example highlights the return of authority over pedagogy and how Indigenous communities demand representation in their own knowledge production.

Like the CTUIR, the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) of Arizona implemented sovereignty over heritage research by promoting archaeology to tribal high schoolers and younger students (Ravesloot 1997:177). The GRIC designed the Red Earth Summer Archaeology Program to create opportunities for Native students to learn about archaeology, methodology, and experience (Ravesloot 1997:177). This type of program is essential for younger tribal members to learn and participate in a new type of archaeology—one which they are included in and help mold.

Reform in archaeological research also needs to come from the training of undergraduates and graduates in anthropology programs (Ravesloot 1997:175). Classes specific to Native American ethics, Indigenous archaeological-related law and rights, and contemporary Native American cultures are not standardized requirements for all North American archaeology programs. If university classes and field schools do not readily incorporate Indigenous perspectives, students training as archaeologists are losing important contexts and ideals. As a result, students often perpetuate a colonial interpretation of archaeology that is founded and institutionalized through their education. It is not up to Indigenous communities to change the minds of archaeologists on proper research and its methodologies. Archaeologists must recognize the discrepancies created by the field and actively change them while promoting Indigenous agency in the process.

Another example of tribal participation comes from the Qwu?gwes wet site on Squaxin Island, Washington. Participants included Dale Croes, the South Puget Sound Community College, and Squaxin Island Tribal members (Foster et al. 2014:167-168). Each one of these collaborators had an essential role of sharing information and a unique background that allowed for a pluralistic and critical approach to the Qwu?gwes site. The students at South Puget Sound Community College were given a unique opportunity compared to most anthropology programs in the United States. *"We students were exposed to the culture we were studying through interaction with people from that culture"* (Foster et al. 2014:174, emphasis added). As mentioned above, accessibility to collaborative field programs is rare and creates a hurdle for Indigenous agency in archaeological investigations. An important factor of this case study is the 50/50 sharing of research (Foster et al. 2014:167). This created a space for dialogue of both archaeological and tribal points of view, where various approaches and interpretations are discussed together.

When basketry was found and excavated at the Qwu?gwes wet site, tribal members were present and included in the removal, as well, tribal basket weavers provided identification, interpretation, and basketry production knowledge to researchers:

> *"To not be allowed to participate while so-called experts were studying and interpreting your culture would have been a violation to all humankind. This would have been disrespectful, and it was something to shy away from. Distrust prevents positive communication, and without communication how can anyone present a comprehensive theory, interpretation, or view of any culture?"* (Foster et al. 2014:171, emphasis added).

The approach being targeted and eradicated here is that of archaeologists as scientific gatekeepers into Indigenous past. Member-oriented archaeological research provides inclusion for identification purposes, but it also brings with it personal and artifact life stories that archaeologists rarely get to hear. *"Our link, our culture, and our future were all incorporated at this site we now called Qwu?gwes (Quot-Qwass), which means "a place to come together, share, and gather" in Lushootseed, our traditional Salish language"* (Foster et al. 2014:168, emphasis added). Direct collaboration and insertion of traditional knowledge creates a holistic and pluralistic approach to resource

management, where respect, trust, and research are not independent of one another and creates new, positive relationships with descent communities.

The Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre of Canada case study represents the promotion of Elder participation in artifact analysis. The project design incorporated critical theory with participatory methodology (Lyons 2013:65). Goals of the Inuvialuit study included conducting oral history interviews, life story interviews, interviews about the state of cultural heritage and its representation, community workshops, and observation of contemporary socio-political structures of the Inuvialuit community (Lyons 2013:67). A theme of importance in the study was artifact interpretation, the subsequent relationship on how history was perceived, and the effects on the contemporary communities. The role of Indigenous languages within the artifact analyses, as well, allowed for new insights in traditional understanding and organization. The Inuvialuit Archaeological Project included asking participants "...to name and describe the objects in their language, and if they had knowledge, how they were made and used" (Lyons 2013:69). When community members look at and interpret artifacts in their own context, they may organize them in different cultural categories, allowing for new inferences of the archaeological record. Many Elders explained the importance of language and the knowledge that is embedded in the artifacts, as it speaks to identity and strength. "In their [Elders] estimation, archaeology ranks alongside oral history and language, within the rubric of cultural heritage practices" (Lyons 2013:148). Archaeology is not solely a specialized category separate from oral history and language, but a commingling approach that helps develop information.

