

July 2016

Ideological Conflict Embedded in Anthropology and the Road to Restructuring the Discipline

Donna L. Moody
University of Massachusetts - Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moody, Donna L., "Ideological Conflict Embedded in Anthropology and the Road to Restructuring the Discipline" (2016). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 712.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/712

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Ideological Conflict Embedded in Anthropology
and the Road to Restructuring the Discipline

A Dissertation Presented

by

DONNA L. MOODY

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY

May 2016

Department of Anthropology

© Copyright by Donna L. Moody 2016

All Rights Reserved

Ideological Conflict Embedded in Anthropology
and the Road to Restructuring the Discipline

A Dissertation Presented

by

DONNA L. MOODY

Approved as to style and content by:

Jean S. Forward, Chair

Robert Paynter, Member

Leah Wing, Member

Jacqueline Urla, Department Chair
Department of Anthropology

DEDICATION

To the spirit of Vine Deloria, Jr. and all who struggle for Indigenous Rights

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must begin by thanking and honoring my ancestors, all of those grandmothers and grandfathers who came before, but especially those brave-hearted women who provided me with life, knowledge, and a rootedness in this world. They set my feet upon this path and sustained me throughout the journey. Ktsi wlini negônzosak.

I would like to thank my advisor, committee chair, and dear friend Dr. Jean Forward for the many years of encouragement and hard work in guiding me to the completion of this dissertation. I want to thank the other two members of my committee, Dr. Robert Paynter and Dr. Leah Wing. Dr. Paynter has been a strong editor, gently guiding me to be a better writer and has been a constant friend. Dr. Wing has provided me with new areas of knowledge, but has also shown me, by personal example, that knowledge, compassion, and gentleness can be quiet manifestations of strength; I have learned much from her in these areas. These three have consistently pushed me to achieve levels of scholarship I didn't know I possessed and they have always been my mentors, friends, and role models throughout this endeavor.

Thank you to Dr. Ingrid Bracey and Dr. Shekhar Regmi of UWW. Their support from my undergrad days to present has been overwhelming.

I would like to thank Dr. Martin Wobst for being the first to push me to pursue graduate studies. Also Dr. Eric Johnson for his unwavering support and encouragement.

I want to acknowledge the support and friendship of Dr. David Stewart-Smith, Dr. Robert Goodby and Dr. Siobhan Senier, each who credit me with far more brilliance than I possess. I also want to thank my good friend and sister Melissa Tantaquidgeon Zobel for her unwavering and constant encouragement throughout the writing of this dissertation.

Dr. Diane Lewis, who passed in August of 2015, deserves special acknowledgment for the groundbreaking work she accomplished in 1973 in recognizing the relationship between Anthropology and colonization. I am grateful for her voice and efforts to transform the discipline.

There are so many others who have encouraged me, pushed me when needed, and always done so with love and friendship; Kasey Jernigan, Dr. Akeia Benard, Dr. Linda Ziegenbein, Dr. Katie Kirakosian, Dr. Milena Marchesi, Dr. Drew Lopenzina, Dr. Tim McKeown, along with the many friends who consistently said, “you can do this,” and all of the members of my graduate cohort. And of course, the girls in the office who keep us all on-track; Shelley Bellor Silva, Debbie Averill, and Grace Rock. Thank you all.

Special acknowledgement goes out to my two sons, Rob Charlebois and Chris Charlebois, and their families for their encouragement, support, and understanding when I missed family events. Also a special thank you to my daughter-in-law Liz Charlebois for the support provided during the dark days of writing. Cousins Bunny Lake, Diane Candee, and Danny Carvalho have provided unending encouragement and love.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to the tribal leaders and elders who graciously provided personal interviews during my research, along with all who participated in the focus group surveys.

My deepest gratitude, wrapped in eternal love, goes to my husband John Moody. He has been ever-present throughout the thinking, writing, tears, and accomplishments; the constant voice each time I was ready to quit, telling me that “the best revenge is to survive and thrive.” Without John’s love, support, and encouragement none of this would have been possible. N’kazeldemi kia Azô.

ABSTRACT

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT EMBEDDED IN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE ROAD
TO RESTRUCTURING THE DISCIPLINE

MAY 2016

DONNA L. MOODY, B.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

PhD., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Jean S. Forward

Keywords: Native American; Indigenous; Indian; Indigenous College Education; Anthropology; Colonization; Imperialism.

Indigenous people have long-held perceptions of the existence of ideological conflicts between indigenous worldview and Western worldview. Western worldview is understood by indigenous people to be embodied in American Anthropology as a discipline and, by extension, in American anthropologists. These conflicts may be considered the genesis of a divide that began with the colonization of the indigenous world and one which continues to sustain the on-going marginalization and oppression of Native populations by a colonizing society; a society which considers indigenous worldview to be an unsubstantiated belief system, while not recognizing that the science upon which anthropological thought is built is itself a belief system and one which reflects a Western worldview.

In examining the history of the ideological conflicts between indigenous people and Anthropology, the long-term results of the conflicts, and considering ways in which the divide may be narrowed, two broad questions were conceived as a beginning point of

study: “is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization and, if so, is some form of resolution possible?” From these two related questions, at least three other questions logically follow and it is these questions upon which the dissertation heavily focuses: first, how does the difference between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? Second, what have been the effects of these differences in efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline; for example, in graduate studies for indigenous students and the formation of professional level organizations? Finally, is a rapprochement possible, and under what conditions?

The continued marginalization of indigenous perspectives raises a number of questions in the minds of indigenous practitioners; questions such as, “why are indigenous knowledge systems excluded from Western pedagogy?” And in particular, “why are indigenous knowledge systems excluded from anthropological pedagogy?” These questions have led indigenous anthropologists to seek ways in which to create a space for expanded and respectful dialogue.

The generous participation of indigenous graduate students, indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists, and the voices of Native American tribal leaders and tribal elders of New England provide an invaluable contribution to this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT EMBEDDED IN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE ROAD TO RESTRUTURING THE DISCIPLINE.....	1
A. Chapter 2: Theory and Method	4
1. Theory	4
a. Critical Race Theory (CRT).....	5
b. Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit).....	5
2. Method	6
a. Research and Positionality	6
b. Indigenous Research	7
c. Ethnographic Techniques.....	7
d. Writing Style.....	7
e. Literature Review.....	8
B. Chapter 3: History of Colonization of the Americas and Anthropology	8
1. Colonizing Principles.....	9
2. Methods of Colonization: Oppression, Violence and the Role of Anthropology	9
a. Colonization of Space	9
b. Colonization of Memory & History.....	10
c. Colonization of Language	11
3. The Consequences of Colonization: Psychological Traumas	11
4. 19th and 20th Century Violence and the Role of Anthropology	12
C. Chapter 4: United States Imperialism, War, and Anthropology	13
1. The Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW)	13
2. World War I.....	14
3. World War II.....	14
4. The Korean War and The Cold War Years.....	15

5. The Cold War (including Vietnam), 1960s to 1990	15
6. 1990 to Present.....	16
D. Chapter 5: Anthropologists and Indians: The Great Divide	16
1. Conceptualizing the Conflict	17
a. Conflicting Historical Narratives	17
b. Conflicts in Ethical Understandings	17
c. Linear vs. Circular Thinking	18
d. Cultural and Spiritual Imperialism.....	19
e. Philosophies of Vine Deloria	19
f. Unequal Power Creates Conflict	19
g. Ideological Clashes in Education.....	19
E. Chapter 6: Indians in the Halls of Academe.....	20
1. A focus group is formed: Surveys and Interviews.....	21
2. Professional Marginalization	22
F. Chapter 7: Bridging the Divide: Attempts, Successes, and Failures	23
1. Education	23
a. What do other Scholars have to say?	23
b. Actions and Results.....	23
c. Recommended Actions	23
2. Professional Organizations	24
a. American Anthropological Association (AAA).....	24
b. Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA).....	24
c. Society for American Archaeology (SAA)	25
d. Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA).....	25
e. World Archaeological Congress (WAC)	25
3. Repatriation and NAGPRA.....	25
a. Ideological Conflicts which Necessitated a Federal Law	26
b. Section 10.11.....	26
4. Writing to Widen the Divide.....	26
G. Chapter 8: Is Rapprochement Possible?.....	26

1. Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice.....	27
a. Conflict Settlement, Conflict Resolution, and Reconciliation ...	27
b. Reparations	27
c. Transitional Justice.....	28
H. Chapter 9: Conclusion.....	28
2. THEORY AND METHOD.....	29
A. Introduction.....	29
B. The Background Narrative	31
C. Theory	33
1. Critical Race Theory (CRT).....	36
2. Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit).....	36
D. Method.....	38
1. Research and Positionality	39
2. Indigenous Research	40
3. Ethnographic Techniques.....	43
4. Writing Style.....	45
5. Literature Review.....	46
3. HISTORY OF COLONIZATION OF THE AMERICAS AND ANTHROPOLOGY	49
A. Introduction.....	49
B. Colonizing Principles	50
C. Methods of Colonization: Oppression, Violence and the Role of Anthropology.....	54
1. Colonization of Space.....	55
2. Colonization of Memory & History.....	58
3. Colonization of Language.....	65
D. The Consequences of Colonization: Psychological Traumas	75
E. 19th and 20th Century Violence and the Role of Anthropology.....	79
F. Conclusion	93
4. UNITED STATES IMPERIALISM, WAR, AND ANTHROPOLOGY	98
A. Introduction.....	98
B. Anthropology and Ethics.....	100

C. The Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW).....	105
D. World War I.....	106
E. World War II.....	109
F. The Korean War and The Cold War Years.....	114
G. The Cold War (including Vietnam), 1960s to 1990.....	121
H. 1990 to Present.....	126
I. Conclusion.....	134
5. ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND INDIANS: THE GREAT DIVIDE.....	141
A. Introduction.....	141
B. Conceptualizing the Areas of Conflict.....	142
1. Conflicting Historical Narratives.....	143
2. Conflicts in Ethical Understandings.....	145
3. Linear vs. Circular Thinking.....	148
4. Cultural and Spiritual Imperialism.....	149
5. Philosophies of Vine Deloria.....	151
6. Unequal Power Creates Conflict.....	157
7. Ideological Clashes in Education.....	159
C. Conclusion.....	163
6. INDIANS IN THE HALLS OF ACADEME.....	166
A. Introduction.....	166
B. A Focus Group is Formed: Surveys and Interviews.....	168
C. Indigenous Graduate Students.....	172
D. Indigenous and non-Indigenous Anthropologists.....	185
E. Professional Marginalization.....	196
F. Conclusion.....	203
7. BRIDGING THE DIVIDE: ATTEMPTS, SUCCESSES, AND FAILURES.....	215
A. Introduction.....	215
B. Education.....	217
1. What do other Scholars have to say?.....	221
2. Actions and Results.....	229
3. Recommended Actions.....	233
C. Professional Organizations.....	236
1. American Anthropological Association (AAA).....	237
2. Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA).....	243
3. Society for American Archaeology (SAA).....	244

4. Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA).....	246
5. World Archaeological Congress (WAC)	247
D. Repatriation and NAGPRA.....	251
1. Ideological Conflicts which Necessitated a Federal Law	254
2. Section 10.11.....	263
E. Writing to Widen the Divide	268
F. Conclusion	276
1. Education	276
2. Professional Organizations	277
3. NAGPRA and Repatriation.....	281
8. IS RAPPROCHEMENT POSSIBLE?	285
A. Introduction	285
B. Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice...287	
1. Conflict Settlement, Conflict Resolution, and Reconciliation	288
2. Reparations	295
3. Transitional Justice	298
C. Conclusion	303
9. CONCLUSION	312
A. Positive Acts of Inclusion.....	314
1. Cultural Resource Management (CRM).....	315
2. Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO).....	316
B. Is Rapprochement Possible? Under What Conditions Could That Occur?....	317
C. Approaching the Conflict.....	318
D. Decolonizing the Discipline.....	321
1. Practicing to Decolonize.....	323
E. Indigenous Anthropology.....	326
F. Final Thoughts.....	328

APPENDICES

A. ANTHROPOLOGICAL SURVEYS FOR INDIGENOUS GRADUATE

STUDENTS, INDIGENOUS PHD AND NON-INDIGENOU PHD ANTHROPOLOGISTS.....	331
B. M.A. DEGREES CONFERRED BY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS 2010-2011 AND 2011-2012.....	337
C. DOCTORAL DEGREES CONFERRED BY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS 2010-2011 AND 2011-2012.....	339
D. DOCTORAL DEGREE PROFILES BY FIELD OF STUDY 2012.....	341
REFERENCES CITED.....	348

CHAPTER 1

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT EMBEDDED IN ANTHROPOLOGY and the ROAD TO RESTRUCTURING THE DISCIPLINE: AN INTRODUCTION

In reinventing anthropology, what if we studied the colonizers instead of the colonized, the culture of power instead of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than poverty?

Laura Nader [1972:289]

Laura Nader wrote a chapter, “Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up,” in *Reinventing Anthropology*, a book edited by Dell Hymes (1972). Nader was suggesting in this chapter that perhaps anthropologists would do well, and would gain clearer insights into modern civilization, by studying the elite members of a society rather than those populations lower in the hierarchy. She is also asking the question, why should anthropology only examine non-Western cultural groups and practices, why not Western cultures as well? This dissertation takes Nader’s concept a step further by turning the lens of scrutiny onto the discipline of Anthropology and those who work within it...anthropologists; it examines both as elite actors in the roles of “the colonizers instead of the colonized, the culture of power instead of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than poverty.”

Indigenous people have long-held perceptions of the existence of ideological conflicts between indigenous worldview and Western worldview. Western worldview is understood by indigenous people to be embodied in American Anthropology as a discipline and, by extension, in American anthropologists. These conflicts may be considered the genesis of a divide that began with the colonization of the indigenous world and one which continues to sustain the on-going marginalizations and oppressions of Native populations by a colonizing society; a society which considers indigenous worldview to be an unsubstantiated belief system, while not recognizing that the science

upon which anthropological thought is built is itself a belief system and one which reflects a Western worldview (Vine Deloria 1997b).

In examining the history of the ideological conflicts between indigenous people and Anthropology, the long-term results of the conflicts, and considering ways in which the divide may be narrowed, two broad questions were conceived as a beginning point of study: “is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization and, if so, is some form of resolution possible?” From these two related questions, at least three other questions logically follow and it is these questions upon which the dissertation heavily focuses: first, how does the difference between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? Second, what have been the effects of these differences in efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline; for example, in graduate studies for indigenous students, the formation of professional level organizations, and the development of key areas of research? Finally, is a rapprochement possible, and under what conditions?

In consideration of pre-existing work accomplished by scholars such as Claude Lévi-Strauss (1966), Walter Mignolo (2003 [1995]), Jack Forbes (2008 [1979]) and others, there is a fundamental assumption in this dissertation that a significant connection exists between colonization and Anthropology that continues to perpetuate not only biases but also perpetuates a continued form of oppression. Indigenous writers such as Vine Deloria (1997a) believed this connection to be pervasive in the discipline in both theory and praxis. In an almost 30 year retrospective in which he initially notes the positive changes in the relationship between Indians and anthropologists, Deloria stated,

there are some things, however, that cannot change because they are the foundations of the relationship. Anthropology carries with it some

incredibly heavy baggage. It is, and continues to be, a deeply colonial academic discipline, founded in the days when it was doctrine that the colored races of the world would be enslaved by Europeans, and the tribal peoples would vanish from the planet. [1997a:211]

The continued marginalization of indigenous perspectives raises a number of questions in the minds of indigenous practitioners; questions such as, “why are indigenous knowledge systems excluded from Western pedagogy?” And in particular, “why are indigenous knowledge systems excluded from anthropological pedagogy?” These questions have led indigenous anthropologists to seek a rethinking of praxis, philosophy, and method and theory in the field of Anthropology which would create a space for expanded inclusion, respectful dialogue, and reconciliation of personal and professional ideologies within the field. Sandy Grande addresses the need for an indigenous pedagogy when she tells us

...it is not only imperative for Indian educators to insist on the incorporation of indigenous knowledge and praxis in schools but also to transform the institutional structures of schools themselves...they need pedagogies that work to disrupt the structures of inequality. [2004:6]

The fact that these questions are being asked by academics, many of whom also happen to be indigenous people along with some non-indigenous academics, is a strong indication that within the field of Anthropology there are serious conflicts between those who may be viewed as mainstream thinkers, both indigenous and non-indigenous, and these considered traditional indigenous thinkers. Those conflicts subsequently flow to indigenous individuals and communities who become the subject matter for anthropologists engaged in research or fieldwork.

This introductory chapter provides a brief overview of the individual chapters within the dissertation. The summaries will enable the reader to contextualize the

theoretical framework of the text. I have used the terms “indigenous,” “Native” or “Native American,” and “Indian” interchangeably throughout the dissertation. I personally feel no attachment or distress in the use of any of these terms as they are all inaccurate. Identifying us by Nation may also be inaccurate as often the individual words used as “tribal” names were assigned to us by the European invaders and not the word we have for ourselves; most have a word in their language which would translate into “the humans” or “the people,” such as *alnôbak* in the Abenaki language. The word “indigenous” is not capitalized throughout the text in keeping with the Chicago Manual of Style. However, the writing of this dissertation is the only time in my life when I will adhere to such manner of case; in future I will not diminish the indigenous peoples of the world, or present them as being less than Americans, Europeans, Asians, or any other global culture group.

A. Chapter 2: Theory and Method

In constructing the Theory and Method that would frame this dissertation, I naturally turn to my own indigenous way of being, a way that is deeply embedded in a particular worldview. This chapter will explain the theories used in framing the dissertation; theories such as Critical Race Theory (CRT), Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), and how issues of liberation struggles involving sovereignty and self-determination may frame theory. The chapter will identify methods engaged in research and writing including positionality, ethnographic techniques in research, writing style, and literature review.

1. Theory

As an indigenous person, locating theory acceptable to the academic community can be challenging and viewed as another obstacle constructed only for minority

populations. If theory is constructed from an indigenous paradigm, it needs to be translated into a Westernized worldview in order to be understood. Critical Race Theory (CRT) and subsequently Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit) as developed by Bryan Brayboy (2005) guided the development of theory in this dissertation.

a. Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Critical Race Theory (CRT) was developed in the 1970s as an outgrowth of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) (Paul Connolly and Romana Khaoury 2008; Brayboy 2005). CLS is a “legal scholarship that argues that law must focus on how it is applied to specific groups in particular circumstances” (Brayboy 2005:428). CRT originally developed as a “form of opposition scholarship” to “address the Civil Rights issues of African American people” (Brayboy 2005:428) that were not being adequately addressed by CLS. The original structure and purpose of CRT dealt only with the “black-white” binary, leaving other minority populations on the periphery of the conversation.

b. Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit)

CRT does not address the legal or political issues of Native Americans, nor does it address their particular experiences of racism, oppression, marginalization, or colonization; CRT does not address issues of indigenous loss of land or of erosion of tribal sovereignty. TribalCrit addresses the “legal and political status of American Indian and Alaska Native peoples as tribal sovereigns, within the framework of tribal critical race theory (TCRT)” (Donna Deyhle and Teresa McCarty 2007:212). TribalCrit “has its roots in Critical Race Theory, Anthropology, Political/Legal Theory, Political Science, American Indian Literatures, Education, and American Indian Studies” (Brayboy

2005:425). The framework of TribalCrit as developed by Brayboy consists of nine principles which are presented in this section of the chapter.

2. Method

Method engaged in this dissertation consisted of research using ethnographic techniques, such as personal interviews and written surveys; literature review; and particular writing style. Indigenous methodology was accomplished through my privileged position as an insider participant and observer; incorporating personal experience, listening to others, and familiarity with New England elders and tribal members.

a. Research and Positionality

Conducting research from an insider position holds both advantages and disadvantages. When conducting personal interviews with tribal elders, I was a known entity: this status provided me with easy access to those elders and their communities; I was trusted to maintain issues of confidentiality and trusted to respect any restrictions placed around stories told me; people were comfortable in speaking with me because they knew me, or knew of me, and considered me to be related by kinship means.

The disadvantages of conducting research from an insider position come from outside of the indigenous communities and individuals, most especially from the discipline itself. “The research community has a number of terms which are used to good effect as exclusionary devices to dismiss the challenges made from outside the fold. Research [accomplished by an “insider”] can be judged as “not rigorous,” “not robust,” “not real,” “not theorized,” “not valid,” or “not reliable”(Linda Tuhiwai Smith 1999:140).

b. Indigenous Research

In my interviews with tribal elders, before we began our conversations, I carefully explained what I was doing, why I was doing it, and what I hoped to accomplish. I explained that I would not write anything they asked me not to, that I would not identify them by name or tribe or position within the tribe. I also explained what I hoped would be of benefit to their community. Most importantly, I explained that the interview afforded their voice and concerns to be heard and their stories told. I wanted them to know what would happen to the information or stories they were sharing on the digital recorder, that the interviews would be erased at the completion of the project.

c. Ethnographic Techniques

Research techniques included ethnographic methods such as Qualitative Research Methodology through the use of focus groups and personal interviews. Focus groups were modified to include written surveys, individual interviews, and interviews with two or more persons.

d. Writing Style

Much of this dissertation is written in a narrative style of writing with “Anthro-Speak,” for the most part, conspicuously absent. I was charged by elders to write this subject, and with that charge is an expectation that the final product would be disseminated to Native communities and individuals. Some of those individuals are highly educated, while others may have less than a high school education. The content needs to be understandable, as much as possible, to the people who have encouraged and supported me throughout my journey. This decision was given much thought and consideration; I concluded that use of “Anthro-Speak” is just one more act of exclusion,

one more attempt to assimilate Native scholars, and one more attempt to separate us from our communities. While my decision to write in common language was first and foremost in consideration of non-academic readers, perhaps there was also a bit of defiance, or resistance, built into the decision.

e. Literature Review

Literature review for each chapter was extensive and is reflected, in part, in the cited references at the end of the dissertation. I explored writings of other scholars who would provide material in support of my statements but I also read authors that expressed opinions and rationales in opposition to my statements.

The major goal of literature research was undertaken to answer the broad questions presented in the dissertation: is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization? Is some form of resolution possible? Next, the questions that flowed from these: how do the differences between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? How have these differences affected efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline? Is rapprochement possible and under what conditions could that occur?

B. Chapter 3: History of Colonization of the Americas and Anthropology

This chapter explores the ways in which the discipline of anthropology has been, and continues to be, complicit in the colonization of the land and peoples of the Americas through examining the history of colonization and the genesis of American Anthropology. Colonizing principles such as the erasure of indigenous languages, histories, memories, and sense of place are investigated. The participation of Anthropology in the oppression of Native people as a result of colonization is explained.

1. Colonizing Principles

Conquest of the Americas was accomplished through violence, exploitation, and oppression. This chapter section explores the Papal Bull of 1455, the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, and the ensuing European waves of invasion which changed forever the landscapes and cultures of the indigenous peoples of the Americas.

As the numbers of Europeans in the Americas increased, the rules and laws of the land began to mirror those in Europe. These new rules and laws were always influenced, and sometimes directly controlled, by Christian doctrine. Jack Forbes (2008:89) tells us that conversion to Christianity meant conversion to (being) European; embracing European customs, laws, and religious belief systems.

2. Methods of Colonization: Oppression, Violence and the Role of Anthropology

Walter Mignolo (2003) in *The Darker Side of the Renaissance* explores the many, sometimes subtle or covert, facets of the colonizing process. He speaks of the ways in which people, lands, and resources are colonized by writing of the “Colonization of Memory,” the “Colonization of History,” the “Colonization of Language,” and the “Colonization of Space.” Beyond these, indigenous bodies are also colonized through control of movement and freedom, health, life or death; minds are colonized through psychological methods, methods which many times result in deep and long-lasting expressions of trauma. The discipline of Anthropology, through all Four Fields, has historically participated in the sustaining and nurturing of these methods of colonizing the indigenous peoples of America.

a. Colonization of Space

The first act of colonization is the taking of space. Indigenous people have an

intimate, intrinsic relationship with homeland. For many indigenous populations the sense of place literally and figuratively defines individual and collective identity. Indigenous histories and family genealogies are connected to place. Knowledge of healing and medicine plants is connected to place. Place is also connected to ceremonial sites and ancestral graves.

Through archaeological excavations, sacred sites and habitation sites have been legally looted: cultural artifacts have been removed from sites and placed (most often) far-away in museum or university collections where descendant owners have little or no access; burial sites have been looted for grave goods, sacred items, and ancestral remains. Medicine plants have been collected, examined, and catalogued along with the traditional knowledge systems relating to the plants. This translates to not only a physical colonization of space, but also one which impacts the spiritual space of indigenous people.

As the artifacts, knowledge, and ancestral remains were appropriated for use by archaeologists, there were tangible gains to be made in academic careers; intellectual and real property rights were taken from indigenous hands and assumed as a right of conquest. Natural resources have been exploited by individuals and federal government agencies for financial gain, with little to none of those monies trickling down to indigenous communities.

b. Colonization of Memory & History

Political, social, and economic subjugation of the colonized by the colonizer is also accomplished through erasure of group history and devaluation of oral tradition. Without an alphabetic system of writing, indigenous histories were written from the

perspective of the colonizer's view of the normal (that being the hegemonic perspective), and ethnographic studies and anthropological analyses were conducted through a European, and later Euro-American lens.

c. Colonization of Language

Mignolo (2003) states that replacing indigenous languages with that of the European invader was a method of creating social and political hierarchies; a method of establishing power and exerting control over the original inhabitants of a land; a method of colonization. Gradually, indigenous languages were replaced with those of the European colonists and European languages became the language of instruction, the language of economy, and the language that constructed socio-political hierarchies.

As indigenous cultures, artifacts, ceremonies, and knowledge systems have been collected and studied by anthropologists, the same has been true of indigenous languages. For many indigenous communities, archived linguistic materials, especially sound tapes, are inaccessible due to distance and financial constraints.

This section of Chapter 3 explores, through literature review and comments made by tribal elders, the competing narratives of those who posit that archiving languages in danger of extinction preserves the language and those who believe that language is an intellectual property. Language is viewed by many indigenous communities as an area within traditional knowledge systems to be protected and that the dissemination of such knowledge should be controlled by indigenous individuals or communities.

3. The Consequences of Colonization: Psychological Traumas

Psychological traumas incurred through the process of colonization have had lingering effects on indigenous peoples to the present day. From the onset of European

invasion, torture, rape, starvation, germ warfare, slavery, and wholesale genocide kept the victims of these forms of violence in a constant state of hyper-vigilance. The term Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) best describes the lasting effects of these experiences which have been passed, generation to generation, through the telling of family and tribal histories.

Threats, overt or implied, and fear are effective tools of manipulation and control. State control of indigenous people was accomplished through governmental policies which endeavored to assimilate them to the Euro-American way of life.

4. 19th and 20th Century Violence and the Role of Anthropology

The many insidious psychological tactics used by the European colonizers, and later the new American government, have been supported and furthered by the discipline of Anthropology. Anthropology has collected what indigenous peoples tell of their own histories, not in such a way that would contribute to historical understandings, but more as a way of presenting examples of the “odd” ways in which some humans imagine the world. This practice devalues oral tradition and understandings of traditional ways of producing knowledge. Paulo Freire refers to this as “cultural invasion” (2012:152).

Manifest Destiny is explored in this section and the role played by ethnologist Alice Fletcher (1838-1923) in accomplishing settler expansion west of the Mississippi River. Fletcher was hired by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in 1882 to survey Indian lands. This position and activity culminated in the enactment and enforcement of the 1887 Dawes Act, or Allotment Act.

C. Chapter 4: United States Imperialism, War, and Anthropology

Chapter 4 is devoted to the illumination of how, in times of global or local wars, the United States government and military have used, and continue to use, anthropologists in the quest for world domination of resources. This is an egregious misuse of academic research and knowledge. It is also antithetical to a field which defines itself as the study and *understanding* of past and present world cultures, a discipline that is often involved in identifying and finding solutions to contemporary problems affecting those cultures, and a discipline that often seeks ways to alleviate the oppressions of indigenous people.

The ways in which individual anthropologists have contributed, knowingly or not, to imperialistic activities, along with methods of recruitment by United States agencies and the military, and the stance taken against such actions by a number of professional anthropological organizations are discussed. The chapter begins with a brief history of the Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW) as an early actor and supporter of anthropologists as counterinsurgents and moves through examples during World War I (WWI), World War II (WWII), Korea, Vietnam, and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

1. The Carnegie Institution of Washington

The Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW), now known as the Carnegie Institution for Science (CIS), was founded in 1902 as a research institute. The CIW supported research in many areas of science, including archaeology, and eventually cultural anthropology. The Institution is also noted for making a large contribution to the shaping of the U.S. military-industrial complex. Many of the trustees, over time, of the CIW were men involved in government and in the military.

During the WWI years, 200 staff members of the CIW (two-thirds of the staff) were either directly or indirectly working in some capacity for the United States Government in the war effort. Also, anthropologist Sylvanus Morley (1883-1948) who was well known to the CIW, while working under the guise of an archaeologist doing field research in Mexico and Central America, conducted activities of espionage (Quetzil Castañeda 2005).

2. World War I

This section begins with a letter written by Franz Boas in 1919 in which he exposed archaeologists who were working as “spies” for the U.S. government in the years leading to World War I (WWI). This letter resulted in Boas being censured by the American Anthropological Association (AAA). The section identifies the archaeologists and their roles in the “war effort” as spies.

3. World War II

World War II (WWII) produced another wave of anthropologists willing to further the war effort by using their profession as a cover tactic to gather information that would aid the Allied efforts. While many activities could be viewed as positive in hastening the end of WWII, there were also activities that would challenge moral imperatives, professional and personal ethics, and hold long-lasting negative effects on vulnerable populations; “studies that identified biological differences among Japanese that could be exploited with biological weapons,” another designed to “destroy food sources for the Japanese homeland,” and studies involving “ethnographic knowledge to refine techniques of terror” (David Price 2011:21). Well-known anthropologists such as Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson are discussed.

4. The Korean War and The Cold War Years

Barely taking a breath from the end of WWII, political and military tensions between the U.S. and her allies, and the USSR and her allies, began to exacerbate in 1947. This date may be considered the beginning of the Cold War, effectively lasting until 1990. During the early Cold War years, the CIA began recruiting anthropologists and other academics through contracts with Stanford, Berkeley, Columbia, Princeton, Yale, and other academic institutions (Price 1998:395).

This section also touches briefly on the McCarthy era destruction of academic careers of those scholars who criticized United States policies during this period of time. Governmental agencies that openly fund counterintelligence research and those agencies that use seemingly innocuous organizations as funding fronts are discussed.

5. The Cold War (including Vietnam), 1960s to 1990

Beginning in the 1960s, The CIA was expanding covert operations throughout the world, focusing specifically on Central America, South America, Southeast Asia, and Africa; in any country where liberation revolution occurred, the CIA was quick to follow. Beyond the CIA, the FBI could be found in communities and organizations in the United States where people were coalescing and working for domestic liberation; Black communities, American Indian communities, and college campuses. It was also during this time that the United States involvement in Vietnam changed from that of “advisory capacity” (which began in 1950) to a commitment of military troops for combat in 1965. Ultimately, the United States involvement extended to Laos and Cambodia.

Counterinsurgency research produced a project that solidified resistance and illuminated ethical concerns among anthropologists: Project Camelot. “Project Camelot can now be recognized as the crisis that began ethical discourse in anthropology”

(Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban 2003:7). And it was Project Camelot that moved the American Anthropological Association to issue an Anti-War Statement.

6. 1990 to Present

The attempts by U.S. government agencies to entice anthropologists and other social scientists into government service have only escalated with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The methods used by these entities and the results obtained are complicit within our educational systems; targeting undergraduate and graduate students majoring in social science (and other) disciplines through use of funding, and even targeting high school students in programs of indoctrination.

The storm of public outrage over the exposure of torture tactics moved the AAA to compose and release a Statement on Torture in 2007. This particular AAA statement is extensive and makes reference to anthropological research.

The use of anthropologists and other academics as members of Human Terrain Teams in Iraq and Afghanistan continues. These tactics by the United States government and United States Military are explored in some depth as are the on-going educational funding of graduate students being recruited by governmental agencies.

D. Chapter 5: Anthropologists and Indians: The Great Divide

The chapters of the dissertation thus far have acknowledged a divide between indigenous people, Anthropology, and some anthropologists. The depth of that divide is most certainly informed by ideological differences, world views that are often diametrically opposed. It is possible to visualize opposing worldviews by comparing the understandings of how land is valued, or exploring the different perceptions of the value of cultural artifacts and languages, or by comparing competing interpretations of history.

The conflict is further explored by the way in which the discipline has been exploited in the interest of capitalism, expanded imperialism, and times of war. This chapter explores the divide in greater depth.

1. Conceptualizing the Conflict

What are the reasons for this divide? From research completed for the dissertation, competing ideologies, based in experiences of colonization, is found in all areas of conflict that entangle relationships between indigenous people or communities and Anthropology or anthropologists.

Many indigenous people view their ideology as being devalued, diminished, and most often discarded by the power structures within the discipline of Anthropology itself. When indigenous people who live outside of the academic world are exposed to Anthropology, usually as subject matter for research, the ideological conflicts are exposed in understandings of history, culture, spiritual belief, and knowledge production.

a. Conflicting Historical Narratives

There is a major disjuncture between indigenous and scientific understandings of history, such as the peopling of the Americas. Indigenous understandings are found in oral tradition, passed from generation to generation. Histories are transmitted through story, songs, and ceremony. Scientific understandings of indigenous history rely solely on evidence such as artifacts from archaeological sites and, from these sites, creating time lines (Deloria 2001; 1997b).

b. Conflicts in Ethical Understandings

Differences in the definition of what constitutes ethical treatment of ancestral remains are one such example. To Native people, ethical treatment of (any) human

remains quite simply means not digging them up, not studying them, and not using human remains as a tool useful in building one's professional career. From this ideological view, indigenous people consider any other treatment of remains to be an expression of a lack of ethics or moral character.

Another example of used in anthropological fieldwork. conflict is methodology Any methodology engaged with indigenous communities or individuals must first and always be predicated on deep respect and humility. A number of elders have reported experiences with anthropologists that left them feeling they, or their communities, had been disrespected.

Yet one more wedge that serves to widen the divide is a lack of consideration of other worldviews. Indigenous worldviews are often diminished as having no "scientific" value.

c. Linear vs. Circular Thinking

Indigenous thinking is circular, forming deep connections to the natural world and other humans. Histories are referenced in spatial terms rather than time. Western thinking is based on linear time, with the beginning seemingly unconnected to the present.

Vine Deloria Jr. discusses the differences between circular and linear ways of understanding time and space in his book *Spirit & Reason* (1999), and both he and Daniel R. Wildcat address the topic in *Power and Place: Indian Education in America* (2001). In an article for *American Antiquity*, Roger Echo-Hawk (2000) writes about the integration of oral traditions with the archaeological record over deep time, and how indigenous understandings of time differ from those of scientific understandings. There is very little reference made to circular vs. linear ways of thinking in non-Native authored

literature, and what does exist simply restates that of Native writers.

d. Cultural and Spiritual Imperialism

The divide is furthered by the fact that Anthropology has continued to serve and expand colonization by appropriating indigenous ancestral remains, languages, cultural material, ceremonies, and knowledge systems. In the process, Anthropology as a discipline and academic study, has removed all of the above from indigenous control and ownership.

e. Philosophies of Vine Deloria

The writings and philosophies of Vine Deloria are briefly considered, as are the reactions to his perceptions of the relationship between Indians and anthropologists. A number of the issues presented in this dissertation were conflicts Deloria addressed over a more than 40 year career.

f. Unequal Power Creates Conflict

The disparaging views held by many indigenous people of the discipline may be seen as an expression of resistance and perhaps, at times, anger to the reality of unbalanced power in the relationship. Power inequalities were addressed by Diane Lewis in 1973 when she wrote, “the anthropologist, like the other Europeans in a colony, occupied a position of economic, political, and psychological superiority vis-à-vis the subject people” (1973:582).

g. Ideological Clashes in Education

When indigenous people enter the field of anthropology, the marginalization and oppression of indigenous ideologies engenders a new form of violence and psychological trauma which widens the margins of the divide. Many indigenous people believe that the only path to success for indigenous students and practitioners is to give oneself over to

the mainstream paradigm. While there is an historical conflict between Indian Communities, Indians and Anthropology, and Indians and some anthropologists, the admittance of indigenous anthropologists and students into the discipline and into the academy has created an added conflict based on ideological difference; differences that have to do with fundamental belief systems, ways of knowing, and knowledge systems. This conclusion is one shared by a number of indigenous and non-indigenous scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Shawn Wilson (2008) and Amanda Tachine (2015).

Indigenous people have an understanding that is unspoken and unwritten, an understanding which suggests that in Anthropology the only way to be “taken seriously” is by totally accepting and adapting, becoming intellectually white. Ray Barnhardt (2002) and Carol Brandt (2008) are two of many scholars who have addressed the perceived need for indigenous students to assimilate. This is reminiscent of 19th century United States Government Assimilation Policies and mission statements of the Government Boarding Schools.

E. Chapter 6: Indians in the Halls of Academe

Another major component of the conflict that exists between indigenous people and Anthropology concerns the dissemination of indigenous knowledge, how and to whom it is presented. In recent generations indigenous students have entered college and university programs to be trained in the field of Anthropology. However, the academy has stagnated in a position of not moving beyond, not considering, any worldview other than that seen through the hegemonic, mainstream, Euro-American lens.

Through the use of written surveys, personal interviews, and individual experiences, this chapter will provide additional voices to mine in describing the

competing world views that contribute to the distancing between Anthropology, anthropologists, and Native American people. The chapter was informed by the participation of indigenous graduate students, indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists, and the voices of Native American tribal leaders and tribal elders of New England .

1. A focus group is formed: Surveys and Interviews

In order to answer the broad questions of the dissertation, and those questions more finely focused, I conceived the idea of a focus group that would consist of indigenous graduate students in anthropological programs, indigenous and non-indigenous academics working as instructors in anthropology departments, and tribal leaders and elders of various Native communities in New England. I devised three separate surveys for the anthropologists in the group with the assistance of a professional survey writer who is also an anthropologist. The three written surveys are found in Appendix A.

Developing a written guideline for interviews with community leaders or elders proved to be difficult and inadequate. I eventually found that allowing the individual to frame the interview in terms of what they think to be important worked best. For all of the community leaders or elders, their experiences that relate to issues in this dissertation vary; some have experience with anthropologists, some have personal experience with higher education, all have experience with remnants of colonization. In the interviews, I simply allowed the individuals to tell their stories and formed questions as the conversations progressed. Unknown to me at the time was the work done by John Omohundro (2008) on engaging in anthropological dialogue which encompasses the

method I used in interviewing elders.

I addressed the questions of the dissertation in this chapter with the goal of learning from indigenous students and indigenous anthropologists exactly how pervasive are perceptions of marginalization, disrespect in Anthropology for other world views, and blatant ignoring of cultural diversity; and, how overwhelming is the expectation that assimilation to mainstream anthropological thought is the first step to becoming an anthropologist.

The chapter presents the results of the three surveys. Results of the interviews with tribal leaders and elders are interspersed throughout the chapters of the dissertation. This method of incorporating the words of the elders was necessitated by the diverse topics discussed in the interviews, topics which did not necessarily follow the questions posed in the written surveys.

2. Professional Marginalization

Professional Marginalization is presented as a separate subsection in the chapter as I deem it to be one of the most under-discussed issues in the discipline. Professional marginalization has the power to destroy professional careers and has historically done so for a variety of reasons; most often targeting those who have strayed outside of the accepted dogma of the fold.

Examples are provided of marginalizations that have been experienced by indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists who have openly invested in the legitimacy of alternate worldviews and who place value on indigenous oral tradition, beyond what is sanctioned by the “official” beliefs and theories of the academy. In attempting to ascertain if this is a pervasive problem within the discipline, I designed

several questions, including follow-up questions, on the anthropological surveys.

F. Chapter 7: Bridging the Divide: Attempts, Successes, and Failures

In Chapter 7, the issues previously identified as points of conflict between Anthropology and indigenous people are expanded upon and the efforts which have been made by institutions, federal legislation, and professional organizations to address those issues and to create a discipline that is more inclusive and welcoming to indigenous people are evaluated. Research for this chapter was accomplished through extensive literature review and insights from indigenous scholars and community members.

1. Education

Problems experienced by Native American students in higher education are identified and expanded upon in this section.

a. What do other Scholars have to say?

Research by Native and non-Native educators has involved learning the causes for low enrollments of Native American students in undergraduate and graduate programs of study. Several case studies are presented in part.

b. Actions and Results

Mining the literature and professional journals was significantly unproductive. While a number of institutions provide cultural centers for indigenous students, there appears to be none on the East Coast that provides traditional counselors. The number of indigenous instructors in Anthropology remains extremely low.

c. Recommended Actions

Increasing the numbers of indigenous instructors and providing culturally appropriate counselors and support services are discussed along with suggestions of ways to increase enrollment and retention of indigenous students in higher education.

Recommended Actions in Education relates to an expansion of one of the dissertation questions: what have been the effects of differences in efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline?

2. Professional Organizations

Professional anthropological organizations were examined to determine what, if any, efforts have been made to present Anthropology as a more welcoming discipline to indigenous people. The organizations chosen to be included in the chapter are the American Anthropological Association (AAA), Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), World Archaeological Congress (WAC), and the Society for American Archaeology (SAA). The Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA), a section of AAA, was also examined.

a. American Anthropological Association (AAA)

The AAA Statement of Ethics provides guidelines to protect indigenous communities and individuals. The AAA has also issued a number of statements on racism. The AAA Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA) was convened to research racism within the academy which focused on experiences of minority graduate students.

b. Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA)

The Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA), a section of AAA, was also examined, although this section appears to hold no solutions or suggested action regarding the difficulties encountered by indigenous people engaged in Anthropology. It remains difficult to discern exactly what the AIA actually provides or accomplishes.

c. Society for American Archaeology (SAA)

The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) is concerned only with the field of Archaeology. The SAA has created a strong political lobbying group to oppose Native rights relating to the ownership and to the determination of the treatment and repatriation of ancestral remains and artifacts. The SAA does not appear to engage with any concerns of indigenous people.

d. Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA)

The SfAA has an established “Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities” which is significantly focused on the consideration and protection of informants or communities involved in studies or projects.

e. World Archaeological Congress (WAC)

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) issued a statement regarding human remains in 1989, followed in 1990 by a code of ethics, and a statement regarding the display of human remains in 2006. All three statements are reproduced in their entirety in this chapter. The chapter Conclusion provides an analysis of the efforts made by professional organizations to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline for indigenous people.

3. Repatriation and NAGPRA

This section consumes a large amount of the text in this chapter. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) is considered to be perhaps the most important piece of federal legislation in regards to indigenous rights in the United States.

a. Ideological Conflicts which Necessitated a Federal Law

Historical situations which led to the necessity for federal legislation are explored in this section. Opposition from some in the archaeological and museum communities, including some professional organizations, is also examined. Positive results in relationships between Native Americans and anthropologists are presented, including the creation of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) and Cultural Resource Management programs.

b. Section 10.11

When oppositional forces failed to prevent the enactment of NAGPRA, devious actions were engaged to circumvent the law, especially as it relates to Culturally Unidentified human remains. The instances of self-interpretation of NAGPRA by some individuals or institutions necessitated a clarifying statement, Section 10.11, to be added to the original document.

4. Writing to Widen the Divide

This section presents a short review of the book *Reburying the Past: The Effects of Repatriation and Reburial on Scientific Inquiry* by Elizabeth Weiss (2008) as an example of the continued opposition by some anthropologists to NAGPRA, repatriation, and Native American rights issues.

G. Chapter 8: Is Rapprochement Possible?

Chapter 8 examines methods that have been utilized in resolving instances of conflict in other arenas and evaluate if similar methods might be effective in addressing the many areas of conflict discussed in this dissertation; areas such as ideology, marginalizations, exclusions, and oppressions where Anthropology and indigeneity grate

against each other. Forms of addressing conflict were studied as were methods used in resolving conflicts; methods known as Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice. The efficacy of engaging one or more of these methods was considered. Dialogical frameworks leading to open discourse between anthropologists and indigenous people are also presented.

1. Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice

The terms “Conflict Resolution,” “Reparations,” “Reconciliation,” and “Transitional Justice” are defined. By understanding the meanings of these terms we can arrive at exactly how the ideological conflicts and all of the attendant consequences might possibly be resolved or even if any of these methods pertain to this situation.

a. Conflict Settlement, Conflict Resolution, and Reconciliation

Reconciliation is defined based on Nadim Rouhana’s (2004) three processes leading toward reconciliation in a study of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He refers to these processes as “Conflict Settlement,” “Conflict Resolution,” and “Reconciliation.” Rouhana states that “these three processes are qualitatively different and, therefore, are not designed to achieve the same endpoint” (2004:34). Turning again to Rouhana (2004:35-36), we find that reconciliation has four components that must be addressed to obtain the end goal; he lists these components as justice, truth, historical responsibility, and, finally, a restructuring of the social and political relationship between the parties in conflict.

b. Reparations

Reparations are monetary or some other form of compensation presented for a loss or damage. Some historical acts of reparations are noted in this section.

c. Transitional Justice

Transitional Justice (TJ) involves methods based in conflict resolution to resolve continuing social conflicts produced through historical trauma, and may be legally mandated. While TJ may ultimately provide a contribution to healing, public acknowledgment and condemnation of violations are the primary process. Truth Commissions are one of a number of the methods of TJ.

H. Chapter 9: Conclusion

The major questions of the dissertation, and those questions that evolved from them, are briefly reviewed. Conclusions drawn from analysis of the written surveys completed by the focus group are presented. One possible solution to the question, “is rapprochement possible” is considered; decolonizing the discipline of Anthropology through a restructuring and enhancement of the academic curriculum.

CHAPTER 2

THEORY and METHOD

If we have been gagged and disempowered by theories, we can also be loosened and empowered by theories.

Gloria Anzaldúa [1990: xxvi]

A. Introduction

I found the above quote from Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) in an article by Tara Yosso (2005:70) which discusses cultural wealth, and which cultures may claim cultural capital, within the framework of Critical Race Theory. Anzaldúa's words resonated with me as perhaps an answer to Audre Lorde's (2007 [1984]) famous quote, "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house."

The difficulty with words, written or spoken, is that once they are presented, interpretation lies with the reader or listener rather than the author or speaker. My interpretation of Lorde's words are that we, as "subaltern" members of oppressed socio-political and economic groups, must find our own methods to undo the lingering manifestations of colonization by the dominant society; that the methods used to create our oppressions cannot be successfully used against the oppressor. I understand that concept, however I do not totally agree with it. I have been heavily criticized when writing that we *must* know what those tools are, how they have been (and continue to be) used, and evaluate them for our own use in regaining agency. Lorde's quote has been used in many disciplines within the Social Sciences in a number of contexts. To date, I have not located any academic writing that supports, enhances, or addresses my interpretation or application of Lorde's words.

Anzaldúa's statement suggests that as members of "minority" communities, our histories and very voices have been silenced by erroneous academic (and

anthropological) theories of who or what we are. I believe she also suggests that we can develop theories which are pertinent to our own knowledges and understandings of our own communities; theories which lie outside of those accepted and promoted by mainstream scholars. Tara Yosso presents a similar analysis of Anzaldúa's statement in relationship to Critical Race Theory (CRT); in 2005 she wrote

indeed, if some knowledges have been used to silence, marginalize and render People of Color invisible, then 'Outsider' knowledges (Hill Collins 1986), *mestiza* knowledges (Anzaldúa,1987) and transgressive knowledges (hooks, 1994) can value the presence and voices of People of Color, and can reenvision the margins as places empowered by transformative resistance (hooks, 1990; Delgado Bernal, 1997; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Critical race theory (CRT) listens to DuBois' racial insight and offers a response to Anzaldúa's theoretical challenge. CRT is a framework that can be used to theorize, examine and challenge the ways race and racism implicitly and explicitly impact on social structures, practices and discourses. [2005:70]

This chapter will explain the theories used in framing the dissertation; theories such as Critical Race Theory (CRT), Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), and how issues of liberation struggles involving sovereignty and self-determination may frame theory. The chapter will identify methods engaged in the research and writing of this dissertation including positionality, ethnographic techniques in research, writing style, and literature review.

Before presenting the theory and method engaged in the dissertation, there is a personal story that was the impetus for my exploring questions of ideological conflict between Anthropology and indigenous people. This personal narrative also provided a framework for my imagining what form of addressing the conflict could possibly be used that might result in a discipline which would be of practical benefit to both indigenous people and anthropologists; one which would be fully inclusive of indigenous peoples and indigenous worldview.

B. The Background Narrative

When I entered graduate school at an advanced age, I was excited and eager to learn what this world of the mind had to offer. I remember the enthusiasm with which I faced each new course in my first year as a graduate student; the wealth of new ideas, reading, and processing all that was being presented by my instructors. My second year in the program was progressively dissatisfying. I often found myself out of sorts, angry. I was becoming “an angry Indian woman,” a label (anger) that is attached to all people of color when they question hegemony, and a label that is dreaded because the genesis of the anger often cannot be explained or understood by non-Indian, non-Black, non-Hispanic, non-Othered people.

As I progressed through that second year, I tried to identify my source of discontent, my source of increasing anger. This process took months, and it wasn't until mid-way through the last semester of that year that I found the core of it all. In my eagerness to learn, to do well, I had lost *myself* in the process of becoming a scholar: I was almost beginning to think like “them,” the white academics with their mainstream view of ordering the world; I was even accused by a friend of going over to “the dark side.”

My intent is not to sow misunderstanding; there were no overt incidents that created this situation. My instructors were wonderful, caring people who simply were unaware of the internal chaos that I was experiencing through their efforts at imparting knowledge. What I discovered the core problem to be was quite simply that the knowledge being presented to me was created from a colonial construct of the world, and in many instances that knowledge was in diametric opposition to that which was based in

my own traditional knowledge. This insight concluded with several questions of some import: if I could be so uprooted at my age, with a long life of being well grounded in my tradition, what was happening to those indigenous students who were 30 or 40 years younger? Did they even realize that they were being deprogrammed and reprogrammed, essentially indoctrinated, into mainstream anthropological thought? I had almost allowed this to happen to me, were they even aware it was happening to them?

Other questions I might construct from this narrative are questions of awareness and of cause; questions that are not meant for the scope of this dissertation, but perhaps are ancillary to the major dissertation questions. Are our non-indigenous instructors aware of these conflicts? How do we bring that awareness to the forefront of their teaching? And in making connections, is this another manifestation of colonization; is the material presented and the manner of presentation an expression of enculturation?

I do not believe in coincidences, perhaps another departure from main-stream American world view. During this second semester of our second year in graduate school, other indigenous students in my cohort, and in the graduate program, began to initiate conversations with me about the exact same issues with which I was struggling: conflicting views of how to be in the world; conflicting ways of producing knowledge; appropriation of indigenous knowledge, language, and material culture while dismissing oral tradition as holding no value. They spoke and I listened; on more than one occasion, a female student wept in frustration or emotional pain. Because I *don't* believe in coincidence, I sought out the connections...what was the value, if any, in our collective experience? I began to realize that this issue would form the core of my dissertation. It is not enough, however, to identify issues of discontent, but it is also necessary to seek

solutions that may serve to address the issues in a positive manner; finding our collective way, and our collective voice, through the morass.

C. Theory

What exactly is theory? According to the on-line Oxford Dictionary, theory and some synonyms of theory are:

a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something; a set of principles on which the practice of an activity is based...hypothesis, conjecture, assumption, opinion, belief, ideology, system of ideas.
[http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/theory?q=THEORY]

However, our friend *Wikipedia* expands the definition to include,

theory can be normative (or prescriptive), meaning a postulation about what ought to be. It provides "goals, norms, and standards". A theory can be a body of knowledge, which may or may not be associated with particular explanatory models. To theorize is to develop this body of knowledge. [<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory>]

To expand definitions of theory further, from a graduate class lecture in Theory and Method of Archaeology given by Robert Paynter, PhD; “theories are explicit statements, metaphors, paradigms, concepts. They are a complex bundle of ideas...” (lecture, October 18, 2011). Basically a theory is a statement which illuminates the connection and relationship between facts.

In considering Theory and Method, I naturally turn to my own indigenous way of being, a way that is deeply embedded in a particular worldview. In Cultural (Social) Anthropology, theory is most often informed by the thought and writings of Western philosophers. In my graduate level course, Theory and Method in Social Anthropology, we studied a number of Western philosophers; G.W.F. Hegel (1770–1831), Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855), Karl Marx (1818–1883), Émile Durkheim (1858–1917), Max

Weber (1864–1920), Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), Hannah Arendt (1906–1975), Louis Althusser (1918-1990), Frantz Fanon (1925–1961), and Michel Foucault (1926–1984). However, no Native American philosophers, or philosophies, were examined; we did not read Charles Eastman (1858-1939), Leslie Marmon Silko (1948), Winona Laduke (1959), John Trudell (1946), or even Vine Deloria Jr. (1933-2005). These last are “what Gramsci called “organic intellectuals,” grassroots philosophers who are uniquely able to relate theory to the concrete experience of oppression” (Mari Matsuda 1995:63).

I continue to wonder why these, and other, Native American writers who hold deep understandings of what it means to be human were left out of my course readings; Anthropology is, after all, the study of humanity. Perhaps it has to do with the striking difference in paradigms; indigenous concepts, including theories, are paradigms which are very similar to what is known as a naturalistic paradigm. A naturalistic paradigm is one which assumes “multiple interpretations of reality” (http://www.encyclo.co.uk/meaning-of_Naturalistic%20paradigm). According to Kathryn Manuelito, “in a naturalistic paradigm, reality is context-based and viewed holistically....In a naturalistic paradigm, knowledge is considered personal and subjective...” (2005:78). American universities continue to assume that Western theories are “the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only ideas which can make sense of the world, or reality” (Smith 1999:56). And it is the Western paradigm which continues to set the standards for what “constitutes legitimate contributions to a field” (Smith 1999:56) of study.

Philosophies of indigenous peoples are not based on Western philosophers but on

ancestral knowledge and oral tradition. When indigenous ways of constructing theory are diminished and marginalized there are human costs; costs which reinforce awareness of being “Other,” destruction of self-esteem, uncertainty of possessing value within the academic community, and perceptions of knowledge and belief systems being challenged or, even worse, dismissed. These particular obstacles encountered by indigenous students stand in stark contrast to Western philosophies; philosophies which are presented in such a way as to support the values and principles of Western civilization. Western philosophies privilege the (white) students who are not members of minority populations by reinforcing their worldview.

Bryan Brayboy shares a personal exchange with a colleague who told him that,

people like me [Brayboy] “told good stories” and later added that because I told good stories, I might not ever be a “good theorist.” I was struck by the seeming disconnect between community stories and personal narratives and “theory.” After this encounter with my colleague, I returned home to Prospect, North Carolina, one of the communities of the Lumbee tribe of which I am an enrolled member, and told several of my relatives and elders about my colleagues’ comments. My mother told me, “Baby, doesn’t she know that our stories are our theories? And she thinks she’s smarter than you because she can’t tell stories?” My mother clearly hit on the reason why locating theory as something absent from stories and practices is problematic in many Indigenous communities and in the work of anthropologists who seek to represent Indigenous communities.

[2005:425]

In further analysis of this encounter, Brayboy explains that the telling of stories outline “theories of sovereignty, self-determination...” and that while these ideas of what constitutes theory conflict with ideas of what constitutes “good theory” by the academy, the conflict really is based in “different epistemologies and ontologies” (2005:427). The response given by Brayboy’s mother reflects the same level of dismissiveness as does the comments of his colleague, however there is no professional cost to the colleague.

As an indigenous person, locating theory acceptable to the academic community can be challenging and viewed as another obstacle constructed only for minority populations. If theory is constructed from an indigenous paradigm, it needs to be translated into a Westernized worldview in order to be understood; an exercise no non-indigenous scholar, or other minority person, ever needs to navigate.

1. Critical Race Theory (CRT)

Critical Race Theory (CRT) was developed in the 1970s as an outgrowth of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) (Connolly and Khaoury 2008; Brayboy 2005). CLS is a “legal scholarship that argues that law must focus on how it is applied to specific groups in particular circumstances” (Brayboy 2005:428). CLS illuminates the unbalanced ways in which law is created to privilege and uphold a hierarchal society and espouses a need for fundamental change to “attain a just society” (Brayboy 2005:428; Matsuda 1995:64). Believing that CLS was moving too slowly in changing legal structures, CRT originally developed as a “form of opposition scholarship” to “address the Civil Rights issues of African American people” (Brayboy 2005:428). The original structure and purpose of CRT dealt only with the “black-white” binary, leaving other minority populations on the periphery of the conversation. Due to this void in CRT, Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) and Asian Critical Race Theory (AsianCrit) were developed to meet the needs of these populations in dialogue and scholarship pertaining to racism and inequality.

2. Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit)

While CRT may be made applicable (in theory) to other minority groups, the focus continues to be on issues specifically affecting African American populations, leaving other minority group issues with no representation in CRT. CRT does not address

the legal or political issues of Native Americans, nor does it address their particular experiences of racism, oppression, marginalization, or colonization; CRT does not address issues of indigenous loss of land or of erosion of tribal sovereignty. Donna Deyhle and Teresa McCarty acknowledge efforts made to correct this void in CRT by writing, “Recently, [Bryan] Brayboy (2005) has extended CRT to address the singular legal and political status of American Indian and Alaska Native peoples as tribal sovereigns, within the framework of tribal critical race theory (TCRT)” (2007:212).

According to Brayboy,

TribalCrit has its roots in Critical Race Theory, Anthropology, Political/Legal Theory, Political Science, American Indian Literatures, Education, and American Indian Studies. This theoretical framework provides a way to address the complicated relationship between American Indians and the United States federal government and begin to make sense of American Indians’ liminality as both racial and legal/political groups and individuals. [2005:425]

Brayboy also perceives TribalCrit to be rooted “in the multiple, nuanced, and historically- and geographically-located epistemologies and ontologies found in Indigenous communities” (2005:427). Logically, with over 700 tribes indigenous to the United States, there are differences in epistemologies and ontologies; however, there are also commonalities and it is within these commonalities that TribalCrit is centered even while continuing to recognize and honor the variations between Nations, communities, and individuals (Brayboy 2005:427).

As stated earlier, I turned to my own indigenous understandings of producing knowledge to frame this dissertation. My cultural understandings mirror Brayboy’s construction of TribalCrit and are deeply embedded in the knowledge that our stories are themselves the theories because the stories are how we make sense of the world. If theory guides us in doing something, stories guide us in how to live.

The framework of TribalCrit as developed by Brayboy consists of nine principles:

1. Colonization is endemic to society.
2. U.S. policies toward Indigenous peoples are rooted in imperialism, White supremacy, and a desire for material gain.
3. Indigenous peoples occupy a liminal space that accounts for both the political and racialized natures of our identities.
4. Indigenous peoples have a desire to obtain and forge tribal sovereignty, tribal autonomy, self-determination, and self-identification.
5. The concepts of culture, knowledge, and power take on new meaning when examined through an Indigenous lens.
6. Governmental policies and educational policies toward Indigenous peoples are intimately linked around the problematic goal of assimilation.
7. Tribal philosophies, beliefs, customs, traditions, and visions for the future are central to understanding the lived realities of Indigenous peoples, but they also illustrate the differences and adaptability among individuals and groups.
8. Stories are not separate from theory; they make up theory and are, therefore, real and legitimate sources of data and ways of being.
9. Theory and practice are connected in deep and explicit ways such that scholars must work towards social change.

[2005:428-429]

These principles reflect appropriate and preferred ways in which to view experiences of indigenous peoples through examination of traditions, thoughts, and knowledge production that are well-seated in oral tradition that has endured for millennia. Engaging TribalCrit produces research methods and data analysis that may contribute to efforts surrounding self-determination and uphold indigenous sovereignty (Brayboy 2005:441).

D. Method

“Method is the logic behind doing something. The more into the logic, the closer

it is to becoming theory” (Paynter, lecture December 6, 2011). Method engaged in this dissertation consists of research using ethnographic techniques, such as personal interviews and written surveys; literature review; and particular writing style. Brayboy’s nine principles, which compose his framework of Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit), provided an indigenous lens through which the data could be analyzed (2005:428-429). I also incorporated my privileged position as an “insider” participant observer. What I mean by this last statement is a definition that is based on my own positionality: I incorporated personal experiences which makes me a participant; I observed through listening to others share their experiences; and as an indigenous person familiar with, and often in kinship relationship with New England tribal community members, I am an insider.

1. Research and Positionality

Conducting research from an insider position holds both advantages and disadvantages. When conducting personal interviews with tribal elders, I was a known entity: this status provided me with easy access to those elders and their communities; I was trusted to maintain issues of confidentiality and trusted to respect any restrictions placed around stories told me; people were comfortable in speaking with me because they knew me, or knew of me, and considered me to be related by kinship means. Western methods of research stress objectivity but objectivity can “close off sources of knowledge;” when indigenous methods of research are engaged, they “acknowledge tribal cultural protocol, which are the actions that a person takes to create a relationship with another person or group” (AmandaTachine 2015). Teresa McCarty supports this method of research by indigenous scholars when she writes “this type of

research...includes attention to the sovereign authority of Indigenous communities and nations, including respectful adherence to the research protocols and guidelines that are increasingly required by U.S. and Canadian tribal governments” (2005:1).

The disadvantages of conducting research from an insider position come from outside of the indigenous communities and individuals, most especially from the discipline itself. “The research community has a number of terms which are used to good effect as exclusionary devices to dismiss the challenges made from outside the fold. Research can be judged as “not rigorous,” “not robust,” “not real,” “not theorized,” “not valid,” “not reliable” (Smith 1999:140). I would argue that positionality, and personal bias, are *always* a component of research and reporting; no one can change their position of “outsider” or “insider,” and as humans with all of our attendant frailties, we all possess personal biases even while making herculean attempts to keep our research balanced. Interpretation of research is *always* effected by a researcher’s subjectivity; personal experiences, beliefs, family background, education, socio-economic position in the hierarchal framework of society, and agency all influence interpretation whether consciously or not.

2. Indigenous Research

Linda Tuhiwai Smith writes that “when indigenous peoples become the researchers and not merely the researched, the activity of research is transformed. Questions are framed differently, priorities are ranked differently, problems are defined differently, people participate on different terms” (1999:193). The questions in the minds of community members surrounding research are often very different than those of the researcher, such as:

Whose research is it? Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed its questions and framed its scope? Who will carry it out? Who will write it up? How will its results be disseminated? These questions are simply part of a larger set of judgements on criteria that a researcher cannot prepare for, such as: Is her spirit clear? Does he have a good heart? What other baggage are they carrying? Are they useful to us? Can they fix up our generator? Can they actually do anything? [Smith 1999:9-10]

While some of these questions appear simplistic or even comical to outsiders, they are important to community members, and most especially to elders. While I most certainly cannot fix a generator, I anticipated the questions that a number of elders might have but would most likely not ask.

In the process of thinking about the distinctive methods necessary to effectively learn about Native people's understandings of the relationship between Anthropology and Native communities, I conceived of a method of working with a focus group knowledgeable about the issue from the perspectives of graduate students, faculty members, and tribal elders. This thought process resulted in the creation of written surveys distributed to indigenous graduate students in Anthropology, indigenous instructors and non-indigenous instructors in departments of Anthropology, and personal interviews with Native community members and elders in New England tribes.

In my interviews with tribal elders, before we began our conversations, I carefully explained what I was doing, why I was doing it, and what I hoped to accomplish. I explained that their words belong to them, that I would not write anything they asked me not to, that I would not identify them by name or tribe or position within the tribe. I also explained what I hoped would be of benefit to their community, perhaps by way of better relationships with non-Native anthropologists, or to their young people going off to college or university, that those institutions might initiate policies to be more inclusive of

diverse understandings and knowledges, and most importantly that the interview afforded their voice to be heard and their stories told. I tried to convey a sense that their individual voices matter, and that I wanted to know what concerns they have for their community and way of life. I wanted them to know what would happen to the information or stories they were sharing on the digital recorder, that the interviews would be erased. I left it up to the elders to decide if my spirit is clear or if I have a good heart.

There are stark differences between indigenous research methodologies and Western research methodologies. The questions presented above are simply one example; Western research methods might possibly anticipate that a community or a community member might be wondering what the research questions are, what the purpose is, and how the information will be used. It is unlikely a non-indigenous researcher would be aware that there are other questions such as how will this research help our community? Is this person carrying baggage that may spiritually harm us? Will any of the information we provide cause government agencies to come in and scrutinize us? And certainly, no Western researcher is likely to anticipate being asked if they can fix a generator.

Beyond these questions lies a difference in what constitutes ethical research. For traditional people, ethical considerations are not limited only to human beings but “includes research involving the environment, archival research and any research which examines ancestors, either as physical remains (extracting DNA), or using their photographs, diaries or archival records” (Smith 1999:191). This means being respectful of oral tradition, stories, ceremonies, plants, animals, insects, and the metaphorical way in which information may be shared.

3. Ethnographic Techniques

According to Russell Sharman, “ethnography is both a method and a genre. It describes what we do as well as what we write. The method is rooted in experience—that of field informants as well as that of the ethnographer” (2007:118). Sharman goes on to posit that a narrative style of writing may be used to “reposition experience as central to the anthropological project” (2007:118). A great deal of this dissertation is written in the narrative, largely due to the fact that much of the dissertation is “rooted in experience;” experience of focus group participants, other scholars, and myself.

Sharman also suggests that ethnography is about telling stories; if the telling of stories constitutes indigenous theory, the stories also provide for method because they represent lived experiences of indigenous peoples. A description of Margaret Kovach’s book *Indigenous Methodologies* (2010) states “Indigenous methodologies flow from tribal knowledge.” The book speaks of doing research in tribal communities and the ways in which indigenous methodologies differ from Western methodologies, however this above quote encapsulates a method that is ancient and centered on respect of all, it underscores the interconnectedness of all.

Research techniques included ethnographic methods such as Qualitative Research Methodology through the use of focus groups and personal interviews. Focus groups were modified to include written surveys, individual interviews, and interviews with two or more persons.

I will admit to a certain bias in the loose criteria constructed in the selection of tribal elders I sought to interview. Societies are complex structures; American society may broadly be defined as two groups, liberal and conservative, however for my purpose

here there is no need to delve into all of the minutiae of those categories. Tribal societies are similar with the two relating factions being known as progressive and traditional. Often these groups are further broken down into traditional progressives and progressive traditionals. I gave consideration only to the broader “progressive” and “traditional” groups when establishing criteria. The elders I chose to interview may all be considered as traditional in varying degrees. By traditional, I do not mean they walk around in beads and feathers every day but rather that they follow indigenous ways of being in the world through participation in ceremony, indigenous ways of producing knowledge, living in balance with the rest of creation, and understanding the interconnectedness of all things. Those who are considered progressives have assimilated to Western worldview and by-and-large have left traditional knowledges and belief systems behind. I had no interest in speaking with them because they are not considered elders in the traditional sense and their input would only mimic that of the dominant society.

The only criterion for inclusion in the focus group comprising indigenous graduate students was being an indigenous graduate student in an Anthropological program of study. Written surveys were distributed to these students and to the very few indigenous anthropologists working in New England; again, the only criteria being that of an indigenous person and an anthropologist. The request for participation extended to non-indigenous anthropologists required only that they be anthropologists in any of the Four Fields of Anthropology. These last surveys were distributed to anthropologists throughout New England and New York. I did not select non-indigenous anthropologists based on my knowledge of their views or practices in relationship to the questions being

addressed by the dissertation, but simply extended the request to anthropologists I know and many of who I have no personal knowledge.

4. Writing Style

Much of this dissertation is written in a narrative style of writing and there is little of “Anthro-Speak” to be found in the following pages. As stated in the Introduction to the dissertation, I was charged by elders to write this subject, and with that charge is an expectation that the final product will be disseminated to Native communities and individuals. Some of those individuals are highly educated, while others may have less than a high school education. The content needs to be understandable, as much as possible, to the people who have encouraged and supported me throughout my journey.

Bea Medicine found the pervasive use of anthropological language to be another area that contributed to a divide between indigenous people and the discipline. “As I come from a culture in which the spoken word and oral history are the mainstays of cultural continuity, perhaps, my written speech might be more concretized with anthropological jargon. This “Anthro Speak” has been a challenge to me in interpreting research results to native peoples” (1998:254). Further, she writes, “often, it is implicit that our research “empowers” people. To me, empowering people - especially “people of color” - means teaching and researching issues of race, class, gender, and power relations in ways that can be understood and utilized by “target populations” (1998:255).

It is understandable that Bea Medicine, even though she was highly educated, might take issue with how written reports of research are presented to indigenous communities. However, there are non-indigenous people who also see a certain lack of appropriateness in using academic language to communicate information to indigenous

peoples outside of the discipline. As early as 1971 Rodolfo Stavenhagen provided one such opinion by writing,

yet how frequently do those communities and these helpful informants whose lives are so carefully laid bare by proficient researchers actually get to know the results of the research? Is any effort made to channel the scientific conclusions and research findings to them; to translate our professional jargon into everyday concepts which the people themselves can understand and from which they can learn something? [1971:336]

Russell Sharman carries this thought further and even attributes the practice to a continued form of colonization by stating that “we become the brutish colonizer, demanding our readers to learn our language, to conform to an intransigent academic style that privileges intellectual over emotional commitment” (2007:119).

The subject of “Anthro-Speak” has consistently been an issue which I simply do not understand. Why do we feel that because we know the language, we must use it to the exclusion of all other methods of communicating our research? Why do anthropologists write only for other anthropologists, rather than the communities of people being researched? This has always struck me as the epitome of hubris, as an empty expression of egotism. Most recently I have come to consider “Anthro-Speak” as just one more act of exclusion, one more attempt to assimilate Native scholars, and one more attempt to separate us from our communities. My suggestion would be to confine this language to the classroom or professional conferences.

5. Literature Review

Literature review for each chapter was extensive and is reflected, in part, in the cited references at the end of the dissertation. The depth and breadth of literature review was a method of research necessary to expand my knowledge base and also to explore ideas beyond my own. I needed to read authors that would provide me with material in

support of my statements but I also needed to read authors that expressed opinions and rationales in opposition to my statements. In the process, I certainly gained knowledge on topics in which I initially felt intellectually limited.

The major goal of literature research was undertaken in the attempt to answer the broad questions presented in the dissertation: is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization? Is some form of resolution possible? Next, the questions that flowed from these: how do the differences between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? How have these differences affected efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline, for example, through graduate school programs for indigenous students, the formation of professional level organizations, and the development of critical areas of research? Is rapprochement possible and under what conditions could that occur?

At various times throughout the literature research I traversed a wide range of emotions; I sometimes experienced anger, calm, hope, frustration, joy, and more anger and frustration. I reviewed in my mind tribal stories, what I sometimes refer to as ancestral knowledge, another form of literature (albeit one not written), in order to form comparisons. Our ancient stories are viewed as literature of value and lessons in how to be in this world in harmony with other humans and all of creation. And in truth, even those readings which elicited feelings of frustration or anger were of great benefit in providing me with broader understandings of a worldview not my own.

Shawn Wilson (Cree), PhD works in areas of rural health through the Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney, Australia. In 2008, Wilson wrote a book titled *Research is Ceremony*. Ceremony indeed! In completing this dissertation, reviewing in

my mind the many journeys of mind and body travelled in the experience, I would argue that not only has the research been ceremony but so too has the entire work of the dissertation been ceremony.

CHAPTER 3
HISTORY OF COLONIZATION of the AMERICAS
and
ANTHROPOLOGY

We need the primitive so that we can distinguish Western civilization from it and congratulate ourselves on the progress we have made.

Vine Deloria [2004:3]

A. Introduction

This chapter will explore the ways in which the discipline of anthropology (in all of the four-fields) has been and continues to be complicit in the colonization of the land and peoples of the Americas, whether consciously, or unconsciously. Despite anthropological statements of ethics, the discipline continues to participate in the subjugation, oppression, and marginalization of indigenous peoples and the exploitation of indigenous resources and lifeways.

In order to contextualize the thesis of past and on-going complicity, a number of historical events must be briefly examined; all of which are intricately and intimately connected. Colonization, imperialism, and anthropology have not occurred within a vacuum, neither have they become established conditions independently of each other. This chapter will briefly explore the history of colonization and the number of ways in which lands and peoples are colonized. It will explore the genesis of American Anthropology and the ways in which the discipline has participated in the colonization of the Americas, focusing on North America.

Before navigating the many ways in which colonization and anthropology have supported, enhanced, and advanced each other, it is important to understand the colonization process. We need to understand how the erasure of indigenous languages,

histories, memories, and sense of place were, and continue to be, accomplished. We need to understand and acknowledge that without indigenous people there would not have been an American Anthropology. We need to understand that without colonization in the Americas there also would have been no American Anthropology.

B. Colonizing Principles

Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980) wrote the introduction to Albert Memmi's (1957) book *The Colonizer and the Colonized* which was first published in the United States, in English, in 1965. Sartre's words continue to echo from almost 60 years ago in their description of colonization and the condition that colonization visits on indigenous peoples of the world, even to present day. In (lengthy) part, Sartre writes,

conquest occurred through violence, and over-exploitation and oppression necessitate continued violence, so the army is present. There would be no contradiction in that, if terror reigned everywhere in the world, but the colonizer enjoys, in the mother country, democratic rights that the colonialist system refuses to the colonized native. In fact, the colonialist system favors population growth to reduce the cost of labor, and it forbids assimilation of the natives, whose numerical superiority, if they had voting rights, would shatter the system. Colonialism denies human rights to human beings whom it has subdued by violence, and keeps them by force in a state of misery and ignorance that Marx would rightly call a subhuman condition. Racism is ingrained in actions, institutions, and in the nature of the colonialist methods of production and exchange. Political and social regulations reinforce one another. Since the native is subhuman, the Declaration of Human Rights does not apply to him; inversely, since he has no rights, he is abandoned without protection to inhuman forces - brought in with the colonialist praxis, engendered every moment by the colonialist apparatus, and sustained by relations of production that define two sorts of individuals - one for whom privilege and humanity are one, who becomes a human being through exercising his rights; and the other, for whom a denial of rights sanctions misery, chronic hunger, ignorance, or, in general, 'subhumanity'. [1957: xxiv]

These words of Sartre can be applied, in large part, to the relationship of colonization, Anthropology, and North American Indian people. The colonizers have

made America their “mother country” and the only rights Indians hold are those that do not threaten the rights of the colonizer, especially what the colonizer may perceive as property rights. By extension, anthropologists claim as their own, various intellectual property rights, even indigenous knowledge systems that have been collected in field work. Sartre’s statement may be analyzed and unpacked in such a way that much of the statement could be applied to the colonialist-anthropologist-Indian paradigm: conquest of the Americas most certainly was accomplished through violence, exploitation, and oppression; the field of American Anthropology’s most respected members are those who have fully assimilated into the Western worldview and mainstream theories; structural racism (overt and covert), oppression, and inequality remain fully ensconced in all aspects of policy-making and practice in institutions in the United States, including academic structures where minorities must publish more and better than white, male counterparts, and women of color must serve on more institutional committees due to double minority status. Faye Harrison writes that there are “trends within anthropology which have effectively peripheralized or erased significant contributions made by peoples of color and women from the canon” (2010:6); Gayatri Spivak is referenced in *Decolonizing Methodologies* as arguing that the problem “for Third World intellectuals remains the problem of being taken seriously” (Smith 1999:71); and personal conversations with tenured women of color anthropologists attesting to being expected to “represent” as double minorities support my statements of structural racism.

Margaret Kohn (2012:1) defines colonialism as a practice of domination that includes the subjugation of one people to another. She further explains that the word “colony” derives from the Latin word, *colonus*, for farmer, and that the transfer of a

population to a new territory entailed permanent settlements that maintained political fealty to the country of origin.

Colonization has most certainly been a practice of expansionist nations since the first states were formed. Kohn (2012:2) speaks of the history of colonialism as not being confined to a particular temporal or spatial site. Colonialism was a practice engaged in by the Romans beginning in 753 BCE, the Moors (711-1492 CE), and the Ottoman Empire beginning in 1299 CE. However, it was the Crusades, or Holy Wars, beginning in 1096 CE and ending in 1272 CE that set the stage for how European colonization of the Americas was justified.

The Crusades provided the initial impetus for developing a legal doctrine that rationalized the conquest and possession of infidel lands. Whereas the Crusades were initially framed as defensive wars to reclaim Christian lands that had been conquered by non-Christians, the resulting theoretical innovations played an important role in subsequent attempts to justify the conquest of the Americas. The core claim was that the “Petrine mandate” to care for the souls of Christ’s human flock required Papal jurisdiction over temporal as well as spiritual matters, and this control extended to non-believers as well as believers. [Kohn 2012:4]

Papal jurisdiction over peoples and lands in the Americas was strengthened by the Papal Bull *Romanus pontifex* written by Pope Nicholas V on January 8, 1455 (Frances Davenport 1917:12). This document continued the policies of colonization; that all newly “discovered” lands inhabited by non-Christian people could be appropriated by the discoverers and the inhabitants converted to Christianity, enslaved, or put to death if they resisted (Davenport 1917:12). The document which was engineered by the authority of the Catholic Church gave implicit and explicit permission, and essentially *mandated* the subjugation of all non-European, non-Christian people. It also gave legal authority to the colonizers that served to excuse the most heinous and atrocious of behaviors—torture,

rape, murder, starvation, and all forms of barbarianism that could be devised.

The course of world-wide domination by European states was driven by the desire to control world resources. Following Cristóbal Colón's (Christopher Columbus) first voyage to the Americas in 1492, the colonizing powers of Castille (Spain) and Portugal came into conflict over control of non-Christian lands, peoples, and natural resources. Rome once again entered the conversation. Pope Alexander VI created the Treaty of Tordesillas in June of 1494. This was a Papal directive that figuratively divided the world in two along a meridian 370 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands, about halfway between the Cape Verde Islands and the islands encountered by Columbus which are now known as Haiti and Cuba. The lands to the east would belong to Portugal and the lands to the west went to Spain to the exclusion of all other European nations. The Treaty was ratified in July of 1494 by Spain and in September of 1494 by Portugal. (Davenport 1917:85)

In reference to 16th century European colonization Kohn writes,

...colonialism changed decisively because of technological developments in navigation that began to connect more remote parts of the world. Fast sailing ships made it possible to reach distant ports and to sustain close ties between the center and colonies. Thus, the modern European colonial project emerged when it became possible to move large numbers of people across the ocean and to maintain political sovereignty in spite of geographical dispersion. [2012:2]

The ensuing European invasion drastically affected, and forever changed, the landscapes and the cultures of the people in which it came in contact. The resources of others' homelands were appropriated and removed, as were the people of those homelands. Intense physical labor necessary for the extraction of resources, clearing of land, and production of crops needed to satisfy an ever-expanding demand by European

monarchies and markets was readily found in the people whose homelands were invaded. In the same way the resources were extracted from the Earth, the people were extracted from their lands, families, and communities. Enslaved labor left communities without their spiritual and political leaders; it left communities without mothers, fathers, and even children, as all were being mined to provide an enforced source of labor for the invaders. Jack Forbes (2008:132) refers to this as “the captivity of innocents” and “the theft of lives.” Forbes describes colonization as a form of cannibalism which he defines as “... the consuming of another’s life for one’s own private purpose or profit” and goes on to say, “...the wealthy and exploitative literally consume the lives of those that they exploit” (2008:24-25).

As the numbers of Europeans in the Americas increased, the rules and laws of the land began to mirror those in Europe. These new rules and laws were always influenced, and sometimes directly controlled, by Christian doctrine. Forbes (2008:89) tells us that conversion to Christianity meant conversion to (being)European; European customs, laws, religious belief systems.

C. Methods of Colonization: Oppression, Violence and the Role of Anthropology

Any situation in which “A” objectively exploits “B” or hinders his and her pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person is one of oppression. Such a situation in itself constitutes violence, even when sweetened by false generosity, because it interferes with the individual’s ontological and historical vocation to be more fully human. With the establishment of a relationship of oppression, violence has already begun.

Paulo Freire [2012:55]

Walter Mignolo (2003) in *The Darker Side of the Renaissance* explores the many, sometimes subtle or covert, facets of the colonizing process. He speaks of the ways in which people, lands, and resources are colonized by writing of the “Colonization of Memory,” the “Colonization of History,” the “Colonization of Language,” and the

“Colonization of Space.” Beyond these, indigenous bodies are also colonized through control of movement and freedom, health, life or death; minds are colonized through psychological methods, methods which many times result in deep and long-lasting expressions of trauma. The discipline of Anthropology has historically participated in the sustaining and nurturing of these methods of colonizing the indigenous peoples of America, participation which will be explored in some depth further in this writing.

1. Colonization of Space

The first act of colonization is the taking of space. This is more than an act of merely occupying land; it is also a tool of colonizing the indigenous population, the inhabitants of that land (space). Indigenous people have an intimate, intrinsic relationship with homeland. Keith Basso (1996:106) apparently recognizes this relationship with landscape when he speaks of “sense of place” and the relationships people have with landscapes that consequently ascribes meaning to those spaces. For many indigenous populations the sense of place literally and figuratively defines individual and collective identity.

Indigenous histories and family genealogies are connected to place. Knowledge of healing and medicine plants is connected to place. Some of us believe that an illness can only be cured by plant medicines that grow in one’s homeland. For example, Gold Thread from a locale outside of the homeland will not be effective, only that from home. This is tied to understandings of traditional belief that Creator gave original instructions to each community of people; those instructions included how to live with the land and all others sharing that land. We are in relationship with all of whom we share space; animals, birds, fishes, insects, trees, plants, and even land formations. Vine Deloria

explains this relationship as being one “of respect, not of orthodoxy” (2001:21). There are many Indian people who will not leave their homeland for specialized medical treatment, even for a life threatening illness because of a lack of personal relationship with place.

Indigenous people are connected to the place where our ancestors reside. Not only are their physical remains interred in the soil of a particular place, but part of their spirits continue to reside in their homeland. Honoring of ancestral burial sites and the ancestors themselves is a responsibility not taken lightly. This is also true of ceremonial sites. For many, particular ceremonies must be performed in specific locales.

The disconnection and removal from ancestral lands and resources which has occurred with colonization produce a lack of rootedness in this world. The sense of being connected to place is essential for survival and well-being; it is essential for identity formation, for a sense of belonging that is as deep as that of belonging to family and community. The colonizing powers viewed space as a locale for extracting resources to provide wealth. Indigenous peoples acknowledge a responsibility given by Creator to care-take the resources; resources that will, if used and cared for with respect, provide all that are necessary to sustain life.

This sense of place is perhaps best captured by a tribal elder in a conversation following a conference we attended in 2014.

I was so interested by what Jessie Little Doe said last weekend when she was talking, ‘In our language, my land. My land is as connected to me as my foot and my hand and my ancestors are as connected to me as those things and when you dig up my land, you’re cutting into me, you’re cutting into my ancestors, you’re cutting into my spirit, my heart, my body.’ And that is something that is a complete disconnect from, really I think, all non-Indian anthropologists. I think some try to empathize with it and may actually do that. But do they actually understand that from the

same perspective that Native people do? I don't think that's possible, because it isn't their land and it isn't their ancestors so they can understand it maybe intellectually, some of those that really make an effort, but can they viscerally feel it? And that's where the disconnect lies. [personal communication, October 23, 2014]

Once the people were removed, the resources taken, the place names changed, and the landscapes no longer recognizable, indigenous lives were forever changed. Communities, families, and cultures became fragmented. The spiritual connection to place was broken. From Linda Tuhiwai Smith we learn of the consequences of European place-name changes in Maori lives; "this newly named land became increasingly disconnected from the songs and chants used by indigenous peoples to trace their histories, to bring forth spiritual elements or to carry out the simplest of ceremonies" (1999:51).

Anthropology has continued and expanded Euro-American colonization of indigenous space. Through archaeological excavations, sacred sites and habitation sites have been legally looted: cultural artifacts have been removed from sites and placed (most often) far-away in museum or university collections where descendant owners have little or no access; in the many decades of North American Archaeology preceding the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), burial sites were looted for not only grave goods and sacred items but also the very bodies of our ancestors, all of which were once again removed to collection facilities or traded to other anthropologists as far away as Europe and Asia; medicine plants have been collected, examined, and catalogued along with the traditional knowledge systems relating to the plants. This translates to not only a physical colonization of space, but also one which impacts the spiritual space of indigenous people.

During a research interview, one tribal elder recalls an experience in recovering ancestral remains from a construction site, prefacing with why the site should have been avoided;

a good archaeological friend of ours...forewarned them, and did that in writing...that this was a very sensitive place and they went ahead with it anyway. Talk about anger, and incredulity about people's lack of sensitivity about our burial places but...It wants to bring tears to my eyes now even just thinking about that kind of project. It was sort of the epitome of the lack of White people's sensitivity. After all, this is about our ancestors who were buried here and it's about a very sacred place. But anyway, when it comes to things that I've participated in, that was a major, major project, oh my goodness. [personal communication, August 3, 2015]

2. Colonization of Memory & History

Political, social, and economic subjugation of the colonized by the colonizer is also accomplished through erasure of group history and devaluation of oral tradition. When Europeans "discovered" the Americas, the peoples indigenous to this "New World" were considered uncivilized because they held no alphabetic system of writing. As new histories were written, ethnographies documented, and anthropological studies conducted, a Westernized construct of the colonized peoples was developed. Histories were written from the perspective of the colonizer's view of the normal (that being the hegemonic perspective), and ethnographic studies and anthropological analyses were conducted through a European, and later Euro-American lens.

Walter Mignolo (2003:125-170) speaks of writing histories of people without history. This is in reference to the European belief that only history recorded by alphabetic writing was accurate, that those populations who used symbols, iconography, and pictograms were uncivilized and incapable of recording their own history. In this context, European colonizers wrote their history for them, and that history began with

colonization; any temporal or spatial events that preceded colonization were considered “prehistoric” events.

Alison Wylie equates the writing of the history of the colonized by the colonizer as a form of domination:

typically these histories employ a stock set of strategies for naturalizing conditions of colonial domination, denying an indigenous, colonized population any capacity for historical agency. Colonial interests lie in inculcating standard racist assumptions about the inherent “backwardness” of those who have been subjugated but not annihilated or assimilated. The presumed incapacity of indigenous people for achievement, their failure to manifest “progressive development,” is seized upon in various of the areas prized by Europeans as marks of “civilization”: for example, social complexity, agriculture, technology, science, and religious and aesthetic or cultural sophistication. In the process, indigenous cultural identities are at once fragmented and constructed as monolithic...Whatever the specific target, colonial “subjects” are denied any identity other than that constructed for them as subjects, and this identity is framed by a series of contrasts with (or reversals of) whatever attributes the dominant colonial population values as distinctive signs of its identity and superiority. It is then entrenched by means of racist assumptions to the effect that these alleged inadequacies are natural and essential to the identity of the subjugated population as African, South Asian, American Indian, creole or mestizo, or Latin American indigene...[1995:260]

Mignolo deals with “alternate forms of writing, recording, and transmitting the past in ways that allow for a reframing of the debate on fiction, literature, and history within the context of literacy, colonization, and the writing of histories of people without histories” (2003:126). In referencing Edouard Glissant (1928-2011) he states, “for Glissant history and literature were just instruments of the Western empire to suppress and subjugate other forms of recording the past and of finding means of interaction for which literature became the paradigm” (2003:126).

Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) was an early 18th century recorder. He postulates three ages of man in a universal history of mankind, each with its own language. The

first is the age of gods with hieroglyphics representing a form of language, the second is the age of heroes with signs and heroic enterprises, and the third is the age of men, or humans, with alphabetic writing. From this model, Vico determined that a civil history was possible with each nation writing its own history using the “language” of the period (Mignolo 2003:145). This premise certainly seems like an alternate mirroring of social Darwinism.

Alice Beck Kehoe connects Vico’s philosophy with the field of archaeology when she writes, “Vico saw oral tradition and documents as artifacts to be examined for their reflection of past states of mind rather than as authority” (1998:1). She further states, “Vico was not an archaeologist, but his formulation of the field of human history laid the philosophical foundation for the discipline of archaeology” (1998:1). Those “philosophical foundations” also laid the groundwork for anthropological theories to be developed which would explain the position of indigenous peoples in social hierarchies and their position in early theories of biological differences.

Building on Vico, Italian historian and ethnographer Bernardo Boturini Benaducci (1702-1753) developed a new concept of history and historiographical writing in 1749 following a protracted journey to Mexico. Boturini concluded that the Amerindians had their own forms of writing prior to European invasion, and that utilization of these writings recorded their histories prior to 1492. Based on the three ages set forth by Vico, Boturini determined that every human community had its own way of recording the past and that alphabetic writing in relationship to the recording of history was an invention of the West. Even with all of his work in developing this concept and understanding the various methods used in the “New World” for recording history, Boturini still had

difficulties avoiding incorporating his own experiences, worldview, and cultural past into his analysis. He still incorporated overlays of the Christian belief system and writing the Amerindian past into a universal history written from a European perspective which placed Europe as the center of the known world. However, Boturini was clear that no one model of a universal history is more accurate than any other (Mignolo 2003:143-165), despite some of his analysis to the contrary.

In making reference to Michel Foucault's (1969) *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith tells us that in speaking of the cultural archive, Foucault states that the archive is the "general system of the formation and transformation of statements" (1999:144). Within this "archive" are all of the rules of imparting knowledge, philosophy, and definitions of human nature—from a Western perspective. In the "formation and transformation" of statements, power structures are developed and utilized in the oppression and colonization of nations and communities. Archives of "recorded histories" from the lens of the colonizer are kept in order to maintain a fictional construct of literary supremacy which negates any possibility of negotiating power relations or privilege. Foucault (2010) also suggests that the archive contains the "rules of practice" for which there is no Western definition because they are taken for granted. Smith (1999) writes that indigenous people can define the rules of practice because they have been the objects of that practice. Perhaps we can view these practices of recording and archiving histories as some of the tools used to build the "Master's house" (Lorde 1984); when we reclaim our histories and reframe them using an indigenous lens that is embedded in oral tradition, we are able to use the same tools to refute, restructure, and decolonize history.

In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* Linda Tuhiwai

Smith references Albert Memmi [1991] by stating,

the fact that indigenous societies had their own systems of order was dismissed through what Albert Memmi referred to as a series of negations: they were not fully human, they were not civilized enough to have systems, they were not literate, their languages and modes of thought were inadequate. [1999:28]

Smith (1999) presents fundamental ideas which are related to understandings of being human and of how humans relate to the world. For indigenous peoples, beliefs are carried and preserved in stories and memories, and they are embedded in indigenous languages. When tribal histories are written by tribal members, those histories restore the agency of indigenous people that was removed through the colonial archives. Rewritten histories from an indigenous perspective also provides for development of theories based in indigenous understandings of the past, theories which will “empower” indigenous people (Anzaldúa 1990).

Again in *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Smith addresses the issue of writing and history from an indigenous perspective, providing one example of conflicting ideologies between academe and indigenous people:

it is not simply about giving an oral account or a genealogical naming of the land and the events which raged over it, but a very powerful need to give testimony to and restore a spirit, to bring back into existence a world fragmented and dying. The sense of history conveyed by these approaches is not the same thing as the discipline of history, and so our accounts collide, crash into each other. [1999:28]

Peter Schmidt and Thomas Patterson edited a book in 1995 titled, *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Societies*. From the Introduction on pg. 13 they write,

if the false separation between science and history silences the contribution of Third World archaeologists within science, so too does the dichotomy between prehistory and history. Both archaeologists and historians of the First World widely accept the validity of prehistory as a concept that applies to preliterate or nonliterate societies, whose pasts can be known to us only through study of archaeological remains. This idea carries with it the additional implication that nonliterate societies lack histories, a view that represents their pasts as mythic because they are expressed through folk histories and oral traditions (Schmidt 1983a, 1983b).

It must be stated that so-called Third World histories are often recorded in petroglyphs, cave paintings, wampum, etc. In examining the terms “First World” and “Third World” it is clear that the term “First World” means technologically advanced, educationally superior, and economically stable while those relegated to the “Third World” remain primitive. Obviously “First World” is deemed superior to “Third World.” From a “Third World” perspective however, we might look at all Europeans as belonging to either a “Second World” or a “Third World” as our (indigenous) “First World” has been turned upside down by European invasion; we were the “First World” in the Americas and in Africa. When our histories are written by those who have no experience of sharing in them, we can view those histories as being colonized.

In referencing Michel Foucault (1977), Barbara Misztal states, “Foucault defined counter-memory as a political force of people who are marginalized by universal discourses, whose knowledges have been disqualified as inadequate to their task, insufficiently elaborated or as naive knowledges, located low down in the hierarchy” (2004:77). Holding fast to our memories, and our memory of our histories, may be viewed as an act of resistance to colonization as well as a form of ensuring survival as a people.

Smith writes a chapter in *Decolonizing Methodologies* titled “Research Through Imperial Eyes” describing “an approach which assumes that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only ideas which can make sense of the world, or reality, of social life, and of human beings” (1999:56). To indigenous people this concept is one of the world being turned upside down; it represents a foreign notion that is far removed from our own reality, and an idea that serves only to divorce us from our memories.

One elder I spoke with while doing research interviews remembers her experiences with an ethnographer as having oral tradition explained away by science or the influence of Christianity, which somehow diminishes the validity or importance of the stories for indigenous people.