Language and Archaeology

The beauty of American anthropology is that anthropologists have the ability to intersect the subfields in order to create a more inclusive understanding of cultural research. Connecting Indigenous archaeologies and linguistic anthropology is accomplished by incorporating linguistic relativity in research approaches. In a contemporary interpretation of linguistic relativity, "...the particular language you speak may predispose you to think a certain way or to engage in certain cultural practices or beliefs, but this relationship is by no means a rigidly deterministic one, nor is it unidirectional" (Ahearn 2017:92). These three categories; language, thought, and culture influence one another on unconscious and conscious levels. This relationship is not static; instead, the interrelations cause changes to occur as actions and reactions take place over time.

With this understanding in mind, its application in Indigenous archaeologies can affect and may differ between researchers and contemporary communities. Archaeology emerged with a positional superiority to those they studied, which often led to the appropriation of Indigenous cultures. Archaeologists have always been interested in the other and ignored self, yet it is the 'self' that constructs what the 'other' is (Smith and Jackson 2006:313). This othering has taken place in various ways including language. Archaeologists dominate Indigenous cultures by controlling the way that they can represent and self-identify, leaving scientific language nonobjective. Language is also integral to the decolonization process in Indigenous archaeologies. People can create violence by using language, but instead of afflicting the body, it afflicts identity (Smith and Jackson 2006:314). Terms, including Aboriginal, Indigenous, and Native, are considered collapsing or consolidating terms, as they ignore the true specificity and diversity that groups represent. This creates a loss of identity through language as people and experiences become erased.

Another term under scrutiny is that of "prehistory". While archaeologists may see this as neutral, it is anything but. The general public's understanding of what history represents does not acknowledge the sole application of written documentation in the thought or use of the term. Using distinctions such as history and prehistory puts an emphasis on European written documentation instead of oral histories, and creates a fake boundary between European invasion and Aboriginal past that brings with its inherent biases and ideologies (Smith and Jackson 2006:316-318). Alternative terms such as near past or deep past could be used in combination with cultural or tribal names and chronological sequence(s) if specifics are needed. Instead of centralizing a purely Western understanding of Indigenous life and past founded on colonial language, archaeologists must actively depart from this legacy and consciously evaluate the way they speak, think, and act.

One approach to intersecting archaeology and language is to apply Indigenous languages in the construction of research ideology. Creating space and roles for Indigenous voices and agency affects how community members are going to perceive archaeology. For example, in the Inuvialuit case study, "[a]rchaeology might be *Ingnilgaqnihat havalgutit*, meaning the 'tools that people worked with long ago,' but the Elders' role in constructing the multiple

stories that create the past are better expressed in the phrase *quliaq tohongniag tuunga,* meaning 'I'm going to tell you stories' or 'I'm going to make histories for you'" (Lyons 2013:163). A dual relationship is established as archaeologists and Indigenous communities, by sharing space, knowledge, and trust create a partnership forged in critical collaboration.

Inclusion of Indigenous languages can also affect how descent communities think and talk about archaeology as a practice. An example comes from Green et al.'s (2003) public archaeological methodology at the Área Indígena do Uaca of Brazil, which approached knowledge production to benefit both local and scholarly communities:

> "Reflecting on our idea of archaeology, the phrase we came up with to describe archaeology, in conjunction with local leadership, was *'ikiska anavi wayk'* or the study of 'things left behind in the ground'. Eighteen months later when 22 people had been trained in excavation techniques and were learning to read soil profiles at the test pits, the dialogic of reciprocal learning had produced a very different phrase: *'ivegboha amekenegben gidukwankis'*- 'reading the tracks of the ancestors'". (Green et al. 2003:377)

When Indigenous peoples talk about and interpret their own communities' materials and past, they may express ideals in them as they represent actual vehicles of heritage. In Green et al. (2003) and the Inuvialuit case study, the way that artifacts and archaeology were thought and talked about changed because inclusive actions took place. What researchers and community members do in archaeology influence the language and thought processes of the project, which is dynamic enough to allow for change over time. Once archaeology is shifted into a positive conception of heritage management and identity, new ways of applying this into research are created and can be applied into practice.