There were some that he would explain away scientifically like...Swamp Gas, things like that but I didn't take his explanation...I chose to believe in the myth or legend rather than his scientific explanation of it. Which, I'm not saying he was wrong, but I just chose to believe what I wanted to believe.... Sometimes it would be a religious explanation, oh of like the dance where a young girl was dancing with a guy and the mother noticed that the guy's feet were hooves so he was the devil...she interpreted it. Well, he could explain that as, well that was because of the Catholic influence.... And to me, it's what you choose to believe. I mean, I choose to believe my grandmother's stories, for whatever reason. The [names tribe] stories, I think there's value. [personal communication, July 14, 2015]

One chapter of Mignolo's book *Darker Side of the Renaissance* (2003), titled “Genres as Social Practices: Histories, *Enkyclopaideias*, and the Limits of Knowledge and Understanding,” finds the author speaking of Bernardino de Sahagún (1499-1590) and his Florentine Codex.

Sahagún was concerned with rhetoric, oratory, and ethics when collecting and organizing the material for book 6 of the Florentine Codex...*elders were respected as the repository of knowledge and source of wisdom.*

During the Renaissance, alphabetic writing and books replaced the 'men of wisdom.' [2003:209, emphasis added]

The colonization of our memories happened when our histories were questioned and “corrected,” or when our spiritual beliefs were supplanted by forced Christianity, when our landscape was forever changed, when place names were changed, when our ceremonies and our languages were forbidden. These are things which have been taken away and forever changed. What the Europeans co-opted from us was the right to keep our memories; the Europeans and later the Americans knew that retention of memory presents a danger to the colonizer, memory ensures that our identities as a separate, non-colonized people remain intact. That danger is real and has strong implications. Partha Chatterjee perceives memory of the past as a threat to the colonizer when he states, “in the historical mode of recalling the past, the power to represent oneself is nothing other than political power itself” (1995:229).

3. Colonization of Language

We know, from both oral tradition and early documentation that many of the early European explorers who became interested in the lands and resources of the Americas learned enough of the indigenous peoples' languages to communicate. If Christopher Columbus, Samuel de Champlain, or Jacques Cartier did not learn the languages themselves, they had members of their exploration parties who became quite adept in indigenous languages. Conversely, indigenous people learned Spanish, French, English, etc. Missionaries also learned indigenous languages in order to translate Christian dogma and the Christian bible for purposes of forced conversion. Gradually, these beautiful indigenous languages were replaced with those of the European colonists and European languages became the language of instruction, the language of economy, and the

language that constructed socio-political hierarchies.

Mignolo (2003) clearly states that replacing indigenous languages with that of the European invader was a method of creating social and political hierarchies; a method of establishing power and exerting control over the original inhabitants of a land; a method of colonization. The Archbishop of Mexico, Francisco Antonio Lorenzana y Buitrón (1722-1804) lamented the fact that after 200 years the Amerindians still had not learned the Castilian language despite a mandate by Spanish law (Mignolo 2003). Here Mignolo quotes Lorenzana,

the Mexican (language), in itself meager and barbarous, was made more abundant by the Castilians who learned it and invented various compositions of words so to adorn it: in their Language, the Indians had no terms for the Holy Sacraments of the Church, nor for the Mysteries of our Holy Faith, and even today they cannot find their own (words) to explain them, such as would give an exact idea. [2003:63]

This quote certainly illuminates Eurocentrism and the belief of Christian European nations that the only legitimate way of being in the world was to adhere to the European worldview. Mignolo cautions us to not relegate this example only to Spain or only to the past,

...the situation repeated itself under the English, French, and German expansions during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and it is still alive today among certain sectors of the population, who consider Amerindian languages inferior to Castilian, French, or English and cannot understand why Amerindians resist the benefits of culture and civilization. [2003:63-64]

Indigenous peoples of the Americas have words and phrases that describe the natural world in which they live, and describe their understandings of ancient systems of knowledge. When translated into a dominant language of a European colonizer, much of the meaning of indigenous languages may be changed, lost, or rendered nonsensical.

Joseph H. Suina illustrates this point in reporting the words of a Pueblo grandmother to her grand-daughter:

as you're growing up here you will hear things, see things and be involved in activities where the white man's tongue has no place. They can never be explained in English because that language does not have the capacity to explain these things. [2004:289]

In one example of misinterpretation of an Athabaskan word, Beth Dementi-Leonard and Perry Gilmore, in examining a language revitalization project in an Alaskan Athabaskan community report,

...inaccuracies in the way missionaries had previously translated the Koyukon word *hutlaane*. The word was translated as "superstition," which carries a condescending, "primitive," and negative interpretation. Further research and more extensive knowledge of Koyukon worldviews... indicate that this word more accurately refers to maintaining a system of laws that governs a symbiotic relationship between humans and their environment, the violation of which can disturb or disrupt the natural order of the environment. The subtle difference in translation suggests a dramatically different and enlightened worldview, more akin to the prestigious ecological awareness of the "Western" scientific community. [1999:42]

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Indian Residential Boarding Schools were established in the U.S. with the primary focus of assimilating American Indian children to the Euro-American society, worldview, and conversion to Christianity. The process of assimilation consisted of the forced adoption of Western clothing, hair styles, religious belief, and language. Children were punished for any infractions that indicated an adherence to their traditional beings. Punishment consisted of the withholding of food, of beatings, of being placed in solitary confinement, and of mouths being "washed with soap."

Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore write in an article for *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*,

many of the native children in this region as well as other parts of Alaska were forced into English-speaking school experiences and recall the confusion and pain of these experiences when they were not able to understand the teachers' requests and were often shamed and humiliated for not understanding. These experiences were marked with stigma and insubordination. [1999:42]

For those individuals who were able to return to their communities as adults, reintegration was extremely difficult and hindered by the loss of their native languages; conversation with family and elders who spoke no English was impossible, engaging in community activities difficult, and participation in religious ceremonies incomprehensible as these ceremonies were conducted in the original language. The following generations would be disconnected from their personal and collective histories, landscapes, and knowledge systems without use of original language.

A great deal of time and effort has been, and continues to be, invested by indigenous communities in the reclamation, or revitalization, and preservation of languages. As indigenous cultures, artifacts, ceremonies, and knowledge systems have been collected and studied by anthropologists, the same has been true of indigenous languages. For many indigenous communities, archived linguistic materials, especially sound tapes, are inaccessible due to distance and financial constraints. Also, as one elder said in an interview, "and universities make sure that you can't access those articles if you're not part of their system" (personal communication, October 23, 2014).

For the communities who do have easy access, these collections are often invaluable tools in language revitalization. One such program is the Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project in Mashpee, Massachusetts. Jessie Little Doe Baird speaks of the Wampanoag language having become a written language in the 18th century due to efforts of Christian missionaries, but that it had essentially "died out" by the mid-1800s. She

began a program to revitalize the language in the mid-1990s, based, in part, on a recurrent dream that included a segment of Wampanoag prophesy; that prophesy stated that “the children of those who had had a hand in breaking the language cycle would help heal it” (Baird 2012). With this impetus, Jessie Little Doe obtained a Master’s Degree in Linguistics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and began the reclamation of the Wampanoag language. In this sense, the work of anthropologists may be seen as a positive, helpful endeavor; but even in this, there are important negative aspects from an indigenous perspective.

While Jesse Little Doe was fortunate in finding materials with which to work, linguistic anthropologists have not necessarily been pro-active in initiating or assisting tribes in language preservation or reclamation. In speaking with a tribal elder while conducting an interview, I asked if linguistic anthropologists had provided any materials, or language reclamation assistance from what they had collected in working with her tribe and her response was: “linguistics is something that many people have studied and one thing that I have noticed, that I’ve found astounding, everybody else [anthropologists as opposed to tribal members] worked in this field forever and brought us nothing, absolutely nothing, helped us not at all, did nothing for us with our language” (personal communication, October 23, 2014). In critiquing the role of Linguistic Anthropology, and Anthropology in general, this same elder went on to explain that in her opinion

the biggest problem I’ve seen with Anthropology from a standpoint of understandings is, how foolish could you have been to think you could study Algonquian people and not talk to the linguists all these years? I’ve talked to so many anthropologists who say, “I don’t know anything about linguists” and linguists who say, “I don’t talk to the anthropologists.” Then we, as Native people studied our language and Anthropology and we say, “My God, it’s all there.” It’s a simple...open up this book, open up that book, put it side by side...that word tells you what it means...that this

basket design means this. The lack of interdisciplinarity is even I think worse than the lack of indigenous people in say the Four Fields in Anthropology...they must, must, must talk across fields because our world cannot become compartmentalized in the same way as theirs. It is not an atomized world, it is a relational world, everything interrelates with everything else and if you break us up into many pieces you see static Indians. [personal communication, October 23, 2014]

Patrick Eisenlohr is one anthropologist who has concerns about the lack of accessibility to archived language collections, especially those that have been electronically digitized; but Eisenlohr perceives aspects of this process that could be of graver concern by writing,

using electronic mediation in language activism implies availability and affordability of access but also some political and economic control over production and dissemination of electronically mass-mediated discourse ...[this] could result in new forms of social inequality and control...the use of electronic mass mediation...is often shaped by power relations between state institutions and populations with an interest in language revitalization or, alternatively, on the ability of such groups to generate necessary resources independently through the middle class or through their ability to attract support from nongovernmental organizations. [2004:26]

Another key obstacle to the linguistic anthropological “mining” of indigenous languages is the objections of some communities to outsiders being exposed to their languages. Eisenlohr recognizes this indigenous concern when he tells us, “...the wide circulation of discourse in a minority language through mass mediation of any sort can also be viewed as a danger to its value and authenticity and therefore to a central ideological credential as an emblem of community” (2004:27). Jane Hill has also written about the reticence exhibited by some indigenous communities to publication of their language. Hill writes,

when the publication of the *Hopi Dictionary* (Hopi Dictionary Project 1998) was announced by the University of Arizona Press, officers of the Hopi Tribe were extremely concerned that the publication of the dictionary would put Hopi in the public domain and reduce the tribe’s

control over the language. They did not want the publisher to profit from the sale of the language and wished to control the copyright of the dictionary. [2002:122]

The colonization of our languages represents yet one more (mis)appropriation by Euro-American populations who lay claim to whatever in the world they see and want, for whatever reasoning, and most often for personal gain. This conveys the sense of a universal ownership, by that I mean it represents a furthering of cultural imperialism by way of claiming ownership through control of the materials being archived; when an institution gains control of ethnographic materials, those materials become the property of that institution, much in the way in which our ancestors remains and belongings placed in their graves have been claimed as a part of “American” history and part of archaeological collections of museums and universities. Jane Hill views universal ownership as effectively alienating “endangered languages from their speakers and other members of communities in which the languages are spoken” (2002:120). The Western concept of universal ownership of indigenous language is explored in more depth further in this section through the writing of K. David Harrison’s (2007).

Indigenous languages are also imbued with holding “intrinsic value,” which places them in the same category as other coveted resources. Hill refers to this as “hyperbolic valorization” and explains the term thus: “the discourse of hyperbolic valorization converts endangered languages into objects more suitable for preservation in museums patronized by exceptionally discerning elites than for ordinary use in everyday life by imperfect human beings” (2002:120).

For many of us, indigenous language falls under intellectual property rights, not commodities to be sold or traded on open global markets. As intellectual property,

indigenous languages are viewed as an area of traditional knowledge systems to be protected; the dissemination of such knowledge to be controlled by indigenous individuals or communities, not academic communities. As indigenous people take advantage of educational opportunities they become proficient in engaging in global discourses and understandings of key issues relating to indigenous rights. The misappropriation of indigenous languages may be viewed as a violation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, Article 31:

Article 31

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions.... They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.

[\[http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf\]](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf)

In 2011 in a panel discussion on the role of languages and culture in the identity of indigenous people, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, Kyung-wha Kang stated that “as indigenous languages die, so too do integral parts of indigenous peoples’ cultures, a process that often involves violations of indigenous peoples’ human rights to culture, language and even self-determination” (<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/HRC18PanelIndigenous.aspx>). While the entire concept of intellectual property rights is a Western concept, it may be viewed as another of the tools of the colonizer which indigenous people can appropriate to regain agency. Utilizing this tool as a method of practicing self-determination does not diminish the fact that traditional indigenous peoples consider languages as a cultural and even spiritual component, crucial in group identity, landscape, and ceremony.

An elder in northern New England worked with an ethnographer to create an indigenous language dictionary. In our interview I learned that while listening to taped interviews conducted by the ethnographer, this elder found that some of the informants were family members.

Even today, I can put in one of those cassette tapes and hear my grandmother, or my Aunt...or Uncle talking and whether they're speaking in English or in [Indian], it just sounds so nice to hear. And for that, I'm thankful for him, for recording that and a lot of history of my family. But I've always been thankful that he did that because I wouldn't be able to sit and listen...and it takes me back too...it's just like being in the room with them again. (personal communication, July 14, 2015)

This elder goes on to say that the tapes are now archived at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire and that the only reason she has copies of the tapes is because they were copied for her, and given to her by John Moody. But even though she appreciates being able to hear the voices of members of her family who have passed on, she has some regrets that the tapes were created. "But I am thankful that [he] recorded all that. I'm not necessarily thankful that everybody else can get copies of it. I can talk about those things, but I don't want everybody in the world talking about them, because they're special to me" (personal communication, July, 14, 2015). She also perceives that recorded family histories, stories that are openly available, could be damaging or embarrassing to living family members today. "Family histories. That so and so had a baby, and what happened to that, she wasn't married, and that kind of thing. I didn't think that that should be information that should be out" (personal communication, July 14, 2015).

As indigenous people, are we being too critical of the collecting and warehousing by linguistic anthropologists of our languages and the knowledges embedded in these

languages? Are we being selfish in wanting control of how these materials are archived and disseminated? Pre-European invasion, the indigenous peoples of the Americas lived in societies which overwhelmingly consisted of egalitarian political structures. Because of this history, Indian people have been known for generosity in all things, which is most likely one of the reasons we have lost so much.

K. David Harrison's writing in *When Languages Die* moves me to believe we haven't been protective enough. He tells us that "languages are complex systems of knowledge" and "repositories for cultural knowledge" (2007:5), and that "language disappearance is an erosion or extinction of ideas, ways of knowing, and ways of talking about the world and human experience" (2007:7). Harrison, by his own words, states that his book about endangered languages and language loss is written from a scientific perspective. From this perspective he writes, "linguists and anthropologists have set out to see what science may learn from these knowledge systems while they are still functioning and available for study" (2007:10).

Other scientific observations about endangered languages made by Harrison include this statement: "the fact that bodies of knowledge are rapidly passing into forgetfulness makes that task urgent, but it is really no different than other scientific pursuits, for example, the rush to document animal species before they pass into extinction" (2007:10). And Harrison provides us with three major reasons for documenting endangered languages that include "our human knowledge base is rapidly eroding," "our rich patrimony of human cultural heritage, including myth and belief systems, wisdom, poetry, songs, and epic tales" and finally "the great puzzle of human cognition and our ability to understand how the mind organizes and processes

information” (2007:19-20).

My point in referencing these quotes from Harrison is to illuminate some of the Western rationale supporting the mining and archiving of indigenous languages. Each of his quotes supports a concept of universal ownership, that somehow these indigenous languages *belong* to, and exist for, Western consumption thereby becoming a part of Western systems of knowledge.

So while the languages of indigenous communities are seen by Harrison (who presents as the embodiment of scientific inquiry and knowledge) to be of universal import and ownership, the preservation of these languages really falls under the same category as “the rush to document animal species before they pass into extinction.” This distillation of all that language encompasses in the indigenous worldview leads me to think we need to be ever-more vigilant and protective of what remains.

D. The Consequences of Colonization: Psychological Traumas

More than 100 years ago James Collier wrote that “civilization is not a thing, but a cerebral state, which the colonists carry with them in their brains” (1905:252). This idea of “civilization being a cerebral state” transported by the colonists to invaded and stolen lands was manifested in indigenous assimilation, sometimes through force and other times unconsciously integrated into the indigenous psyche. Further in this section we shall see how anthropology has contributed to these psychological tactics.

The many writings of Jack Forbes (1934-2011) exhibit a crucial understanding of the ways in which psychology was used as a very effective tool in the colonization of indigenous peoples. Forbes was an educator of Powhatan-Renapé-Lenape descent who held an undergraduate degree in Philosophy and graduate degrees in History and

Anthropology. He adhered to a traditional indigenous worldview and from that perspective described psychosis as a “sickness of the soul [or] spirit” (2008:173).

Indigenous worldview tells us that all things in the universe are connected. It also tells us that our well-being is not dependent only on physical health but is a holistic state; that physical, mental, and spiritual are all one thing and one being. In order to be a whole person, a person in balance, our physical, spiritual, and mental conditions must all be well, in a good place, and in balance with the entirety of all creation. Our worldview tells us that if any part of our being is out of balance, then the other parts are negatively affected. This is understood to be crucial to human survival.

Psychological traumas incurred through the process of colonization have had lingering effects on indigenous peoples to the present day. From the onset of European invasion, torture, rape, starvation, germ warfare, slavery, and wholesale genocide kept the victims of these forms of violence in a constant state of hyper-vigilance. Today we use the term Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) to encapsulate the effects of these experiences which have been passed, generation to generation, through the telling of family and tribal histories. Without a final “scientific” determination on the validity of what is termed “historical,” or “genetic,” memory, there are a number of indigenous people who believe that we carry the remnants of those traumas within us, and the fear of actual recurrence of the events that initially produced the traumas.

As the methods of psychological traumas were proven to be a successful contributing factor to the process of colonization, similar forms of psychological violence were found to be useful in maintaining state control of indigenous populations, individually and collectively; in fact, Forbes (2008:132) referred to these as “collective

brutality.” Once the so called Indian Wars were ended, the remnants of tribes moved to small reservation land, and the totality of the North American continent stolen in that greed which Forbes (2008:24-25) terms ‘cannibalism’, the policies of extermination were found to be not 100 percent successful. In keeping with the typical European model of paternalism, policies had to be created and enacted which would maintain control of the remaining indigenous population, and which would ensure the safety of the hegemonic, hierarchal form of United States governing. In other words, above all else, white male property rights *must* be protected. Most assuredly, as Franz Fanon stated in *Black Skin, White Masks* this is a part of “...the psychological phenomena that governs the relationship between the colonized and the colonizer” (1967:83), an assimilation to the dominant culture in an unconscious attempt to be accepted by that culture as anything but “Other” or a conscious act to ensure survival. In the acceptance of hegemonic power traits, whether it be intentional or socially acquired, the replication of those traits may be a method of negotiating a space within the white, male dominated, capitalist world.

Frantz Fanon (1925-1961), Martinique born, was a practicing psychiatrist, whose work was focused on the psychopathology of colonization; as such, his writing reflects the thought processes involved in his analyses of the binary of colonizer-colonized, oppressor-oppressed, white-black. His work was influenced by phenomenology, and it is that study of structure of consciousness that suggests that much of his writing may be based on his personal life’s experiences and his analysis of those experiences. Fanon (1967) dedicates a not inconsiderable amount of space in *Black Skin, White Masks* to incidents of racist practice that produce “inferiority complexes;” what is now termed “internalized racism.” Internalized racism is the contemporary term for the self-hatred,

and often hatred of one's own people, which is often held by people of color; it may be related to color, gender, or class.

Threats, overt or implied, and fear are effective tools of manipulation and control. State control of indigenous people was accomplished through governmental policies which endeavored to assimilate them to the Euro-American way of life. Governmental boarding schools were established in order to break the on-going passing of traditional knowledge systems from generation to generation and to remove the chances of the survival of cultural, spiritual, and linguistic knowledge. To leave communities empty of entire generations of children was an act of psychological violence that can barely be imagined. Many of those sent to boarding schools were never seen again by their communities or families. Many did not survive the experience.

Negative stereotypes which began in the earliest days following European invasion were perpetuated and expanded upon; beliefs that Indians are uncivilized, intellectually inferior, pagans or heathens, lazy, dirty, drunkards, and promiscuous. Even if the "civilizing" goals of the boarding schools were met, these stereotypes would not disappear. The labelling and assignment of negative attributes produces psychological conditions of low self-esteem, belief of inferiority, and further social, political, and economic marginalization. Jack Forbes made reference to this form of colonization by writing,

not only do the oppressed usually adopt the guidelines set by the colonizers...but these guidelines often embody the notion of racial and cultural inferiority. Thus the conquered masses feel inferior to the ruling group, and the in-between people, the mixed bloods and the de-nativized, usually go to extreme lengths to identify with the rulers. [2008:95]

This statement by Forbes was built on Paulo Freire's writing in *Pedagogy of the*

Oppressed, “for cultural invasion to succeed, it is essential that those invaded become convinced of their intrinsic inferiority” (2012:153).

In northern New England the instituting of state sanctioned, and eventually state mandated, Eugenics policies which began in the 1920s continued and promoted the earlier Policies of Extermination. While Eugenics programs were essentially nationwide, in northern New England the effects on families of non-consent sterilizations continue to present day. In indigenous communities and individual families, children are treasured and hold a position of the highest importance. To be denied the basic human right of procreation produces psychological pain, especially in a culture which places such high value on children and family. To this day, individuals still speak of family members who were “hunted down, rounded up” and removed to state mental institutions or reform schools and who subsequently in later life had no children. Some of these personal, family stories were shared with Nancy Gallagher during the research phase of her thesis and writing of the book *Breeding Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State* (1999:81-85). These policies produced a multi-generational fear of state agencies, hospitals, and medical doctors; these fears continue to exist today in the older generations and the stories are passed down as family oral tradition.

E. 19th and 20th Century Violence and the Role of Anthropology

...it is not difficult to see why many subjugated people regard anthropologists as the rear guard of the conqueror's invasion force. Whenever the United States Army defeated a band of native people in battle, anthropologists from the Bureau of American Ethnology usually followed close behind and quickly set about doing salvage anthropology. Their goal was to gather as much information about the “dying” cultures as possible and to trundle away as many ethnographic artifacts as they could.

Richard O. Clemmer [1972:215]

The many insidious psychological tactics used by the European colonizers, and later the new American government, have been supported and furthered by the discipline of Anthropology. Paulo Freire tells us that “in order to dominate, the dominator has no choice but to deny true praxis to the people, deny them the right to say their own word and think their own thoughts” (2012:126). Anthropology has collected what indigenous peoples tell of their own histories, not in such a way that would contribute to historical understandings, but more as a way of presenting examples of the “odd” ways in which some humans imagine the world. This practice devalues oral tradition and understandings of traditional ways of producing knowledge. Freire refers to this as “cultural invasion” and writes,

the theory of antidiological action has one last fundamental characteristic: cultural invasion, which like divisive tactics and manipulation also serves the ends of conquest. In this phenomenon, the invaders penetrate the cultural context of another group, in disrespect of the latter’s potentialities; they impose their own view of the world upon those they invade and inhibit the creativity of the invaded by curbing their expression. [2012:152]

And further states,

cultural invasion, which serves the ends of conquest and the preservation of oppression, always involves a parochial view of reality, a static perception of the world, and the imposition of one world view upon another. It implies the “superiority” of the invader and the “inferiority” of those who are invaded, as well as the imposition of values by the former, who possess the latter and are afraid of losing them. [2012:160]

Manifest Destiny was a 19th century imperialistic belief that North America was a “no-man’s land” (*terra nullius*); indigenous peoples did not use land in the same manner as the Euro-Americans, they did not practice individual ownership, and they did not exploit the resources or engage in agriculture or pastoralism in the same way as did the Euro-Americans. Due to this lack of “civilized” land use, coupled with a lack of

alphabetic writing and non-practice of Christianity, the Euro-Americans believed that God meant their destiny to be one of expansionism; displacing indigenous people, settling and owning the land and resources from the Atlantic shores to the Pacific Ocean. The so-called “Indian Problem” was, in truth, nothing more than a term that described Indian attempts to stave off Euro-American encroachment on tribal village sites and subsistence grounds. Policies to remove Indians and obtain their lands for white settlement began with the first waves of European invasion.

According to David Price, Thomas Jefferson proposed a plan in the late 18th-early 19th centuries to deal with the Indian Problem.

Jefferson’s counterinsurgency operation [r/t his plan for teaching agriculture to Indians in order to remove the necessity of forested land for hunting, which land then could be opened up for white settlement] recognized that the US government could provide economic incentives for Indians to become more dependent on raising stock, and therefore “abandoning hunting,” which would open more lands for the US government to claim. This planned destruction of the Indian’s reliance on their traditional economy would necessarily erode cultural cohesion. [2011:13]

Following the U.S. Civil War, the movement toward western expansion was marked by the so-called Indian Wars. As populations of Euro-Americans in the East grew, hunger for more lands resulted in further displacement of indigenous peoples in the western territories amid demands for white settlement.

Alice Fletcher (1838-1923) was an American Ethnologist who lived with and studied the Omaha Indians in the late 1800s in what is now the state of Nebraska. Fletcher adhered to Lewis Henry Morgan’s (1818-1881) anthropological theory of Cultural Evolution which posited that all cultural groups traversed the same stages of development and in the same order, ranging from a state of barbarism to one of

civilization. Fletcher believed that the only way for American Indians to advance to a civilized state of being would be to follow the white American practice of private land ownership, farm the land, and adopt Western modes of existence. She became a staunch proponent of allotment, the distribution of communally owned land to individual tribal members. Fletcher was hired by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in 1882 to survey Indian lands. This position and activity culminated in the enactment and enforcing of the 1887 Dawes Act, or Allotment Act, which proved to be a dismal failure for indigenous peoples and a huge success for the taking of yet more land by white Americans, expanding the colonization process through encroachment of tribal territories (http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/people/d_h/fletcher.htm).

The General Allotment Act of 1887 was perhaps the ultimate expression of Friere's (2012:152) explanation of the "Cultural Invasion" phenomenon. The General Allotment Act of 1887, also known simply as the Allotment Act or more popularly the Dawes Act (named for its author, Senator Henry Laurens Dawes of Massachusetts), was designed specifically to address two concerns of the United States government: destruction of tribal cohesiveness through forced assimilation of individuals; western expansion for white settlers. This act gave the President of the United States authority to have tribal lands surveyed and divided into individual allotments; each head-of-household would receive 160 acres of communally held reservation land to be individually owned, and each single person (male of course) would be granted 80 acres of land. The act also provided that every allotment recipient who adopted a "civilized" life lived separately from the tribe would be granted United States citizenship. After the allotments were distributed, any excess reservation land would be available for general

land sale to white settlers. The federal government held the allotment lands in trust for 25 years after which individuals could sell their land.

Vine Deloria held strong opinions of the devastating results to Indians of the Allotment Act, which eventually affected the majority of Indian Nations in the United States:

by 1934 Indians had lost nearly 90 million acres through land sales, many of them fraudulent. The basic device for holding individual lands was the trust, under which an Indian was declared to be incompetent. Indians were encouraged to ask for their papers of competency, after which land was sold for a song by the untutored Indian who had never heard of buying and selling land by means of a paper. [1988:47]

In 1893 the Dawes Commission was established in order to include the “Five Civilized Tribes” (Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek [Muscogee], and Seminole) in the allotment process from which they had previously been excluded. Tribal members were registered in what would become known as the Dawes Rolls. The process of assimilation to United States life-ways was deemed completed by the Curtis Act of 1898 in which the United States government no longer recognized tribal governments and forbade jurisdiction of tribal lands by tribal governments.

In the later nineteenth century, this policy [Dawes] continued to be buttressed by evolutionary anthropologists, including [John Wesley] Powell in the Bureau of American Ethnology, who distributed copies of *Ancient Society* to his staff, so that Bureau ethnologists “went into the field with Morgan’s book and with his kinship charts” (Resek 1960:150). Powell’s two-decade-long program for identifying and classifying American Indian languages was closely linked to the needs of the newly expanded government Indian bureaucracy (Kehoe 1985:46; Hinsley 1981).” [Feit.1993:113]

Harvey Feit provides evidence of further governmental advocacy and attachment to the Dawes Act by writing, “in his first annual message to Congress, President Theodore Roosevelt characterized the General Allotment Act as “a mighty pulverizing

engine to break up the tribal mass”...(1993:113).

Yet more violence against American Indians in the 19th century was committed by Physical Anthropologists in the creation of the U.S. Army Medical Museum (1868-1900). Elise Juzda, in an article in *Studies in History and Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, writes,

throughout the year 1868, Dr. George Alexander Otis (1830–1881), Assistant Surgeon General of the United States Army, widely distributed a circular amongst medical officers stationed in what he called ‘Indian country’. The principal object of Otis’s letter was to urge the Army’s medical staff to contribute to a growing collection of Indian artefacts, skeletons, and crania that was rapidly becoming a showpiece of the United States Army Medical Museum (AMM), situated in Washington, DC. The purpose of such a collection, wrote Otis, was to ‘aid in the progress of anthropological science by obtaining measurements of a large number of skulls of the aboriginal races of North America.’ Otis was emphatic on the point of quantity, not least because it would enable the museum to represent the widest variety of tribes. From the perspective of racial research, the importance of procuring ‘sufficiently large series of adult crania of the principal Indian tribes’ was essential; large numbers were required ‘to furnish accurate average measurements.’ The appeal was a clear success from the point of view of the Surgeon General himself, Joseph K. Barnes (1817–1883), who in 1873 boasted that ‘the Medical Officers of the Army have collected a much larger series of American skulls than have ever before been available for study’...the accumulation of craniological specimens in the United States by institutions including the AMM has been situated within larger historical movements charting the fulfilment of ‘manifest destiny:’ a movement in which the murder and displacement of American Indigenes were justified by scientific theories of racial inferiority. [2009: 156]

Juzda writes further that

despite the sentiments of its detractors, the cranial collection of the AMM is in many ways remarkable. Not only did it contain some 3,000 specimens by the time it was transferred to the Smithsonian around 1900—making it one of the largest cranial collections in the world—but also, as Bieder (1990) has observed, it is the only known example of a national government officially engaging in the collection of human crania and explicitly exploiting a period of conflict—the Indian Wars—to further the needs of physical anthropology. [2009:157]

The collection of skulls at the AMM was eventually transferred to the Smithsonian Institution. However, the collecting continued unabated. George Gibbs (1815-1873) was an ethnologist who worked in the Pacific Northwest and also worked as a geologist and surveyor for many years. He finally relocated to Washington D.C. and studied Indian languages at the Smithsonian (Smithsonian Institution Archives). Thomas Patterson reproduces a letter written by Gibbs in 1862 as a “set of instructions for archaeological research.”

the Smithsonian Institution, being desirous of adding to its collections in archaeology all such materials as bears upon the physical type, the arts and manufactures of the original inhabitants of America, solicits the cooperation of officers of the army and navy, missionaries, superintendents, and agents of the Indian department, residents in the Indian country, and travelers to that end.

Among the first of the desiderata is a full series of the skulls of American Indians...It is requisite for the purpose of arriving at particular result, that the most positive determination be made of the nation or tribe to which the skull belongs...Unless, therefore, information of a direct nature is obtained, the collector should be guarded in assigning absolute nationality to his specimens. It would be better to state accurately the locality whence they are derived (Gibbs 1962, 392-94 [date in error, should read 1862]). [1995:52]

There are personal stories also, stories that have become part of family histories and passed from generation to generation. Charon Asetoyer tells of how the heads of her Comanche ancestors were severed from those killed on the battlefield, packed in ice, and shipped to Washington D.C. by train. As horrific as this scene is to contemplate, Charon reports that there were also heads severed from bodies “not quite dead” (personal communication, Charon Asetoyer, Comanche Nation, 2005).

The collection of American Indian skulls was not confined only to the Army Medical Museum. Ann Fabian references anthropologist Franz Boas by writing, “in the

1890s, Franz Boas acknowledged that peddling skulls was ‘unpleasant work’ but helped finance his studies” (2010:188). Also in this same book, *The Skull Collectors*, Fabian made reference to the vast collection of Aleš Hrdlička (1869-1943), another American Anthropologist:

by the time Hrdlička died in 1943, he had collected and cataloged nearly twenty thousand human skulls, a number to dwarf poor Morton’s grandest dreams. Hrdlička was a modern collector, ambitious in his collecting and efficient in his catalogs. His search for rare ancient specimens mixed with more recent burials prompted him to gather up as many skulls as he could find. For four decades, he added specimens to his bulging collection. As the twentieth century drew to a close, shock at the scale of Hrdlička’s collection helped prompt a new conversation about burial rights, as Native American activists pushed Congress to pass legislation that mandated the return and reburial of Native American dead. [2010:208]

A concluding remark from Ann Fabian illuminates the vastness of the 18th and 19th century frenetic mania to collect American Indian skeletal remains,

in the 1980s, the Native American Rights Fund estimated that there were as many as 600,000 pieces of human remains (including thousands of skulls) in American collections—in libraries, museums, historical societies, universities, anatomical collections, and private cabinets. [2010:223]

Understanding the collecting of human remains for “scientific” purposes as an act of violence to descendant communities is perhaps best explained by Kenneth Nystrom’s 2014 article “The Bioarchaeology of Structural Violence and Dissection in the 19th-Century United States” which appeared in *American Anthropologist*. While Nystrom’s article is specifically relating to human remains that were obtained from prisons, poor farms, or stolen from fresh graves, the principle may also be applied to American Indian ancestral remains stolen from battlefields, recent (at time of theft) graves, or ancient graves.

The phrase “structural violence” was coined by Johan Galtung in 1969 and refers

to a social structure or institution causing harm to persons or communities which prevents them from meeting their basic human needs. Nystrom's article draws a direct relationship between desecrations of human remains with structural violence. From [Paul] Farmer et al. (2006), Nystrom writes "a key feature of structural violence is that it is so deeply embedded within political and economic organization that it becomes normalized and invisible" (2014: 774). Nystrom defines structural violence as "harm done to individuals or groups through the normalization of social inequalities in political-economic organization" and further states that "conceptualizing dissection as a manifestation of structural violence extends the concept to encapsulate postmortem manifestations of social inequality" (2014:765). The major thread of Nystrom's article posits that social identity does not end with death, but that, as referenced by Hallam et al. 1999 and Tarlow 2008, "the dead may still exist in a relational social network" (2014:766). Nystrom also references work by Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2011) by writing, "if we accept that social identity doesn't end at death and that, indeed, death may intensify personhood, then the act of fragmentation itself and the resulting objectification of the body, and not just the political-economic context that legitimated the act, represents structural violence as well" (2014:775).

This article by Nystrom dealt almost exclusively with white skeletal remains. Indian remains have historically not been afforded the same degree of respect as remains of White populations in the United States. Thomas Patterson provides an example of this by writing of a protest in 1971

when members of the American Indian Movement disrupted an archaeological excavation in Minnesota by filling the trenches, seizing the collections, and destroying field notes. Maria Pierson, a Lakota Sioux woman, passionately described the emotions she felt when the remains of

white people from a CRM-excavated site were reburied at a nearby cemetery, whereas the remains of Indians from the same site were placed in cardboard boxes and deposited in a natural history museum. [1999:168]

But even Patterson does not refer to this as structural violence in the article. Essentially, that reference is made in print only by indigenous people. However, if we accept that indigenous peoples enjoy the same designations of personhood, then the only logical conclusion to be made is that the many tens-of-thousands of ancestral remains collected in the name of science by American (and other) anthropologists represent an act of structural violence against indigenous individuals, families, and communities.

In the mid-20th century, American Anthropology was once again engaged in bolstering the extermination policies of the U.S. federal government. In 2008, Marc Pinkoski wrote an article for publication in the 4th volume of the *Histories of Anthropology Annual* titled “Julian Steward, American Anthropology, and Colonialism.” In this article, Pinkoski acknowledges important writings such as that of Talal Asad by stating,

within anthropology, the critique of colonialism is represented most authoritatively in the work of Talal Asad, and most prominently in his edited collection *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (Asad 1973). Asad’s essentially hopeful message about the promise for anthropology to “transcend itself” is predicated on focusing a new anthropological method on the historical power relationship between the West and the Third World and to examine the ways in which it has been dialectically linked to the practical conditions, the working assumptions and the intellectual product of all disciplines representing the European understanding of non-European humanity. (Asad 1973:18–19) [2008:173].

He pays homage to other writers and their works on the subject when he writes,

Asad’s text is complemented by several other representative works on the topic: Kathleen Gough’s slightly earlier cry that anthropology was the “child of imperialism” in her “New Proposals for Anthropologists” (1968); Diane Lewis’s concurrent essay, “Anthropology and Colonialism,” in *Current Anthropology* (1973); George Stocking’s edited

History of Anthropology, Volume 7, *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge* (1991); and finally, Peter Pels's *Annual Review of Anthropology* survey, "The Anthropology of Colonialism" (1997). In each of these works, the author engages in critical analyses of the discipline to expose and hopefully de-couple anthropology's relationship with colonial practices. Taken together these scholars demonstrate that the discipline of anthropology is deeply intertwined with politics of imperialism and colonial practices; and, they agree that the discipline needs to address this history fully, because the relationship is at least twofold. They contend it has a structural history enmeshed with the foundations of Western Enlightenment thought and the basis of anthropological enquiry; and this deep structure manifests itself in the individual theories, methods, and agency of the practitioners of the discipline. [2008:173-174]

But Pinkoski also levels a critique against Asad and some of the more well-known works and writers that tie the discipline of Anthropology to practices of colonization and imperialism; important works by authors such as Edward Said (1989), Peter Pels (1997), and others. While all of these authors and their writings have been important in addressing the close ties between Anthropology and colonialism or imperialism, Pinkoski identifies a major omission in the written works:

tellingly, Asad, Lewis, and Pels also make no mention of the processes of colonialism within the United States or of the involvement of American anthropology within their representative articles. As observers, they see colonialism as distant from North America and somehow exotic, and most fully represented by British social anthropology and its preoccupation with Africa and Polynesia. As analysts working from a self-reflexive project to stave off the "crises" in the discipline, and even often situated in the United States themselves, these authors have focused their gaze away from North America. [2008:176]

And Pinkoski continues this observation when he writes,

within these accounts there is virtually no recognition that North America continues to be colonized (Asch 2002) and no acknowledgment of the role that anthropology has played in this ongoing project. This denial occurs despite the protestations of activists such as Deloria (1969), who, throughout his career, questioned the role of anthropology in Native Americans' lives. [2008:177]

In an effort to turn the anthropological gaze to North America, Pinkoski focuses on a well-known icon of American Anthropology, Julian Steward. Julian Steward (1902-1972) was a prominent anthropologist and a former student at Berkeley under Alfred Kroeber. Pinkoski articulates the many projects, writings, and students of Steward that helped to create the image of him as an internationally well-known American anthropologist.

This is because of his ethnographic and archaeological work in the American Great Basin, work that resulted in the seminal ethnography, *Basin-Plateau Aboriginal Sociopolitical Groups* (1938); also because of his edited monumental six volume collection, *The Handbook of South American Indians* (1946a, 1946b, 1948b, 1948a, 1949, 1950) and *The People of Puerto Rico* (1956); and, enhanced by his edited three volume-collection on modernization and development (Steward 1967). Beyond his ethnographic purview, Steward was a prolific writer during his forty-four-year academic career, a characteristic demonstrated, for example, by his dozens of contributions to *American Anthropologist* and his *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (1955a[1954])...it has been reported that Steward supervised the completion of thirty-five doctoral dissertations in his six-year tenure at Columbia University (Murphy 1981), with some of his most prominent students during this time being Eric Wolf, Elman Service, Morton Fried, Robert Murphy, Robert Manners, Stanley Diamond, Louis Faron, and Sidney Mintz (Manners 1973; Kerns 2003). [2008:179]

In regards to Steward's high status within the discipline, Pinkoski has this to say:

at a minimum, one of the foundational claims that has become canonized within the discipline is that Steward's theoretical paradigm and the representations of Indigenous societies that flow from it are the result of objective, scientific analysis and, therefore, represent a value-free foundation for the study of society in general and of Indigenous societies in particular. [2008:181]

Following the list of Steward's achievements and fame, of which only a portion have been recorded here, Marc Pinkoski goes on to unpack the work Steward performed for the United States government by obstructing the interests of American Indian tribes. A small sampling of that destructive work is given below.

According to Pinkoski, Steward was asked in 1949 to testify for the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) as an “expert witness” before the Indian Claims Commission (ICC). Pinkoski, in referencing Nancy Lurie (1970), describes the ICC thus, “...the Commission’s mandate was predicated on the assumption that the so-called “Indian problem” could be addressed through compensation for lands taken rather than by addressing the systemic problems that facilitated the taking of the lands to begin with (Lurie 1970)” (2008:182). Pinkoski goes on to say,

both the renewed acceptance of “neo-evolutionary” developmental stage-theories within the discipline and anthropologists’ newly accepted “scientific” expertise outside the discipline led [Sheree]Ronaasen et al. to conclude that the “very nature of the ICC itself placed anthropologists in a position to legitimize the denial of indigenous rights to collectively held land and to other collective rights guaranteed by treaty with the U.S. government” (1999:171; e.g., Barney 1955). [2008:183]

It was within this context, and within this climate of oppression, that Steward was asked to testify on behalf of the federal government.

Steward went on to work for the DOJ as an expert witness before the ICC for seven years, in this position every case in which he testified produced a negative finding (against tribes) for the DOJ. His final undoing according to Pinkoski,

...unravels entirely when his ICC testimony is contrasted with his original statements concerning Shoshone political organization. In “The Economic and Social Basis of Primitive Bands” (1936), Steward states that all bands are “politically autonomous,” “communally landowning,” and have rules for “land inheritance,” and concludes that all people live in this state of social organization, at a minimum. In this early paper, written directly after his fieldwork in the Great Basin but before joining the federal government, Steward specifies that the Owens Valley Paiute, the Southern California Shoshone, and “other Paiute” are either composite or patrilineal bands and are therefore, de facto, politically autonomous, land owning, and are a recognizable group with a degree of central control and common interests (1936:338). [2008:193]

In summary, Pinkoski not only critiques Steward's standing within the anthropological community, but offers a challenge to the discipline itself.

Contrary to the standard references on him, Julian Steward played a crucial role in the U.S. colonial project, working on the side of the colonial authorities to undermine the land rights of Indian nations. As such, this analysis begins to fill a deep gap in the discipline's self-examination of our relationship to colonial practices. To support this proposition, I have provided information to show that Steward took a leading advocacy role on behalf of the colonial project by locating himself as an advisor to and expert witness for the U.S. Government's Department of Justice, that he helped to develop an ethnographic image and legal opinion that the Indians of the Great Basin were of the lowest order of social evolution, and that his academic, proclaimed, and celebrated "objective" work, is in places his verbatim testimony before the ICC that had the explicit goal of creating a jurisdictional vacuum in the Great Basin; specifically creating a social evolutionary ladder, in the concept of "the levels of sociocultural evolution," that had exact applicability for undermining the rights to land of the people he was testifying against in court.

In light of Steward's intimate connection and positioning within the colonial project, as I have demonstrated in this paper, I ask the discipline to consider where it positions itself in this struggle when it valorizes his work as foundational for the development of a value-free, objective science and accepts the methodological "advancements" offered in the past few decades as sufficient for addressing this relationship. [2008:196]

From this very lengthy example provided through the clear writing of Marc Pinkoski, it is obvious that a connection between colonization, anthropology, and indigenous communities has been recognized beyond the imagination of American Indian minds. The American Anthropological Association (AAA) was founded in 1902, with an initial membership of 175 people; that number has grown to 11,000 members with the largest growth occurring in the 1950s (<http://www.aaanet.org/about/>). However, it has only been within the past 40 or so years that professional anthropologists have begun to question the role of their discipline in the oppression, subjugation, and (sometimes) annihilation of the subject peoples they study. When specific examples of that complicity are articulated, as in the case study of Julian Steward, it becomes clear that there *is* a deep

connection and that the connection of Anthropology to colonialism is deeply embedded within the foundations of theory and praxis of American Anthropology. The unfortunate aspect in acknowledging the connection between Anthropology and colonization is to be found in the belief of many anthropologists that the discipline's complicity exists only as an early historical fact, not recognizing that Anthropology continues to abet American imperialism today in global communities and in modern Native America.

F. Conclusion

Anthropology emerged as an institutional discipline in Europe as an outgrowth of natural history studies during the 17th century period of European expansionism and colonization. The studies that originated during this time came from the discovery of "the Other" during European invasions of the Americas. Ethnographic studies were conducted on the "human primitives" who were subjected to European programs of imperial and colonial rule.

Anthropology is a colonizing discipline in the sense that it is a *tool* of colonization and colonizing ideology; consciously or not, anthropology upholds and promotes the colonization of indigenous peoples of the world. Traditionally in North America, anthropologists have descended on Indian reservations and communities every year for ethnographic field work. Much of the information gathered is used by the entities that provide funding for field studies. A number of these funding sources are state or federal government institutions, universities, and museums such as the Smithsonian Institution. The majority of the information or material culture gathered reside in government files, university museums and archives, government archives, or on museum shelves or

storerooms; locations which often are inaccessible to all except a minority population consisting of researchers or elites.

Marc Pinkoski writes that, “the relationship between anthropological theory and colonialism in North America has been widely neglected in the historiography of the discipline” (2008:172). This neglect, or collective amnesia, on the part of the discipline and practitioners may be linked to structures of power which have become institutionalized within the discipline and within the academy. Pinkoski refers to Talal Asad (1973:17) writing in *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*,

anthropologists can claim to have contributed to the cultural heritage of the societies they study by a sympathetic recording of indigenous forms of life that would have been left to posterity. But they have also contributed, sometimes indirectly, towards maintaining the structure of power represented by the colonial system. [2008:173]

Diane Lewis supports the notion of “power by association” in writing,

the anthropologist, like the other Europeans in a colony, occupied a position of economic, political, and psychological superiority vis-à-vis the subject people... Economic and legal advantages accorded other Europeans in the form of better jobs, higher wages, lower taxes, and access to cheaper labor were also enjoyed by the anthropologist, who, ideally, obtained a large research grant (tax-free), paid informants a pittance, if anything, and landed a prestigious job when he returned home. All too often, little attention was paid to the fact that the benefits gained were based on exploitation of the natives...The psychological superiority of the anthropologist was derived from the fact that he consistently received preferential treatment, not only from other Europeans in positions of political power, but also from the subject peoples themselves. For the most part, this special treatment was accorded, not because of superior accomplishments or contributions valued by the native people, but simply because the anthropologist was a member of the group in power. [1973:582]

To provide further distance from claiming any responsibility in the process of colonization, there has been a deafening silence on the part of anthropologists to (borrowing a term from Laura Nader, 1972) “study-up.” Even in a book which should

certainly address the topic of anthropology-anthropologists and colonialism-colonization, George Stocking's edited book *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, in his History of Anthropology series, is apparently lacking. Pinkoski quotes Stocking as saying about the text that it "cover[s] the range of modern ethnography in its major phases." Pinkoski then goes on to write, "...not one article focuses on the colonization of the United States or on the connection of the discipline of anthropology to U.S. colonial policy" (2008:176).

Other authors in the early 1970s gave voice to the relationship between anthropology and colonization. Dell Hymes' statement is brief, but pointedly accurate, "under its present name [anthropology] it cannot perhaps escape its history as an expression of a certain period in the discovery, then domination, of the rest of the world by European and North American societies" (1972:5). William Willis expanded the definition of anthropology to say,

the context of white rule provides a conception of anthropology that emphasizes what it actually has been. *To a considerable extent, anthropology has been the social science that studies dominated colored peoples—and their ancestors—living outside the boundaries of modern white societies.* This minimal definition of anthropology avoids key deficiencies in prevailing descriptions of anthropology as the science of man, as the science of culture, and as the science that employs field-work methodology. At best, these descriptions are aspirations of contemporary anthropologists seeking design in a historical development; at worst, they are ways to avoid admitting that anthropology has been an instrument of white rule. [1972:123]

Further, Willis writes, "to anthropologists, the study of dominated colored peoples was not merely exoticism nor even only service to imperialism. The ultimate aim of anthropology was the improvement of white societies everywhere" (1972:131).

With anthropologists in the 1970s examining the role played by American

Anthropology in the colonization of the indigenous peoples of the Americas, the obvious questions are what happened to this line of inquiry? Why does it appear to have been dropped off the radar of study? Is it perhaps that by acknowledging and owning this history, a complete reorganization of the discipline would be necessary and would most certainly be accompanied by a loss of institutional power, power that would be given over to indigenous people? Or would such inquiry necessitate a restructuring of ownership of land, resources, and the vast quantities of materials collected by anthropologists?

The role with which Anthropology has contributed to colonialism and United States imperialism abroad will be examined further in this dissertation; also to be discussed are specific areas of conflict between the discipline of anthropology and indigenous people from the perspective of American Indian graduate students, anthropologists, and tribal community members in the northeastern United States. Anthropologists such as Kathleen Gough Aberle (1967; 1968), Dell Hymes (1972), David Hurst Thomas (2000) and many others will appear in the discussion; some of these anthropologists have recognized that an awareness of anthropological praxis has, and continues to, cause harm to indigenous peoples globally and have put forth suggestions for reform; some have voiced a need for acknowledging the historicity of the discipline and advocate for institutional change. All of this content is seated in the thought of finding ways to create a more inclusive discipline that will be of mutual benefit and one which will encompass with deeds the purpose of the AAA statements on Ethics and Race.

Revisiting the history of colonization, revisiting the participation in that history by the discipline of anthropology, and specific individual anthropologists, is a painful

journey for indigenous people; it is emotionally and spiritually painful and it is traumatic, always. However, revisit it we do. We revisit it at every social gathering; we revisit it at academic conferences; we revisit it on social media; we revisit it at kitchen tables or around camp fires; and, we revisit it every day when the evening news reports social, economic, or political oppressions of groups that seemingly forever remain in the periphery. We must revisit it because we live the consequences of this history we share with “America” and share with academic disciplines, including anthropology. We must revisit it as we try to negotiate a space in the fabric of academe or of global economies. Our remembering the history of colonization allows us to recognize and interpret the ongoing imperialism in which the United States has so heavily invested in the past century. Our remembering perpetuates our resistance to the Euro-American policies of subjugation, marginalization, oppression, and assimilation.

CHAPTER 4

UNITED STATES IMPERIALISM, WAR, and ANTHROPOLOGY

Anthropology since its inception has contained a dual but contradictory heritage. On the one hand it derives from a humanistic tradition of concern with people. On the other hand, anthropology is a discipline developed alongside and within the growth of the colonial and imperial powers. By what they have studied (and what they have not studied) anthropologists have assisted in, or at least acquiesced to, the goals of imperialist policy.—Radical Caucus of the American Anthropological Association, 1969

David H. Price [2011:173]

A. Introduction

The historical connections examined in the last chapter between Anthropology and the colonization of the peoples and lands of the Americas established a framework for on-going imperialistic practices of the United States government; a government which throughout its history has consistently sought control of world resources and expansion of Capitalism. I have devoted this chapter to the illumination of how, in times of global or local wars, the United States government and military have used, and continue to use, anthropologists in the quest for world domination of resources. I, and many others cited in this chapter, believe this is an egregious misuse of academic research and knowledge. It is also a contradiction of purpose in a discipline that professes to be devoted to the study and *understanding* of past and present world cultures, a discipline that is often involved in identifying and finding solutions to contemporary problems affecting those cultures, and a discipline that often seeks ways to alleviate the oppressions of indigenous people.

By the many examples provided in this chapter, it should be obvious that using anthropological knowledge to further subjugate, oppress, and erase indigenous peoples and to exploit indigenous resources is incongruent with all that the discipline of Anthropology seeks to accomplish. Professional organizations have become so deeply

concerned with the misappropriation of anthropological research and knowledge that statements on ethics, race, torture, and recruitment by agencies such as the Department of Defense have been issued. While none of these statements explicitly accuse those anthropologists or the discipline of being complicit with imperialistic practices which cause great harm to those of other cultures, the “do no harm” article of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) Statement on Ethics would imply that complicity is the unstated reality. However, this has not always been the position of professional organizations; the Executive Council of the AAA, following a letter written and published in *The Nation* in 1919 by Franz Boas, passed by a 2-1 vote a move to censure Boas for his public criticism of anthropologists engaged in activities of espionage for the United States in WWI. Further in this chapter, a small space is dedicated to this censuring of Boas as a way of illuminating the change of organizational stance over time, or perhaps it has simply to do with patriotism and the fact that some wars are popularly considered to be “just” while others are not.

One might wonder why this dissertation contains an entire chapter on the use of Anthropology and anthropologists by the military. I consider this chapter to be a vital component in addressing the dissertation questions which relate to efforts engaged in creating a discipline that is more welcoming to indigenous people. Those efforts are undermined by continuing acts of oppression, acts which serve to widen the divide between anthropologists and indigenous people. The true goals of war are largely left unstated. From an indigenous perspective, the true goals always consist of control of resources and control of culture groups; along with the knowledge that Anthropology and some anthropologists are either manipulated into, or willingly participate in, furthering

those goals contributes to suspicion and wariness on the part of indigenous people toward the discipline and the discipline's practitioners. If repetition is, in fact, the best teacher, indigenous people have this lesson well integrated in their consciousness.

This chapter will examine early statements by various organizations, such as the American Anthropological Association (AAA) and the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), which pertain to ethical practices along with more recent iterations of these statements (these statements, and those of other professional organizations, will be visited in more depth in a later chapter of this dissertation). Individual sections of the chapter will be devoted to the overt and covert ways in which anthropologists have been used or manipulated by government agencies in World Wars I and II, Korea and Vietnam, the Cold War years, and most recently in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of the instances expressed in this chapter became the impetus for professional organizations to issue statements which provide guidelines as to what constitutes "best practice" for their members.

B. Anthropology and Ethics

"The conclusions about ethics and later strategies that we reached as a result of our experience [in World War II] was embodied in the code of ethics adopted by the Society for Applied Anthropology (Brown, Chapple, and Mead 1949)" (Margaret Mead 1979:146). The seeds of this Code of Ethics were planted during a panel discussion at the spring meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) in 1946, at which time a committee of three was formed with Mead designated as the Chair (Mead, Chapple, Brown 1949:20).

In *Weaponizing Anthropology*, David Price quotes a paragraph from Margaret

Mead's 1949 Report of the Committee on Ethics published in *Human Organization*:

as a result of its members' experiences in World War II, in 1948 the Society for Applied Anthropology articulated the first formalized American anthropological code of ethics. This code stressed that the "anthropologist must take responsibility for the effects of his recommendations, never maintaining that he is merely a technician unconcerned with the ends toward which his applied scientific skills are directed" (Mead et al. 1949:20). It stated that, "the applied anthropologist should recognize a special responsibility to use his skill in such a way as to prevent any occurrence which will set in motion a train of events which involves irreversible losses of health or the loss of life to individuals or groups or irreversible damage to the natural productivity of the physical environment" (Mead et al. 1949:21). [2011:21]

The Code is written in paragraphs rather than numbered articles. The first two paragraphs are the most specific to the present discussion, and they read:

We recognize:

That the applied anthropologist must take responsibility for the effects of his recommendations, never maintaining that he is merely a technician unconcerned with the ends toward which his applied scientific skills are directed.

That the specific means adopted will inevitably determine the ends attained, hence ends can never be used to justify means and full responsibility must be taken for the ethical and social implications of both means and ends recommended or employed. [Mead, Chapple, Brown 1949:20]

The current SfAA Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities reflects the 1949 Code in the first two articles.

1. To the peoples we study we owe disclosure of our research goals, methods, and sponsorship. The participation of people in our research activities shall only be on a voluntary basis. We shall provide a means through our research activities and in subsequent publications to maintain the confidentiality of those we study. The people we study must be made aware of the likely limits of confidentiality and must not be promised a greater degree of confidentiality than can be realistically expected under current legal circumstances in our respective nations. We shall, within the limits of our knowledge, disclose any significant risks to those we study that may result from our activities.

2. To the communities ultimately affected by our activities we owe respect for their dignity, integrity, and worth. We recognize that human survival is contingent upon the continued existence of a diversity of human communities, and guide our professional activities accordingly. We will avoid taking or recommending action on behalf of a sponsor which is harmful to the interests of the community.

[\[http://www.sfaa.net/about/ethics/\]](http://www.sfaa.net/about/ethics/)

The policies of engaged warfare during the Vietnam War engendered a fair amount of outrage by anthropologists, essentially relating to the use of anthropological research in counterinsurgency applications. In *Weaponizing Anthropology*, David Price describes the ethical concerns of a number of anthropologists.

For many American anthropologists of the mid-1960s, it was this prospect of using anthropology for counterinsurgency that raised the most fundamental ethical and political questions about applying anthropology to the needs of warfare. Using anthropology to alter and undermine indigenous cultural movements cut against the grain of widely shared anthropological assumptions about the rights of cultures and people to determine their own destiny. In 1968 a full-page ad for a Vietnam War PYSOP Counterinsurgency [Psychological Operations] position appearing in the back of the *American Anthropologist* journal led over eight hundred anthropologists to sign a statement protesting the running of this ad...These border incursions by military and intelligence agencies pushed the AAA to undertake steps that led them closer to drafting its first ethics code... [2011:24]

In 1967 the American Anthropological Association established a Statement, or Code, of Ethics which has been periodically revisited and revised in 1971, 1987, 1998, 2009, and most recently in 2012 (<http://blog.aaanet.org/tag/aaa-code-of-ethics/>). Perhaps the most important article of the Statement of Ethics is that which dictates “do no harm.”

This article is found in the statement under:

III. Research.

A. Responsibility to people and animals with whom anthropological researchers work and whose lives and cultures they study.

2. In conducting and publishing their research, or otherwise disseminating their research results, anthropological researchers must ensure that they do

not harm the safety, dignity, or privacy of the people with whom they work, conduct research, or perform other professional activities, or who might reasonably be thought to be affected by their research.

The Statement of Ethics for the SfAA and for the AAA clearly establishes that, as members of a discipline that works with human subjects, it is incumbent upon anthropologists to ensure the safety of their informant subjects; to not contribute in any way to their oppression, physical or emotional harm, or any form of retribution from oppressive governments either domestic or foreign. There are a number of similar Statements of Ethics for the various fields of anthropology.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 in the United States, there has been a great deal written regarding the military and U.S. Department of Defense employment of anthropologists. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have created an upsurge in the recruitment of anthropologists, most especially cultural and linguistic anthropologists; with this recruitment have come concerns of the ethical implications of embedding anthropologists as members of what is termed Human Terrain Teams (HTT). These concerns have been of such significance as to engender a statement in 2007 from the AAA specific to HTT. The AAA Statement on HTT has essentially served as a warning to anthropologists, especially those whose focus is in Cultural or Linguistic Anthropology, that their contributions may be in violation of the “do no harm” portion of the AAA Statement of Ethics (<http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/statements/Human-Terrain-System-Statement.cfm>).

The AAA concern is founded on the fact that the use by government agencies of information contained in anthropological reports, papers, or summaries, despite denials by the military, Departments of Defense, National Security, or Homeland Security, may

be used to target so-called military and/or political insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such use places innocent informants and their families in grave danger either as civilian victims of “collateral damage” or as targets of retribution from insurgents.

In the concluding remarks, the Executive Board of the AAA states, in part,

...in the context of a war that is widely recognized as a denial of human rights and based on faulty intelligence and undemocratic principles, the Executive Board sees the HTS project as a problematic application of anthropological expertise, most specifically on ethical grounds. We have grave concerns about the involvement of anthropological knowledge and skill in the HTS project. The Executive Board views the HTS project as an unacceptable application of anthropological expertise.

[\[http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/statements/Human-Terrain-System-Statement.cfm\]](http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/statements/Human-Terrain-System-Statement.cfm)

The use of anthropologists in times of war is not a contemporary practice only, but has a long history that dates to the beginning days of American Anthropology. While it’s earliest use was in the colonizing practices of United States western expansion and Manifest Destiny, the current use of embedding anthropologists in HTTs might also be viewed as collusion and complicity in United States imperialism; an attempt by United States government policy to gain and maintain control of global resources resulting in the further subjugation, oppression, marginalization, and exploitation of indigenous peoples, cultures, and resources. David Price describes various ways in which anthropologists, specifically archaeologists, may be used in gathering information:

archaeologists can move easily across borders and into the world’s hinterlands. They are familiar with the attitudes and opinions of the people living where they excavate and have natural opportunities to watch troop movements, note the distribution of military hardware and bases, and even commit sabotage. Many archaeologists are trained in deciphering dead languages, a skill useful in mastering codes. [2003:31]

C. The Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW)

According to Quetzil E. Castañeda, the Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW), now known as the Carnegie Institution for Science (CIS), was founded in 1902 “as a research institute during the formative period of U.S. science” (2005:27) and initially funded by Andrew Carnegie with \$10 million in steel stock.

As a part of its scientific mission, it supported research in many, but not all, areas of science, including archaeology, and eventually, social anthropology. The legacy of the Carnegie also includes, to a great extent, the shaping of both the U.S. military-industrial complex and the shaping of the contemporary structure of scientific research in the United States. As is well known, CIW president Vannevar Bush [1890-1974] orchestrated the collaboration of science, industry, and military during World War II and then forged the development of the National Research Foundation (Bush 1990; Zachary 1999). Less known, however, is that the second CIW president, Robert S. Woodward [1849-1924], had already established institutional precedent for how science and scientists would contribute to the U.S. government during war time. [Castañeda 2005:27]

Interestingly, John S. Billings was the chairman of the Board of Trustees from 1903-1913. This is the same John S. Billings who organized “specimens” at the Army Medical Museum where he was the curator; one of the many “Skull Collectors” identified by Ann Fabian (2010). But beyond this small sidebar, many of the trustees of the institute over time were men involved in government and in the military: men such as William H. Taft, future President of the United States; Elihu Root of Tammany Hall fame who became Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and a United States Senator; former Assistant Secretary of State John L. Cadwalader. The CIW, under Woodward’s presidency, was engaged as an institutional manager of the scientific-military-industrial war effort (Castañeda 2005:42). At this time Woodward stated,

the time has apparently arrived when it is permissible to state that no inconsiderable portion of the time and attention of the President of the Institution during the past four years has been devoted to the business of watching Germans connected with the...[CIW] staff (BT1919:763). In

other words, since 1915 President Woodward, whom the secondary literature on the history of anthropology claims was a friend of Boas from their Columbia days, was also conducting espionage, albeit in-house, on those "persons suspected of pro-German tendencies" (details provided in BT1918:763-766.) [Castañeda 2005:51]

Woodward also wrote of the almost 200 staff members of the CIW (two-thirds of the staff) who were either directly or indirectly working in some capacity for the United States government in the war effort. He was especially proud of the efforts of anthropologist Sylvanus Morley (1883-1948) who, under the guise of an archaeologist doing field research in Mexico and Central America, conducted activities of espionage.

New trustees of the CIW following WWI included Herbert Hoover, Gen. John Pershing, Charles Lindbergh, and W. Cameron Forbes who was former Governor General of the Philippines and Ambassador to Japan. By the mid-1930s, Vannevar Bush was giving voice to a need for the military, science, and industry to prepare for war (Castañeda 2005:47). Having set the precedent, anthropologists would once again be engaged in espionage.

D. World War I

A person, however, who uses science as a cover for political spying, who demeans himself to pose before a foreign government as an investigator and asks for assistance in his alleged researches in order to carry on, under this cloak, his political machinations, prostitutes sciences in an unpardonable way and forfeits the right to be classed as a scientist.

Franz Boas [1919]

The above quote is an excerpt from a letter written by Franz Boas (1858-1942) that was published in *The Nation*, a weekly magazine, on December 20, 1919. The letter served as an excuse by the Executive Council of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) to return a vote, by a margin of 20 to 10, to censure Boas and, according to David Browman, strip "Boas of his National Research Council (NRC)

council membership” (2011:14).

There were broad reasons for Boas’ censure and some which were narrower and more contained within the political atmosphere of the discipline. Browman states that the

American anthropological community already knew about the activities that Boas was describing here. The accused archaeologists had contributed to the successful war effort, and were viewed by many as patriots and heroes for having helped win the war. They were friends and colleagues from the AMNH [American Museum of Natural History], CIW, Field Museum, Peabody Museum, University Museum, and academic departments. [2011:13]

In other words, patriotism inflamed by war was at work in the censuring of Boas. Browman (2011) explains further that there was an on-going conflict between the cultural anthropologists, physical anthropologists, and archaeologists for control of the AAA. Perhaps this struggle could be perceived as one of holding control over the many funding sources for research. According to the AAA policy website, the censuring of Boas was rescinded on June 15, 2005 (<http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/Uncensoring-Franz-Boas.cfm>).

Yet, even today, the exact explanation of this act of censure on the part of the AAA is unclear and open only to speculation. Was this a case of extreme patriotism? Was it a case of intradisciplinary control of power and financial resources? Or was it a manifestation of institutional racism? Boas was a strong opponent of the accepted theory of the time that race is a biological fact and argued that race was, in fact, a social construct; Boas was also a strong voice against anti-Semitism, living in a country (United States) where anti-Semitic rhetoric and actions were ubiquitous, along with burgeoning anti-German sentiment. Beyond this, his grandparents were known to be Jewish and, although Boas did not identify as being Jewish, he rejected Christianity. Certainly his

personal history was known to members of the academy, along with his educational background and his having received his degrees in Germany.

In recent years, a good number of books and articles have been written about Boas' motivations for penning a letter that would expose archaeologists who were working as "spies" for the U.S. government in the years leading to World War I (WWI), but again, this is all based on speculation. For the purposes of this dissertation, only a brief summary is necessary to illuminate the fact that American anthropologists, working as archaeologists, were recruited to gather information of possible German activities off the coasts of Central and South America.

Browman's article makes frequent reference to a 2003 book, *The Archaeologist Was A Spy: Sylvanus G. Morley and the Office of Naval Intelligence*, written by Charles Harris and Louis Sadler. Harris and Sadler composed a list of Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI) agents which "includes nine individuals (2003:371–379) who conducted archaeological research as a 'cover' while simultaneously carrying out intelligence gathering for the ONI" (Browman 2011:10).

Several of the archaeologists identified included William Mechling (1888-1953), John Mason (1885-1967), Sylvanus Morley (1883-1948), Herbert Spinden (1879-1967), and Samuel Lothrop (1892-1965). According to Browman (2011:11-12), there were threads in civilian life that connected some of these men: Mechling and Mason were both Fellows at the International School of American Archaeology and Ethnology in Mexico City, both worked at the Field Museum in Chicago; Morley worked at the CIW and Spinden worked at the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH), but both worked together on a project in Central America; Morley recruited Samuel Lothrop, a fellow

member of the Cosmos Club, who, along with John Held (1889-1958), became a civilian agent. “Lothrop employed Mayan hieroglyphs to encode his espionage materials” (Browman. 2011:12). John Held was another interesting character who is described by Browman as “...a museum artist... Held purportedly was hired by the CIW to study Maya art forms, but his real job was to sketch the coastline and scout for military operations” (2011:12). Even amateur archaeologists, such as Thomas Gann (1867-1938) were recruited. Of Gann, Browman writes, “as an amateur archaeologist, he also worked with Morley...During the war, he became one of Morley’s most important ONI sub-agents, and he conducted his intelligence work while using the cover of being an archaeologist with research funds from both the Heye Foundation and the CIW” (2011:12).

The espionage activities of archaeologists apparently were not a secret to those in the discipline. Browman writes that “the research institutions to which these archaeologists were associated knew of the collaboration of their personnel with the ONI. CIW paid Morley the difference between his ONI and Carnegie salaries (Brunhouse, 1971:115), and the AMNH and Field Museum did the same for their personnel...” (2011:11).

E. World War II

World War II (WWII) produced another wave of anthropologists willing to further the war effort by using their profession as a cover tactic to gather information that would aid the Allied efforts. According to David Price, “American anthropologists weren’t the only anthropologists contributing to the global war. British, German, French, Japanese, and anthropologists from other nations contributed their cultural, geographical and linguistic knowledge to their nations during the war” (2011:20).

Nationalism and patriotism surrounding WWII resulted in the recruitment of anthropologists into service to be essentially self-induced, as was true of most of the general population. “Anthropologist Murray Wax recalled that at Berkeley, “after Pearl Harbor, Alfred Kroeber came to the departmental common room and encouraged the students and junior faculty by declaring, ‘We will show them what anthropology can do!’ Indeed, anthropologists recruited themselves” (Wax 2002:2)” (Price. 2011:19). This is further affirmed by Margaret Mead who stated,

before Pearl Harbor, there were many dissonant voices among American anthropologists; there were those who sympathized with the Soviet Union because of their commitment to the domestic issues espoused by the Communist Party or because of their objection to the United States’ becoming involved in another European war. The German invasion of Russia and the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor ended these disagreements, made it possible for organized groups of anthropologists to take the initiative of wholehearted participation in the war effort. [1979:146]

Under the guise of working as a “civilian” anthropologist, there were a number of areas in which information could be gathered. David Price identifies such areas of expertise:

given anthropology’s geographical, cultural and linguistic expertise, anthropologists had vital sources of information for commanders and American troops fighting their way northward from New Guinea, through Micronesia towards the Japanese homeland—and throughout Africa, southern and eastern Asia and Europe. Anthropologists scouted for the needed natural resources like petroleum, magnesium, tin, and rubber in Central and South America—sometimes lying about their intentions while posing as fieldworkers; at least one of the spies that Boas had criticized during World War One, reprised his role of archaeologist spy in Peru (Price 2000). Some anthropologists formed secret and quasi-secret agencies like the Ethnogeographic Board (meeting in the Smithsonian’s castle) and the “M-Project” (secretly meeting in the Library of Congress to generate fantastical scenarios for relocating refugees at the war’s end), while others worked in the War Relocation Authority camps detaining Japanese American citizens (Price 2008). [2011:20]

In a retrospective, Anthony Paredes writes that

the 1940s were a period of intense, direct utilization of anthropologists in the United States. During World War II, anthropologists were employed to develop cultural and psychological profiles of the national character of enemies and allies. Along with some sociologists, anthropologists were put to work in the management of Japanese relocation centers. Yet others, including anthropological linguists such as Stanley Newman, were enlisted to develop techniques for intensive teaching of exotic languages needed in various theatres of war. [1997:485]

While much of this may be viewed as positive activities which could hasten the end of WWII, there were also activities that would challenge moral imperatives, professional and personal ethics, and hold long-lasting negative effects on vulnerable populations.

American anthropologists at times also worked on disturbing war projects. One OSS [Office of Strategic Services] study sought to identify specific biological differences among the Japanese that could be exploited with biological weapons. Another OSS project was designed to destroy food sources for the Japanese homeland, hoping to use ethnographic knowledge to refine techniques of terror. Some anthropological projects used newly developed applied anthropological methods to manipulate studied populations (at home and abroad) in ways that troubled some of these anthropologists at the time and at times subverted democratic movements. [Price. 2011:21]

One notable carry-over from Boas' criticism of anthropologists as agents during WWI, Harvard archaeologist Samuel Lothrop, appears here again, 20 years later.

In 1940, J. Edgar Hoover wrote New York socialite Vincent Astor (a confidante of FDR who at the time was being considered to run the intelligence agency that became the OSS) that he was establishing "as comprehensive a program as is possible in utilizing the services of archaeologists" who could spy while working in Costa Rica, Guatemala, British Honduras, and Mexico. On Astor's recommendation, Lothrop was selected for this mission, which was run by Special Intelligence Service (SIS), an FBI-supervised foreign intelligence division operating in Central and South America. Lothrop received FBI training in the use of secret codes, invisible inks, mail drops, and covert contact protocols. His mission sent him to Peru where he gathered intelligence and managed numerous local operatives--while his cover story maintained he was conducting

archaeological research at Lima's National Museum. [Price. 2003:32]

One can only wonder how much of Lothrop's information gathered in Central America during WWII was used in later years to support and expand existing U.S. imperialistic activities in Mexico, Central, and South America. Or, to U.S. foreign policies that most assuredly directly and indirectly contributed to the domination, oppression, and deaths of many thousands of indigenous peoples in, most especially, Central America. In *Open Veins of Latin America*, Eduardo Galeano writes, "in the geopolitical concept of imperialism, Central America is no more than a natural appendage of the United States" (1997:107).

As we shall see further in this chapter, a number of anthropologists established new careers in government service following WWII. But there were also those whose experiences during the war years left them disturbed by the work they did in the name of furthering the war effort or national security. One such anthropologist was Gregory Bateson [1904-1980]. Bateson and Margaret Mead were partners in marriage from 1936-1950. According to Carleton Mabee,

even though both Mead and Bateson were disturbed by the use of deceit in psychological warfare, Mead was not as upset by it as Bateson was. During the war and after, the naturally optimistic Mead never lost her basic faith that science, if responsibly applied, could contribute to solving the practical problems of society, whereas Bateson, more pessimistic by nature, and deeply upset by this wartime experience, emphasized that applying science to society was inherently dangerous, and that the most useful role of science was to foster understanding rather than action. These differences between them were reflected in the breakup of their marriage just after the war. [1987:8]

Maybee (1987:7) describes Bateson's war work as beginning in 1943, in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and his assignment which began in Washington D.C. and culminated in the areas of India, Burma, and China. One of the people Bateson

worked closely with in the OSS was a journalist named Edmond Taylor. Mabee gives this portrayal of Bateson's assignment and the long-lasting personal effect on his life:

Bateson collected intelligence, but was uneasy because he did not know how the information would be used. He also engaged in deceitful propaganda, which made him even more uneasy. Bateson helped to operate an allied radio station that pretended to be an official Japanese station: it undermined Japanese propaganda by following the official Japanese line but exaggerating it. Bateson's uneasiness in participating in such deceit evidently helped to foster in Taylor a doubt whether the OSS's use of deceit was wise. Bateson himself became depressed. [1987:7]

David Price claims that Bateson held reservations about the work being done by anthropologists even before taking on his assignment.

Even before Bateson considered joining the OSS, he was troubled by the ethical questions raised by anthropologists using their knowledge as a weapon in war, or further- that social scientists could expect to have little say in what was done with their research. [1998:380]

Price then quotes Bateson's biographer, David Lipset as reporting,

...after the war Bateson complained that he was "very disturbed with the O.S.S. treatment of the natives... [and according to Geoffrey Gorer] he felt that he was associated with a dishonest outfit." (Lipset 1980:174; see also Yans-McLaughlin 1986a:202-203). (1987:8). [Price 1998:382]

The OSS was the direct ancestor of what would become the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Price writes that the OSS was created in 1942 by President Roosevelt and that "there was a great variation in the type of work these individuals undertook—ranging from assignments as linguists, spies, budgetary managers, economic forecasters, and foreign news analysts" (1998:379). In further description of the OSS, and in relation to Mead and Bateson, Price states,

from its creation onward, the OSS was a fundamentally new type of military-intelligence agency. Its Director, "Wild" Bill Donovan, saw the OSS as a new type of multidisciplinary intelligence agency which relied on a variety of creative and unconventional means of both collecting intelligence and undertaking covert actions. The OSS recruited the best

and brightest from elite academic and social circles for its ranks. In many ways, Gregory Bateson was a natural candidate for the OSS. Since 1940, Bateson and his then-wife Margaret Mead had been developing and refining the methods used in their studies of "culture at a distance" (Yans-McLaughlin 1986a: 196). These were the very sorts of techniques that the OSS was interested in using to understand and subvert the enemy. [1998:380]

Gregory Bateson's instincts and discomfort in relationship to OSS tactics could perhaps be viewed from the distance of 75 years as a manifestation of precognition. The often unorthodox methods of the OSS as parent have been surpassed by those of its CIA child in questionable legality of International Law at the least and human codes of ethics and morality, beginning with the Cold War and continuing on a global scale to present day.

F. The Korean War and The Cold War Years

Competing ideologies have often been the excuse for imperialistic acts which are based, in reality, in attempts to control global resources including developing technologies. After World War II, the United States and her allies, most notably the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (USSR, Soviet Union, or Russia), began carving up the Axis countries and the political ideologies of Capitalism and Communism were the excuse used in a race for world supremacy that positioned the world on the brink of a war that could potentially result in total destruction.

Barely taking a breath from the end of WWII, political and military tensions between the U.S. and her allies, and the USSR and her allies began to exacerbate in 1947. This date may be considered the beginning of the Cold War, effectively lasting until 1990.

In 1910, the countries of Korea and Japan signed the Annexation Treaty which

placed Korea under Japanese imperial rule until 1945. When Russia declared war on Japan in 1945, by U.S. agreement, Russia occupied Korea north of the 38th parallel and the U.S. occupied Korea south of this dividing line. By 1948, two separate Korean governments had been established, each of which claimed to be the legitimate government (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_War).

Events in Asia had dramatic impacts on all areas of American life and the intellectual community was not exempted. Laura Nader writes,

debates over universal military service were ongoing with the complete takeover of China by the Communists in 1949 and China's intervention in Korea. It was a time of deep pessimism and concern in the university. The "military-industrial complex" was real, but it did not mobilize graduate student resistance. [1997:110]

and continues with,

as if the Soviet atomic bomb and the existence of Red China were not enough, the psychodrama of purging the "Red Menace" accelerated when North Korean troops stormed across the 38th parallel in 1950. The belief quickly spread that Moscow sought to dominate the world, and the only way to stop Soviet nuclear destruction was by means of nuclear deterrence. [1997:110]

In specific reference to American social scientists and the Korean War, Robert Oppenheim writes,

the most famous instance of direct American anthropological involvement in the Korean War (1950–53) is barely recognized as anthropology at all. In December 1950, after the Inch'ŏn landing had driven back the initial North Korean advance and before the second capture of Seoul, three university-employed social scientists and a PhD-holding CIA and Air Force-affiliated psychological warfare specialist were hastily assembled and dispatched to the peninsula to study the North Korean occupation of the South and, by proxy, the Northern system itself. A month later they just as quickly withdrew, but over the months that followed produced a series of classified and unclassified reports on "Sovietization" and the "impact of Communism" for their governmental sponsors, as well as scholarly articles and a popular book on the occupation of Seoul, *The Reds Take a City*, that would be distributed worldwide by the State Department

as a staple anti-communist text. [2008:220]

According to David Price,

U.S. anthropology and intelligence work broke new grounds during the post-war period. It was then that the...CIA contracted out research projects to institutes at Stanford, Berkeley, Columbia, Princeton, the University of Denver and Yale, and enlisted anthropologists, archaeologists, art historians and other academics to use their fieldwork for C.I.A. intelligence-gathering purposes (Wiener 1987:204). [1998:395]

Some of the information gathered and submitted in field work was conceptualized in propaganda pamphlets and distributed to the South Korean public in order to produce fear of the on-coming Communist tide. As noted in Chapter 3, fear is an effective tactic used in psychological warfare.

The years between 1950 and 1956 may be noted as a time of collective, national paranoia bordering on hysteria. These were the McCarthy years; those working in government, entertainment, education, and of course Union organizers were targeted as potential Russian spies, Communist sympathizers, or members of the Communist Party—essentially high-profile citizens. Thousands of people were suspected, accused, questioned, or brought before various governmental panels, committees, or Congress to be examined for Communist leanings or “un-American activities.” Certainly anyone who questioned or voiced dissent relating to government or military policies or actions qualified them as targets for investigation. In attempts to save their own career or to divert attention from themselves, some high profile people provided names of those who might be suspect.

Laura Nader has written about personal memories she holds of that time. She speaks specifically about Harvard University, Brandeis, and the University System of California. In relationship to Harvard University Nader reports that,

although [President] Conant discouraged classified research at Harvard, he encouraged his faculty to participate in the cold war research effort. The Russian Research Center was founded in 1947 with an initial grant from the Carnegie Corporation and the blessings of the U.S. State Department, the military, and the newly created CIA—a fruitful collaboration between the intelligence agencies and Harvard. The center had as its director, veteran OSS anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn...the center was to satisfy the requirements of open scholarship and covert government needs by exploring Soviet culture and its military...Nearby, Project Troy, a secret study headquartered at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) explored how the U.S. government could use communications technology to penetrate the Iron Curtain, then expanded to research on political and psychological warfare. [1997:112]

In the same section of this chapter, Nader speaks about faculty who lost positions or were targeted because of their political beliefs or activities.

Stories concerning the erosion of the academy came out bit by bit in anthropology. The linguist anthropologist Maurice Swadesh could not find a job and eventually relocated to Mexico. According to Elizabeth Colson, Kathleen Gough was considered an embarrassment to Brandeis and not promoted because, according to university officials, she was a bad teacher. Knowing Gough to be an excellent teacher, Elizabeth Colson resigned from Brandeis. Gough and her husband, David Aberle, moved west from Brandeis and later to Canada. Paul Radin, Marc Borofsky, and Jack Harris were other target cases. [1997:112]

Institutions also began requiring employees swear a loyalty oath.

In 1950, the Regents of the University of California added the loyalty oath to the employment contract. The university was ripped apart: faculty were fired, while others simply left. The heart of the loyalty oath document brings to our attention that there are enemies of the United States, that they are here and abroad—foreign and domestic enemies are equated. In this context dissident voices were branded as seditious, thereby encouraging a culture of false patriotism and conformity, a society where independence of thought and action are frowned upon. [Nader 1997:111]

To this day, a similar loyalty oath continues to be required for faculty employment in the State of Vermont University System, and it would not surprise me to find that true in other states as well.

Government and military organizations or departments formed during the post WWII period for the purpose of gathering information that would be used to confront Communist expansion, or later, Third World Counterinsurgency, included the CIA, the Agency for International Development (AID), the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) under the Department of Defense, the Center for Research in Social Systems (CRESS), and a host of others including private research corporations such as Arthur D. Little and the Atlantic Research Corporation (Nader 1997). A number of anthropologists were employed by these agencies and corporations.

Considering the awareness that was gained by members of the SfAA in 1946 that resulted in a Code of Ethics in 1949, the obvious question that needs to be answered is: how could a large number of anthropologists seek employment with agencies or join projects with such questionable ethics? We know from a number of writings that projects were “sectioned;” by this I mean that the larger picture of projects that were classified were known, not to the individual investigators working on a singular segment, but only to the government or military agency coordinating the study. David Price also believes that not all anthropologists were aware of the scope of their research:

not all anthropologists who have worked for intelligence agencies have done so wittingly. This is a vital point; there are many documented instances where anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists have been used to work on research programs of interest to the government, while these individuals were never a whit the wiser (Church 1976; Marks 1979; Stephenson 1978). [1998:397]

Some projects were funded by seemingly reliable private funding agencies that were, in fact, front organizations for the military or for government agencies. One such incident is reported by Richard M. Stephenson, a sociologist who was working at Rutgers University in the 1950s. In this short article, Stephenson reports,

the Society [Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology] was first made known to me in 1956 by a colleague who had learned that a study of Hungarian refugees quartered at Camp Kilmer (a deactivated World War II facility) was being contemplated. In a brochure I received at the time, the Society was designated as "a non-profit organization incorporated May 25, 1955 pursuant to the Membership Corporation Laws of the State of New York." It was described as "an outgrowth of the work of the Human Ecology Study Program at Cornell University Medical College which has been conducted over a period of 25 years." It was further stated that, "In 1955, grants from beneficiaries of this study program enabled the establishment of the society with the purposes as described." These purposes were described as supporting and conducting research on human ecology in its social, cultural, psychological and physical aspects; investigating patterns of human adaptation to the environment and how they affect people's health, behavior and emotions; disseminating knowledge in these matters through lectures, seminars, and publishing; and giving fellowships, scholarships, grants, and donations to individuals and groups for these purposes. Eminent professors of medicine, law, psychology and psychiatry from major medical centers and universities were listed as directors and officers of the society. [1978:129]

Stephenson did not learn until 1977 that the research had been secretly funded by the CIA. The research in which Stephenson participated consisted of interviewing Hungarian refugees of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Stephenson describes the purpose of the project as:

...a team of specialists in varied fields, including medicine, psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, and sociology, to examine a selected sample of the refugees. A central purpose of the study was to investigate the source and effects of stress, disaffection, or alienation on individuals and groups, how people adapt to such experiences, and the consequences of these adaptations for those involved in them. It was thought that the presence of the refugees offered a unique opportunity for such investigations. [1978:129]

Upon learning of CIA involvement in his research, 20 years after the fact, Stephenson was most concerned in realizing that his respondents were as unaware of CIA involvement as was he; but more importantly, he states,

still more serious was the potential violation of the respondents' anonymity. The cases in my files are identified by number only. Where of

necessity or convenience names appeared on early draft interviews, they were cut off or blotted out. However, a list of names identifying cases was necessary at the Society Center to collate the results of the separate studies of each case. I do not know if the CIA had access to these files or, if it did, how it might have used the information. Respondents seemed to speak quite freely and frankly of their activities prior to and during the revolution, and frequently described the activities of friends, relatives, co-workers and others still in Hungary. Some of the respondents or people they knew played sensitive roles in affairs in Hungary; they well may not have been so candid in the interviews if they had known of the CIA involvement...Thus, some twenty years after the fact, I find that I unwittingly misled my informants, possibly violated their anonymity, and in the process I may have placed them or others in varying degrees of potential jeopardy. [1978:131]

The project with which Stephenson was involved was known as MKUltra, “a CIA project designed to identify, test, or study “materials and methods useful in altering human behavior patterns” (Stephenson 1978:128). While this case illustrates a researcher who was unwittingly involved in working for the CIA, there were (and continue to be) a good number of social scientists, including anthropologists, who were aware of exactly who they were working for and also aware of the ultimate goals and results of their projects. Laura Nader illuminates this by writing,

World War II activities had involved “patriotic” anthropologists working in the war effort; however, wartime networks merged into a Cold War period that was something of another character. An ideology of freedom versus totalitarianism created Cold Warrior academics, such as Kluckhohn, academics who acquiesced to external funding authorities. [1997:113]

MKUltra, the CIA project in which Richard Stephenson unwittingly participated, needs a further introduction as this project is a prominent feature in future CIA and military activities that have continued to date. David Price has obtained a great deal of information on MKUltra through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

The human ecology fund (1955-1965): The Human Ecology Fund (also known as the Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology) was an

academic funding front created by the Central Intelligence Agency in 1955. The Human Ecology Fund was itself funded by a variety of other CIA funding fronts and "legitimate" funding institutions including the Baird Foundation, the Broad-High Foundation, the Derwent Foundation, the Foresight Foundation, the Littauer Foundation, the Michigan Fund, the Phoenix Foundation, and the Southern and Western Foundation.

Using the Human Ecology Fund as a cover, the CIA directly funded a variety of anthropological research projects. Most of these were related to [Harold G.] Wolffs [neurologist and pain specialist] and the CIA's interest in *pain, interrogation, and the role of stress in different cultures, and the possible uses of stress*. Many of the anthropologists appear to have been unaware of the CIA's involvement in this research, and clearly some of the funded research even seems to have had no application to the interests of MKUltra and may have been funded for no other reason than to establish an air of legitimacy for the HEF (one such probable example was the funding of Janet A. Hartle to re-examine some Mongolian Skulls originally collected in 1912 by Ales Hrdlicka).

All of this raises many serious ethical questions. The CIA's own Inspector General noted that Project MKUltra needed a secret source of funding because the methods involved were "considered by many authorities in medicine and related fields to be professionally unethical, therefore the reputation of professional participants [was] on occasion in jeopardy" (SSCI1977: 70). [1998:399, emphasis added]

G. The Cold War (including Vietnam), 1960s to 1990

The 1960s and 1970s were a time of domestic and foreign unrest. The U.S. government and military escalated and expanded propaganda programs and activities concerning the perceived threat of Soviet world domination. The CIA was also expanding covert operations throughout the world, focusing specifically on Central America, South America, Southeast Asia, and Africa; in any country where liberation revolution occurred, the CIA was quick to follow. Beyond the CIA, the FBI could be found in communities and organizations in the United States where people were coalescing and working for domestic liberation; Black communities, American Indian communities, and college campuses. Laura Nader bears witness to this by writing:

domestic and international insurgency were conceptually merged, just as in the loyalty oath. Civil rights leaders were shadowed as were leaders in

the American Indian Movement. Racial protests, as earlier in Africa, were merged with Communist provocateurs. So, too, as indicated by my colleagues [Gerald] Berreman and [John] Gumperz, race was intermixed with strategies of counterinsurgency that thwarted indigenous leadership possibilities. A decade later, Gumperz discovered that teenage Native Americans were being tracked to adulthood and sometimes entrapped in criminal behavior, which then became the new subject matter for the linguistic anthropologist interested in courtroom behavior. [1997:129]

Anthropological area research was revisited or expanded into regions of North America during this period. “The Canadian north had become a northern hemisphere security area by virtue of its proximity to the Soviet Union; research funds flowed and area studies in the United States expanded, as did anthropology, as more native peoples and lands were destroyed” (Nader 1997:130).

In the early 1960s the United States involvement in Vietnam morphed from that of “advisory capacity,” which began in 1950, to commitment of military troops for the purpose of military engagement in 1965 (<http://history1900s.about.com/od/vietnamwar/a/vietnamwar.htm>). The United States considered this action a furtherance of policies of containment in efforts to stem the tide of Communist expansion. Simplistically, the Communist government of North Vietnam, supported by the Soviet Union and China, was attempting to unify North and South Vietnam under Communist rule. Ultimately, the United States involvement extended to Laos and Cambodia.

From its inception to the time of United States troop withdrawal with the fall of Saigon in 1975, the U.S. government referred to this military action as a “conflict,” never a “war.” By 1968, there were over 500,000 United States military troops in Vietnam. As Americans watched the evening news on television, they saw footage of engagements, medics tending the wounded, and body bags; staggering numbers of body bags being loaded onto planes. Eventually, by 1975, those body bags would total 58,220

(<http://www.archives.gov/research/military/vietnam-war/casualty-statistics.html>); the full number of United States wounded throughout the course of the “conflict” was 303,644; and the total number of United States military troops, men and women, deployed to South Vietnam over 19 years was 2,594,000 (<http://www.statisticbrain.com/vietnam-war-statistics/>). By any intelligent, rational person’s analysis, these statistics alone would suggest that the United States was involved in a war in Southeast Asia, not a mere conflict; and the official statistics do not encompass the numbers of veterans of that war who committed suicide on return home, or the numbers who have since died of diseases due to exposure to Agent Orange (defoliant), nor do they reflect the numbers of veterans who live their lives battling the long-term psychological and spiritual traumas of combat.

“Counterinsurgency” became the rationale for military and government policies in the Vietnam era. “But counterinsurgency isn’t just concerned with occupations through forms of indirect rule. At times, counterinsurgency campaigns underline traditional power structures and traditional economic systems, inserting external economic forces on indigenous political economies” (Price 2011:12). Nader refers to counterinsurgency tactics as a way in which to “eliminate the means used by people to resist oppression” (1997:119). Counterinsurgency research produced a project that solidified resistance and illuminated ethical concerns among anthropologists: Project Camelot.

By 1965, Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung revealed some details of a program in which anthropologists were reported to be working in counterinsurgency research in Latin America. The story would later break in the South American, then the American press. Project Camelot can now be recognized as the crisis that began ethical discourse in anthropology. [Fluehr-Lobban 2003:7]

Price describes the central thesis of Camelot and the reaction of anthropologists that influenced the Anti-War Statement by the AAA.

In 1964, the U.S. Army's Project Camelot sought to use anthropologists and sociologists to study patterns of Third World social upheaval and revolution. Project Camelot planned to use anthropologists' and sociologists' research to develop counterinsurgency tactics to quell uprisings (democratic or otherwise) in Latin America. When the Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung was contacted in a futile effort to recruit him for Camelot's Chilean counterinsurgency program, he publicly exposed the project. A sizable public uproar followed and soon the AAA began scrutinizing programs designed to use social science to inform counterinsurgency. [2011:23]

Nader describes the academic environment and position surrounding Camelot in writing that

in 1964-65, the issue of anthropologists being recruited for work in counterinsurgency exploded. Some of us participated in the public unveiling of Project Camelot...The unveiling of Project Camelot was followed by a move to develop guidelines on research and ethics for anthropologists, culminating with the Thai affair, the mutipurposes of modernization and development projects, the role of the AAA for studying the use of defoliants in Vietnam, and the move by the executive board in 1972 to establish a committee on harmful research. [1997:122]

At the 1966 annual meeting of the AAA, a resolution was passed which addressed the practices of the U.S. military in Vietnam. Thomas Patterson includes part of that resolution in *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*:

...we condemn the use of napalm, chemical defoliants, harmful gases, bombing, the torture and killing of prisoners of war and political prisoners and the intentional or deliberate policies of genocide of forced transportation of population for the purpose of terminating their cultural and/or genetic heritages by anyone anywhere.

These methods of warfare deeply offend human nature. We ask that all governments put an end to their use at once and proceed as rapidly as possible to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam (*AAA Newsletter*, December 1966, p. 2 quoted by Wakin 1992:32-3). [2001:125-126]

Kathleen Gough Aberle was moved to respond to criticisms (made by some anthropologists) of the AAA Anti-War resolution. She wrote, in part,

scientists have special social obligations, *as scientists*, because of their special knowledge and the power it confers. Anthropologists' special knowledge relates in part to the needs, sufferings, and aspirations of

contemporary non-western peoples. Our special obligations include that of defending their welfare and internationally recognized rights. We must dissociate ourselves from the acts of governments that seek to destroy these peoples or to infringe their rights. We must do so the more firmly when the offenders are our own governments, *precisely because* we are largely funded by our governments. [1967:10-11]

The My Lai massacre in 1968 of more than 500 Vietnamese civilians was not an isolated incident of use of force or acts of atrocity. One need only research the Phoenix program or watch the documentary film *Winter Soldier* (1972), and hear the testimony of Vietnam Veterans to begin to grasp the staggering number of acts of violence and excesses that defied the terms of the Geneva Convention. What are not included in the documentary are, once again, MKUltra projects.