Long-Term Archaeological Collaboration

Archaeologists should be allowed to embrace Indigenous social values and concerns when conducting research because it allows a trusted relationship from which to begin and grow. There needs to be a constant back and forth between research, drafts of analysis, and community feedback (Lyons 2013:74). Research should not be solely in and out projects, but studies that create long lasting engagements. Information gathered by archaeologists is given relevance through community-based workshops and presentations, protection and respect, and accessibility to literature and material (Lyons 2013:76-78). Community-based projects are changeable, and their direction will be structured around what and who is conducting the research. Archaeologists need to acknowledge the power relations of traditional research approaches and be willing to restructure those assumptions into return of knowledge. Reciprocity, sharing, and contributing are all key words and ideals foundational to community-based archaeology. Direct engagement and new skill forming will not always be easy; problems will arise and need to be dealt with as they come. However, by confronting differences, archaeologists produce unique knowledge that is based in representative collaboration.

Long-term collaboration goes beyond the short-term, extraction research style of traditional archaeology and creates personal relationships, mutual trust, and a relevant location for dialogue. Clark, in their research on Groote Eylandt archaeology is Northern Australia, created summary reports for the first two months after every fieldwork excursion and would distribute these to the Indigenous peoples who were involved and displayed them in public areas (Clark 2002:256). The summaries were a success because people became more interested in archaeological matters as researchers involved the whole community, instead of simply extracting data. As well, research strategies and overall design met the concerns of the Indigenous peoples about consent, meaningful archaeological processes, and reflexivity in research (Clark 2002:250). Respecting Indigenous agency in archaeological research is produced by restructuring fieldwork approaches and creating lasting relationships based in collaborative, community-based methodology.

These types of small gestures are how personal ties and trust are founded. Archaeologists must understand where Indigenous hesitation and criticism comes from, and be prepared to answer serious questions that groups have. Long term, participatory archaeology allows stakeholders to have a say in the research and changes the overall range of the anthropological narrative. What archaeologists need to normalize is the creation of space for respectable communication and continuous maintenance of relationships between researchers and descent communities.

Intellectual Property Rights in Archaeology

Of great concern is the lack in discussions of archaeologists on intellectual property rights of Indigenous communities:

> "Janke (1998:3) proposes the term 'Indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights' to refer to 'Indigenous people's rights to their heritage,' wherein heritage comprises all objects, sites, and knowledge, the nature or use of which has been transmitted or continues to be transmitted from generation to generation, and which is regarded as pertaining to a particular Indigenous group or its territory". (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:328)

Products and research of archaeology, and anthropology as a whole, meet this description. While there are parts of archaeological research that have tangible qualities, there are also materials that are extracted as data which qualify as a different manifestation; immaterial materials. Immaterial materials are recordings in film, song, and text-artifacts which surmounts to a great deal of information about Indigenous peoples which, for the most part, are stored in non-Native institutions (Anderson et al. 2017:185). These immaterials have become a great focus because none of these are covered by law, including NAGPRA (Anderson et al. 2017:185). This falls under the context of who has access to, controls, or owns such materials, culture, and language that the immaterials represent.

One way Indigenous tribes are trying to protect their intellectual property rights is through copyright laws. "There are currently no services available for helping communities navigate the terrain of copyright ownership and no tools that actively work to correct or augment the public historical record according to cultural sensitivities and responsibilities in practice" (Anderson et al. 2017:187). The online platform "Local Context" is a critique of this absence and helps Indigenous peoples navigate ownership through advocating agency. The platform promotes collaboration between specific tribes and non-Native institutions that emphasize Indigenous understandings of culture. This project also includes licensing and labeling strategies to assert authority over intellectual property (Anderson et al. 2017:188).

Intellectual property within archaeological research design is exemplified by the Inuvialuit Archaeology Partnership case study. Team members created a charter in writing that specifies a set of ethics, gives the Inuvialuit Cultural Resource Centre a copy-right of the data produced, and allows partners to create works that can later be given feedback (Lyons 2013:73). This charter represents a living, dynamic document that creates a trusting space and relationship throughout the research process. Further research, dialogue, and insertion of intellectual property rights needs to come from archaeologists and become a standardized practice within the field of anthropology.