The CIA controlled MKUltra project is important to this discussion because of the use and exploitation of social science knowledge and research, and of (mostly) unwitting use of social scientists. In summarizing MKUltra projects, Price notes,

a declassified 1963 CIA report...stressed the interdisciplinary scope of the project, noting that: 'over the ten-year life of the program many additional avenues to the control of human behavior have been designed by the [CIA's Technical Services Division] management as appropriate to investigation under the MKUltra charter, including radiation, electro-shock, various fields of psychology, psychiatry, sociology, and anthropology, graphology, harassment substances, and paramilitary devices and materials' (CIA 1963a: 4). This report explains how MK-Ultra programmes secretly used CIA money to fund academic researchers affiliated with universities through Agency funding fronts designed to look like legitimate academic research institutions. In some cases these academics knew they were funded by laundered CIA funds, but in most instances they were completely unwitting participants. [2007:9]

Essentially the end product of the MKUltra project met the objective of authoring the Kubark Manual, a counterintelligence guidebook to interrogation techniques, some of which are in violation of the Geneva Convention (Price 2007). Price quotes a passage

from the 2006 book written by Alfred McCoy, *A Question of Torture: CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror*:

[T]he CIA distilled its findings in its seminal *Kubark Counterinsurgency Interrogation* handbook. For the next forty years, the *Kubark* manual would define the agency's interrogation methods and training program throughout the Third World. Synthesizing the behavioral research done by contract academics, the manual spelled out a revolutionary two-phase form of torture that relied on sensory deprivation and self-inflicted pain for an effect that, for the first time in the two millennia of their cruel science, was more psychological than physical (McCoy 2006:50). [2007:18]

It is chilling to grasp and attempt to integrate the knowledge that the *Kubark Counterinsurgency Interrogation* manual was the guideline used for interrogation and the precursor to other interrogation manuals including the *Human Resource Exploitation Training Manual – 1983*. This last was used in training courses in Central America and at the School of the Americas in the training of the military of right wing regimes of Central America's dirty wars; wars that lasted for decades. Both manuals are available on-line in their entirety.

In 1975, a United States Senate Select Committee, referred to as the Church Committee (named for Sen. Frank Church, chair) was convened to investigate intelligence gathering activities by the CIA. The interrogation manuals subsequently were rewritten by the CIA and United States Army as to use of language; torture techniques are now known as some form of the phrase, "Enhanced Interrogation."

H. 1990 to Present

The attempts by U.S. government agencies to entice anthropologists and other social scientists into government service have only escalated with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; David Price (2011) refers to these tactics as "Weaponizing Anthropology" and Roberto Gonzalez (2007) uses the term "Mercenary Anthropology". The methods

used by these entities and the results obtained are complicit within our educational systems; targeting undergraduate and graduate students majoring in social science (and other) disciplines through use of funding and even targeting high school students in programs of indoctrination.

Due to public and congressional inquiry into methods of interrogation, new manuals have been composed and used as guidebooks in training programs and for use in the field in methods of “enhanced” interrogation. The storm of public outrage over the exposure of torture tactics in the past moved the AAA to compose and release yet another statement issued in 2007 (<http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-Torture.cfm>). By this date the United States had already been engaged in wars in the Middle East beginning with Desert Storm in 1991 and seamlessly carrying forward to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which are on-going. This particular AAA statement is extensive and makes reference to anthropological research, it states in part:

be it moved that the American Anthropological Association unequivocally condemns the use of anthropological knowledge as an element of physical and psychological torture; condemns the use of physical and psychological torture by U.S. Military and Intelligence personnel, subcontractors, and proxies; and urges the U.S. Congress and President George W. Bush to: Comply fully with national and international anti-torture laws, including the Geneva Conventions and protocols, the U.N. Convention Against Torture, the 1996 U.S. War Crimes Act, and U.S. Criminal Code, Sections 2340-2340A...[<http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-Torture.cfm>]

According to Price, the utility of exploiting anthropological productions of knowledge has increased exponentially with U.S. involvement in political and economic global structures; he writes,

President Bush’s wars at home, Afghanistan and Iraq brought new uses for anthropology and anthropologists, many of these engagements occurred without ethical complications, while others, especially those involving counterinsurgency went far beyond what the previous generation of

anthropologists would [have] considered ethical uses of anthropology. Increasing numbers of anthropologists responded to militarized calls in ways that viewed anthropological ethics as a luxury not to be afforded by those needing anthropology's ethnographic knowledge for warfare. The clearest expression of these views came from anthropologist Montgomery McFate, who openly sought to militarize anthropology with the development of embedded Counterinsurgency teams known as Human Terrain Teams. Doctor McFate led the charge to recruit anthropologists, bluntly admitting that "despite the fact that military applications of cultural knowledge might be distasteful to ethically inclined anthropologists, their assistance is necessary" (McFate 2005:37). Rather than confronting the complexity of ethical relationships, McFate's Human Terrain Teams simply ignored them. [2011:27]

In relationship to anthropologists, Price states that their recruitment into government work continues unabated, is sometimes more open, but that their unwitting participation is still valued. He also refers to a collective amnesia by writing,

somewhere between 1971 and today, American anthropologists lost their collective strong sense of outrage over the discipline being so nakedly used for counterinsurgency. Part of this loss of outrage comes with the degeneration of historical memory as fewer Americans know the history of the CIA's legacy of assassinations, coups and death squads and a history of undermining democratic movements harmful to the interests of American elites. [2007:13]

Yudhijit Bhattacharjee recognizes a similarity between the Cold War efforts of anthropologists and the wars in the Middle East while also acknowledging the denial of anthropologists' involvement during the Vietnam War:

the new program is not the first time the military has tried to integrate cultural, behavioral, and economic aspects of an adversary into its battle plans. During the Cold War, for example, U.S. defense and intelligence agencies hired dozens of anthropologists to prepare dossiers on Soviet society. Similar efforts were made during the U.S. war in Vietnam, with little success. [2007:535]

Roberto Gonzalez speaks of the first new counterinsurgency manual in 20 years having been released in 2006, the value of cultural knowledge, and the participation of a cultural anthropologist in the construction of the manual which is named FM 3-24.

At least one anthropologist played a role in preparing the 282-page document: Montgomery McFate, a cultural anthropologist from the US, co-authored a chapter entitled ‘Intelligence in counterinsurgency’ with a military intelligence specialist.

Such involvement in the preparation of the counterinsurgency manual is the latest development in a trend that has become increasingly evident since 2001: the use of ‘cultural knowledge’ to wage the ‘war on terror’.

FM 3-24 is a counterinsurgency handbook written by dozens of contributors. ‘Cultural knowledge’ is highlighted in the first chapter:

cultural knowledge is essential to waging a successful counterinsurgency. American ideas of what is ‘normal’ or ‘rational’ are not universal. To the contrary, members of other societies often have different notions of rationality, appropriate behavior, level of religious devotion, and norms concerning gender. Thus, what may appear abnormal or strange to an external observer may appear as self-evidently normal to a group member. For this reason, counter-insurgents – especially commanders, planners, and small-scale unit leaders – should strive to avoid imposing their ideals of normalcy on a foreign cultural problem (p. 1/15).

This is elaborated in chapter 3 (coauthored by McFate), which begins by carving out an anthropological niche: ‘IPB [intelligence preparation of the battlefield] in COIN [counterinsurgency] requires personnel to work in areas like economics, anthropology, and governance that may be outside their expertise...external experts with local and regional knowledge are critical to effective preparation’ (p. 3/2). [2007:14]

Price [2005:2] refers to an essay written by Montgomery McFate in 2005 which appeared in the publication *Military Review* in which McFate stated “...that codes of ethics stand in the way of the military application of anthropology.” Gonzalez draws an analogy between *FM 3-24* and colonial rule, although he states “empire and imperial are taboo words, never used in reference to US power” (2007:16).

Gonzalez (2007:17) also makes mention of anthropologists as members of Human Terrain Teams (HTT) actually being embedded with teams in Iraq and Afghanistan as “cultural advisors.” Equally concerning may be the recruitment and employment of

anthropologists by civilian contractors, those anthropologists he calls “cultural mercenaries,” who are often hired to design counterinsurgency projects or “enhanced interrogation techniques.” Even beyond all of this is the disturbing history of governmental funding to universities and individuals, funding that I can only conceive of as the mega-carrot enticement. These concerns are reflected by Price when he writes, “as the training of anthropology graduate students becomes increasingly dependent on programs like the 1991 National Security Education Program—with its required governmental-service payback stipulations—the issue takes on increased (though seldom discussed) importance” (2000:27).

In *Weaponizing Anthropology* (2011), David Price devotes three full chapters, essentially 60 pages of writing, to the various government agency funding programs available to university undergraduate and graduate students. On page 33 he states that since 2001, “several programs developed in the past half-decade found new ways to secretly place students with undisclosed ties to the CIA, FBI, NSA, the Defense Intelligence Agency and Homeland Security in American university classrooms...” and goes on to describe the National Security Education Program (NSEP) as providing as much as \$40,000 per year to study, what he terms, “in demand” languages. NSEP stipulates that these students, upon graduation, “work for unspecified U.S. national security agencies.”

In 2004, Congress passed the Intelligence Authorization Act which, in part, supports the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP) named for Sen. Pat Roberts. PRISP funds graduate students up to \$25,000 per year who are majoring in the areas of China, the Middle East, Korea, Russia, China, Africa, South America, and other

countries. The program is most interested in students gaining proficiency in languages (Price 2011).

Also in 2004, Congress approved the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act. The Director of National Intelligence oversees the Intelligence Community Scholars Program (ISCP), yet another scholarship program. This program provides \$40,000 per year for a maximum of four years. However, according to Price,

the 2004 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act stated that if ICSP recipients decline to work for their sponsoring intelligence agency upon completing their education, the student “shall be liable to the United States for an amount equal to the total amount of the scholarships received [and] the interest on the amounts of such awards which would be payable if at the time the awards were received they were loans bearing interest and the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States, *multiplied by three*” (US Congress 2004, Public Law 108-458:h, 2. b). [2011:45]

PRISP underwent a transformation in 2009 when Dennis C. Blair, Director of National Intelligence established a program which created a “Reserve Officers’ Training Corps” which Price describes as training

...unidentified future intelligence officers in U.S. college classrooms. Like students receiving PRISP funds, the identities of students participating in these programs would not be known to professors, university administrators or fellow students—in effect, these future intelligence analysts and agents would conduct their first covert missions in our university classrooms. [2011:56]

In 2008, Secretary of Defense Gates announced a Department of Defense (DOD) program, called the Minerva Consortium, which would even more closely connect universities to the DOD. About Minerva, Price writes:

Gates envisioned that the Minerva initiative would consist of “*a consortia of universities that will promote research in specific areas. These consortia could also be repositories of open-source documentary archives. The Department of Defense, perhaps in conjunction with other government agencies, could provide the funding for these projects*” (Gates 2008). Minerva issued requests for proposals, their initial interests consist

of projects working on: “Chinese Military and Technology Research and Archive Programs,” “Studies of the strategic impact of religious and cultural changes within the Islamic World,” an “Iraqi Perspectives Project,” “Studies of Terrorist Organization and Ideologies,” and “New approaches to understanding dimensions of national security, conflict and cooperation. [2011:59]

And further, on pg.64,

Minerva seeks to increase the military’s understanding of other cultures. This is a different project than the Cold War funding programs that openly sought to increase policy makers’ understanding of other cultures. The Bush Doctrine’s proximity to Minerva suggests a program designed to give the tools of culture to those in the military who will be told where to invade and occupy, not to those who might be asked of the wisdom of such actions.

Writing in *The Guardian*, Nafeez Ahmed reports on recent projects being underwritten by Minerva:

among the projects awarded for the period 2014-2017 is a Cornell University-led study managed by the US Air Force Office of Scientific Research which aims to develop an empirical model "of the dynamics of social movement mobilisation and contagions." The project will determine "the critical mass (tipping point)" of social contagions by studying their "digital traces" in the cases of "the 2011 Egyptian revolution, the 2011 Russian Duma elections, the 2012 Nigerian fuel subsidy crisis and the 2013 Gazi park protests in Turkey.

Another project awarded this year to the University of Washington "seeks to uncover the conditions under which political movements aimed at large-scale political and economic change originate," along with their "characteristics and consequences." The project, managed by the US Army Research Office, focuses on "large-scale movements involving more than 1,000 participants in enduring activity," and will cover 58 countries in total. [2014:1]

Ahmed exposes an internal staff email by writing,

an internal Minerva staff email communication referenced in a 2012 Masters dissertation reveals that the programme is geared toward producing quick results that are directly applicable to field operations. The dissertation was part of a Minerva-funded project on "counter-radical Muslim discourse" at Arizona State University. [2014:1]

All of these programs and projects should give one pause and bring one to question whether these projects are truly to aid efforts in preventing terrorism or if they are, in fact, aimed to expand global acts of U.S. imperialism.

These military and government agency programs seem to procreate, with the individual numbers growing each year. Price writes that,

in 2005, the first wave of ICCAE [Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence] centers were installed at ten university campuses...Between 2008-2010 another wave of expansion brought ICCAE programs to another eleven campuses...But the CIA and FBI aren't the only intelligence agencies that ICCAE brings to American university campuses. ICCAE quietly brings a smorgasbord of intelligence agencies to campuses with fifteen agencies, such as the National Security Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and Homeland Security on our campuses. [2011:73]

Perhaps the most personally disturbing program is a reference made by Price to Roberto Gonzalez's book *Militarizing Culture*.

Roberto González's research explores how ICCAE's university programs are but part of a larger project that also seeks to connect intelligence agencies with American students in high school and even younger. In *Militarizing Culture*, González notes that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence's program plan encourages grantees to "consider coordinating summer camps for junior high students...[they] should be at least one week in duration with high energy programs that excite the participants" (González 2010:39). He also describes programs tailored especially for high school students, such as the Norfolk State's "simulation exercise in which faculty asked Nashville-area high schoolers to locate ten simulated 'weapons of mass destruction' hidden in the city" and the university of Texas Pan American's high school summer camp which featured talks "from speakers from intelligence community agencies, such as the CIA and FBI." [2011:73]

These tactics represent nothing less than indoctrination of America's youth into nationalism, political domestic and foreign policy, systems of belief, and potential expansion of a militarized state...much as the Hitler Youth were indoctrinated into Nazism from 1933 to 1945.

To bring this chapter to a close, one final quote from Price on Human Terrain

Teams seems appropriate:

in his book *American Counterinsurgency: Human Science and the Human Terrain*, anthropologist Roberto González quotes U.S. Army, Lt. Colonel Gian Gentile, scoffing at suggestions that such cultural data would not be used for targeting in active war situations, responding to similar claims by Human Terrain anthropologist Marcus Griffin, Gentile wrote: Dear Dr. Griffin: “*Don’t fool yourself. These Human Terrain Teams whether they want to acknowledge it or not, in a generalized and subtle way, do at some point contribute to the collective knowledge of a commander which allows him to target and kill the enemy in the Civil War in Iraq.* [2011:108]

I. Conclusion

This chapter has elicited the deep connection between anthropology, some anthropologists, and policies of United States imperialism which have operated on a global scale for several centuries; from the first wave of European invasion in 1492 until present day, indigenous peoples of the Americas and others, now globally, have been the victims of structural and institutional exploitation, domination, oppression, and genocide. From Columbus’ search for gold in the Caribbean and the Spanish exploitation of the silver mines of Potosí to satisfy the greed of European monarchs, the plundering of resources progressed from European hands to control by United States interests. The profits of United States elites were (and remain) protected by the United States government, invasion by the United States Marines, and the complicity of the CIA. Resources exploited in Central America, South America, the Caribbean, and Africa include gold, diamonds, oil, coffee, bananas, sugar, tobacco, rubber, copper, and countless other resources. United States families and individuals who have reaped the enormous financial benefits of these resources include United Fruit Co. interest holders Henry Cabot Lodge and John Cabot; the Rockefeller family’s control of Standard Oil and

railroads; Charles Goodyear and Thomas Hancock's of United States Rubber Co., and many others.

Interest in these geographical areas have returned huge profits to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank through money lending practices that are established in ways which make it impossible for any amelioration of the debt. As protected United States interests purchase increasingly more land for mining or agricultural pursuits, all of the Third World energies are funneled into single commodity production in order to try to repay these loans; single commodity economy means that all other commodities (even food) must be purchased from other countries, at artificially inflated prices. Those who suffer the most are the poor who have been enslaved, impressed, or recruited to perform the labor of production and who barely receive enough return to sustain life; and the poor in Third World nations are almost always the indigenous people of the land.

John Allison was the Tribal Anthropologist for the Klamath Tribes of southern Oregon and northern California. After losing his job, in 2008, as a Cultural Resource Archaeologist, he received a response to posting his CV on-line from a Human Terrain Systems (HTS) recruiter. After almost two years in the training program, Allison resigned due to personal ethical conflicts. David Price writes that at one point "...John wrote to HTS training personnel that this "is not so different from what the European-Americans did to the Native Americans in the USA. Now, several generations later, the stories are passed on and are deep in the collective consciousness of those Indian peoples..." (2011:163). The lines between colonization and imperialism are thin; the domination and expendable lives of the oppressed are ubiquitous.

Kathleen Gough Aberle linked anthropology and United States imperialism almost 50 years ago when she wrote,

Anthropology is a child of Western imperialism. It has roots in the humanist visions of the Enlightenment, but as a university discipline and a modern science it came into its own in the last decades of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. This was the period in which the Western nations were making their final push to bring practically the whole pre-industrial, non-Western world under their political and economic control. [1968:12-13]

And, Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban conceptualizes a modern day contradiction by writing,

ironically, as American anthropology has begun to decolonize in both discourse and practice, it is being called upon to serve a declining US imperialism, where ethics and morality are often confused with politics, and morality has become a contested notion. After Vietnam, and with daily reminders of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the US has become a self-conscious imperial power, embarrassed by its defeats, but still open to finding novel solutions to global dilemmas through the knowledge and methods anthropology affords. Anthropologists urgently need clarity about this engagement. [2008:22]

Apparently repetition is not always the best teacher but, as suggested recently by a friend, “unless, of course, it is actually working for those in power.”

This chapter was difficult to write on a number of levels. The amount of reference material on the subjugation or annihilation of indigenous peoples globally as a result of covert and overt political policy and action is staggering. David Price alone has filled reams of paper with well researched information on how members of the academy have been (and continue to be), at times willing and at times unwitting, partners to the oppression of indigenous peoples while safe-guarding the profits of Corporate America. The sheer wealth of material available and deciding what resources to use in order to illuminate these issues has been, at times, a seemingly overwhelming task. There were so very many more government or military programs and projects than what could be

covered in the scope of this dissertation.

The collusion of the United States government and use of military force to uphold the colonization of the Americas and the even more recent course of United States imperialism is distressing; and the instances of complicity by anthropologists of the discipline is disheartening, most especially in light of the many Statements or Codes of Ethics. Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban is one anthropologist (among, I am certain, many) who has also struggled with these issues and addressed them in this way:

as a potential solution to the fear that labeling as unethical all government-related work—clearly not the case—I propose that secret or clandestine research be distinguished from proprietary, client-based research. Secret research is privileged, is contracted by a private or government agency, and is not intended to be made public or available to the people studied. This type of research is unethical because it violates a recognized, basic principle about openness and full disclosure in scientific research. Research is still research, but secret research is not ethical research, and that needs to be clearly stated... [2003:21]

However there are questions which, to the best of my knowledge, are not being asked by anthropologists or by Anthropology's professional organizations, and which most certainly need to be addressed. Questions such as why have Statements on Ethics, Racism, and Torture only emerged long after United States engagement in war? Anthropology is a global discipline, why have no statements been issued that pertains to civil wars in other countries such as those in Africa or in Ireland? Following the adoption of a Code of Ethics by the SfAA as early as 1949 and the Statement of Ethics by the AAA in 1967 with revisions in 1971, 1987, 1998, 2009, and again in 2012, why do so many anthropologists seek employment with agencies or engage in projects which challenge and strain acceptable ethical practice as outlined by their professional organizations? What has become of the outrage over human rights violations during the

Vietnam War when the AAA adopted the 1967 Statement of Ethics?

There is little in the way of definitively answering these questions other than my own analysis based purely on contemplating the questions, conclusions drawn which I have no way of proving because the conversation is not being engaged within the discipline. The AAA Statement on Ethics which was adopted in 1967 was instigated by a group of what might be considered “radical” anthropologists who grabbed political power at AAA meetings to “push through political resolutions against anthropological contributions to the [Vietnam] war” (Price 2011:24). A year later, 800 members of the AAA signed a petition in opposition to the recruitment ad in the *American Anthropologist* journal seeking anthropologists for a Vietnam War Psychological Operations Counterinsurgency position. Why has this outrage and activism disappeared? Is it just the collective reaction to the horror of the moment that drives the periodic demands for change? And is it simply part of the national amnesia, the apathy that has enveloped this country in relationship to third world oppressions, the non-remembrance of a time in recent history which so fragmented the country? What of the five revisions to the AAA Statement on Ethics? What of the Statements on Torture or Racism or Human Terrain Teams? It appears that professional organizations, and the AAA specifically, adopt Statements or Codes only as a reactive measure to some horrendous condition and it would further suggest that these Statements are not yet a serious component of the discipline, but guides that are devised almost as an after-thought.

Why are no statements issued by the AAA in relationship to wars and conflicts waged in other countries, conflicts in which the United States does not intervene? There is a premise that Anthropology is not a political discipline. I disagree. Anthropology is

deeply invested globally in the study of non-Western cultures, languages, and archaeology. If anthropologists are engaged in research in other countries, that research always has the potential to be used for political agendas. Do we not issue statements on human right abuses because those abuses are committed by governments outside of the United States? Is the United States invested in these countries and would those investments be jeopardized by United States intervention? Does that make the discipline further complicit in the abuse? Anthropology is a global discipline, not a discipline confined only within the geographical boundaries of the United States.

Perhaps some of the answers to these questions are embedded in the answer to asking “why do so many anthropologists seek employment with agencies or engage in projects which challenge and strain acceptable ethical practice as outlined by their professional organizations?” There are no penalties or sanctions levied against those individuals who willingly participate in projects that defy ethical practice as defined by Statements. There is no censuring by the academy of individuals such as the censuring of Boas in 1919 by the AAA. Careers are not destroyed or even mildly negatively impacted. This is analogous to enacting a law that contains no penalties for infractions. Until Anthropology devises ways in which to discipline its practitioners, the Statements and Codes are nothing more than empty rhetoric that “looks good on paper.” Anthropology desperately needs to engage in proactive, rather than reactive, statements that define the best practices of the discipline, with strong guidelines which suggest professional marginalization for activities beyond the stated scope of practice.

Throughout my research, I have been angered by the facts, saddened by the brilliant scholars lost to the insanity of the McCarthy era, and I have wept over the

“Disappeared” of Chile, Guatemala, and Mexico; those tortured and murdered in the past in all of North America, Mexico, Central America, South America, the Caribbean, and Africa—all for the sake of gold, diamonds, tin, copper, oil, rubber, coffee, bananas, cotton, tobacco, and other resources plundered in order to perpetuate the wealth and power of First World individuals. I have also been saddened over the needless loss of lives in all of the wars fought in the name of justice, but in reality have and continue to be fought for the purpose of maintaining the already colonized states and the imperialistic control of others.

Anti-Communist propaganda in the 1950s and 1960s, most certainly devised by the U.S. military and disseminated by the U.S. government, produced a level of fear in the American population of Soviet nuclear attack that resulted in people constructing underground, concrete fall-out shelters in their back yards. In our schools, nuclear attack drills were conducted on a monthly basis; when the sirens blared, we crawled under our desks with our arms encircling our heads. I remember wondering, as a seven year old child in 1953, how our wooden desks would protect us...certainly most of us had seen the newsreel images of nuclear bomb testing...but I admired and trusted my teachers so believed they must know best what to do. By the end of the 1950s, someone must have posed the question because now, when the sirens blared, we moved as quickly and orderly as possible to the basement corridors without windows. If the Cold War began in 1947 and ended in 1990, then excepting the year in which I was born, there has not been a day of my life where war has not been a constant companion, and well-noted by a friend, war has also been a constant companion of my discipline.

CHAPTER 5

ANTHROPOLOGISTS and INDIANS: THE GREAT DIVIDE

Anthropology will survive in a changing world by allowing itself to perish in order to be born again under a new guise.

Claude Lévi-Strauss [1966:126]

A. Introduction

The dissertation thus far has briefly examined the history of colonization and the methods used in that process, along with the ways in which the discipline and practitioners of the Four Fields of Anthropology have been complicit, wittingly or not, with colonization and imperialistic practices; in that examination, the ways in which indigenous peoples view Anthropology, and by extension anthropologists, as collaborators in their oppression should be evident. These perceptions have understandably created a divide between indigenous communities or indigenous individuals and anthropologists. The divide, however, goes beyond historical practices of colonization.

The causes of such a divide do not reside solely in the perceptions of indigenous people or communities, but also within the structure of Anthropology and practices of some anthropologists. The depth of that divide is most certainly informed by ideological differences; world views that are often diametrically opposed. Indigenous peoples are able to visualize the divide because we live within that space, while the divide often remains invisible to, or ignored by, non-indigenous peoples and the disciplinary practice of Anthropology as a whole. Not exploring the divide sustains the hegemonic practices and underlying anthropological theories of mainstream, non-indigenous practitioners, allowing the Eurocentric privilege of understandings about the world to remain intact, unexamined, and unchallenged.

From the article, “Representing the Colonized,” we can see that Edward Said is identifying the divide as ideological, but also social in nature.

The native point of view, despite the way it has often been portrayed, is not an ethnographic fact only, is not a hermeneutical construct primarily or even principally; it is in large measure a continuing, protracted, and sustained adversarial resistance to the discipline and the praxis of anthropology (as representative of “outside” power) itself, anthropology not as textuality but as an often direct agent of political dominance. [1989:220]

Ideological and socio-political frameworks have been translated in practice to expressions of unequal power structures.

B. Conceptualizing the Areas of Conflict

What are the reasons for this divide that separates indigenous people and indigenous anthropologists from Anthropology and mainstream, non-indigenous anthropologists? Perhaps an indigenous sense of violation that began with colonization and which has been perpetuated by Anthropology through looting of ancestral graves, cultural and spiritual appropriations, denigrating designations of indigenous people as an “Other,” and the unequal social, economic, and political power structures created by colonization and sustained by the discipline. Another cause of the divide is the perception of indigenous scholars that the only way for indigenous people to participate in the field is through assimilation, to become as white and Westernized in thinking as possible. Even with the possibility of indigenous scholars attaining some degree of acceptance within the academy, indigenous worldview, indigenous ways of knowing, and indigenous belief systems have, to date, not been accorded equal standing, respect, or consideration with their counterparts in the Westernized hegemonic canons of academe. The genesis and lingering effects of these conditions are deeply embedded in historical

processes of colonization, processes which have been used to establish the theories and method of the discipline of Anthropology, thus perpetuating the colonization of indigenous peoples.

Many indigenous people view their ideology as being devalued, diminished, and most often discarded by the power structures within the discipline of Anthropology itself. Firsthand accounts of this perception are provided further in the dissertation by indigenous anthropologists and indigenous graduate students in Anthropology departments. Indigenous scholars within and outside of the discipline have authored books and articles which illuminate this perception (e.g. Smith 1999; Deloria 1988, 1997, 1999; Atalay 2012; Wilcox 2012). As an indigenous person, I have a personal narrative that gives voice to the divide; instances and experiences that have contributed to my own feelings of being held on the margins of the anthropological world while putatively being a part of that world.

When indigenous people who live beyond the boundaries of the academic world are exposed to Anthropology, usually as subject matter for research, the ideological conflicts are expressed in understandings of history, culture, spiritual belief, and knowledge production. Senses of self-esteem are eroded when faced with educated outsiders who portray an image of holding expert knowledge and bring with them an aura of affluence unknown to the community.

1. Conflicting Historical Narratives

There is a major disjuncture between indigenous and scientific understandings of history, such as the peopling of the Americas. Indigenous understandings are founded in oral tradition with each Nation holding and passing on, from generation to generation,

their stories which tell of how they arrived in their traditional homeland; some tell of migrations from the North and some speak of being in place since “the beginning of time” (creation). Many of the stories are framed as metaphors, such as the Maori story of “riding on the back of a whale” to settle in New Zealand, the whale being a metaphor for large ocean-going canoes. Scientific understandings of indigenous history rely solely on evidence such as artifacts from archaeological sites and, from these sites, scientists create time lines and stories (DeLoria 2001; 1997b). However, even when anthropologists strive to interpret artifacts, they so often arrive at erroneous conclusions. One tribal elder with whom I spoke noted that,

did I find that there was anything that we got from anybody outside of our community who could better interpret our objects? No. Absolutely, positively no. In fact, just the opposite. There were interpretations that were bizarre and absurd and within the community the interpretations were deep and magnificent and there was nothing, nothing that was ever added. [personal communication, October 23, 2014]

The anthropological theory of the peopling of the Americas, which continues to be considered dogma by many anthropologists, adheres to a human occupation of North America beginning between 12,000 to 15,000 years ago with the migration of humans crossing the Bering Strait Land Bridge. Another line of scientific evidence is based in linguistics. However, linguists such as Johanna Nichols (1990) have long been in disagreement with this timeline. Nichols posits that diversity of languages in Native North and South America could not have developed in less than 35,000 to 50,000 years (1990:475).

The timeline for the peopling of the Americas is partially based in the artefactual evidence of Clovis points, a particular style of point or tool which supposedly was carried across the Land Bridge, being the earliest dated points. But as Paulette Steeves tells us,

“no evidence of fluted Clovis tools has ever been found outside of the Western Hemisphere” (2015:49). Why would this disagreement between indigenous people and anthropologists hold any importance? Paulette Steeves (2015:48) recognizes, and Elizabeth Brumfield (2003:207) suggests, that those who control history hold political, economic, and social capital and are therefore a source of power. Brumfield tells us that “...history provides a potent social weapon. People use history to position themselves with respect to others: to entitle some individuals and to deny others rights to resources, citizenship, and social status (Williams 1989)” (2003:207).

As each indigenous Nation holds its own version of history, transmitted generation-to-generation through oral tradition and through symbolic artifacts and symbols, anthropologists hold to Euro-American versions of those tribal histories which have been warehoused in colonial archives. These colonial versions are endowed with legitimacy by ongoing power structures and have become part of the national canon of instruction. Anthropologists bring those erroneous archived histories into communities and use them to frame anthropological theory with an authority that is conveyed on the anthropologist through academic privilege. And, in reference to the above statement of the tribal elder, the anthropologist so often forms conclusions which are “bizarre and absurd” in the eyes of the community, conclusions bearing no resemblance to what the community knows as historical truth.

2. Conflicts in Ethical Understandings

The next point of ideological difference is one of ethical practice. Differences in the definition of what constitutes ethical treatment of ancestral remains are an example of conflict and are discussed in depth in another chapter in this dissertation. Of course there

are many anthropologists who hold deep understandings of the indigenous worldview on this issue; but there are also many who dismiss and ignore Native concerns surrounding the dead by positing that these concerns are based solely in “religious belief” and therefore have no scientific validity (see, for example, Weiss 2008). Yes, there is an aspect of religious belief attached to the vehement opposition of indigenous ancestral remains being exhumed and subjected to use as teaching tools or to invasive procedures; however, science is also a belief system and much of anthropological science is built on conjecture formed through individual interpretation (Deloria 1997b). Perhaps even more importantly, the core issue is one of respect and common human decency of leaving the dead to lie in peace. This is essentially a universal understanding and practice. Throughout the proceedings that resulted in the passing into federal law of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), this topic was repeatedly identified by Native people and Senate hearing committee members as a human right; the only voices of dissent were those from the scientific community, and there were even those within that community that gave recognition to this concept. Honoring and caring for ancestral graves is part of every culture, including the general population of North America.

To many Native people, ethical treatment of (any) human remains quite simply means not digging them up, not studying them, and not using human remains as a tool useful in building one’s professional career. From this ideological view, indigenous people consider any other treatment of remains to be an expression of a lack of ethics or moral character. In fact, one elder interviewed during my research stated,

that’s a difficult topic because, for me, I was taught by *my* elders that only people who were the most vile and filthy creatures on the face of the Earth

touched our bones, and so I don't even have, from a very biased cultural standpoint, any understanding of what those people would be doing. To me, they were simply violating my family and anything they could have discovered was of no interest to me. And I've never heard of anything they've discovered that was enlightening in any way so... [personal communication, October 23, 2014]

Yet one more example of conflict is methodology used in anthropological fieldwork. Indigenous people recognize that there are unstated but well-established protocols that must be followed when interacting with communities or individuals. Some of the interviews I have conducted with tribal elders elicited expressions of lack of respect for themselves, their communities, or their culture by some anthropologists. Any methodology engaged with indigenous communities or individuals must first and always be predicated on deep respect and humility. Each world culture holds norms, or codes of conduct, which include behaviors that are considered acceptable when engaging in interpersonal discourse or interaction. This is simply a matter of being a "good guest" in another's home or community. Often when conducting fieldwork, anthropologists enter a community with an air of superiority, considering their advanced education and knowledge as a permit to disregard the community's protocols for socially correct behavior; elders are not treated with the level of respect they should be given for their wisdom and knowledge; community history may be "corrected" to privilege the scientific version; ceremony may be ridiculed as superstitious nonsense or simply dismissed as being unimportant to the researcher; and the researcher may give the impression of knowing more about the community than the members themselves.

A wedge that further serves to widen the divide is a lack of consideration of other worldviews in general. While anthropologists certainly are aware that indigenous people do not view the universe in exactly the same way as do forms of Western science, they

appear to make no effort to explore the possibility that indigenous worldview is also based in science and may, in fact, have accurate understandings of the world. Rather, the scientific world seems to propose universal truths without understanding that there may be more than one way at arriving at the same answer. Science does not consider anything outside of the physical world. Anthropology is defined by James Deetz as "...the study of man in the broadest sense, including his physical, cultural, and psychological aspects, and their interrelationships" (1967:3). Unfortunately Deetz does not include "spiritual" in this definition, and indigenous perspective is grounded in the spiritual, in the understanding that all are connected relationships.

3. Linear vs. Circular Thinking

In unpacking indigenous ways of producing knowledge, some anthropologists have recognized that indigenous ways of speaking of, and relating to, the world are circular and connected, with events occupying a specific space rather than linear or straight lines relating only to time. Indigenous people often speak in metaphors, relating a time in history, not by a date, but by an astronomical occurrence, or a time of famine or plenty, or relate time to events in the life of an ancestor. This concept of time and space is often difficult for scientists to understand.

Vine Deloria describes the indigenous relationship with space as being one of humans with the natural world but also explains that

perceptions of experience articulated in predominantly spatial terms incorporate the immediacy of the situation without including prior causations and future projections as part of the original experience. Thus the immediate event is passed forward as it occurred, without editorial reordering... [1999:364]

Deloria then presents Marshall McLuhan (1965) as suggesting that "our ideas of cause

and effect in the literate West have long been in the form of things in sequence and succession...an idea [way of understanding the world] that strikes any tribal or auditory culture as quite ridiculous, and one that has lost its prime place in our own new physics and biology” (1999:364).

Vine Deloria Jr. discusses the differences between circular and linear ways of understanding time and space in his book *Spirit & Reason* (1999), and both he and Daniel R. Wildcat address the topic in *Power and Place: Indian Education in America* (2001). In an article for *American Antiquity*, Roger Echo-Hawk (2000) writes about the integration of oral traditions with the archaeological record over deep time, and how indigenous understandings of time differ from those of scientific understandings. There is very little reference made to circular vs. linear ways of thinking in non-Native authored literature, and what does exist simply restates that of Native writers. For those who are unable to recognize or understand circular thinking, what they may be told about it is dismissed as having no value, being mere expressions of primitive superstition, or being nonsensical.

4. Cultural and Spiritual Imperialism

The divide is furthered by the fact that Anthropology has continued to serve and expand colonization by appropriating indigenous ancestral remains, languages, cultural material, ceremonies, and knowledge systems. In the process, Anthropology as a discipline and academic study, has removed all of the above from indigenous control and ownership while supporting the stereotypes of an “inferior culture,” thereby perpetuating the image of indigenous people as the “exotic Other.” Through indigenous eyes both the presence of lingering stereotypes, which Philip Deloria (1999) identifies as a form of

racial domination, and the ongoing appropriation of indigenous culture can be viewed as on-going colonization. These are all historical traumas that remain unaddressed and unredressed.

The conflict I am identifying also has much to do with the gathering of indigenous knowledges, the removal of knowledge from indigenous communities, and the fact that the very worldviews which make such knowledge valuable in Western eyes is denied value or credence in the discipline of Anthropology. By this I mean that while the materials (language, ceremonies, cultural practices, material culture, etc.) are deemed to hold great value for collections and for advancing careers of anthropologists, their intrinsic value is neglected. Anthropologists assign value to these materials based on what the materials can provide by way of answering questions being asked by the discipline. Indigenous people recognize the value of these same materials to be found in and of themselves, in relationship to the people individually or communally and often as being necessary to a way of life. Sonya Atalay addresses this concern by writing,

within the United States, Native American communities have vehemently voiced their dissatisfaction when archaeologists claimed stewardship over these items, devalued their knowledge, and ignored their Indigenous understandings. [2012:57]

This assessment has been supported in the highly publicized conversations that surrounded the structuring, and passing, of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990 as evidenced in writings by scholars such as David Hurst Thomas' (2000) *Skull Wars*, Kathleen Fine-Dare's (2002) *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*, and *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience* by C. Timothy McKeown (2012). It would appear that the field of

Anthropology has always been in need of an “Other” in order to survive in its historical role of researching, collecting, interpreting, and writing.

5. Philosophies of Vine Deloria

I often think about Vine Deloria’s views on the interactions between anthropologists and Indians and the sardonic summaries he wrote, summaries which most often elicited angry responses from those engaged in the field of anthropology. In *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Deloria wrote,

behind each successful man stands a woman and behind each policy and program with which Indians are plagued, if traced completely back to its origin, stands the anthropologist. [1969:81]

And, perhaps Deloria’s most well-noted and highly contested quote:

into each life, it is said, some rain must fall. Some people have bad horoscopes, others take tips on the stock market...Churches possess the real world. But Indians have been cursed above all other people in history. Indians have anthropologists. [1969:78]

This recurring theme of Deloria’s speaks of the social, political, and economic ways in which anthropological study has contributed to the marginalization of indigenous peoples. As the colonizers appropriated land and resources, anthropologists and the discipline have appropriated indigenous knowledge systems, rewritten those knowledge systems from a colonial Euro-American perspective, and then archived the information in places often inaccessible to the very people who provided the information.

Deloria also is speaking out against the ways in which field work is financially supported. Financial resources are allocated through universities, National Science Foundation (NSF) grants, the Ford Foundation, and countless other funding entities. While these monies support the living expenses including travel, research, and writing time of the anthropologist, rarely does it benefit the communities or individuals being

studied. Some members of indigenous communities may often be under-educated, but this should not suggest that these people are ignorant; they recognize that, once again, something is being either freely given to outsiders, or stolen by outsiders. One reviewer of *Custer*, Mark E. Randall, appears to have understood and supported what Deloria was stating,

what Deloria, as spokesman for all Indians, wants from anthropologists, is to either be left alone, or to be shown some tangible advantage to being studied. Is this unreasonable? Is it heresy for an anthropologist to support such a suggestion? (I say "suggestion"-Deloria might say "demand.") The thought of splitting funds for research between the anthropologist and the people being studied is, I know, rather distasteful to say the least to anyone plotting a grant proposal-imagine tacking on a small addendum at the end of the proposal: "And the same amount for the Indians." [1971:985]

There was, of course, a rebuttal to Randall's positive review written by C. Adrian Heidenreich (1972), a professor of History and Native American Studies, which may be difficult to categorize as anything but defensive...not as an anthropologist, but most likely as an academic. Heidenreich titled his reply *The Sins of Custer Are Not Anthropological Sins: A Reply to Mark E. Randall*. Some examples of Heidenreich's comments:

He [Deloria] is a spokesman, certainly, for himself and for a few other educated Indians, and he speaks most forcefully to *their* felt "plight."

Perhaps even more important, however, is Randall's unfortunate and apparently ill-informed point about native peoples being "poked and prodded, spied upon, and portrayed as strange creatures with odd habits put upon the earth to entertain and amuse the rest of us." Ironically, more than any other group of Whites (or non-Whites), anthropologists have been engaged in...tangible activities. [1972:1032-1033]

Following this last statement, Heidenreich goes on to list two columns worth of contributions made by anthropologists to the good of Indian people and communities. I would personally, today, use Deloria to make a counter-reply to this last statement, and

support Randall, with the following, which encapsulates the modern Indian experience of being “poked and prodded, spied upon, and portrayed as strange creatures with odd habits put upon the earth to entertain and amuse the rest of us” (Randall 1971:985).

The family was not, however, the nuclear family of modern-day America, nor was it even the modern Indian family, which has, in addition to its blood-related members, an FBI undercover agent, an anthropologist, a movie maker, and a white psychologist looking for a spiritual experience. [Deloria 2001:44]

Another excerpt from Heidenreich’s rebuttal concerns the issue of field-work funding which was addressed by Deloria in *Custer* and mentioned by Randall in his review.

To the suggestion of splitting funds for research between the anthropologists and the people being studied, one may be reminded that this practice traditionally has been carried out formally under the category of “informants’ fees,” and informal exchanges also are a usual part of most fieldwork. If a researcher chooses to increase the amount of grant money he asks for and give the money outright to the tribe (unless the tribe itself is financing the study), that is an ethical matter between him, the people he studies, and the granting agency. [Heidenreich 1972:1032-1033]

One segment of my research for this dissertation consisted of personal interviews with tribal elders. I asked about this issue of funding received by anthropologists for field work and if any of those resources were shared with the tribe or individual informants. I learned of no case or project in New England where those resources were shared. Maybe it’s a Western Indian Reservation thing? I certainly agree with Heidenreich’s statement that “if a researcher chooses to increase the amount of grant money he asks for and give the money outright to the tribe (unless the tribe itself is financing the study), that is an ethical matter between him, the people he studies, and the granting agency” (1972:1033); perhaps suggesting this action would be a good addendum to the various Statements or Code on Ethics adopted by professional organizations. The

practice of bringing gifts is considered a cultural norm in Indian Country. Personally, I had no research funding for my dissertation fieldwork, so monetary gifts were not a consideration for me; however, each tribal elder I interviewed received some form of gift such as sweetgrass I had harvested, maple syrup, home-canned preserves, or a book. This is an example of acceptable (and expected) behavior in method when interacting with indigenous communities or individuals, one of those “unstated but well-established protocols” referred to previously in this chapter.

In reading and re-reading Heidenreich’s (1972) comments, I am repeatedly struck by the same thought; what is manifested in this very negative response to *Custer* is an example of one of the conflicts I was able to identify through all phases of my research; it is a conflict which exists in academe between Indians and anthropologists specifically, and perhaps academe in general, and that conflict is hubris. Misplaced hubris in which the academic “expert” knows more about Indians than Indians themselves. One tribal elder I interviewed during research spoke of a specific archaeologist and phrased it as, “he’s the professor, he’s the educated one, he knows and what you knew or offered was not as much value as what he had...he was intimidating” (personal communication, July 14, 2015). This idea is incorporated in a number of comments made by indigenous graduate students who participated in my focus group; they speak of a need for more indigenous instructors who are grounded in traditional knowledge who would be able to balance the voices of the “experts” with real lived knowledge of Indian communities and Indian people; perhaps we could refer to these instructors as Myth Busters.

Not everyone in the academic world understood what Deloria was speaking to in *Custer*. By his own account, in a reply to a book review written by Deward Walker on

We Talk, You Listen: New Tribes, New Turf which appeared in *Human Organization*, Deloria wasn't really writing about Indians; rather in both this book and *Custer* he was writing "about the forces outside Indian country that intrude consciously or unconsciously into the business of Indian people and thereby become disruptive and often destructive" (1971:321). Certainly, placing indigenous communities under the anthropological microscope with no visible benefit to the communities qualifies as disruptive and potentially destructive. Historically, the most severe form of "destructive" occurs when anthropological research results in indigenous individuals and communities coming under federal or state government scrutiny.

While Dr. Walker understood Deloria's literary purpose, there were others so blinded by outrage that they totally missed his thesis; and outrage was expressed not only by anthropologists but by some in different disciplines. One such person was Joseph C. Muskrat writing a book review for the *American Bar Association Journal*.

Vine Deloria, Jr., former director of the National Congress of American Indians, himself part Sioux, and a law student at the University of Colorado, has managed in 279 pages to present the reader with some of the most outrageous nonsense and muddled anthropological thought ever to appear in print. When he is right, he is generally right for the wrong reasons. When he is wrong (which is often) the non sequiturs flow freely and smoothly. Interspersed is a never-never world of unstructured analysis, straw men that the author constantly erects and then destroys, metaphysical nonsense, and an obvious confusion on the part of the author as to precisely what the issues are. [1969:1172]

The phrase "metaphysical nonsense" can only be understood as a direct disparagement of indigenous spiritual beliefs and reminiscent of the rhetoric employed by early Christian missionaries when they first encountered Indian people in the Americas.

A review of *Custer* written in the *Washington University Law Review* by Robert L. Bennett however struck a more positive note.

Mr. Deloria has made an outstanding contribution with his writing to put the American Indian situation in perspective from an Indian point of view. All of us who are American Indians applaud this effort which brings into focus, as he indicates, what American Indians have been thinking or saying or both for a long time. [1970:218]

I spent a good number of hours researching book reviews for *Custer Died for your Sins* (Deloria 1988 [1969]) and my efforts were rewarded by a mere eight reviews found in professional journals. Other than the negative review written by Muskrat (1969) and the negative response to Randall (1971) by Heidenreich (1972), positive reviews were submitted by James E. Officer (1970) in the publication *Arizona and the West*, and Kenneth M. Roemer (1970) for the *American Quarterly*. I'm left wondering why there was so little response to *Custer* in the first few years after publication: perhaps anthropologists were so shocked at how Deloria portrayed them in general that they didn't want to draw attention to the book by responding to it; perhaps they hoped that Deloria would disappear if they ignored him; or perhaps they dismissed the young Vine Deloria because he was an outsider to the tightly knit discipline or because his *indigenous voice* simply did not matter to them.