Ways that intellectual property rights are lacking are in their representation in land issues. "One of the features of the international discussions of TK [traditional knowledge] and intellectual property is the way in which states have conceptually portioned the intellectual property issues from land rights issues" (Drahos 2011:239). Researchers must be aware and respect that land represents the most important property right to many Indigenous peoples. "Archaeological sites by any definition are traditional use sites, and the knowledge represented at these sites is worth considering in the context of cultural and intellectual property" (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:334). Land is only one sphere, a physical manifestation of the dynamic Indigenous systems that were created and maintained for centuries. To ignore the interconnectedness of traditional knowledge, intellectual property rights, and land undermines Indigenous innovation systems which demand connectionist and interrelated organization of understanding (Drahos 2011:237).

A second issue is that intellectual property debates are not as widely prominent compared to other issues in archaeological legislation. "Since archaeologists are in the position to choose what they will or will not publish, information potentially useful to Indigenous peoples may simply not be available because it fell outside of the interests of the investigator and was not pursued" (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:339). This is superiority over knowledge production at its most basic level and is a generalized practice in the anthropological field. Archaeologists must work extensively with the communities they participate with to lay out what types of goals, products, and ownership will be created. As well, descent communities should have access to archaeological research materials, even if not published, as tribal authorities may want to further investigate matters that the archaeologist(s) did or could not.

Another important aspect to consider is what is being published about Indigenous languages and stories. In 1990, a linguist named Malotki intended on publishing a translated volume of Hopi stories, including one of their "salt trail" pilgrimages (Anderson et al. 2017:190). This was largely fought against because Hopi leaders did not believe

that ceremonial activities should be published for scholarly consumption as those reading the manuscript may represent noninitiates (Anderson et al. 2017:190). While this example focuses on linguistics and oral histories, there are obvious intersects of archaeological research and intellectual property rights. Protections such as copyright, patents, trademarks, industrial design, and trade secrets all have relevance to archaeology and must be further explored (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:329). Archaeology will continue to be held down by its colonial history if it does not acknowledge the different issues brought up by ownership and control of not just artifacts and human remains, but also of knowledge that is produced from its research.

Conclusion

The pluralistic and critical nature of Indigenous archaeologies are relevant not only in the anthropological field but intersects with decolonization and self-determination movements. Indigenous archaeologies are not individual practices that need to be considered separate from 'scientific' archaeology, but intermingling systems that only enhance the knowledge of the field. The relationships between archaeological and Indigenous knowledge presents various standpoints like addressing conflicts between archaeology and local interpretations of history, the right of the archaeologists to law claim on to Indigenous knowledge, and the collaboration with descent communities on using archaeology in modern policies (Stump 2013:268). An Indigenous archaeological approach cuts at the core of archaeologists as cultural gatekeepers who use Indigenous communities for their own personal, scholarly consumption. Collaboration needs to be seen not as a static set of practices but dynamic and fluid processes. Archaeologists and Indigenous community-members can be active participants in knowledge production and continue to create a relevant archaeology to both.

Methodologies argued in this paper included tribal member material analysis, language and lifeway promotions, community-based workshops, and discussion of intellectual property issues. The case studies reviewed from Australia, the United States, Canada, and Brazil each explore different yet related methodological intersects of Indigenous archaeologies. Major themes within this paper call for multi-disciplinary, action-orientated approaches within Indigenous archaeological practices. While the archaeological field continues to become further specialized in specific focuses, researchers should actively incorporate different understandings of culture to create a more holistic anthropology.

The absence of archaeological voices in intellectual property rights discussions is an alarming problem that needs to be dealt with immediately. The lack of legal protection of immaterial materials that represent Indigenous heritage and identity warrants further research and actions. The scope of this paper is not able to address whether or not intellectual property rights are beneficial for all Indigenous communities, but to create visibility of an insufficient custom of archaeologists. Different archaeologists will have varying ideals of how far rights on either side should go; however, it is key to begin the application of intellectual property into discourse and approaches of archaeological research.