Alfonso Ortiz (1971) wrote a largely positive review of *Custer* in *American Anthropologist*, but Ortiz' praise could be perceived as somewhat guarded. While Ortiz appears to have enjoyed Deloria's sardonic style of stating issues, he tries to understate the severity of what Deloria is laying at the feet of Anthropology. Ortiz was a fairly new PhD (1967) in Anthropology when *Custer* was published, in an academic environment that I can only imagine to be more unwelcoming to indigenous scholars than the world of today. I can only speculate as to the marginally negative aspects of Ortiz' review: he was enthusiastic about his own area of focus, the Pueblos of the American Southwest, as he

studied his own people from the perspective of a cultural anthropologist and voiced disappointment that Deloria focused his gaze on the Plains tribes; as a young PhD in Anthropology, agreeing too strongly with Deloria's assessment of anthropologists would likely not have served to further his career...heavily criticizing one's own discipline generally falls within the purview of old men or old women who are at the end of their professional careers. Ortiz ended his review with

this book does not pretend to be a scholarly work, but this fact only underscores the need for a well-researched and truly balanced national assessment-by an Indian or several-of current Indian thinking, needs, and aspirations. It remains to be written. [1971:955]

I believe he may have been saying that while he enjoyed the book (somewhat), it really needed to be written through an anthropological lens.

6. Unequal Power Creates Conflict

A major challenge in forming relationships between Anthropology and indigenous people is the inequality of power structures that exist. Larry Zimmerman believes that,

involvement of nonarchaeologists puts some control into their hands, and most archaeologists will be reluctant to relinquish control over their research...To communicate effectively with Native American people, archaeologists will need to learn how to share control of the past. [1994:68]

Historically the power to take, interpret, and disseminate has been held tightly in the hands of anthropologists and the academy. Sonya Atalay writes, "knowledge is powerful capital, and those who produce it gain power" (2012:56). Carol Brandt adds that,

the territory encircled by the cultural borders of Eurocentric science provides a position of legitimacy, a location of credibility, and a place of power (Gieryn, 1999). I argue that scientific discourse is one way that borders are policed and maintained in the academy. Rhetoric is part of controlling the borders that monitor what kind of knowledge enters and leaves. [2008:838]

Any amount of power shift to indigenous academics, peoples, or communities has the potential to also effect a shift in allocation of financial resources. A shift in power should strongly indicate that the disposition and use of materials (for example language, material culture, and ceremonies) gathered in research and field work would be determined by the community from which they were located. A shift in power would also suggest that the not inconsiderable amounts of funding provided for research and fieldwork by universities and other funding entities would be shared with the communities and individuals who share in the work or are sources of information. The disparaging views held by many indigenous people of the discipline may be seen as an expression of resistance and perhaps, at times, anger relating to the reality of unbalanced power in the relationship.

There are voices other than those of indigenous people who recognize the collaborative role of Anthropology in the colonization process. From within the academy itself, even before Deloria's 1969 writing of *Custer Died for Your Sins*, Claude Lévi-Strauss identified Anthropology as a colonizing instrument and as a perpetrator of violence against indigenous people in an article for *Current Anthropology* when he wrote,

Anthropology is the outcome of an historical process, which has made the larger part of mankind subservient to the other, and during which millions of innocent human beings have had their resources plundered, their institutions and beliefs destroyed while they themselves were ruthlessly killed, thrown into bondage, and contaminated by diseases they were unable to resist. Anthropology is the daughter to this era of violence. [1966:126]

Diane Lewis made reference to the above quote of Lévi-Strauss by writing,

this 'era of violence' produced a social system which had a pervasive effect on the relationship between the anthropologist and the people he studied. Whether he played the role of detached observer (theoretical

anthropologist) or that of liaison between the dominant European and subject nonwhite groups (applied anthropologist), the roles were significantly affected by his membership in the dominant group. The anthropologist, like the other Europeans in a colony, occupied a position of economic, political, and psychological superiority vis-à-vis the subject people. [1973:582]

These citations provide examples of power inequalities. All of these circumstances contribute to indigenous people viewing Anthropology and anthropologists with deep suspicion. Bea Medicine was both a Lakota woman and an anthropologist; from her positionality of being Indian and of being an academic, Medicine lived in the “between” spaces of the ideological and practical divide. She wrote,

the disenchantment with anthropology as a discipline and the anthropologist as "officious meddler" is still a part of the fabric of research in reservation and urban communities. This disdain may increase as issues of repatriation and intellectual property rights escalate... [1998:254]

7. Ideological Clashes in Education

In examining the major questions of the dissertation (how do the differences between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought and how have these differences affected efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline?), I have found that these questions reflect a major topic of conversation and writing by a number of indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists currently working in the discipline. There are indigenous anthropologists such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and Shawn Wilson (2008) who write about changing anthropological research methods that would utilize traditional indigenous formats of human interaction and non-indigenous anthropologists like Bob Goodby (2006) who relates a personal journey that brought him to a place of understanding, and *incorporating*, indigenous ways of being and knowledge into his field work as an

archaeologist; but there are also others, such as Lévi-Strauss (1966), who began addressing the topic decades ago. The questions, as yet, remain to be answered and, although having generated much debate within the field, there is little in the way of disciplinary consensus. Through my research and conversations with indigenous elders and students, I am hoping that this dissertation will provide additional voices to these others who came before in an effort to renew and push the conversation forward.

When indigenous people enter the field of anthropology, the marginalization and oppression of indigenous ideologies engenders a new form of violence and psychological trauma which widens the margins of the divide. Many indigenous people believe that the only path to success for indigenous students and practitioners is to give oneself over to the mainstream paradigm. While there is an historical conflict between Indian communities, Indians and Anthropology, and Indians and some anthropologists, the admittance of indigenous anthropologists and students into the discipline and into the academy has created an added conflict based on ideological difference; differences that have to do with fundamental belief systems, ways of knowing, and knowledge systems. When Indian students or anthropologists feel coerced into assimilating to Western systems of belief in order to succeed, they are essentially participating in self-recolonization or at the very least surrendering to participating in their own oppression. I consider this an instance of racism, an unstated requirement that is not encountered by non-indigenous students who are privileged members of society by accident of birth. And where indigenous voices are not structurally forbidden in the processes of teaching, learning, and practice they are too often met with sympathetic, if still somewhat

unsophisticated, understandings of indigenous thought systems and practices; a continuance of Western paternalism.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith paraphrases Gayatri Spivak (1990) by writing,

Third World intellectuals have to position themselves strategically as intellectuals within the academy, within the Third World or indigenous world, and within the Western world in which many intellectuals actually work. The problem, she argues, for Third World intellectuals remains the problem of being taken seriously. [1999:71]

Indigenous people have an understanding that is unspoken and unwritten, an understanding which suggests that in Anthropology the only way to be “taken seriously” is by totally accepting and adapting, becoming intellectually white. Ray Barnhardt (2002) and Carol Brandt (2008) are two of many scholars who have addressed the perceived need for indigenous students to assimilate. This is reminiscent of 19th century United States Government Assimilation Policies and mission statements of the Government and Missionary Boarding Schools.

Trevor Purcell identifies Western knowledge as that which “...implies a set of understandings that include scientific knowledge and methodology” (1998:259). He goes to great lengths to describe indigenous knowledge as:

...the body of historically constituted (emic) knowledge instrumental in the long-term adaptation of human groups to the biophysical environment. The human group and the biophysical environment mediated by this knowledge constitute human ecology (Bennett 1976; Moran 1990). Based on the history of its usage in applied anthropology, the term knowledge here is meant to have a more delimited meaning than the term culture; it is meant to denote that which is directly functional in long-term survival. The reason is not simply a matter of antecedent usage; *it is intended to place indigenous knowledge on an equitable epistemological plane with - but in analytic contrast to - Western instrumental scientific knowledge...*

Placing indigenous knowledge and Western (scientific) knowledge on a comparative analytic plane...locates the historical struggle between the cultural rights of indigenous peoples and the dictates of positivist-inclined

science within academic discourse as a political and ethical issue. The schism between indigenous knowledge and "Western" knowledge has been treated by some anthropologists as an empirical methodological issue in development (Brokensha et al. 1980; Reed and Behrens 1989). The contemporary discourse, however, shows it to be far more than that (Fahim 1982). It is ideological, it is ethical, and it is epistemological. Once these dimensions are made explicit, we can begin to bridge the gap between methodology and ideology by showing the hidden interdependence that has existed all along. [1998:259-260, emphasis added]

In reading and understanding what Purcell is saying, it is not surprising that a “split” would occur. Without being aware of the “hidden interdependence,” there is no awareness that the two ways of understanding knowledge enhance each other. To tease apart Purcell’s statement in somewhat small measure is appropriate to the discussions. Understanding knowledge as being that which is “directly functional in long-term survival” is clear. Knowledge in this sense is all of the accumulated understandings of the world around us which make it possible to not only survive but to thrive as part of the natural world, and as distinct cultures. The interconnectedness of these knowledges occurs when we “borrow” specific knowledges between disparate cultures, much in the way that the first Europeans adopted indigenous ways of using medicine plants, growing food, and subsistence living when entering an environment different than the one they knew in Europe. Indigenous people of the Americas adopted material goods of the Europeans which theoretically could enhance their methods of survival such as tools, fabrics for clothing, etc.

The intersection of Anthropology and indigenous knowledge, or ways of being, has been built on the blunt fact that without indigenous people, American Anthropology would not have developed as a discipline. Beyond that, the interdependence is built upon oppression of the anthropological subjects of study and it is those oppressions, or power

inequalities, which have created many of the conflicts discussed in this dissertation. Anthropology has been constructed upon European processes of power inequality; placing one group of people above another in a hierarchal system, and one that was designed to protect white Euro-American privilege through maintaining property rights and Capitalism. The points of intersectionality remain intact and fixed until those who hold the social, economic, and political power recognize their privilege and are willing to confront that privilege. If the playing field were to be leveled, so to speak, the interdependence of differing knowledge systems would be situated not on oppressions and hierarchies, but on a foundation created through understanding; exploring the knowledge systems of each in an exchange that would enhance each, much as the non-lethal sharings of early contact between Europeans and Indians enhanced the survival of those individuals.

C. Conclusion

This chapter has presented specific areas and instances which illuminate the spaces where indigenous and Western concepts grate against each other. Some of those spaces represent areas of ideological conflict that pertain specifically to differences in worldview, narrating indigenous history, ethical values, power structures that disadvantage American Indians, and understandings of science and ways in which knowledge is produced.

A very small sampling of the clear insights and wisdom shared with us by Vine Deloria Jr. throughout a more than 40 year career was incorporated in this chapter. Many of us believe that Deloria possessed a prodigious intellect and we are always at a loss as to why so many in the academic world failed to understand his analyses of the Indian-

Western paradigm conflicts. It is a part of the human condition that people dislike criticism, especially if it is grounded in a truth that is unpleasant to contemplate. Also, those who are in socially privileged positions are reluctant to acknowledge their role in the oppression of those upon whom that privilege has been acquired. However, avoiding the discussion simply exacerbates the conflict.

There are also conflicts within the discipline between indigenous scholars and what may be perceived as the outmoded dogma of Anthropology; a form of doxa that consigns indigenous scholars to the dark, liminal spaces of the discipline. As indigenous people we did not acquiesce to European or American colonization of our bodies, our lands, our histories, or our languages. If we allow ourselves to assimilate to the mainstream dogma of Anthropology through furthering our education then we are allowing Anthropology to recolonize indigenous people; but this time we are volunteering for recolonization, a colonization of our minds. What is meant by this is that in order to successfully navigate a graduate program in Anthropology, indigenous students must allow themselves to undergo a form of cerebral and spiritual deprogramming; forgetting everything learned from communities, families, and elders that allowed us to make sense of the world and the universe, and replacing all of that ancient knowledge and wisdom with a westernized understanding of such things. For indigenous people this is a form of cultural genocide. Resisting the efforts to colonize mind and spirit is exhausting.

Indigenous people perceive that adherents to the practice of Anthropology from a hegemonic position are resistant to allowing space for indigenous approaches to the discipline. Bagele Chilisa speaks of indigenous scholars such as Sandy Grande (2000)

and G.H. Smith (2000) when positing,

post-colonial theory can easily become a strategy for Western researchers to perpetuate control over research related to indigenous peoples and the colonized Other in general, while at the same time ignoring their concerns and ways of knowing. [2012:49]

Using such a theory as strategy for control of the discipline certainly is a form of erasure of indigenous concerns and ideologies.

Examples of various iterations of these points of departure will be provided in the next chapter through the voices of those who contributed their experiences as graduate students in Anthropology programs, as indigenous professors, as non-indigenous professors, and tribal elders. This topic is complex and consists of many layers, but as difficult as unpacking the layers may be, it is a discussion that needs to once again be opened.

CHAPTER 6

INDIANS in the HALLS of ACADEME

Since the publication of Custer [1969] there has been no concerted effort by the academic community, or by anthros themselves, to open the ranks of the discipline to American Indians. Anthropology departments still cling fiercely to the belief that it is more valid and scholarly to have an Anglo study an Indian tribe than to have a member of that tribe trained in anthropology.

Vine Deloria [1997:211]

With some degree of malicious intent I sought out information on the major beliefs of anthropology from a variety of sources to see if my suspicions were true—there was no such thing as a body of knowledge among them, only a body of beliefs, supported by virtually no evidence, for the best book or article on evolution, the Bering Strait, big game hunters, pre-Columbian expeditions to the Western Hemisphere, and a host of other topics, I learned that much of what is taught in anthropology has no factual basis whatsoever and is supported primarily by the fact that it has always been taught.

Vine Deloria [1999:124]

A. Introduction

As discussed in the previous chapter, a deep chasm has been created between Anthropology and indigenous peoples through fundamental differences in worldview, ways of understanding human life in the world, the conflicting historical narratives of indigenous origins in the Americas, and academe's erroneous understandings of indigenous peoples. Despite indigenous students entering college and university programs in recent generations to be trained in the field of Anthropology (albeit in very small numbers), the academy still does not consider any worldview other than that seen through the hegemonic, Euro-American lens. Applied Anthropology, Participant Observer, and Community Based Collaborative Research (CBCR) models, to name only a few, continue to practice and teach primarily through the limited lens of Western principles of philosophy.

Opening the academic door to indigenous students, scholars, and elders is merely a first step. The next, crucial step is to clearly, thoroughly, and ethically illuminate the

indigenous worldviews, historical narratives, and underlying understandings which indigenous people have developed over thousands of years, and continue to use, in order to survive in this world. While the capitalist, competitive “market place of ideas” approach is typical in academe in general, and in Anthropology in particular, I would suggest that the core approach in this effort must be inclusive, collaborative, and interdisciplinary.

As I pondered the above Deloria quotes, I also placed them into the context of conversations with my peers; casual conversations in which they gave voice to their struggles as indigenous students in Anthropology. Thoughts and ideas began to form and I began asking them if they thought there would be any benefit to devoting a chapter on these issues in my dissertation. The response was an overwhelming “yes.” I carried the conversation to other indigenous scholars and tribal elders when we met in various social contexts and the feedback I received was that they all felt this to be a safe location for their individual voices to be heard. I approached my committee with my thoughts about all of this and together we decided that perhaps the best way to capture in depth comments would be to think in terms of a focus group rather than using a statistical sample. The results from the focus group could be used in the future to structure a statistical sample if that seemed warranted.

Through the use of written surveys given to the focus group, personal interviews, and expressed individual experiences, this chapter will provide additional voices to mine in describing the competing world views and historical narratives which engender the distance between Anthropology, anthropologists, and Native American people. The generous participation of indigenous graduate students, indigenous and non-indigenous

anthropologists, and the voices of Native American tribal leaders and tribal elders of New England proved to be an invaluable contribution to this dissertation.

B. A Focus Group is Formed: Surveys and Interviews

The idea of interviews and surveys expanded from initially considering only indigenous graduate students to include indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists, and personal interviews with community leaders and elders from various indigenous nations in New England. I devised three separate surveys for the focus group with the assistance of a professional survey writer who is also an anthropologist. The three written surveys are found in Appendix A. A written consent form to be signed by each participant was also constructed. The surveys were presented to my Dissertation Committee and approved. The appropriate forms were completed as required by the University of Massachusetts Internal Review Board (IRB) for Research Involving Human Subjects and IRB approval was granted.

Developing a strict protocol for interviews with community leaders or elders proved to be difficult, inadequate, and inappropriate in meeting cultural needs. I eventually found that a more open-ended approach allowing the individual to frame the interview in terms of what they thought to be important worked best. In Native communities, there are protocols which are not documented by Anthropology but are clearly understood, especially by indigenous anthropologists; protocols based in respect. This process should be considered an indigenous methodology used in research. In speaking with elders, the conversation is often lengthy and takes on a course of its own, always guided by the person being interviewed. For all of the community leaders or elders, their experiences that relate to issues in this dissertation vary; some have

experience with anthropologists, some have personal experience with higher education, all have experience with remnants of colonization. In the interviews, I simply allowed the individuals to tell their stories and formed questions as the conversations progressed. Unknown to me at the time was the work done by John Omohundro (2008) on engaging in anthropological dialogue which encompasses the method I used in interviewing elders.

The major questions of this dissertation, “is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization and, if so, is some form of resolution possible?” brought forth other questions such as: *how* do the differences between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? How have these differences affected efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline, for example, through graduate school programs for indigenous students, the formation of professional level organizations, and the development of critical areas of research? Is rapprochement possible and under what conditions could that occur? In addressing some of these questions within this chapter, I wanted (needed) to learn from indigenous students and indigenous anthropologists how pervasive are perceptions of marginalization, disrespect for other world views, and blatant ignoring of cultural diversity; and, exactly how overwhelming is the expectation that assimilation to mainstream anthropological thought is the first step to becoming an anthropologist. Vine Deloria believed that

education in the English-American context resembles indoctrination more than it does other forms of teaching because it insists on implanting a particular body of knowledge and a specific view of the world, which often does not correspond to the life experiences that people have or might be expected to encounter. [2001:42]

Beyond this, I also wanted to know if there exists an inherent structural or institutional

racism involved that has been in existence since the beginning days of American Anthropology; one that remains so deeply embedded in the discipline that no one even notices. Or perhaps those students or instructors who are Native notice it but have buried or subdued their consciousness of the situation in order to succeed.

Questions pertaining to perceptions of Anthropology promoting colonization were presented to all participants of the focus group and were constructed in order to ascertain whether graduate students and indigenous or non-indigenous professors recognized this as a problem in the discipline. If so, I wanted to know how they addressed the issue in their learning or teaching. In order to move members of the focus group to thinking about this, I asked for thoughts on what measures might be enacted for Anthropology to be a more inclusive discipline. Over the course of recent years I have heard indigenous graduate students and graduates give voice to these concerns, so I knew this was not a new topic of conversation, although it may be one that non-indigenous instructors or students rarely (if ever) think about because it does not present a point of personal, internal conflict.

Difficult questions sometimes need to be asked in order to engage a conversation, especially a conversation that needs to occur. One purpose of higher education is to produce “good citizens,” people who will not only obey the laws of the land, but who will also accept and promote the hegemony which those laws legitimize. For indigenous people, higher education may be viewed as a perpetuation of colonization; colonization is based on relationships of power, and those who hold power determine what is taught and how it is taught. What is taught becomes the foundation of indoctrination into Western worldview and Western modes of producing knowledge.

Conversations with community leaders and elders were engaged in order to learn of their experiences, good and bad, with anthropologists or with education. I wanted to hear what they took from those experiences, if their communities were enriched in any way(s) by the experiences, and how the experiences formed their perceptions of Anthropology, anthropologists, and higher education. From personal experience with members of indigenous communities throughout the Americas I have found that Indian people are overwhelmingly polite, most especially to outsiders. This may possibly be a cultural trait developed through fears of repercussions delivered by colonizing powers. This politeness should not be misunderstood as acquiescence or apathy when interacting with others; they hold opinions and assessments of interactions that assist communities in decision-making and sometimes arriving at a course of action.

In addressing the question of rapprochement, I asked all members of the focus group for possible solutions to bridging the divide between indigenous people and Anthropology. When speaking with elders and community leaders, I asked what measures they thought should be taken by non-Native researchers or academics when working with the community or individuals. If their focus was on education, I asked what changes they perceived to be necessary to increase the interest of Native people in higher education.

The focus group consisted of twelve indigenous graduate students from colleges or universities throughout New England with eleven responses (92%); six indigenous PhD and twenty-five non-indigenous PhD instructors from all of the New England states and New York with three indigenous PhDs (50%) and eight non-Indigenous PhDs (32%) responding; eight elders or community leaders from five of the six New England states

were interviewed. The response rate from elders or community leaders was 100% of those requested to participate; a response rate which I interpret as indicative of the deep concern elders have regarding the issues being discussed.

The results of the written surveys are presented and discussed in the following section of this chapter. Samples of answers to each question posed are provided. In choosing which answers to present, those which best illustrated a response to the questions are included; as well as those answers which disagree with the (unstated) premise of marginalization, racism, lack of indigenous worldview inclusion in curriculum, or continued colonization. All of these last were 100% reproduced and reproduced in their entirety. In other words, no “cherry-picking” of answers was engaged in order to support a biased position. Further discussion of the surveys and analysis will be presented in the chapter conclusion.

Responses from personal interviews with community leaders or elders are interspersed throughout the chapters of the dissertation. In general, community leaders in the Northeast are elders who hold traditional views. Their voices are crucially important as they are considered the voices of wisdom. I chose to place them, not in one place, but throughout the dissertation where their comments would be of most value to the discussion. Their words are given a great amount of consideration and respect; the elders of today are the ancestors of tomorrow.

C. Indigenous Graduate Students

One of my Abenaki friends is a poet. A number of years ago I tried to convince her to apply to graduate school, not knowing at the time that she had been in a graduate program. She has four published books to her credit and a Pulitzer Prize nomination. She

writes about her life growing up in rural America, about environmentally caused health issues impacting indigenous people, about feminist issues, and about being Abenaki. In a writing course in graduate school, the instructor consistently wrote on her submitted assignments, “Stop writing about Indians.” “Indians” were what she knew. Finally, as the course turned to Native American literature, the instructor told her, “Now you can write about Indians,” which, she said, was what she had been doing (and wanted to do) all along. She dropped out of the program, but wrote a great poem about it!

In the written survey I constructed for indigenous graduate students, I addressed questions specific to competing worldviews. The two questions posed and some of the responses are:

- 1. Are any indigenous worldviews presented in your courses of study in Anthropology?*
 - a. If so, in which courses are they presented?*

This question elicited a 50-50 split, with exactly one half of the students stating yes, worldviews were presented in Anthropology graduate courses. The courses identified were those specific to Native American studies such as Contemporary Issues in Native America, Theory and Method in Cultural Anthropology, and an Indigenous Language course. From my own experience, I would have to add Theory and Method in Archaeology. One graduate student wrote, “indigenous worldviews have been presented in several of my courses, but ONLY by indigenous students who are sharing their worldviews for discussion.”

From these responses it would appear that the courses in which instructors present indigenous perspectives are confined to Native American studies, to certain instructors,

or to contributions made by indigenous students. Carol Brandt references Kawagley, Norris-Tull, and Norris-Tull (1998) when writing,

Kawagley, Norris-Tull, and Norris-Tull (1998) point out that approaching Eurocentric science entirely from a Western, positivist viewpoint has serious consequences for students from non-Western cultures and languages. Students from American Indian communities have difficulty adapting to the reductionist, impersonal approach of Eurocentric science. [2008:827]

2. *If the answer to the above question (1) is yes, do you feel indigenous worldviews are imbued with equal value as are mainstream Anthropological theories?*
 - a. *If not, how are they presented differently (or unequally)? For example, as myth, folklore, superstition?*

This question becomes a bit more specific. One person did not answer the question and the remainder of the respondents all answered “no” to the initial question. A few examples from the second part of the question (2-a) provided student perceptions such as:

In some classes they seem to be respected in [the] professors’ wording and actions. In others, professors seem to find these views credible and even claim to be practitioners...but their actions outside the classroom disregard the views they claim to hold.

On the occasion that they are presented in class, I haven’t ever felt that they are given space or recognition as a way of understanding the world. This isn’t to say they are presented as myth, but rather that it is outside the way we (as academics) interpret the world we live in and study.

Indigenous worldviews are discussed briefly...sometimes as topical...a subject to study but not as ways of thinking or theorizing.

The fact that they have not been presented through the curriculum—rather only by other students who are indigenous—situates indigenous worldviews as unequal in the curriculum. However, the students who have presented their worldviews have done so in ways that speak powerfully and truthfully to these views...

Beyond course content and presentation of indigenous worldview, there are other issues that affect indigenous students: separation from family and community; lack of access to elders; lack of access to ceremonies; perceptions of marginalization either on their individual campuses or in their departments; overt, covert, or internalized racism. Any of these circumstances present challenges to indigenous students (of any age, in any institution) which are not burdens for mainstream white students.

Indigenous worldview does not conceptualize life in a linear mode of thinking; everything is connected. In Euro-American constructs, if one contracts an illness, it is physical; if one has a mental illness, it is an illness of the mind; if one adheres to a religious dogma, it is spiritual. Western medicine is just beginning to conceive of connections between physical illness and mental or spiritual states of wellness. For indigenous people, all of mind, body, and spirit are connected and all is connected to the world in which we live. Any of the above mentioned challenges have a deeply profound effect on the whole; they cannot be compartmentalized or viewed as singular issues. I presented questions that I hoped would illuminate the degree and depth of these challenges, or if they even exist in academic institutions today.

The questions posed and a sampling of responses:

Have you ever felt marginalized in your program; for example, culturally or spiritually? If yes, please explain.

All of the graduate student respondents circled “yes,” they have felt marginalized. The overwhelming sense of the narratives is that indigenous students perceive that they are expected to “represent” in certain contexts or be “invisible” in others.

Every time I walk up the hallway to the department I feel like I should be wearing red paint.

Parts of me don't feel like they [indigenous students] have a place in the department, or the university...

Just being a person of color alone marks me as different from many in the university and the department. I have had personal encounters with people who don't understand where I am coming from when talking about experiences of marginalization and discrimination, which is sometimes just as (if not more) painful and frustrating than active marginalization.

I've learned it's better to remain quiet in general conversations or discussions unless something needs to be corrected. My "background" always comes up and I'm questioned in relation to that.

I want to complete the degree, but I honestly feel sick when I see our department building.

I've been asked how much (blood quantum) Indian I am; I've been asked if when I am at home, do people recognize me as Indian. Also, I've been in a class where another student said that people who are mixed (i.e., Indigenous and non-Indigenous) must also identify as non-Indigenous or else it is insincere. It was a deeply disturbing conversation.

If I have an idea, I'm asked if I'm too involved because of my background. If the next person has exactly the same idea, they're given praise. My ideas, from my mouth, seem not to be as valuable as when they're in another's.

I have felt at times that because I identify as Indigenous, I have to "prove" my indigeneity to others. This has made me feel marginalized because other students, others who do not identify as indigenous, do not have to prove their identity in ways that I am called upon to prove it.

These narratives certainly express feelings of marginalization. They also support a general perception of a divide that is created through questions of identity, somehow needing to prove identity, diminishing and devaluing of thoughts as being based in indigenous inferiority. There is also a suggestion of covert racism. One response identified marginalization perfectly, but it also identified a significant expression of racism:

there are blood quantum politics and phenotype politics that absolutely affect how one's work is received and perceived by faculty members.

There are divisions between Native studies faculty that leave grad students pariahs no one wants to be seen as affiliating or “siding” with.

I want to share a story of an indigenous friend studying Anthropology at an unnamed institution and her experience with an African American instructor. Through an almost semester long interaction, my friend was increasingly feeling uncomfortable with her perception of the interactions between herself and the instructor. At one meeting, she said to the instructor, “I feel like you are always speaking to me like I’m a white person you don’t like. I’m not white, I’m Cherokee.” The instructor’s response was, “Yeah? What are you 1/32?” Lateral racism by any definition.

Many times indigenous students are expected to simply assimilate. The institution is a predominately white institution; the department is a predominately white department, and often times the instructor was trained in an earlier era that practiced Anthropology in an environment that insisted on assimilation and has continued that unstated policy forward in subtle ways. A personal example of this occurred about 20 years ago at Dartmouth College. For a number of reasons—conferences, social events, and the suicide of an indigenous student—I had been spending a good amount of time with the Native students. One young Diné woman called me to discuss a traditional concern; her grandmother, who was very traditional Diné, had called her to ask, “What are you doing up there, in that place? I have been very sick. You are doing something that is making me sick.” This young woman knew exactly what she was doing: in order to complete her credit requirements for graduation, she was taking a museum course as an elective; when she enrolled for the course, she did not know she would be required to go into the collection “stacks.” Traditional Diné have no contact with belongings of those who have died.

The student asked me to accompany her to a meeting with her professor, which I did. She sat quietly as I presented her with her difficulty. He asked why I was with her as she was “a grown-up woman” who should be dealing with this herself. I had to explain to him that in her tradition, as a woman, she was precluded from speaking to him about these matters. The professor was not a “bad” person, he simply did not understand; I’m not certain he has to this day. She was expected to assimilate to the mainstream, anthropological worldview. The professor ultimately accommodated her traditional beliefs and asked that she write a paper explaining why she was unable to work in the collection.

The concept of “double consciousness” was developed by W. E. B. DuBois when he wrote,

it is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. [2005:3]

Daniel Wildcat quotes Ladonna Harris from a conference in 2000 as stating, “we do not live in two worlds. If you try to do that you will be schizophrenic” (2001:116). While I can appreciate and understand Harris’ statement to mean that it’s all one thing, one world, I believe this idea of double consciousness can be applied appropriately to all people of color who need to navigate in a world where they are considered the minority population; minority by social construct if not by numbers. It’s a matter of not just understanding the concept of the white Euro-American world, but mastering it and coming to terms with it as being crucial to negotiating space in that world and claiming agency. There are certainly times when one might feel a tad “schizophrenic” while

embracing this sense of double consciousness, most especially when there are competing personas striving for dominancy; and yet, few of us live in a closed society where we can simply be who we are without need to interact with those in the social majority.

I do not perceive double consciousness and bicultural to have the same definition; simply because one may legitimately check off two “racial” categories in the United States census does not mean that one lives in a space requiring consciousness of being. Most likely, the majority of us are bi-racial or even tri-racial; however, we may not all have been raised within a culture or worldview that is not white, Euro-American. For those who have been raised within the majority white culture, they think of themselves as being a part of that culture and so do not need to navigate the minority world of home *and* the majority world of white but may simply think of themselves as “white;” in never thinking about being bicultural or even biracial, internal conflicts over identity may be non-existent. Keeping all of this in mind, I wanted to learn how indigenous students struggling with issues of being members of a minority culture, a culture significantly different from mainstream American culture, navigated that “white” space in graduate programs in anthropology and the attendant stress factors that are specific to indigenous students.

I posed two questions:

1. As an anthropology student and an indigenous person, what are some feelings that surface as you embody both identities? How might conflict between those identities manifest?

I’m often torn, can anthropology be redeemed? Is it worth it? I think so, but the damage “scientific” race studies have done is massive, and sometimes I feel like a traitor.

In anthropology, we are taught theoretical constructs to help us make sense of our research and the world around us, yet the theory we are taught

is not always (almost never) relevant to indigenous ways of being and knowing. This is a serious conflict because I am indigenous and my work is with my community.

The above response would seem to be indicating that Anthropology does not value indigenous theoretical frameworks, which only serves to widen the divide.

It feels like both these identities have to be kept far apart. It makes me angry, isolated, and so very tired. I've been told in the past that my native views run counter to the scientific method and shouldn't be trusted as much.

A huge issue in Indian Country is identity and how that is tied into everything related to health, yet no one wants to fund it because it is "too hard to study." I think that ties into identity politics that anthropology as a discipline doesn't want to consider – and that ties into the next question about anthropology as a tool of colonization – how anthropology argues vehemently against identity as a static, fixed entity, yet demands indigenous identities to be understood as fixed in order for the discipline to work in specific ways.

This last response illuminates a significant contradiction built into the discipline itself: while in theory, Anthropology argues for fluidity of indigenous identity and culture, in practice it continues to require that those same aspects of indigeneity remain fixed.

I've always felt a bit of a mix, a product of strange historical and cultural encounters...I think I was drawn to Anthropology for exactly these reasons, that it would be a way to look at myself, my history and family and understand the context and conditions of that history.

2. Please describe any stressful factors you have experienced as an indigenous student living away from family and community. Examples could possibly include not being able to speak your language (with others), or being separated from cultural and spiritual ceremonies.

Distance from family and comfortable community, feeling very different from my peers in the department and the university, feeling like I was expected to know and accept a slightly pretentious academic vocabulary and way of thinking when that's not what or how I want to be.

...it is extremely stressful having to act “white” and hide who I really am while at school. I feel like it [who I really am?] won’t be valued.

The above response is a perfect example of double consciousness in practice; having to “act” white while on campus in order to be accepted into the majority society, establishing a different persona.

I just feel incredibly homesick and miss our family traditions.

I’ve had a lot of strange things happen while living in_____. Many of these events don’t make sense, so I’ve had to seek out traditional knowledge to help me understand and make sense of many things. Yet being away from family and community, makes it hard for me to access these different kinds of knowledge. My Elders have felt limited in their ability to give me advice or counsel because they don’t know the land, the local particularities, or even how I’ve changed these past years. This also speaks to often not trusting the knowledge that we carry (I’ve been told that some people are scared to tell stories or share knowledge because they don’t know if it’s true). I think that being away from my people has helped to broaden these types of fractures. I sometimes find myself not trusting myself, my knowledge. It feels like some ways of knowing and being are slipping away as other types of knowledge (i.e., academic) are replacing or filling in gaps.

This response illustrates not only a conflict, or divide, in disparate worldviews but also a spiritual crisis that is created by indoctrination into an epistemology that presents understandings that are foreign to the student’s lived experiences. As new forms of knowledge are presented, an entire lifetime of beliefs is forced into question. This conflict is difficult to sort out when the elders who have previously provided guidance have no experience in the new landscape (physical and theoretical) that the student is struggling to navigate. It is important to remember that indigenous people are intimately tied to physical landscape; physical landscape is connected to histories, oral traditions, ceremonies, and plays a role in individual and group identity.

A major issue I have is the disconnect between the department and indigenous communities in the area...as a guest on the occupied territory

of other peoples, I don't think we do enough to recognize where we are.

I found this last comment interesting in relationship to worldview. Indigenous people are, in general, very polite and good guests when in another's homeland. I have rarely heard a non-Native person acknowledge that they are in someone's homeland in all of the many, many lectures, conferences, public programs, or graduate courses in which I have attended or participated.

In reading the responses to these questions, phrases such as "I'm often torn," "I feel like a traitor" (obviously to one's own people), "...both of these identities have to be kept far apart," "having to act white," and words such as "angry," "isolated," "very tired," "homesick," and "disconnected" all suggest crisis of identity, marginalization from the mainstream, expectations of assimilation, and a sense of "Otherness." I wonder what the professionals who are charged with teaching and mentoring these students would think about these statements, if they have any idea of these struggles, and if they might then understand the ideological divide that has produced the "crisis of identity" being experienced by indigenous students.

The last two questions of note I presented to indigenous graduate students in Anthropology relate to the discipline and colonization. I was not surprised that all of the responses supported the concept of Anthropology being intimately linked to colonization; awareness in indigenous graduate students is a crucial beginning and this gives me hope for the possibility of change when these students gain their PhDs and become the next generation of anthropologists who may possibly present Anthropology within a new framework of understanding.

1. Do you consider Anthropology to be a tool of colonization? If so, in what way(s)?

I feel like I was drawn to Anthropology here at _____ because it is far more progressive and diverse than many other places and because of that my answer to this might have been 'no'. However, over the past year I've come to think seriously about the way Anthropology (and academia in general) attempts to *colonize my mind* and tell me the ways I ought to think, to write, to research—and in ways that I'm often uncomfortable with. [emphasis added]

100%! Anthropology is the study of people...if they fit into proven methods or theories. If they don't, anthros can misrepresent a culture, on purpose. This is viewed as doctrine and it's rare for reinterpretation to take place.

This last response views Anthropology as supporting colonization by the theoretical rigidity of the discipline in forming conclusions that adhere only to a strict paradigm which presents as the ultimate authority.

Since its inception Anthropology has been used to justify or modify colonial expansion. Today anthropologists help the military in counterinsurgency and companies engaged in resource extraction. Not much has changed.

The perceived complicity of Anthropology in colonizing and imperialistic practices is evident in the above statement.

Yes! Specifically to the Other(s), there is a demand for authenticity that anthropology generates, and this works as a tool of colonization by fixing people in Other categories. While anthropology contends that identity is a complicated process that comes from social interaction, there are still a lot of markers for identity that are used to make sense of identity processes.

I used to believe that Anthropology could be used for Native communities and to educate others about us. I still believe that it could be, but...housed within academia wherein cut-throat competition, "selling" your own identity for promotions, and hyping your own work to get you ahead, I believe it can be spiritually disastrous for Native people.

In this last response, "selling your own identity for promotions, and hyping your own work to get you ahead," is in total contradiction to Native ways of being in the world. Indigenous people simply do not promote themselves; to do so would be to place

self above community and would place humans as superior to the rest of creation, both of which are in opposition to indigenous ways of understanding the universe. This brought back two personal memories; on two separate occasions, two Abenaki scholars were invited to participate in a panel discussion or present a paper at a conference, each topic in some way was based on colonization or ways in which American history or anthropology has exploited indigenous peoples in the northeast. One scholar declined by stating, “I don’t think this would be in my best interests right now” and the other scholar responded with, “This would not be good for my career.”

The statement “I believe it can be spiritually disastrous for Native people” is a direct acknowledgement of these activities being spiritually destructive; perhaps making the analogy to the phrase “selling your soul to the devil” is the best way of explanation.

The second question relating to colonization and anthropology was:

2. What measures do you feel need to be enacted for Anthropology to be a more inclusive discipline?

I feel that professors and all students need to be better connected; that professors must see themselves as having a role that exists to serve others.

I think there’s a lot of looking away from serious problems in the discipline, along the lines of “not my problem” or “I’m not one of the bad guys.”

I think that Anthropology needs to practice what it preaches— understanding different ways of life and thinking.

A profound de-centering of European epistemic traditions and the serious engagement of different kinds of indigenous thought, not as a supplement to curriculum but as a challenge to take other ways of knowing and other worlds seriously.

There is a difference between linear and cyclical thinking and time. While I can navigate both, it would be nice to know the latter is equally valued and respected.

We need more Indian students, but we also need to recognize that western theory isn't the only theory. The way forward is allowing space for Indians to bring in our own approaches to making sense of the world. This means being inclusive and changing our ways of understanding research.

The responses to this question articulate a need to restructure the student-teacher relationship and mode of interacting, restructure the discipline in ways that not only acknowledge but respect and value different worldviews, and create a discipline that provides a coordination of theory and practice. These statements are the indigenous voices of the next generation of anthropologists and they give evidence to recognizing the divide as both an historical fact and as personal experiences. Hopefully they can affect the much needed changes within the discipline that will welcome worldviews and knowledge production beyond the current Euro-American myopic model.

D. Indigenous and non-Indigenous Anthropologists

Two surveys were designed for PhD instructors in Anthropology; one for indigenous instructors and one for non-indigenous instructors. My goal was to ascertain practices in teaching such as inclusion of indigenous concepts and oral tradition; to elicit experiences of marginalization by peers or organizations for presenting or supporting different types of knowledge production or worldviews; and, perceptions of Anthropology as related to colonization; all issues which have served to create and perpetuate the divide between indigenous people and Anthropology. I was also interested in graduate school experiences of the indigenous instructors and designed a question that would allow for such a narrative.

The first set of questions address how indigenous worldviews are presented by the instructor. The answers are a sampling representation of those who responded. The respondents will be identified after the comment by (I) as an indigenous instructor and

(NI) as a non-indigenous instructor.

1. When teaching anthropology, or anthropological concepts, in what ways do you present indigenous worldview? For example, do you present indigenous worldviews as carrying equal value to mainstream anthropological theories or are they presented as myth, folklore, or superstition. Please explain.

Depending on the context, I teach indigenous worldviews as both an object of study (a system of beliefs-understandings) and an interpretive paradigm (theories). Obviously, when they are presented as an interpretive paradigm it is easier to make them more equivalent to anthropological theories, although I use as many Native voices as possible when I present worldviews as an object of study. (I)

I often discuss indigenous worldviews when talking about several concepts including *time*, *the life cycle*, and *health-illness*. I absolutely present these worldviews as having equal value—mostly by deconstructing our concepts of the above and highlighting that indigenous systems have been around for FAR longer than concepts on linear time, our concept of the linear life span (as opposed to spiritual life cycle), and germ/gene theory. I also mention how contemporary European and North American worldviews emerged to serve the elite, while indigenous concepts emerged to serve all. Indigenous concepts are based on common sense and experience, while “Western” concepts such as biomedicine and physics lie beyond the grasp of most. Most importantly, I think, is that I discuss anthropology and the development of theory in historical context. The field of anthropology emerged as a colonial discourse whose theory was meant to undermine and devalue indigenous experience and worldview and as long as indigenous people are studied as the “other” the discipline will continue to do so. I ask students to think about how indigenous worldviews might give them a sense of peace, purpose, health and power in ways that a capitalist or traditional academic worldview cannot. I also present indigenous worldview as valid science, based upon observation and experience. (I)

They are presented as a credible resource, as credible as “science.” (NI)

In selected cases, I make it plain that an alternative indigenous world view exists, and that it can (depending on the case), compliment, enhance, contradict, or refute the standard anthropological view. I routinely do this when discussing the respective origin stories told by anthropologists and traditional Native people about how people came to be here. (NI)

I present Indigenous worldviews as deserving of respect by researchers and of central importance to Indigenous communities...I do not introduce

these as myths, folklore, or superstition, but oral traditions. I would not say I explain these as carrying equal value to anthropological theories, as I see them as different but valid ways of understanding the past. (NI)

When I have taught _____ in the past, I have made a point of including creation myths and folktales from the different cultures we study. I did so out of belief that it is important to understand how the members of those societies made sense of the world around them and their place within it. I offered those readings to contrast with the traditional anthropological perspective so that students can get an appreciation of, and develop a respect for, different knowledge traditions. My intention is that all of the information be viewed and treated equally. Upon reflection, though, I can see how even the act of discussing “myth” as an anthropological concept signals that these stories are not the same as the ones academics tell. I never refer to superstitions and do not present these beliefs as superstitious in any way. (NI)

Yes, I try to present Indigenous worldviews in a variety of classes. For example, when I teach an Intro to Anthropology course, one of the first things I do is take concepts that students take as given, like ways of measuring time and space, and present them with a variety of alternatives, including examples from Native North American and Australian Aboriginal people. When I teach an undergraduate North American Archaeology course, we talk about multiple ways of knowing and a variety of sources of evidence that can be brought to bear on questions of time, space, and relationships among people, places, animals, ecologies, etc. We engage with some examples of Native deep time oral traditions (written or recounted by Native storytellers in text and video form) when talking about earliest material evidence of human occupation of the continent and the limitations of that material evidence. I try to present Indigenous worldviews as having the potential to enhance our understandings of human relationships, and as perhaps more relevant and productive than some mainstream theories (e.g., functionalist, processual, etc.). (NI)

I try to incorporate indigenous ideas and beliefs into my teaching as much as possible...However, I try to differentiate between various types of indigenous ideas and narratives (just as different members of an indigenous society often do, especially today). I also try to explain which aspects of indigenous worldviews are still widely shared in a native community and which have been largely let go (e.g., shamanism in Alaska). For example, migration stories dealing with the local landscape may have to be differentiated from accounts of how the group's ancestors had once come out of the underground world or descended from the sky. I treat the latter accounts with utmost respect, just as I would treat stories from the Bible or the Koran. However, I do not feel that I have to treat

them as "ultimate truth" or use them to undermine anthropological theories of origins of Native Americans. If I did, I would also have to give equal time to (Christian) Creationism alongside evolutionism. (NI)

In all of my teaching I emphasize that there are many different epistemologies (ways of knowing) and that science (and I consider anthropology to be a social science) is only one such epistemology. I also emphasize that it is not valid to evaluate "truth" across epistemologies. And I also emphasize that within the scientific epistemology there is no such thing as "truth" or "proof." (NI)

It depends on the class I am teaching...I do not consider myself an expert in indigenous studies or any particular indigenous community... So I have been very reluctant, to claim the right to teach at length or in depth about indigenous world views... When I have brought these worldviews into the discussion they have been presented as criticisms of the field and pathways towards decolonizing the discipline worthy of careful consideration and incorporation in one's anthropological work.

Unlike other classes, two have had indigenous life and worldviews as their centerpiece. These courses present indigenous worldviews as complex and sophisticated ways of thinking and being. Caught in the process of colonization, they have persisted in ways that should give members of Euroamerican and indigenous societies much to think with and about.

So in terms of your example of an answer, in all my classes indigenous worldviews and ways of life are offered as having equal value to mainstream theory and anthropological practice, and often they are presented as superior in providing information about indigenous communities as well as about EuroAmerican society. (NI)

The responses provided to this question are detailed and obviously were given a great deal of thought and consideration. The answers were provided by instructors who are all anthropologists teaching at a number of institutions in New York State and from all of the states in New England. It is noteworthy that indigenous worldviews are presented in a number of classes and presented in ways that do not diminish their value. It would be interesting to learn if indigenous students who attended these classes assessed them in the same way as the instructors; self-reporting is valuable in learning intent, outside evaluation illuminates the success (or lack of success) of the intention or goal. I

was intrigued by the several responses that indicated indigenous worldviews being presented in juxtaposition with Western worldview; this suggests the possibility of presenting both views in a balanced way which does not necessarily privilege one knowledge system over another.

The second question posed is essentially a follow-up question. The question appeared only on the surveys presented to non-indigenous PhD instructors. By posing this question, I was attempting to learn the reason(s) non-indigenous professors might give for not incorporating indigenous thought into their courses, or ways in which they have worked around obstacles in order to present other worldviews outside of the western paradigm.

2. What barriers to presenting indigenous thought or worldviews have you encountered? How have you over-come these barriers?

I guess the short answer would be that I do not portray myself as someone who is in the ethical or authoritative to present other epistemologies, so I typically have guest speakers or key readings to present those.

In my 30-year long career as a teacher of anthropology at several major American institutions of higher learning I have never encountered any barriers to presenting indigenous worldviews.

One barrier is that students have preconceived notions of what Indigenous knowledge is and so there is some work that has to be done to disassemble that and get them to look critically at their own assumptions about knowledge and validity. This gets us into the realm of epistemology and ontology and as someone without a strong background in philosophy; I find it challenging to make this a productive discussion, particularly with undergraduates early in their career. With archaeology in particular, students are often looking for a truth—an explanation of what happened. They often see Indigenous knowledge as being “just another story” that is presented and therefore likely biased. Another barrier is that I find myself in the position of characterizing Indigenous worldviews largely based on what I have learned from Indigenous people and teachers and what I have read, but as a non-Indigenous person I am not entirely comfortable in this position.

The barriers I've encountered really stem from my own lack of understanding of indigenous cultures and, relatedly, my lack of knowledge about sources I could use to deepen that understanding. I've tried to overcome them by listening to indigenous scholars, learning more about the impact of colonization in the New World on the indigenous people, and reading academic work by indigenous scholars...

I find that as an archaeologist, I am sometimes uncomfortable sharing Indigenous worldviews, as these are not "my" stories or "my" beliefs. I want to remain respectful while presenting them, but not pretend that I am an expert on these worldviews. I am not able to explain these in great depth, as I only know what I have read in most instances.

Relatively few. The biggest limitation is my own knowledge and understanding of them, as I have not given them the scholarly attention that I have to other areas where I claim expertise. I try to overcome this the old fashioned way by reading and consulting knowledgeable folks... Oral history is not as credible as written documents—a common myth debunked by teaching source criticism of written documents.

These answers would indicate that there exists a serious void in graduate programs in the field of Anthropology. Every single survey that was returned contained some form of the above answers: essentially, "I don't know enough about indigenous worldview" and the reliance on indigenous friends or acquaintances to provide information. Why aren't we reading more writings by indigenous authors while attending graduate programs in Anthropology? Why aren't we asking the questions that would help define indigenous worldview? Bryan Brayboy, Tsianina Lomawaima, and Malia Villegas co-authored a retrospective on the work of Bea Medicine and Vine Deloria Jr. for *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* which addressed this very question. In part they wrote,

we believe that Deloria and Medicine offered different epistemic frames, and the power of their work is rooted in these different forms. We cannot help but notice, however, the absence of their work among many anthropologists of education and among those engaged in the examination of Indigenous communities. Indeed, both Medicine and Deloria were often marginalized in and by the academic community, and it is worth noting

that it is their passing—their absence—that has opened this space to engage with and pay tribute to their work. [2007:231]

The questions that elicited the most fervent responses were those that addressed Anthropology and colonization. I developed these questions as a nod to Laura Nader's (1972) concept of *Studying Up*, leading anthropologists to think about ways in which the discipline is informed by colonial issues of power, oppression, and marginalization and how that might translate or connect to the historical and contemporary practice and theory within the discipline which has certainly contributed to the divide.

1. Do you consider Anthropology to be a tool of colonization? If so, in what way(s)?

Absolutely. I don't feel that we have come to a place in our discipline where we have shed ANY of the colonial bias of anthropology. At most, we've replaced words like "primitive" with "third world" and words like "civilized" with "modern." I think the discipline needs a *major* paradigm shift. Because colonization is mental as well as physical and because it now mostly takes place in the cultural-economic realm as opposed to the political, the fact that anthropologists study culture as a thing, try to pick it apart for its parts for analysis, try to study how globalization affects indigenous people (as if they have no say or perspective on it), is every bit as paternalistic and colonial as it has ever been, however benevolent or collaborative we try to be. (I)

I think anthropology has been a critical tool of colonization, in furthering the objectification and rationalization of indigenous peoples and cultures. This was far clearer in its earliest forms, where various forms of scientific racism defined the discipline. (I)

The answer is that yes, it was historically, that yes, it is in some ways today, and that yes, it can be a tool of decolonization as well and there are many examples of attempts in this direction (postcolonial theory, indigenous archaeology, African diasporic archaeology, feminist archaeology and anthropology, etc.) (NI)

The answer below deserves inclusion in its entirety because it answers the question in depth.

Most broadly, professional anthropology in the U.S. is founded as part of a colonizing culture's attempt to come to grips with the people whose land they are conquering. The four-field approach is partially founded in the need to understand and thereby manage these Indigenous communities.

And as such the education to be an anthropologist has significant elements of this colonial engagement. Prominently is its historical job description, as William Willis puts it, to be the field that studies poor people of color, leaving the study of poor White people to sociology. An outcome of this division of labor is that the field does not have a long tradition of studying European colonialism. In short it does not have an anthropology of anthropology.

It does, however, have one of the most extensive bodies of knowledge about non-western communities of any field in the academy and at least a formal commitment to cultural relativism. This can attract students from communities studied by anthropology to the field. But usually not for the same reason that the field came into existence, namely to understand for purposes of managing these communities. To the extent that their teachers do not understand the possibility of this disconnect, the process of becoming an anthropologist is another step towards colonization.

It all gets complicated because the field also attracts EuroAmerican students, and eventually professionals, who to varying degrees are alienated from their own culture. The nature of that alienation is crucial. If it seeks romantic escapism, it can further exoticize students from indigenous communities. If it is careerism, then they will also help the colonizing force along by not challenging key tenets of the field. But there are also anthropologists with an interest in changing things, and with them the possibilities of mentorship, alliances-building, and decolonization arise. There is a body of such work that can form the context for ongoing education that is productive for students and faculty alike.

So, yes, anthropology is a tool of colonization, and one with contradictions. There are cracks that can be put to the good use of changing the edifice and make for a less harmful and more productive anthropology. (NI)

By and large, I do not. There might have been occasional cooperation between individual American anthropologists working on American Indian reservations or in Third World countries and government officials, but such cases were rare and they have become extremely rare. The absolute majority of American anthropologists today abide by the American Anthropological Association's code of ethics, which is quite explicitly anti-colonial. Moreover, most American anthropologists tend to lean to the liberal left and strive to make sure their research helps the communities in which they conduct their research. (NI)

I think it certainly has been a tool of colonization and continues to be so, but I am also optimistic that it is changing (at least, in some places in some ways). The basic goal of anthropology, to understand people, is neutral, but when structural, political, economic, and social inequities are layered on (and/or not addressed), it becomes exploitative. The discipline bears the weight of its history and the various pernicious uses that it has been put to. It has been and continues to be largely extractive—sucking knowledge, resources, materials, etc. out of communities and producing knowledge that may have little consequence for those communities. But there are also many examples of anthropology being marshaled to fight racism and inequalities of many types. So I don't think colonization is inherent in the fundamental goal of anthropology. (NI)

I think American anthropology can be and has been a tool of colonization, but it does not need to be and is not always. The fact that so many people of privilege make their careers from studying the lives of the marginalized and disempowered in the past and present yet do so little to encourage their success in the academy is disheartening. From this perspective, it is difficult to not view anthropologists as cultural consumers and colonizers in this light. (NI)

I think Anthropology, historically and today, is in the business of heritage management although, at times, we may fail to see that [what] we do is political. I first got this sense while doing dissertation research and gaining access to archaeological collections and archives *because of* my affiliation and credentials. Although I am unsure how my project would have been met if I were a non-academic Tribal member [who] wanted to do similar research, I did see collections policies that were rather ambiguous in terms of who would be *allowed* to gain access. From here, my experiences *within* archives were painful and difficult at times, such as the images and written descriptions of archaeological excavations and Native human remains in particular. Other issues that I see are not specific to American Anthropology and are related to academia in general and the classism that exists here and makes Higher Education inaccessible for many. (NI)

Yes and no. Of course it has been used as a tool of colonization, gathering data to better control people on reservations, creating the bastardized cranial data that supported white supremacy in the early days, or more subtly, as Bruce Trigger has pointed out, in depicting Native cultures as stagnant and only changing in response to external forces. On the other hand, anthropology has been filled by the thousands of oddballs in the white world who, over the years, have maintained that Native cultures and history are worth studying and knowing about...I think the key is in your question, with the term "tool"—it IS a tool, and like a hammer that can be used to build shelter or to stave in someone's skull, it can be used for good or ill...Scientific knowledge can complement traditional knowledge,

sometimes by supporting it, and sometimes by raising contrasts in accounts and perspectives that are good fodder for open, inquiring minds. And sometimes (and I can easily think of examples from my own white Euroamerican culture) traditional knowledge is just plain wrong, in which case it can't be afforded equal value. The claims of scientists are often wrong as well, but in theory (and often in practice) science is the only epistemological approach which requires testing, replication, and self-correction...(NI)

The follow-up question was:

2. *Would you have interest in a restructuring of Anthropology which would result in a fully decolonized field that encourages traditionally minded Indigenous anthropologists to be viewed as full members of the discipline, equally respected, and whose work based in traditional teachings is given equal value as that of mainstream Anthropological thinkers?*

I would definitely be interested in this. A more partial, collaborative project may or may not be anthropology anymore, but I often see colonial contexts requiring indigenous people to use disciplines like anthropology and history to protect rights, traditions, and world views, and this often requires using forms of colonial anthropology in its objectivist tradition. (I)

In the above answer the author states, “a more partial, collaborative project may or may not be anthropology anymore” would have benefitted from an expanded explanation. In discussions relating to Anthropology with indigenous students and with indigenous PhDs, there is an understanding that the discipline of Anthropology was created by the study of the “Other” and that this focus continues to present day. The logical assessment of this author’s statement suggests that if full decolonization of the discipline were to occur then Anthropology might possibly become some other “-ology” within the Social Sciences.

I would first need to know what “traditionally minded Indigenous anthropologist” means. (NI)

Again, a complicated question. Yes, I think traditional teachings should be given equal value. But I do still think one needs to acknowledge that there are multiple ways of knowing. We don't need to turn Indigenous peoples into anthropologists, and we don't necessarily need to turn social scientists

into Indigenous peoples. I am not sure this is one I can write in a short paragraph... (NI)

A wholehearted yes. (NI)

Yes. I would think to help with this, perhaps more peer-reviewed journals or publishers are needed that value and accept these topics and types of work. I was unsure what was literally meant here by “given equal value,” but this connected to professional advancement and tenure for me personally. (NI)

Wow. That’s a huge question. To me, it rises and falls again on the question about science. Flawed as its application has been, anthropology was an outgrowth of the western Enlightenment tradition that assumes an objective, empirical reality knowable through science. I still believe in this, at the same time I acknowledge that important historical insights and broad human wisdom are present in many bodies of traditional knowledge. I also believe that, like our subjects, anthropology is too broad and powerful to be constrained by the science/humanities dichotomy, and that a full understanding of the human experience requires both, using each where they are appropriate, and looking for the intersections where one informs and inspires the other. Here, perhaps, is where traditional knowledge fits into the discipline. (NI)

Fifty percent of the respondents replied “yes” with no added commentary. There may have been some confusion surrounding the term “traditional knowledge,” and perhaps that term needed to be defined in the question.

Beyond confusion of the term “traditional knowledge,” it is difficult to determine why 50% of the respondents did not elaborate on their answer. Perhaps they felt that elaboration called for actions that would be necessary to accomplish a restructuring of Anthropology and the respondent held no suggestions. It is, as one author wrote, a complex question suggesting deep change not only to the discipline but also to the teaching of the discipline; the possibility of totally restructuring courses one has taught for several decades could certainly be daunting.

E. Professional Marginalization

Assigning this topic, Professional Marginalization, special status in its own subsection in this chapter is a reflection of the deep concern which all anthropologists should hold knowing that this practice exists, and that professional marginalization results in grave consequences for individuals. In this section I will provide examples of marginalization that have been experienced by indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists who have openly invested in the legitimacy of alternate worldviews and place value on indigenous oral tradition, beyond what are sanctioned by the “official” beliefs and theories of the academy. In attempting to ascertain if this is a pervasive problem within the discipline, I designed several questions, including follow-up questions, on the anthropological surveys.

The first question is worded differently for indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists. This is an intentional and conscious choice in wording as I believe the identity of indigenous vs. non-indigenous would have a significant bearing on the experience; by that I mean that it would be highly unlikely for an indigenous person to be advised to avoid presenting oral tradition or indigenous worldview. However, the two answers below to this question suggest I may have been wrong in that assumption.

The question posed for indigenous anthropologists:

In writing professional papers or books for publication, have you ever avoided presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldview, or referred to traditional teachings?

Yes. I have tried, on three occasions to publish an article that presented African oral history *as* history—without application of traditional anthropological theory, and without analysis beyond what was said to me during informal interviews. Each time, I received feedback that the work lacked theoretical orientation, that I needed to present what was said in the context of “actual” historical events, and that the narrative lacked logical

arrangement and was too broad (as if anthropological theory is always clear-cut and easy to understand!). I am currently working on the same piece, but have had to “theorize” the narrative using post-colonial theory and minimizing the validity of the actual narrative, which I tried to avoid.

When I write publications, I try to rely on oral traditions that are already in the public domain if I have to use them. I tend to use interviews and oral traditions for my research as framing devices and part of the interpretive paradigms in my work.

And the question as framed for non-indigenous anthropologists:

In writing professional papers or books for publication, have you ever been advised to avoid presenting oral tradition or indigenous worldview?

Each respondent answered “no” to this question. One anthropologist wrote, “For a long time I didn't think I had the right, either from the academy or from my interaction with Native communities to hold forth on oral tradition.” And further, “I have not been specifically sanctioned in my professional writings or presentations. I did not have an anthropologist say to me something like...“You don't believe that nonsense, do you?” Nor have I had an indigenous person in print or in person take me to task.”

Another anthropologist expanded on the answer with, “Actually the opposite. Perhaps this is because the venues that I have published in and things I have written about focus largely on Indigenous experiences of colonialism and collaborative practice and those domains (and the reviewers in them) may be “friendlier” to IK [Indigenous Knowledge].”

One non-indigenous archaeologist, whose field work each summer is in Central America, shared her experience with me in informal conversation several years ago. She said that following that years’ research, she wrote an article that included oral tradition shared with her by the indigenous people in her work area. She submitted the article to a professional journal which rejected it for publication. She was told to remove all

references to oral tradition, resubmit, and it would be published. This woman is not new to the profession, research and writing, or teaching, but has, in fact been in the profession for well over a decade.

The second question, presented to both indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists, continues to examine issues of professional marginalization and is presented in two parts:

2-a. Have you ever experienced marginalization by your peers, your department, or professional organizations for presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldviews, or referring to traditional teachings?

I have not experienced marginalization—I have however been told by another faculty member (who is North American, but a practitioner of African Traditional Religion) that it is a struggle to present material in a way that students “will take seriously” as opposed to it just appearing to be the instructor talking about their own religious experience. At the time, I felt that it was a commentary on how I had just presented material on African religion to the class. (I)

I have generally been in ethnic studies situations in my career where indigenous points of view are valued and welcomed. That said, I have been exposed to anthropologists who are particularly wary of me taking the political side of Native peoples. This, more than the culture or world view is what seems to threaten non-Native anthropologists the most. (I)

Overall, when I present indigenous worldviews, I receive positive feedback from peers—however, this is not necessarily because indigenous worldviews are seen as equally valid—it’s because in presenting “alternate” perspectives, I am engaging students in critical thinking. It appears to me that the value of critical thinking is not in seeing other perspectives as valid, but rather questioning one’s own worldview to *understand* the biases and assumptions one holds, without being responsible for doing anything about it. (I)

Not explicitly. But I did feel that in general when I was pre-tenure (at another institution) that by not focusing on “basic research” (that is, scientific archaeology) that I was potentially jeopardizing my tenure case. That is largely why I then left and came to _____ where I knew engaged approaches would be embraced. (NI)

Yes, comments that the presentations are not “rigorous”. Smiles when indigenous knowledge is given equal respect. (NI)

And this answer in part, which although lengthy, merits inclusion:

This might be a good place to go off on a tangent...while I claim no expertise in oral tradition, indigenous worldviews, or traditional teachings, I have written a number of pieces where, entirely on my own authority, I try to give voice to the Native people of the past that I am writing about, usually in what I hope is an empathetic exercise in what’s called creative non-fiction, taking the empirical facts (environmental setting, activities, basic assumptions about the existence of children, gender, sights, smells, etc.) and using them as inspiration to write about what the Native experience at my sites might have been like, to humanize my archaeological work, and to move it away from a purely technical discussion and empirical description of mute objects. In doing so, I sometimes invoke characters, people who have age, gender, status, and try to write about their world as they may have experienced it, at least in my own limited imagination, following Janet Spector’s wonderful book “What This Awl Means” (1993)...In any case, I have occasionally gotten grief for doing that. A clear example of that is from _____, when, in my final technical report on the site, I included a brief interpretation of the site using the creative non-fiction approach ... “For the next thousand years, the site was left unused by Native people...What had changed was the place of the site in the social and spiritual system of the Native people, who...would pass by the site, perhaps speaking of it with its ancient name, on their way to other destinations around the lakes.” I was specifically slammed for this passage by the former state archaeologist, who demanded to know what the name was, implying that if I didn’t know I couldn’t say it had one. I had to remove it from the final draft of the report, although it did later appear in the version published in _____. (NI)

All of the remainder of the respondents denied experiences of marginalization for presenting indigenous worldview or oral tradition. One stated her work does not touch on indigenous sites and another that she typically submits to publications that are open to alternate systems of knowledge, so has not received negative feed-back. From the responses to the question it would appear that those anthropologists who present alternative materials or worldview perspectives have found avenues receptive to non-mainstream dogma. Even these professionals have endured some forms of negative

expressions as evidenced by statements such as “by not focusing on “basic research” (that is, scientific archaeology) that I was potentially jeopardizing my tenure case,” “comments that the presentations are not “rigorous,” “I have been exposed to anthropologists who are particularly wary of me taking the political side of Native peoples,” and “when I present indigenous worldviews, I receive positive feedback from peers—however, this is not necessarily because indigenous worldviews are seen as equally valid—it’s because in presenting “alternate” perspectives, I am engaging students in critical thinking.” So while there may be no formal marginalization or sanctioning of these individuals, there certainly is a degree of nuanced criticism.

2-b. Do you intentionally not present oral tradition, indigenous worldviews or traditional teachings out of fear of such sanctioning?

I find that I most often do this when I present concepts of health-wellness. Although I don’t think anything I’ve ever said about indigenous medicine or spiritual practice would harm students, when they ask for *personal* advice, I do fear that saying how I feel about health, the body, and illness would be seen as inappropriate. In addition, I also don’t feel I am an authority in these areas—so I avoid speaking about healing-health as spiritual and all-encompassing, as I know it to be. (I)

I keep in mind that there may be a negative reaction, and tailor my inclusion of those things to the audience—it’s far more likely to appear in a work for broad audiences than in a narrow, technical paper that appears in the professional literature. So there is some subtle self-censorship going on, although I’m not that dismayed by it, as I think it’s far more important to put an awareness of indigenous perspectives out in the public domain than in a technical paper destined to be read by eight people whose views on such issues are already set. (NI)

With no intent to put words into this last author’s mouth, I interpret this to mean that educating the public may have positive results, but that those in the profession are deeply and adamantly attached to the Eurocentric dogma of the discipline. All others responded with “no” which is somewhat difficult to assess; do they have no fear of

marginalization or do they not present oral tradition or indigenous worldview for other reasons?

In the survey for indigenous graduate students, I asked a question relating to stress factors that non-indigenous students may not need to navigate; such as a distance from language speakers or from cultural and spiritual ceremonies. I included a similar question for indigenous anthropologists:

For traditional indigenous peoples, living away from family and community, separation from language and culture, or lack of participation in spiritual ceremonies can be a major stress factor non-indigenous anthropologists do not normally experience. Are any of these factors a major concern or burden for you?

No. I was not brought up participating in spiritual ceremonies, so this is not a burden for me. If anything (ironically) being an anthropologist and engaging in fieldwork gives me a space to participate in ceremony and culture in a way that connects me to my roots more than my upbringing did.

I think as much as there is stress from a lack of access to cultural traditions, there is stress from being apart from other Native people and your community in particular. *Peer and social support for Native anthropologists, as they are often singled out for being “inside” or not objective enough in their research.* [emphasis added]

This last quote is especially troubling as it indicates a marginalization based on racist thought or a practice of theory that is non-inclusive and non-welcoming to indigenous people in the profession. The author of the quote is illuminating a marginalization that is constructed by non-Native anthropologists who believe that an indigenous person's research cannot be objective due to the researcher's positionality and that therefore the research results are deemed invalid. In other words, if the researcher were a non-Native person, their work would not be questioned. The author of this statement is clearly communicating that the lack of peer support in their research is based

solely on the fact that it is being conducted by an “insider” and is based on this individual’s “race;” and that can only be classified as racism. This statement also brought to mind a response from a Native graduate student who wrote,

one of the greatest challenges...is generating buy-in from distinguished anthropologists (i.e., old white men or women who have been using western theory to explain everything!) and from funding agencies.

In private conversation, another indigenous graduate student reported to me that a funding proposal had been denied on the grounds that she would not be able to be objective in her research as she was considered an “insider.”

In an opinion piece for *Al Jazeera*, new PhD Amanda Tachine (Diné) writes,

that feeling of isolation can be compounded by a sense of marginalization, particularly if their research leads them away from the Eurocentric methodological approaches that predominate the social sciences... research methods rooted in white ideologies — from the racially motivated origins of statistics and the eugenics movement to manipulating statistics to cast people of color as the problem — can oppress underrepresented populations’ approaches to research. For example, Eurocentric methods rely on objectivity as the standard norm in scientific inquiry. While objectivity has its place, it can also close off sources of knowledge. Indigenous methods acknowledge tribal cultural protocol, which are the actions that a person takes to create a relationship with another person or group. Therefore, to pursue research with individuals from tribal nations, creating and fostering relationships with the people matter. As a researcher, I do not attempt to distance myself from the people who share their experiences with me, as Eurocentric methods would require. Rather, over time our relationships often strengthen and I believe a deeper awareness and understanding of experiences are revealed. [\[http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academic-study.html\]](http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academic-study.html)

While the responses to the questions on professional marginalization do not suggest any actions as severe as the censure of Franz Boas, they certainly indicate that there are boundaries not to be breached in teaching or in research, that both must be done within the confines of accepted anthropological practice. The term “professional suicide”

is most definitely in use in conversations and within the term is an implicit warning to practitioners that to make waves may result in serious negative career consequences.

F. Conclusion

Whether knowingly or not, the indoctrination to Western pedagogy, Western epistemology, and Western paradigms engaged in the process of preparing indigenous Anthropology students to become anthropologists perpetuates the assimilation policies of colonial governments as assuredly as the 19th and 20th century religious and government boarding schools; both are destructive of personal identity and both have contributed to the divide between Anthropology and indigenous people. The present modality also borders on, if not blatantly falls under, violation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples which states in part:

Article 8

1. Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.

[http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf]

In consideration of the intent of Article 8, anthropologists and the discipline would do well to question how, and if, Article 8 pertains to modern practices. Such an examination could be used to develop a larger set of questions in bridging the Anthropological divide.

As opposed to the residential boarding schools of the past, there does not exist today a threat of physical punishment for lack of assimilation. However, from some of the answers provided by graduate students in Anthropology departments, there is a very real psychological fear of not succeeding without fully accepting the Western worldview and beliefs of the discipline: “I’ve learned it’s better to remain quiet in general conversations or discussions...,” “...it is extremely stressful having to act “white” and

hide who I really am...,” “...attempts to colonize my mind and tell me the ways I ought to think, to write, to research—and in ways that I’m often uncomfortable with...,” and even from a non-indigenous PhD, “...when I was pre-tenure... by not focusing on “basic research” (that is, scientific archaeology) that I was potentially jeopardizing my tenure case.”

Article 11

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to practise and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes *the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures*, such as archaeological and historical sites, artefacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature. [emphasis added]

Article 13

1. Indigenous peoples have *the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures*, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons. [emphasis added]

Article 15

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall be *appropriately reflected in education* and public information. [emphasis added]

and lastly,

Article 31

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural

heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions.
[http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf]

The written surveys I devised for indigenous graduate students and indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists provided information based on experience, praxis, and personal opinion. The responses I included in this chapter were not all inclusive but were a fair and objective representation of those received, and were presented with the goal of being as balanced as possible. I included a sampling of responses that supported the concept of Anthropology as a tool of colonization, practices or perceptions of marginalization by peers or the discipline, and I included *all* of the responses that did not support these themes. I provided a sampling of indigenous graduate student struggles in order to illuminate the fact that a very real problem exists in our graduate programs in Anthropology; every single graduate student participating in this focus group elaborated experiences that produced psychological or spiritual trauma or other barriers constructed through ideological conflict which they perceived to be obstructive to successful completion of their program of study.

Several of the non-indigenous anthropologists requested anonymity either by name, institution, or name and institution. Only one graduate student requested anonymity and none of the indigenous anthropologists requested anonymity. Due to tribal position, one elder requested anonymity to avoid the appearance of speaking for that particular Nation. Because of my concerns that any of my informants could potentially experience institutional or professional repercussions, I made the decision to maintain anonymity as to name, institution, or tribal identity for all of the participants.

While the information I received was valuable, the percentage of return of the written surveys, in some instances, was discouraging. Indigenous graduate student

returns were high, with only one student not participating. Of the indigenous anthropologists that were invited to participate in the study, 50% complied. The non-indigenous anthropologists who participated translated to only 32%. All of the tribal elders and tribal community leaders who were asked to provide personal interviews did so and appeared to welcome the opportunity for their voices to be heard.

One non-indigenous anthropologist who declined participation felt that because she was not Native the study held no relevance to her. This gives support to the premise that a lack of awareness as to the needs of indigenous students contributes to an environment that produces feelings of marginalization, and feelings of exclusion, in indigenous students. Two other non-indigenous anthropologists felt that some of the questions were “problematic” and so declined participation.

Perhaps the most disappointing result of the written surveys was generated from my own department: sixteen surveys were distributed to department anthropologists across all four fields; only five were returned and of those, two were members of my committee and two were recent (within 10 years) graduates of the program who, as of this writing, are working in other institutions. The members of my committee who participated and one recent graduate signed consent forms giving me permission to identify them by name and institution. One recent graduate signed a consent form allowing me to use the answers to the survey but wished to remain anonymous. The third current faculty member who participated in the survey signed a consent form allowing for identification of the institution but asked to not be identified by name. The overwhelming majority of responses came from other institutions throughout New England and New York State.

Examination of the responses to questions from all three written surveys would indicate some general trends. In a general answering of “yes” or “no” to the questions posed, indigenous graduate students were in total consensus; the individual experiences or thoughts varied, but not widely.

On issues concerning marginalization, all of the indigenous graduate students in anthropology programs surveyed conveyed a sense of being marginalized because of their indigeneity; some felt they have been negatively targeted or penalized by peers or instructors for their non-Western, or non-scientific, worldview or ways of producing knowledge; there were expressions of indigenous knowledge presented by students as being challenged and non-authentic because such knowledge did not coincide with that of Western theory, or because of perceptions of the presenter being biased. Some students reported feeling marginalized due to issues of identity, either being expected to “prove” their identity or needing to “represent.” The result often seems to be a further silencing of their voices, albeit a self-imposed silence used as a strategy to avoid knowledge being challenged or to avoid being singled out as different. Some have experienced overt instances of marginalization or blatant racism.

The graduate students perceived that indigenous worldviews and knowledge are either not presented, presented only in courses particular to Native studies or by a minority of instructors; also that, with few exceptions, these views were not presented as carrying equal value to Western worldview or scientific knowledge.

All of the graduate students surveyed believe that Anthropology has been, and continues to be, a tool of colonization. Some spoke about specific historical instances of anthropological research being used to further colonization and one student described

feelings of attempts made to “colonize the mind.” Issues relating to “loss of self” or a crisis of spirit while navigating new forms of knowledge were articulated. These are psychological traumas which are known to be tactics employed in the process of colonization.

Another theme elicited from the graduate student responses was that relating to a basic thesis of the discipline; fluidity of culture or identity. While Anthropology espouses that cultures are not static, students felt that in the university setting, and in the classroom specifically, their identities were viewed as being fixed in some stereotypical form.

As with the graduate students, indigenous anthropologists were in consensus with the broader “yes” or “no” responses to questions relating to presenting indigenous worldview. All stated they present indigenous worldview in their courses and that they present indigenous knowledge and ways of thinking as holding equal value to Western systems of knowledge.

Non-indigenous anthropologists all stated that they present indigenous worldview in some form in at least some of their courses. However, only 80% of those responding reported they present views as carrying equal value to mainstream scientific knowledge. We need to remember here that this 80% is representative of those who responded which was only 32% of the number of requests submitted by me to non-indigenous anthropologists. The non-indigenous responses to this question do not reflect the responses from the graduate students. This discrepancy is perhaps the difference between self-evaluation (intent) and student evaluation (effect). Most instructors I know feel that student evaluations are heavily influenced by conflicting personalities, the student not having done the work and receiving a poor grade, or the student believing the course is

either too difficult or too demanding. Some of this reasoning may hold true for undergraduate students; graduate students in my experience have more mature criteria for evaluating a course such as content, clarity, a sense of collegiality in the classroom, etc. Somewhere between the responses of the graduate students and the non-indigenous instructors lies an unbiased evaluation. And now to partially erase that very good statement: who gets to decide if someone feels ostracized, targeted, ridiculed, or “Othered?” And who is qualified to evaluate if course material and its presentation privileges one worldview over another?

Regarding issues of written work, indigenous anthropologists have experienced some form of criticism relating to their scholarship if they include indigenous concepts. However, non-indigenous anthropologists *all* stated they have never experienced any criticisms regarding the use of indigenous materials, even oral tradition, in their publications. But when examining the question that asks about marginalization by peers, academic department, or professional organization due to presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldviews, or traditional teachings, 43% of the non-indigenous anthropologists surveyed reported a sense of peer sanctioning in some form. The indigenous anthropologists all agreed that, while they haven’t technically been marginalized, they have, at times, been “taken to task” for using or presenting such concepts.

Not surprisingly, the question regarding Anthropology as a tool of colonization found the indigenous anthropologists all agreeing with the premise and all answered that they would be interested in a restructuring of the discipline that would result in inclusion of indigenous teachings as being presented with equal value to mainstream teachings. Of

the responses from non-indigenous anthropologists, 70% viewed Anthropology as a tool of colonization, 15% did not, and 15% view the use of Anthropology in abetting colonization as occurring only in the past. As to restructuring of the discipline, most agreed with some degree of restructure; one response did not want any restructuring; and one thought maybe yes, maybe no. While I am not interested in presenting these findings as a generalization, I feel they help to illuminate some of the ideological divide between Native people and some anthropologists.

A much larger sampling of informants would certainly have been preferable. From the responses submitted it would appear that indigenous graduate students and indigenous anthropologists all perceive major inadequacies within the academy; problems with epistemology, adherence to sometimes outmoded paradigms, and issues of non-inclusion of indigenous people or alternate ways of being in the world. The most interesting trend is among non-indigenous anthropologists: those most receptive to presenting and writing about indigenous worldview as a valuable addition to the discipline are anthropologists who have entered the field within the past decade, certainly there are exceptions to be found in those who have held a more inclusive view for decades. Those most resistant to change are anthropologists who are nearing the end of their professional careers and who remain attached to the past cultural hegemony and practices of the discipline.

As anthropologists and educators, should we be concerned by the questions posed in this chapter or by the responses the questions generated? The American Anthropological Association (AAA) certainly articulated a concern in 2007 when the Executive Board of the AAA established a Commission on Race and Racism in

Anthropology (CRRA). The final report of the CRRA in 2010 (<http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/commissions/upload/CRRA-fial-report-19-Oct-2010.pdf>) will be examined further in the next chapter; a publication of additional findings will also be presented (<http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/commissions/Racism-in-the-AcademyNewMillenium.cfm>).

Another reason to be concerned is the evidence provided in the *Digest of Education Statistics* from the United States Department of Education. Of the data provided, I am most interested in that which pertains to Master's Degrees and Doctoral Degrees for the academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (latest years available at this time) because this chapter is, after all, largely concerned with indigenous graduate students. The total number of Master's Degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions in the United States in 2010-2011 was 730,635; of this number only 3,948 were earned by American Indian-Alaska Native students. There were 17,081 degrees conferred in all of the Social Sciences, 84 of which went to American Indian-Alaska Natives. In 2011-2012, there were a total of 754,229 Master's Degrees, an increase of over 33,000 new degrees, with 3,674 being earned by American Indian-Alaska Native students, a loss of almost 300 from the previous year. Also in 2011-2012, 17,734 Master's Degrees were conferred in the Social Sciences (an increase of almost 700) with 77 awarded to American Indian-Alaska Native students...7 less than the previous year (http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_323.30.asp). The male-female split was essentially 50/50.

The total number of all Doctoral Degrees for the 2010-2011 academic year was 163,765 and 947 of these were earned by American Indian-Alaska Native students. For all areas of the Social Sciences, there were 3,482 degrees conferred with 11 going to

American Indian-Alaska Natives. The academic year 2011-2012 produced a total of 170,062 new PhDs, an increase of over 6,000 from the previous academic year. In this same year there were 913 new American Indian-Alaska Native PhDs, or 37 less than the previous year. The Social Sciences gained 3,628 new PhDs, and of these, only 10 were American Indian-Alaska Native, and again the male-female ratio was fairly equal (http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tales/dt13_324.25.asp).

To break the data down by social science subfields, I looked to the National Science Foundation (NSF) where I found their website impossible to navigate. However, Courtney Dowdall obtained the necessary data from NSF and posted it on the AAA Blog in February of 2014. The NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) for the academic year 2011-2012, according to Dowdall, elicited a 92% response rate. Dowdall writes that according to the NSF

the proportion of doctorates [all fields] awarded to blacks or African Americans has risen from 4.0% in 1992 to 6.3% in 2012, and the proportion awarded to Hispanics or Latinos has risen from 3.3% in 1992 to 6.5% in 2012. The number of American Indian or Alaska Native doctorate recipients fell to its lowest point of the past 20 years. [<http://www.aaanet.org/resources/researchers/upload/Anthropology-Doctorates-Increase-in-Number-and-Diversity-6-4-14-edit.pdf>]

Extracted from the NSF SED Table 22 in Dowdall's writing, in academic year 2011-2012, there were 546 Doctoral Degrees awarded in Anthropology. Of these, only four (4) were earned by American Indian-Alaska Native people (<http://www.aaanet.org/resources/researchers/upload/22-doctorate-recipients-by-citizen-race-ethnic-subfield-2012.xls>). These national statistics clearly illuminate that American Indian-Alaska Native people are either not engaging in Anthropology or not completing graduate programs in Anthropology. All of this honestly makes me wonder if anyone in the field is paying

attention.

If the discipline and practitioners were to have no concerns from the findings of the anthropological surveys presented in this chapter, one might be led to hope that the numbers presented in the data from the United States Department of Education and the NSF SED would elicit some questions, and concerns, from individual and collective members of the academy. The data sheets from the United States Department of Education and the NSF SED may be found in Appendices B through D.

Amanda Tachine (2015) writes that “from 2000 to 2010, the overall Native population increased by 39 percent, while in contrast, conferred doctoral degrees stagnate at less than 1 percent. Unless it is counteracted, this gap is likely to widen over time. It poses the question, “What are institutions doing to increase and support Native students toward degree completion?” (<http://america.aljazeera.com/opions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academic-study.html>).

After reading, rereading, and thinking about the responses to the surveys from indigenous graduate students, indigenous anthropologists, non-indigenous anthropologists and the conversations with tribal elders, I am left wondering why indigenous people who try to maintain their personal, and group, identity *and* succeed in a profession within anthropology pose a threat to the discipline and to some within it? Other questions that logically follow are why those committed to the discipline and the organizational statements against racism, colonization, and imperialism are not addressing these issues? What actions are required to change these statistics and is anyone actively working on change?

I have personally stumbled onto what I term “The Third Rail of Anthropology.” The “Third Rail” refers to those topics which are taboo, topics that challenge the hegemonic dogma of the discipline—the very principles that are the basis of the ideology of Anthropology and considered as incontrovertible truths. The term “Third Rail” would suggest that there exists *a* Third Rail, but I have personally encountered several in the past three years. This dissertation addresses topics which challenge Western worldview and anthropological dogma; at the very least, it challenges the unequal power structures within the discipline, power structures that are obsolete and that were created to ensure the survival of white Euro-American theory and praxis which preclude any competing narrative or understanding. This line of inquiry and examination is apparently threatening because it suggests a need for significant change; perhaps a full decolonization of the discipline and a shift in power structures.

CHAPTER 7

BRIDGING THE DIVIDE: ATTEMPTS, SUCCESSES, and FAILURES

A. Introduction

The previous two chapters were devoted to identifying various causes of dissension and conflict between indigenous individuals, indigenous communities, indigenous scholars, the discipline of Anthropology, and some anthropologists. Once a problem has been identified, steps to some form of resolution need to be conceptualized and evaluated. This chapter will recap and expand issues that were identified in those chapters, and will examine and evaluate efforts which have been made by institutions, federal legislation, and professional organizations to address those issues and to create a discipline that is more inclusive and welcoming to indigenous people.

Research for this chapter was accomplished through literature review and insights gained through focus group surveys from indigenous scholars and personal interviews with community members. Literature examined includes those writings which pertain to education, repatriation, and efforts made by professional organizations attempting to create a more inclusive atmosphere for indigenous people in Anthropology. Writings by indigenous scholars who have attempted to bridge the divide were examined (e.g. Bea Medicine (1988), James Riding In (1992), Roger Echo-Hawk (2000), Angayuqaq Oscar Sawagley (2005), Leo Killsback (2013), Dorothy Lippert (2013), and Vine Deloria, Jr. (1969; 1999; 2001; 200). Books and articles written by non-indigenous scholars with the same goals (e.g. Donna Deyhle and Teresa McCarty (2007), Ray Barnhardt (2002), Carol Brandt (2008), Melvin Jenkins (1999), Larry Zimmerman (1994), Kevin Yelvington (2015), were read and given great consideration, as were the insights provided by indigenous people whose concerns are with achieving equality in educational

opportunities that do not entail assimilation to western epistemology at the expense of traditional knowledge production, professional opportunities within the discipline, and for indigenous anthropologists, a share in the political power structure of the discipline. Throughout the literature review of the above mentioned authors it became evident that the core issues that serve as points of division between Anthropology and Native people being addressed echo those presented in Chapter 6 by the graduate focus group and indigenous anthropologists. From the dates of publication of the writings, by both indigenous and non-indigenous scholars, it becomes clear that these issues are not new concerns but have been articulated for decades.

Identifying and evaluating the efficacy of broad-scale efforts which have been established to create a more inclusive discipline will be examined; efforts such as graduate programs that incorporate Native American studies, federal laws such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and professional organization statements from the American Anthropological Association (AAA), Society for American Archaeology (SAA), the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), and the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) along with a special focus section of the AAA known as the Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA). As the chapter progresses, it may become evident that the goals of Native and non-Native people differ slightly or even, at times, greatly; it may also become evident that existing power structures position themselves to determine the goals or to create results with minimum input from dissatisfied minority groups. The persistence of hierarchal adherence to power suggests either a conscious or unconscious tactic designed to maintain control of goals and outcomes privileging the majority population of the discipline.

B. Education

Ideology is...the systematic whole of ideas that explain, justify, and camouflage an entrenched praxis.

Enrique Dussel [2003:181]

This section provides a brief over-view of the history of education in relationship to Native people in the United States. The section further identifies obstacles to educational success encountered by Native scholars through writings of both indigenous and non-indigenous educators, and suggests actions which could lessen the negative impacts on Native students. Many of the obstacles highlighted in this section are issues presented previously by the focus group surveys completed by indigenous graduate students and indigenous instructors.

The above epigraph is from Enrique Dussel's (2003) important work *Philosophy of Liberation*. The focus of the book is oppression, and it addresses that condition in a generalized and globalized manner through identifying the "culture of the center" (elites of the West) and the "peoples of the periphery" (predominantly the oppressed classes of Latin America and Africa). Educational pedagogy is built upon philosophical foundations and we should perhaps understand Dussel to be suggesting that those foundations are in need of change when he tells us that "there is no philosophical practice without an academic 'apparatus' for instruction and learning...Needing to create a consensus, the dominant classes organize a hegemonic ideologico-academic apparatus... Philosophy plays a central role in the dominant ideological formation and within the hegemonic apparatus" (2003:187).

Daniel Wildcat supports Dussel in theory when he speaks of the studies on Indian education by writing,

almost all Indian education studies, reports, and commissions have described, analyzed, and bemoaned a Western-inspired institution built on curriculum, methodologies, and pedagogy consistent with the Western worldview. This much-studied educational system was and, sadly, remains too often directed toward cultural assimilation into the dominant society. [2001:19]

Wildcat further elaborates with,

there is no way to get around the fact that Indian education in America has been and, one might argue, continues to exist as a handmaiden of assimilation. The assimilation of differently minded indigenous people into the dominant, essentially Western Culture, and I mean culture with a big C—the values, beliefs, customs, habits, practices, technology, and languages of Western civilization—has been up to now Indian education. That education is an assimilation process ought to be intrinsically troubling to anyone with democratic values. [2001:139]

The particular philosophy that favors white, Euro-American praxis in education in the United States was illuminated in an article by Diane Lewis as early as 1976 when she made reference to Asa Hilliard who wrote of “ethnocentric mythology” in education.

Hilliard (1975), a proponent of cultural pluralism, points out the prevailing “ethnocentric mythology” in education: *every school subject, if taught truthfully and realistically requires a plural cultural perspective. Science, literature, the behavioral sciences all must be freed from the monocultural ethnocentric focus that characterizes most standard coursework...We can no longer tolerate nor afford to permit a subject area to be called generally “music,” “history,” “psychology,” “political science,” when it is really a culture specific music, history, psychology, or political science. Such a condition will cause the school to be primarily the servant of a special interest or favored culture.* [1976:35]

On the surface, what Hilliard is describing in “subject area” (“music,” “history,” “psychology,” “political science”) appears to be innocuous; in truth it is representative of cultural homogenization which simply reduces or eliminates cultural diversity. Native students enrolled in these courses would soon learn that the courses favored a dominant white culture which erases the rich Native contributions to music, the Native histories which are never found in the colonial record, the psychological traumas specific to Native

peoples, or the political landscapes contributing to and perpetuating social ills in Native communities.

Dussel's philosophy is further upheld by Scott Ketchum who believes that "Colonial Power as a form of authority functions ontologically as an eraser of difference between two encountering groups by subjugating one group's narrative to the authority of another's for the explicit purpose of becoming "them" (2014:31). And, in a retrospective on the life and work of Bea Medicine, Donna Deyhle and Teresa McCarty tell us that "Bea Medicine's foundational claim—and the reality she ardently fought throughout her life—is that the goal of schooling is to "whiten" American Indian children and thereby transform and "uplift" a "race" (2007:211-212). The "whitening" of Indian children and attempts to "uplift a race" were certainly exemplified in the church supported and government boarding schools of the late 1800s and early-to-mid 1900s. Despite the primary goal of increasing land for Euro-American settlement, the General Allotment Act, also known as the Dawes Act, of 1887 mentioned earlier in this dissertation was built upon assimilation policies; educating Native people in animal husbandry, farming, and holding property in private ownership in order to civilize (or improve) their lot in life by making them more like "white" people.

Historically several of what are now considered to be "Ivy League" colleges and universities included programming aimed at the education of Indian youth; the two institutions in New England with the oldest history of educating Native Americans are Harvard University and Dartmouth College. Harvard College, now University, founded in 1636 quickly began floundering financially; the institution received funding in 1650 from the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England for a

program specifically meant for “the education of the English & Indian Youth of this country in knowledge and godliness” (<https://www.peabody.harvard.edu/node/477>). Dartmouth College was founded in 1769 with a mandate to “educate Indian youth and others,” but once established invested 200 years in the “others” with active recruitment of Native American students beginning only in the year 1969. In the intervening more than 200 years, other colleges and universities, both private and public, have established programming and recruitment of Native American students.

The initial mandates of Harvard and Dartmouth included general education and indoctrination into Christian theology in the hopes that Indian graduates would return to their communities and “spread the gospel” of Christianity. Today those same institutions, and others, recruit Native students as a method of increasing institutional diversity and inclusiveness. However, the reality belies those goals. While diversity of campus population may be accomplished, understandings of, and maintaining, cultural diversity continue to be absent. Using Dartmouth College as an example: in 1972 Native students and their supporters demanded removal of the Indian mascot and its image, yet even today there are those alumni and current students who continue to use, or wear, the image. Perhaps the most damaging are overt expressions of racism; each year as the Native students demonstrate in opposition to Columbus Day, racist counter-demonstrations, flyers, and rhetoric occur. While the institutional administration does not condone these acts, nothing is done to ascertain the identities of the perpetrators.

Dartmouth College boasts the largest number of Native American alumni, more than all other colleges or universities in the country combined yet, in this author’s experience, the standards for cultural understandings from an indigenous perspective

remain low. One example of lack of cultural understanding is provided in Chapter 6, specifically the experience of the young Diné woman on whose behalf I intervened. So while these institutions may believe that their recruitment and education of Native American students is an act of inclusiveness, an honor bestowed on members of a minority population, or way of bridging a divide, the experiences of the students themselves only serve to widen the divide. As stated, the original mandate of the institution was to educate and Christianize Indian youth, basically assimilation to white Euro-American culture; however, the assimilation does not, in practice, eliminate the status of these students as being non-white and, as such, little consideration is given to cultural or spiritual needs that are other than white, Euro-American Christian. The proliferation in recent decades of tribal colleges west of the Mississippi River may be a response to those experiences and a form of resistance to the methods engaged in teaching which primarily are viewed through a lens of white Euro-American understandings.

1. What do other Scholars have to say?

The previous chapter (Chapter 6) focused on some of the experiences of indigenous graduate students in Anthropology programs throughout the Northeast along with experiences and thoughts of both indigenous and non-indigenous PhD anthropologists who teach in those programs. The conclusions and concerns generated by the input of these persons has led me to a deeper investigation into the issues and of the perceived failings within the discipline, and also what actions have been engaged to ameliorate the ways in which we prepare students for careers in Anthropology.

Indigenous and non-indigenous scholars have invested a considerable amount of

time and research into many of the same areas of difficulty that were given voice to by indigenous graduate students in the anthropological surveys for this dissertation. Much of that research has involved learning the causes for low enrollments of Native American students in undergraduate and graduate programs of study. Some of those findings are identified below and will be familiar as to the experiences and perceptions expressed in the previous chapter.