Indigenous archaeologies are practices that allow for all these recognitions to be intersected into methodology. There is an acceptance that anthropological research is more than for the sake of knowledge itself. If archaeologists are going to collaborate with Indigenous communities it must be culturally relevant and appropriate for each, requiring unique and situational strategies. The Anishinaabe concept of *Gikinawaabi*, "passing or reproduction of knowledge, through experience, from elder to younger generations," can be used to better understand the importance of Indigenous archaeologies (Atalay 2006:296). Knowledge isn't words in a book stored in a library or facts that are recited—it is internal, shared, and practiced by its communities (Atalay 2006:296). It is the implementation of collaboration as a standard practice that brings with it change in the field because archaeology will not simply deconstruct its own colonial history. Indigenous archaeologies are an intentional shift in the archaeological paradigm; however, collaboration is not the end all solution to problems faced in the field. It is only one beginning to a greater change in knowledge production. It is up to archaeologists to take personal responsibility in the deconstruction of colonial systems and to move theoretic, decolonizing approaches into archaeological practices.

References

Ahearn, Laura M.
    2017. "Language, Thought, and Culture." In *Living Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology,* edited by Wiley-Blackwell, 87–116. West Sussex, UK: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Anderson, Jane, Hannah McElgunn, and Justin Richard.
    2017. "Labeling Knowledge: The Semiotics of Immaterial Cultural Property and the Production of New Indigenous Publics." In *Engaging Native American Publics: Linguistic Anthropology in a Collaborative Key*, edited by Paul V Kroskrity and Barbara A Key, 184–202. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atalay, Sonya.
    2006. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." *American Indian Quarterly* 30: 280–310.

Begay, Richard M.
    1997. "The Role of Archaeology on Indian Lands: The Navajo Nation." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 161–66. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Carter, Cecile Elkins.
    1997. "Straight Talk and Trust." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 151–55. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Clark, Anne.
    2002. "The Ideal and the Real: Cultural and Personal Transformation of Archaeological Research on Groote Eylandt, Northern Australia." *World Archaeology* 34, no. 2: 249–64.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T.J. Ferguson, and Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman.
    2010. "The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 34, no. 2: 228–38.

Colwell, Chip.
    2016. "Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45, no. 1: 113–27.

Cypress, Billy L.
    1997. "The Role of Archaeology in the Seminole Tribe of Florida." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 156–60. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Downer, Alan S.
    1997. "Archaeologists-Native American Relations." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 23–34. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Drahos, Peter.
    2011. "When Cosmology Meets Property: Indigenous People's Innovation and Intellectual Property." *Prometheus* 29, no. 3: 233–52.

Fabian, Johannes.
    1990. "Presence and Representation: The Other and Anthropological Writing." *Critical Inquiry* 16, no. 4: 753–72.

Foster, Rhonda, Larry Ross, and Dale R. Croes.
    2014. "Archaeological/ Anthropological-Native American Coordination: An Example of Sharing the Research on the Northwest Coast of North America." Essay. In *Seeking Our Past: An Introduction to North American Archaeology,* 2nd ed., 167–74. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Green, Lesley Fordred, David R Green, and Eduardo Góes Neves.
    2003. "Indigenous Knowledge and Archaeological Science: The Challenges of Public Archaeology in the Reserva Uaçá." *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 366–97.

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

Nicholas, George P, and Kelly P Bannister.
    2004. "Copyright the Past? Emerging Intellectual Property Rights Issues in Archaeology." *Current Anthropology* 45, no. 3: 327-50.

Pevar, Stephen L.
    2012. "Civil Rights of Indians." In *The Rights of Indians and Tribes,* 4th ed., 221-40. Oxford University Press.
Ravesloot, John C.
    1997. "Changing Native Americans Perceptions of Archaeology and Archaeologists." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 172–77. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Said, Edward.
    1994. "*From* Orientalism." Essay. In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory,* edited by Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams, 132–48. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
Smith, Claire, and Gary Jackson.
    2006. "Decolonizing Indigenous Archaeology: Developments from Down Under." *American Indian Quarterly* 30: 311–49.
Stump, Daryl.
    2013. "On Applied Archaeology, Indigenous Knowledge, and the Usable Past." *Current Anthropology* 54, no. 3: 268–98.
Van Pelt, Jeffrey, Tom Bailor, and Michael S Burney.
    1997. "Protecting Cultural Resources on the Umatilla Indian Reservation." In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground,* edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S Downer, 167–71. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
Watkins, Joe.
    2011. "Indigenous Archaeology as Complement to, Not Separate From, Scientific Archaeology." *Jangwa Pana* 10, no. 1: 46–60.