From information provided by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (2003:xi), Ray Barnhardt and Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley found that “...the cultural histories and practices of Native students are rarely incorporated in the learning environment” (2005:10). In one published case study of American Indian undergraduates, Carol Brandt states that “the distance from their families while attending college, and the culture of the campus are just a few of the hurdles these students face” (2008:827) and that “borders or boundaries, both real and perceived, demarcate the worlds through which students move (Phelan et al., 1991). Aikenhead (1996, 1997, 2001) characterizes this movement as “border crossing” and argues these movements bear risks to students whose worldviews conflict with Eurocentric science” (2008:830). Significantly, Brandt also writes about the graduation statistics at the University of New Mexico by noting,

the rate of graduation of American Indian students at the University of New Mexico (UNM) is far below any other ethnic group. The UNM Office of Institutional Research points out that only 19% of American Indians who started as freshmen at UNM in 1991 completed a bachelor’s degree after 8 years, as opposed to 49.1% of the entire freshmen cohort from that same year. [2008:827]

Amanda R. Tachine is a young Diné (Navajo) woman who received a PhD in Education in 2015 from the University of Arizona. Tachine wrote an opinion article for *Aljazeera* addressing some of the same issues identified by graduate students in my

anthropological surveys by citing higher education reports which

show multiple barriers that inhibit degree attainment. Cultural alienation, racism and discrimination, a lack of indigenous role models and financial stresses all can be serious impediments to Native graduate students completing their degrees... that feeling of isolation can be compounded by a sense of marginalization, particularly if their research leads them away from the Eurocentric methodological approaches that predominate the social sciences. [<http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academic-study.html>]

These are not new issues; in 2002 Ray Barnhardt wrote,

Native students trying to survive in the university environment (an institution that is a virtual embodiment of modern consciousness) must acquire and accept a new form of consciousness, an orientation that not only displaces but often devalues the worldviews they bring with them...Those who do survive in the academic environment for four or more years often find themselves caught between different worlds, neither of which can fully satisfy their acquired tastes and aspirations, and thus they enter into a struggle to reconcile their conflicting forms of consciousness. [2002:241]

Bea Medicine had much to say over her long career about Indian education. In at least one writing, she reflected on being “caught between different worlds” and “conflicting forms of consciousness” when she wrote that

interacting in a "home-community" culture and in Anthropology may underlay constant segmentalization of dual lives which may be the lot of "Anthros of Color." It has been a survival strategy for me. In my time, doctoral degrees were seen as alienating from our societies. [1998:254]

Here we see Medicine giving voice to issues of double consciousness mentioned in the previous chapter. Attaining advanced education is often still a form of alienation from home community as scholars may be suspected of having assimilated to White ways and accused of no longer being “Indian enough.”

This same feeling of being alienated from home community is borne out by case studies Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy (2005) completed a decade ago. Brayboy reported the experiences of two Native students, one a female and one a male, at two Ivy

League colleges. About the young man, Brayboy writes, “On campus, he was largely disconnected from what was happening socially and knew few of his peers outside of classes... “I ran into one of my boys [a friend from home] who ignored me last week and told me that I had been away for too long.” Later in the conversation, he said, “I know what I know, so I will keep going, but it hurts me to know that I’ll never really go home again,” and about the young woman Brayboy writes, “Heather [fictitious name]... spent much of her time outside of class alone. She returned home once each semester where she often encountered problems similar to John’s, except she had been away longer” (2005:204). This issue is not insignificant for indigenous students; we need to remember that relationships (family and community) are central and are among the most important aspects of indigenous worldview. The double-edged pain in these situations is that many of these students are enrolled in programs of higher education because they have been asked to be there by their elders, or their Nation, to engage in a specific course of study in order to return to the community and occupy a role that is greatly needed. Sometimes the personal cost of serving one’s people is high indeed.

In the above examples, we can see a wider cultural divide between White America and Indian communities, and this divide is supported by the expectations of educational institutions. Higher education in the affluent or middle classes of the American general population is almost seen as a given expectation, as a right-of-passage if you will. Children in these populations are expected to leave home, enter college, and become independent of the nuclear family unit and, perhaps, the wider home community. Again, one of the main roles of a college or university is to produce good citizens; this may be interpreted to mean citizens who will become successful, obey the law of the

land, and be productive members of society. Ties to all that came before often consist of joining nuclear and extended family for holidays, weddings, and funerals. Often geographic location of abode is not within the community where close family reside, but many times miles away, even in different regions of the country. Childhood friendships frequently are left behind and replaced with those formed through graduate school and professional experiences.

All of the above is in stark contrast to the expectations of Indian families and communities, most especially those adhering to traditional ways of living. For example, in the Northeast, the first expectation is that young people will find their own way; finding one's path is considered to be a personal journey, not one that is orchestrated by family. Family, community, and elders provide guidance. If a young person elects higher education, the expectation is that once that education has been accomplished the individual will return to the community. Education is viewed as a tool to be used in providing service to community, not in furthering self. All relationships are highly valued and maintaining deep connections to family and friends are important to identity. Higher education becomes a painful experience when those connections are stretched by distance or severed by perceptions within the community that one no longer fits in or no longer really belongs.

In 1999, Melvin Jenkins wrote that "according to [Robert W.J.] Scott (1986), cultural differences may well be the most significant factor which leads to Native American failure in higher education. The term includes not only differences in physical appearance, but also perceptions of hostility, racism, or bias within the college setting" (1999:51). Those perceptions of marginalization may be very real. Carol Brandt

published a case study of an undergraduate American Indian student who she calls Deborah. Deborah relates an interaction she had with a Science professor.

I told him, “It’s really hard for me to understand you. A lot of what you are saying I can’t understand because it’s not in my world. And I have to write down what you are saying, or read the textbook, and then I have to translate back into my Navajo thinking. And then when I try to do that, it’s like, no way! It doesn’t make sense.” And he just told me, “do or die.” Either you believe it or you don’t. [2008:837]

Brandt addresses and analyses this interaction:

Deborah felt belittled by her professor’s refusal to discuss her quandary over the dissonance between her traditional creation story and evolution. “You’re going to have to compromise something here,” he said to her. The professor does not explicitly say exactly *what* should be compromised, but Deborah understood his words in this way: that she should abandon her traditional worldview. Barnhardt (2002) describes similar experiences among Native Alaskans in higher education. “Native students trying to survive in the university environment... must acquire and accept a new form of consciousness, an orientation that not only displaces but often devalues the worldviews they bring with them” (p. 241). [2008:839]

The above case study exemplifies lack of institutional understandings of cultural differences but it also exemplifies tolerance of such a lack of understandings. The genesis of this tolerance could possibly be as simple as college and university administrators not being educated in cultural differences, another example of a need for eliminating the mono-paradigmatic status quo of teaching and learning. However, there are also perceptions that institutions striving to increase enrollment of diverse populations has more to do with financial gain rather than an effort to desegregate the campus or broaden understandings of diverse cultures; institutions receive federal monies for the education of minority students, and those monies are based on enrollment.

Another issue which was raised by indigenous graduate students, that of self-imposed silencing of voice in the classroom, has been, as recently as 2014, addressed by Scott Ketchum who tells us,

the fear of speaking but not being heard produces and reproduces an outlook of inferiority when entering public spaces and academic interactions. This is the way historical trauma operates as a discontinuity between self-affirmation and community healing, making any ability to redress modes of oppression dependent upon reprioritizing our understanding of privilege and its relationship to law. [2014:31]

Although this is a self-imposed silencing, it remains a marginalization. Regardless of the reason(s) these students remain silent, whether from fear of ridicule from past experiences or cultural differences preventing full understanding of the material, this marginalization prevents them from fully participating in the course discussions and locating them further into the periphery.

In Amanda Tachine's (2015) article, she identified a "lack of indigenous role models" as a factor which may contribute to high rates of attrition of Native American students in graduate school programs. Bea Medicine broached this topic in referencing a report from the American Association for the Advancement of Science from 1976 when she stated, "other salient factors that can be extracted from this report are the need for role models in graduate schools..." (1988:90). S. Masturah Ismail and Courtney B. Cazden also mentioned a lack of indigenous instructors in reviewing an article in *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* written by Julie Kaomea (2005):

highlighting the underrepresentation of Indigenous teachers in the classroom, [Julie] Kaomea [2005] traces how the discourse of Hawaiian violence is worryingly perpetuated from their colonial origins through unquestioning teachers who pass on the myth to their students as "Truth" that can literally be pointed out in the textbook. Simply put, a non-Indigenous teacher, not having the historical experience of being

Indigenous, may not be equipped with the “lenses” or the training necessary to discern distortions in the text. [2005:88]

In an interview I conducted with an elder in southern New England, I posed the question, “do you think that courses, that college courses, relating to Native American studies should be taught by Native American instructors?” She answered without hesitation.

One hundred percent of the time. And the reason I say that is, because for so long courses about White American studies were taught by White people, courses about Black American studies are still by and large taught by Black people. Why not give Indians a little chance here. Give us a shot, ya know? Just let it be ours to make a mistake, have that respect that you gave everybody else. Just for a short amount of time, give it to us. That we do deserve, and frankly, I question the ethics of non-Indian people who go into the discipline and don't put Indian people first. Because, if you really want to help Indian people, then help them. Help them help themselves; don't put yourself ahead of them. I have a hard time believing that you really want to help Indian people if you take a job away from them, if you take a spot away from them, if you're putting your thoughts ahead of theirs, you're teaching what you believe as opposed to letting them teach what they believe, you're not helping them. [personal interview, October 23, 2014]

Engaging instructors who are indigenous people does not fully address the issue. Indigenous educators may be viewed as culture brokers, “mediators who link ethnic minorities with individuals and institutions in the dominant culture” (Jean Forward 1986:13). These culture brokers however fall into two different categories; traditional patron brokers and innovative ethnic brokers. Traditional patron brokers encourage assimilation to the ways and beliefs of the dominant culture thereby exacerbating the problem as seen by indigenous people. Innovative ethnic brokers uphold the minority culture and worldview (Forward 1986:13). So simply placing indigenous people in the classroom is not a solution, vetting those persons to establish their method of disseminating knowledge congruent with indigenous culture is crucial.

Many of the issues that negatively impact indigenous students being identified in this chapter mirror some of the issues which were addressed by graduate students in Anthropology programs via the anthropological surveys in the last chapter; issues such as perceptions of marginalization, silencing of voice, disconnect or fractures with home community, instructors not familiar with diverse cultures, and lack of indigenous instructors. From the writings reviewed here by both indigenous and non-indigenous scholars, we can see that many of these issues have been recognized and discussed as early as four decades ago. Actions and approaches that have been implemented to address the issues will now be examined.

2. Actions and Results

Exploring the literature produced very, very sparse results. From Barnhardt and Kawagley in 2005:

actions currently being taken by Indigenous people in communities throughout the world clearly demonstrate that a significant “paradigm shift” is under way in which Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing are recognized as complex knowledge systems with an adaptive integrity of their own...As this shift evolves, Indigenous people are not the only beneficiaries; the issues are of equal significance in non-Indigenous contexts (Nader 1996). Many problems manifested within conditions of marginalization have gravitated from the periphery to the center of industrial societies, so that new (but old) insights emerging from Indigenous societies are of equal benefit to the broader educational community. [2005:9]

And further:

recently, many Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have begun to recognize the limitations of a monocultural education system, and new approaches have begun to emerge that are contributing to our understanding of the relationship between Indigenous ways of knowing and those associated with Western society and formal education. Our challenge now is to devise a system of education for all people that respects the epistemological and pedagogical foundations provided by Indigenous as well as Western cultural traditions. [2005:9]

I have found no follow-up on this last passage. Mining the literature and professional journals was significantly unproductive. Primary and middle schools often have a form of multi-cultural education that consists of units; Indians are studied in November in relationship to Thanksgiving and African Americans are studied during Black History month in February. Colleges and universities highlight books in their libraries that correspond to these topics during November and February. But this is not really pertinent to the question: has a system been devised *anywhere* outside of Tribal Colleges that presents indigenous traditions concurrently with Western traditions? This paper by Barnhardt and Kawagley was written a full decade ago. When a friend reports to me that a student in her class in 2015 quoted another instructor as describing the Aborigines of Australia as "just like the Native Americans of the U.S. were," I am unable to believe without documented proof that Barnhardt and Kawagley's "system of education for all people that respects the epistemological and pedagogical foundations provided by Indigenous as well as Western cultural traditions" (2005:9) exists in mainstream higher education.

Also in 2005, Teresa McCarty wrote "we are confident that the academic enterprise itself will be revitalized by the insights of a new Indigenous critical posture that privileges Indigenous knowledges and offers critiques of existing erroneous portrayals of Indigenous peoples based on limiting theoretical lenses and outsider misunderstandings" (2005:4). However, at present, this could be accomplished only within the framework of the Western educational paradigm which continues to hold fast to the theories of Western knowledge and Western superiority thus placing indigenous knowledge outside of mainstream comprehension. McCarty wrote this as the Editor's

Introduction to a special themed issue in the *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*; unfortunately all of the articles in this themed issue were written by women which, in male dominated disciplines, immediately diminishes value and suggests a likely unsuccessful chance of a paradigm shift.

Professional organizations have, at times, raised issues that address lapses in educational programs, identified critical experiences of indigenous students and other cultural groups which form barriers to success in learning, and sometimes have issued a call for institutional change. Because so many of the members of professional anthropological organizations are educators, these organizations could provide the perfect vehicle for identifying problems and posing steps to be taken in correcting the problems. For instance, at the 2014 AAA meeting, the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) convened a panel discussion to address these issues in graduate level programs of Anthropology. Reporting on the panel for a 2015 issue of *American Anthropologist*, Kevin Yelvington, et.al. wrote,

although the “Beyond Statistics” panel [at the SfAA] focused on issues specific to African American students, many of the experiences shared resonate more broadly with other underrepresented groups in graduate programs in anthropology. The panelists spoke of feelings of isolation, of being unduly questioned by some of their professors and graduate student peers on their choice of research topics, and about the integrity of native anthropology. They expressed their dismay at seeing contributions of black and other anthropologists of color marginalized within or excluded from the discipline’s canon and said that these experiences fostered feelings of self-doubt... They remarked on the experiences of being made to feel like invisible outsiders at some times (e.g., not being introduced to department visitors when others were; being viewed as subjects instead of scholars and peers in classroom discussions) and as racialized and visible representatives of diversity at others (e.g., seen as universal experts on the subject of race). [2015:387]

This sounds like an exciting and energetic panel, addressing issues that should be of deep

concern to members of the AAA who are employed in the education and training of future anthropologists. One might assume that the topics being addressed would make this a session not to be missed. Yet the session being missed is most certainly what appears to have happened.

This call to consciousness expressed by the panelists coincided with, and echoed, current concerns within the discipline, and it resonated with initiatives by the AAA and by individual departments. Yet the panel was poorly attended, despite the presence of the executive director of the AAA. The president of the SfAA visited briefly and offered support for the panel, apologizing for the low attendance. *Such under participation could suggest that, in the context of competing priorities of conference attendees, the panel's topic was not considered of high importance to anthropologists in attendance, which means that more work needs to done.* [Yelvington 2015:388, emphasis added]

The lack of attendance at this session gives the appearance of apathy on the part of the very individuals who are in a position to take action to correct the institutional barriers to education experienced by minority students. Bluntly, my impression of this reporting is that non-indigenous, non-African American, non-Hispanic instructors have no interest in learning what problems exist for their graduate students and certainly no interest in doing the hard work necessary to make the educational experience of the discipline more inclusive or attractive to those students.

Certainly every campus has long since initiated policies on racism and discrimination. Actions of racism or discrimination that Native students speak about are almost always covert, or perceived, rather than blatant overt acts. Culturally, indigenous people do not draw attention to “self,” which leads Native students to either under-report or fail to formally report discrimination. Coming from communities that have received repercussions from institutions which hold power, both historically and contemporaneously, contributes to Native students’ reticence to take advantage of such

institutional policies. For many students coming from traditional communities, drawing attention to oneself is a way to open the door to overt acts of racism, with the underlying principle being that it is better to remain invisible than to become a target. Without overt expressions of racism or discrimination, or with lack of reporting of incidents, institutions are unable to initiate disciplinary action. And certainly, intentions of the subtle occurrences are essentially impossible to prove as to being racist or discriminatory.

3. Recommended Actions

Issues examined in this section will include increased presence of indigenous faculty in educational institutions, culturally appropriate support services on campuses, and opportunities for cultural expression or simply an indigenous space that feels safe to indigenous students in which to gather. These issues represent some of the major concerns or obstacles identified by the graduate student focus group surveys; and again, some of these issues have been addressed by indigenous scholars for decades.

One of the most frequently spoken of issues in educating indigenous students surrounds the cultural affiliation of those who do the teaching; from Bea Medicine articulating “the need for role models in graduate school” (1988:90) to the surveys completed by indigenous graduate students in the last chapter, a need for a greater number of indigenous instructors is a recurring theme. Issues of marginalization, of being different in physical appearance, life experiences, or beliefs, can either be reinforced or eliminated by the institutional authority in the classroom. If the instructor has little or no experience with indigenous cultures, and has not been trained in those cultures, a lack of intervention during a discussion eliciting diverse opinions may serve to reinforce perceptions of marginalization or of “Otherness.” I personally experienced just such an

incident. I was enrolled in a graduate level course in which one half of the class belonged to a minority culture group and the other half were white students and myself, the only Indian. The instructor belonged to the first minority group and this group dominated discussion in class meetings with the white students basically “going with the flow” so to speak. If I voiced an opinion about the topic of the week from an indigenous perspective, I was immediately informed by the dominating group that I was wrong. Some rather contentious class meetings ensued, but the instructor never once intervened or pointed out that there might be multiple ways or viewpoints in which to address the topic. From the comments contributed on the surveys by indigenous graduate students and some of the case studies presented in this chapter, the majority of indigenous students fall into a habit of being silent as a way of navigating a similar incident, they simply disappear as participants. My only concession to silencing was in cutting a class meeting for the first and only time in my academic career.

Forty years ago, Diane Lewis was concerned with the education of minority students and possible methods which would accomplish full inclusion of those students into the academic arena. At that time Lewis noted

successful multi-cultural education of minorities must incorporate methods which are responsive to perceived group as well as individual differences. One such method might be the use of bi-cultural teachers to assist in the teaching of specialized knowledge and skills in a context where both one’s own group accomplishments and inter-group interaction are stressed. [1976:35]

Amanda Tachine (2015) notes that

increasing Native graduate student enrollment to college is just one piece of the solution. We also need to advocate for more Native faculty who can contribute to scholarship and Indigenous methodologies. We need to provide a space for Native students to share their perspectives, questions and concerns, which will help find answers to increase their representation

in higher education. We must be attentive to the ingrained ideologies and systematic structures that contribute to invisibility, isolation and overall exclusion.

<http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academicstudy.html>

The idea of increasing indigenous faculty has also been supported by Melvin Jenkins in suggesting “student support services may also include institutional commitments in the forms of increased American Indian faculty and the provision of American Indian counselors for students” (1999:50). But how do we increase the number of indigenous faculty at an institution if the disciplines in which they would teach are so alienating to the “Other” that enrollment in programs which train these professionals are so minimal as to be almost non-existent?

Culturally appropriate support services in an academic setting are crucial for indigenous students. Jenkins’ (1999) last suggestion, “the provision of American Indian counselors for students” is of major concern. I know of no institution of higher learning, other than tribal colleges, where this accommodation has been made; counseling services are staffed with counselors trained in Western medicine and Indian students are expected, or assumed, to be assimilated into a cultural milieu where Western practices of counseling would be effective. The reality is that students from traditional backgrounds need indigenous counsellors trained in traditional methods of healing, with understandings of holistic connections between body, mind, and spirit. I found only one reference to this topic in a literature search; a paper authored by Charline L. Burton and presented at the Annual Conference on Ethnic and Minority Studies in 1980 in which she states,

most traditional counseling methods do not consider the Native American student’s world view and values. As a result, he is not able to relate well

with the counselor and does not gain insight and self-understanding.
[<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED190330>]

Such counseling programs may be available in non-tribal universities or colleges outside of New England, but my search for them was unsuccessful. In New England, the institutions with strong Native American programming find students seeking Native directors or staff of those programs for guidance; however, these people are not trained counselors.

As an indigenous woman and recent PhD graduate, we should be listening carefully to Amanda Tachine (2015) when she advocates for a community of support that includes indigenous graduate students and faculty. Institutional development of Cultural Centers for Native American students are perhaps the one action that has provided the most support and encouragement contributing to success of Indian students. Sense of community and belonging are crucial in indigenous worldview. I look forward to more insightful writing by Amanda Tachine; she may be one of the moving forces in effecting the necessary paradigm shift in response to Dussel's (2003) "hegemonic academic apparatus."

C. Professional Organizations

In addressing the question of "what efforts have been made to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline?" efforts made by professional organizations must be evaluated. This section will explore some of those efforts, especially those which address core issues identified by graduate students and professional indigenous anthropologists as areas which negatively impact indigenous peoples or serve as obstructions to full inclusion within the discipline.

Anthropological professional organizations have, in some cases, strived to make

Anthropology a more inclusive discipline for minority peoples. The American Anthropological Association (AAA), Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), World Archaeological Congress (WAC), and the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) are the organizations chosen for inclusion in this chapter. All have some form of Statements on Ethics and some have Statements, or Codes, pertaining specifically to issues of diversity, racism, and human remains or repatriation. The statements on human remains or repatriation will be explored in the section under NAGPRA. The Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA), a section of the AAA, will also be reviewed.

1. American Anthropological Association (AAA)

The American Anthropological Association (AAA) is widely recognized as *the* professional anthropological association in the United States and one of the major anthropological organizations in the world. It is essentially the governing body of the discipline of Anthropology, setting the standards for ethical practice in the field, common methodologies employed, and keeping the boundaries of the discipline. It is also the nexus of the discipline where anthropological pedagogy is established, albeit in a non-official, non-verbal framework; a pedagogy which has become normalized and which has been challenged only sporadically by members such as Bea Medicine or non-members like Vine Deloria. AAA has the largest membership of anthropological organizations with approximately 11,000 members. There are a number of sub-sections within the organization which address special interest groups within the field of Anthropology, and of course, sections for all Four Fields of the discipline.

The AAA was established in 1902 and throughout 113 years has constructed multiple versions of a Statement of Ethics. However the first statement was not issued

until 1967, a full 65 years after the organization was founded. This somehow begs the question, why did it take so long for the AAA to begin thinking about ethical practice? The next Statement was issued in 1971 with that version subsequently amended through 1986, again in 2009, and the most recent version being written in 2012. The Statement lists what it refers to as “core principles,” the first and over-arching is “Do No Harm.” This principle states that “among the most serious harms that anthropologists should seek to avoid are harm to dignity, and to bodily and material well-being, especially when research is conducted among vulnerable populations” (<http://ethics.aaanet.org/ethics-statement-1-do-no-harm/>). This is of deepest concern to indigenous people who could potentially be targeted for repercussions by state or federal governments. We should disabuse ourselves of the thought that governmental repercussions occur only in other countries; there are numerous cases of anthropologists being asked to testify, or their written reports being used, to negatively impact land claims and petitions for federal recognition in the United States by American Indian tribes.

The second and third principles are “Be Open and Honest Regarding Your Work,” and “Obtain Informed Consent.” The intent of these principles is to prevent any misrepresentation regarding research or unauthorized use of information.

Researchers who mislead participants about the nature of the research and/or its sponsors; who omit significant information that might bear on a participant’s decision to engage in the research; or who otherwise engage in clandestine or secretive research that manipulates or deceives research participants about the sponsorship, purpose, goals or implications of the research, do not satisfy ethical requirements for openness, honesty, transparency and fully informed consent. [<http://ethics.aaanet.org/ethics-statement-1-do-no-harm/>]

This principle is also important to indigenous people in the context of historical experiences that may have found cultural or spiritual information, or material objects,

gathered without consent or knowledge, or ways in which that knowledge or artifacts would be curated or disseminated. In a previous chapter, I reported a story of taped interviews conducted with elders by an ethnologist which included family histories, oral tradition, language, etc. When I asked the informant if there were any verbal or written consents obtained by the researcher to use these materials she said, “No, at that time it wasn’t required” (personal communication, July 14, 2014).

The fifth principle discussed is “Make Your Results Accessible.” When research results are being shared with others, informants should also have access. This principle goes on to state that research results should not be disseminated indiscriminately when restrictions are in place. From an indigenous perspective, this should also be read to include restrictions placed by the informant or the community.

Adhering to these ethical principles would certainly benefit anthropologists as well as their indigenous persons of study. When thinking about the long history of exploitation of indigenous people by anthropologists in the Four Fields, it is not unreasonable to assume that trust issues are precarious. These stated principles by the AAA, if used to guide research would, in time, ease somewhat the conflicts between anthropologists and indigenous communities. These principles however are merely guidelines, and as such are not adopted by every researcher. They are also open to individual interpretation. It should be noted that there are no formal sanctions in place for infractions of the principles.

The resolutions against racism issued by the AAA in 1961, 1969, 1971, 1972, and 1998 finally began to contradict centuries-old beliefs that “race” is determined by “major biological differences” and established the concept of race as a social construct. In the

May, 2014 issue of *Anthropology News*, writing the “President’s Report” for 2013, under the heading of “Diversity,” Leith Mullings wrote

in 2008, then-President Alan Goodman formed the Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology. They produced a report in 2010, including a series of recommendations *designed to increase the presence of US historically underrepresented racialized minorities in the association and in the discipline*. In 2012, I appointed a Task Force on Race and Racism, co-chaired by Karen Brodtkin and Raymond Codrington, to address these recommendations. They focused on three key suggestions. To provide baseline data and to measure our progress going forward, they created and administered a survey for the membership....Furthermore the task force organized a roundtable for the 2013 November meeting, “Numbers Matter: Agenda and Strategies,” *to discuss best practices for recruiting underrepresented minorities, particularly in the subfields where they are severely underrepresented*...In addition, the EB will review and renew efforts to address all forms of discrimination in the association and the discipline. [2014: e30–e46, emphasis added].

A Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA) was convened and the final report was written by Janis Hutchinson and Thomas C. Patterson as Co-Chairs in 2010. This report is 14 pages in length; the general purposes of the CRRA were,

(1) to collect information in order to better expose how privilege has been maintained in anthropology and the AAA, including but not limited to departments and the academic pipeline, and (2) to develop a comprehensive plan for the Association and the field of anthropology to increase the ethnic, racial, gender and class diversity of the discipline and organization. Through discussion, the members of the commission decided to focus on the following goals: (1) to collect data on ethnoracial diversity in the field and the association; (2) to examine what anthropology programs are doing to increase diversity; (3) to look at “best practices” in other professional organizations; and (4) to consider possible restructuring of the association’s Committee on Minority Issues in Anthropology (CMIA).

<http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1910>

The report is well worth reading as it contains a great deal of information that is far too extensive space-wise for the purposes of this dissertation. However, in 2008 the CRRA conducted surveys of minority members of the AAA to ascertain their experiences as

graduate students. There are three pages of comments listed in the report, of which a small sampling most pertinent to Native students is presented below. Many of these comments are familiar and have been presented in other contexts in this, and the last, chapter:

- Too few role models.
- No other Indians taking classes; felt very much alone.
- Small number racial minority peers within the discipline made it a lonely endeavor at times.
- Frankly, bigotry, ranging from questions regarding my “ability to get through such a rigorous program with such serious disabilities” to tacky comments about my age (academic shelf-life) or my interest in Native American culture.
- I also found resistance in general to non-mainstream approaches to anthropology.
- Not feeling that I belonged in my department or my opinion was valued. Getting grief from other native students for being in an anthropology department. Not having people from my community understand what exactly it was that I was doing.
[\[http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1910\]](http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1910)

The last comment is noteworthy in that it supports comments made by graduate students in the focus group for this dissertation and also supports comments contributed by other academics in previous pages; an alienation from others in the graduate school department and an alienation from other Native people. Sadly, the final recommendations of the commission left me shaking my head and sighing. There were five recommendations which consisted of data collection on enrollment, degree, and faculty trends in order to construct a website making the data available; undergraduate recruitment; providing information to admission committees about racialized minorities class and race advantages in standardized testing; increasing fellowship aid to graduate

students of color; and constructing a website linking services, information, and funding assistance for minority anthropologists of color. I feel that the core issues identified in the CRRA surveys were left unaddressed with no proposed actions for resolution. However, a new book was produced as a result of the CRRA titled *Racism in the Academy: The New Millennium*. The description of this edited volume states:

We are anthropologists and we found ourselves wanting to bring the anthropological lens to another kind of project, an ethnography—the systematic description of human culture—of the academy, to more fully describe the lived experiences of racism in colleges and universities.
[\[http://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2639\]](http://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2639)

The volume consists of 171 pages, with essays written by 11 individual authors, each of whom is African American. My greatest disappointment in reading this entire book was in finding not one single American Indian author included who could give voice to the bias, bigotry, discrimination, or racism specific to American Indian professionals or to indigenous students in graduate programs of Anthropology, even though these students represent, by far, the smallest numbers of minority students. This effort (book) is laudable as a critique of African American experiences in the educational realm of the discipline but does not illuminate a single incidence defining the struggles unique to indigenous students. Therefore, nothing in this volume could possibly be of benefit in bridging the ideological divide addressed in this dissertation, which most likely was never the intent of the editors or the contributors.

An article for *Anthropology News* written by Florence Babb reports on a session convened at the AAA 2014 annual meeting. Babb's article summarizes this panel:

broadly, we viewed this session as fitting squarely within the CWA (AAA Committee on World Anthropologies) mission to decolonize knowledge and challenge the current geopolitics of scholarly participation.

The panel questioned and challenged the ways in which the discipline values different forms and sites of knowledge production. The increasing attention to decentering the Euro-American production of anthropologies has given greater visibility and recognition to “anthropology otherwise.”

Central to our discussion was an examination of feminist interventions by scholars or activists who are calling for an epistemic shift that will enable “border thinking” by those wishing to promote dialogue that includes Afro-descendant, indigenous, and other populations that historically have been underrepresented in the field. To address both knowledge production through research and teaching practices, we examined collaborative research and teaching methodologies that contribute to broad decolonial and feminist projects. [2015:27]

This panel discussion appears to merit attention as did the “Beyond Statistics” panel at the same meeting which was convened by the SfAA and reported on by Kevin Yelvington (2015). Knowing the number of attendees at this panel would be helpful in discerning the level of interest among the conference participants to the subject at hand; unfortunately that information is not provided.

2. Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA)

Fairly recently, in 2007, under the auspices of the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA) was founded. When I learned of AIA, I visualized a convocation of indigenous and non-indigenous anthropologists, sitting in circle, working on a restructured, inclusive discipline; one that would include indigenous worldview. I was wrong; initially hopeful, but wrong.

In investigating the AIA what I found was a group of anthropologists who incidentally happen to be Indian; indigenous people already well-indoctrinated into Western pedagogy, into mainstream anthropology. In examining the AIA web-page (<http://www.aaanet.org/sections/aia/about/>) I found a list outlining the purposes of AIA:

- to advance anthropological study relating to Indigenous peoples, both past and present;

- to support and encourage the professional development of members by supporting a forum for respectful and engaged discussion of common issues and current work;
- to provide a network for the support and encouragement of Indigenous undergraduate and graduate students of anthropology;
- to increase intellectual exchange by sponsoring symposia, sessions, workshops, exhibitions and publications;
- to advance and facilitate stronger ties between Indigenous communities and the field of anthropology;
- to encourage professional work that will benefit both the discipline of anthropology and Indigenous communities

There is no mention of including indigenous knowledge systems or worldview into the discipline. There is no mention of including indigenous knowledge systems or worldview into the academic programs that train anthropologists; the same programs that intellectually recolonize indigenous undergraduate and graduate students by presenting only mainstream anthropological courses of study; the same programs that require assimilation to Western forms of knowledge and Western forms of thinking in order for their work to be given weight.

3. Society for American Archaeology (SAA)

The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) is the second largest anthropological organization with approximately 8,000 members. The SAA is concerned only with the field of Archaeology. The SAA is a strong group which frequently invests in political lobbying in opposition to issues of repatriation and enactment of the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) which will be explored further in this chapter.

The SAA, in 1996, released a statement on ethics which had been in the process of construction since 1991 termed “Principles of Archaeological Ethics” (<http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>)

This document consists of eight “Principles,” none of which give voice to a statement comparable to the AAA “Do No Harm;” rather, the SAA statement concerns itself more with what appears to be archaeological issues of “ownership.” The eight principles are summarized below.

The first Principle is “Stewardship,” which states in part, “it is the responsibility of all archaeologists to work for the long-term conservation and protection of the archaeological record by practicing and promoting stewardship of the archaeological record.” This principle also considers material artifacts to be a part of the archaeological record.

The second Principle is “Accountability” which refers to the archaeologist making good faith effort to “consult actively with affected group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved.” This principle could be interpreted to include Native American communities.

The third Principle is “Commercialization” which addresses the unethical selling of archaeological materials. The fourth Principle “Public Education and Outreach” identifies goals as “1) enlist public support for the stewardship of the archaeological record; 2) explain and promote the use of archaeological methods and techniques in understanding human behavior and culture; and 3) communicate archaeological interpretations of the past.”

The fifth Principle addresses “Intellectual Property.” According to the SAA, intellectual property is found in the “knowledge and documents created through the study of archaeological resources, [and] is part of the archaeological record.” Indigenous people could certainly understand this to mean that they hold no rights to the materials archaeologists have mined from their knowledge production, ceremonies, language, culture, or material objects but rather these items are now to be considered universal property. This is certainly an alienating concept in the relationship between Anthropology and indigenous peoples.

The sixth Principle, “Public Reporting and Publication,” also suggests ownership by the anthropological community. This principle states in part, “The documents and materials on which publication and other forms of public reporting are based should be deposited in a suitable place for permanent safekeeping.”

Principle seven “Records and Preservation” and Principle eight “Training and Resources” again pertain to archaeologists protecting that which they perceive as their domain. This document holds very little that would serve to recognize the sovereignty of indigenous communities.

4. Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA)

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) is a professional organization with 2,000+ members. The SfAA also has an established Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities (<https://www.sfaa.net/about/ethics/>). The focus of the SfAA members is concerned with human behavior and how to apply the findings of investigation to contemporary problems faced by human communities. Applied Anthropology encompasses a number of disciplines but stresses both involvement and activism within the community being studied. Perhaps it is due to this very specific interest that the

Society's Statement of Ethics is heavily focused on consideration and protection of informants and communities involved in studies or projects.

The SfAA Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities gives guidance in six specific areas: the first guarantees transparency to individual subjects relating to goals, methods, and sponsorship of a project and stresses voluntary participation; the second pays respect to individuals being studied that ensures "dignity, integrity, and worth;" the third item relates to not impeding efforts of colleagues; the fourth concern speaks to "nondiscriminatory access" to the education of students and interns; the last two items on the Statement, the fifth and sixth, address responsibilities to employers or sponsors and to communicate "understanding of human life to the society at large" gained through the study of sociocultural communities. While not as extensive or in-depth as the AAA guide to ethics, the SfAA Statement is certainly more oriented to protecting the interests of informant communities and individuals than is that of the SAA.

5. World Archaeological Congress (WAC)

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) is the smallest professional organization being examined, at least in terms of the estimated 1200 members. However, from an indigenous standpoint, I consider the organization's "Code of Ethics" and "Rules to Adhere To" as a model of best practices in Archaeology (<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>).

The *Vermillion Accord on Human Remains*, consisting of six articles, was adopted by WAC in 1989. The *Tamaki Makau-rau Accord on the Display of Human Remains and Sacred Objects*, which also consists of six articles, was adopted by WAC in 2006, as a follow-up and expansion to the *Vermillion Accord*. These two documents will be examined further in the Repatriation section of this chapter.

The *First Code of Ethics* was adopted by WAC in 1990. According to the WAC website (<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>), this Code consists of eight principles, all of which pertain to indigenous peoples. The Code is followed by seven *Rules to Adhere To*. The *First Code of Ethics* and the *Rules to Adhere To* are presented below in their entirety in order to illuminate the striking difference between WAC philosophy and methods of practice and those of other professional organizations.

First Code of Ethics

- To acknowledge the importance of indigenous cultural heritage, including sites, places, objects, artefacts, human remains, to the survival of indigenous cultures.
- To acknowledge the importance of protecting indigenous cultural heritage to the well-being of indigenous peoples.
- To acknowledge the special importance of indigenous ancestral human remains, and sites containing and/or associated with such remains, to indigenous peoples.
- To acknowledge that the important relationship between indigenous peoples and their cultural heritage exists irrespective of legal ownership.
- To acknowledge that the indigenous cultural heritage rightfully belongs to the indigenous descendants of that heritage.
- To acknowledge and recognise indigenous methodologies for interpreting, curating, managing and protecting indigenous cultural heritage.
- To establish equitable partnerships and relationships between Members and indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is being investigated.
- To seek, whenever possible, representation of indigenous peoples in agencies funding or authorising research to be certain their view is considered as critically important in setting research standards, questions, priorities and goals.

Rules to Adhere To

Members agree that they will adhere to the following rules prior to, during and after their investigations.

- Prior to conducting any investigation and/or examination, Members shall with rigorous endeavour seek to define the indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation.
- Members shall negotiate with and obtain the informed consent of representatives authorized by the indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation.
- Members shall ensure that the authorised representatives of the indigenous peoples whose culture is being investigated are kept informed during all stages of the investigation.
- Members shall ensure that the results of their work are presented with deference and respect to the identified indigenous peoples.
- Members shall not interfere with and/or remove human remains of indigenous peoples without the express consent of those concerned.
- Members shall not interfere with and/or remove artefacts or objects of special cultural significance, as defined by associated indigenous peoples, without their express consent.
- Members shall recognise their obligation to employ and/or train indigenous peoples in proper techniques as part of their projects, and utilise indigenous peoples to monitor the projects.

WAC cautions members that “the new Code should not be taken in isolation; it was seen by Council as following on from WAC’s adoption of the Vermillion Accord passed in 1989 at the South Dakota Inter-Congress” (<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>).

Larry Zimmerman expounds on WAC and its *Code of Ethics* when he writes,

the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) in its ethics code has taken steps to share control with indigenous peoples. The WAC code eve[n] puts the development of research into indigenous hands. For example, WAC has eight indigenous representatives on its executive committee. Its ethics code demands that WAC members seek representation for indigenous peoples in agencies funding or authorizing research to be certain that their views are considered in setting research standards, questions, priorities, and goals. Archaeologists do not stop developing research questions—the difference is they share them with indigenous peoples, who then become more familiar with archaeological thinking. [1994:68]

WAC is not without detractors from within the profession; this is not surprising when one considers how much emphasis the organization places on indigenous rights. The *Code Of Ethics* also appears to shift a significant amount of power to indigenous people in all aspects of engaging research, a condition not encountered in any other professional organization or educational institutions. Zimmerman describes one criticism aimed at WAC by the archaeological community in general:

because WAC has openly acknowledged and embraced the political side of archaeology, some archaeologists still tend to think of WAC as a political, rather than a scientific or scholarly, organization. For members, especially in Eurocentric countries, it is not uncommon to hear the charge that “WAC does politics, not archaeology.” This has been especially the situation in the United States where archaeology has been epistemologically science-centered for decades. WAC certainly “does science” but maintains that all archaeology is political...[2014:7868]

WAC maintains a book publishing program, as do most of the professional organizations examined in this section. Perhaps the major difference between the publishing endeavor of WAC and other anthropological organizations is how the profits from book sales are used. Zimmerman reports on this endeavor by WAC:

the Worlds of Archaeology series presents the global diversity of archaeology, foregrounding many different voices, particularly those silenced by colonial processes. The Archaeology and Indigenous Peoples series examines the current relationship and possibilities for collaboration between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples... All royalties from all series publications go to support travel for disadvantaged scholars, students, and Indigenous people to attend WAC meetings. [2014:7868]

If I were an archaeologist, this is the professional organization in which I would feel was the most congruent with my personal philosophy. A number of the points covered in the *First Code of Ethics* and in the *Rules to Adhere To* address concerns raised by indigenous graduate students, indigenous anthropological practitioners, and indigenous elders. Specifically, in the *Code of Ethics* points #1, #3, #5, #6, #7, and #8 all pertain to issues

tribal elders have struggled with since the first episode of looting in the United States occurred: the relationship indigenous people have to material culture, language, and ancestors, all of which is intimately connected to tribal and individual identity. Points #6 and #8 may be viewed as addressing concerns of indigenous graduate students by challenging funding entities that claim researchers who are considered insiders cannot be objective. Points #5 and #6 of the *Rules to Adhere To* prohibit the looting of Indian graves or removal of artifacts or sacred objects from a community without proper permission. Point #7 may be viewed as being inclusive of indigenous archaeologists or anthropologists in a project by employment and monitoring of the project. Both the *Code* and the *Rules* reflect an understanding, recognition, and acceptance of indigenous ideology by the members of the organization. The WAC documents presented in this chapter are the best example of archaeologists making every effort to bridge the ideological divide with indigenous people.

D. Repatriation and NAGPRA

Yet a life story-complete with birth, kinship ties, societal roles, individual aspirations, and death-is connected with each Indian remain, regardless of whether it has been disinterred or lies within the earth. This is one of the reasons why most Indians view deceased bodies as representing human life, not as scientific data to be exploited for profit and professional development.

James Riding In [1992:101]

Issues surrounding the care of our ancestors—State sanctioned and unsanctioned looting of graves, public display of skeletal remains, examination and study of remains by scientists, and the sometimes disrespectful and inadequate manner of curation—has perhaps been the most unifying theme for American Indians since George Armstrong Custer was defeated at the Battle of the Greasy Grass in June of 1876. The enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in November of

1990 is considered by a great many Native Americans to be the most important legislative act of recent generations. Although an unstated and most likely an unintentional goal, NAGPRA has become the strongest expression of Congressional effort made to bridge the ideological divide between indigenous people and anthropologists in the United States. Historically American Indians and the U.S. government have not enjoyed a peaceful, or even marginally equitable, existence. Further in the chapter I will present ways in which the enactment of NAGPRA has created conditions of collaboration and inclusion between anthropologists and indigenous communities and individuals.

The greatly abbreviated version of NAGPRA provides for the return of all American Indian physical remains, associated grave goods, and ceremonial items in the possession of any museum, college or university, and entities of Federal and State Governments, such as the Bureau of Land Management, Army Corps of Engineers, state museums or any other entity within the United States which receives federal funding. NAGPRA also provides for the protection of American Indian sacred sites and burials (http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/FHPL_NAGPRA.pdf). The NAGPRA law and resulting rules and procedures have begun to place Native nations on an equal plane with those institutions and agencies holding collections of material culture and ancestral bodies. From personal experience in facilitating repatriations of Abenaki ancestors, grave goods, and sacred items over the past 22 years, the enactment of NAGPRA has effectively placed Native people in charge of the final stages of righting some of the most egregious wrongs in the colonization of Native Americans by western powers over the last 500 years; this is an essential first step in decolonizing any institution, government,

or process.

On May 14, 2010, a final rule relating to the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains became effective. “Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains,” also known as “Culturally Unaffiliated Human Remains,” are those human remains in collections for which no tribal affiliation can be determined, or, for ancestral remains of non-federally recognized tribes. This rule, referred to as Section 10.11, is meant to add clarity to the corresponding section in NAGPRA and states in summary,

this final rule implements the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act by adding procedures for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable Native American human remains in the possession or control of museums or Federal agencies. This rule also amends sections related to purpose and applicability of the regulations, definitions, inventories of human remains and related funerary objects, civil penalties, and limitations and remedies. [<https://federalregister.gov/a/2010-5283>]

The term “culturally unaffiliated” in relationship to non-federally recognized tribes has, for 25 years, been a contentious term for members of those tribes. Our ancestors are as connected, or “affiliated,” to us as are those to the people the United States government “recognizes.” Non-federally recognized tribes are required to provide the same “preponderance of evidence” as federally recognized tribes. From a traditional view, we believe that Creator places no less value on tribes that do not carry the same relationship with the federal government as those that have been recognized. While Section 10.11 does not change the NAGPRA standing of tribes not federally recognized, it does lessen the ability of entities and individuals responsible for NAGPRA sensitive materials to avoid repatriation through loose interpretation of the law.

Roger Echo-Hawk (Pawnee) defines the term “Cultural Affiliation” as it pertains to NAGPRA:

a cultural affiliation under NAGPRA is deemed to have been "reasonably traced" when it is supported by a "preponderance of the evidence," consisting of more than 50 percent of the total realm of relevant evidence. This evidence can be drawn from "geographical, kinship, biological, archaeological, anthropological, linguistic, folkloric, oral traditional, historical, or other relevant information or expert opinion." In U.S. law, evidence is loosely defined as information that supports a conclusion, and in scholarship, evidence is viewed as information that has survived critical scrutiny according to applicable academic standards. Neither environment is particularly friendly toward unsupported opinion, religious belief, or speculation. [2000:269]

The new Rule (Section 10.11) attached to NAGPRA has been the source of a great deal of controversy, most especially within the anthropological community. Before exploring the controversy surrounding Section 10.11, which will occur further in this chapter, it is important to examine those historical conflicts which accompanied the creation of NAGPRA; the same conflicts which made the law necessary. Finally, the ways in which NAGPRA has contributed to bridging the divide between Anthropology and Native communities will be analyzed.

1. Ideological Conflicts which Necessitated a Federal Law

NAGPRA did not become federal law without a great deal of debate; on one side of the conflict were Native Americans; on the opposite side of this conflict were museums and universities who maintained that their collections of Native American physical remains, grave goods, and ceremonial objects were necessary for their respective purposes of caring for the past and educating the next generation of archaeologists and anthropologists. The third voice, which was also the second voice of dissension, was situated among the scientific community who insisted that the past belongs to everyone and that no special consideration should be given to one group of people over any other. Even while espousing these arguments, special consideration to one group is exactly what

the scientific community was seeking for itself. Some within these last two groups also felt strongly that the value to science of any collections far outweighed the human rights issues of repatriation and sacred site protection.

The setting which pushed Native Americans to seek federal legislation to address the issue of grave desecration and the stealing of Indian ancestral remains was largely established in the 1980s when “the Native American Rights Fund estimated that there were as many as 600,000 pieces of human remains (including thousands of skulls) in American collections—in libraries, museums, historical societies, universities, anatomical collections, and private cabinets” (Fabian 2010:223). As some states began to enact burial protection laws, dissenting parties and professional organizations initiated campaigns to counteract such laws. The American Committee for Preservation of Archaeological Collections based in California had passed an anti-burial resolution in 1981 with other organizations following suit (Zimmerman 1992:46).

After completing my literature review on the history of NAGPRA, I found C. Timothy (Tim) McKeown’s 2012 book, *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Struggle for National Repatriation Legislation, 1986-1990* to be the seminal work reporting on “the history of legislative bills proposed between 1986 and 1990 that laid the foundation for NAGPRA and the act that created the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI)” (Young 2013:803). McKeown notes that “identified opponents of repatriation legislation included the Army Medical Museum, National Park Service, and the SAA, the last specifically described as an “anti-Indian group” (2012:83). These were not the only opponents of federal legislation however; the American Association of Museums (AAM), now the American Alliance of Museums, and the Smithsonian aligned

with opponents of legislation.

Clayton Dumont has also written on NAGPRA's legislative history; "from 1987 to November 1990, when an amended version of H.R. 5237 passed and became NAGPRA, five congressional hearings were held on eight different bills, seven of which related directly to the return or reburial of Native dead" (2011:9). In anticipation of a federal mandate addressing Native American ancestral remains, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) issued a "Statement Concerning the Treatment of Human Remains" in 1988. This statement strongly opposed any Federal legislation regarding the disposition of human remains and may be found at the SAA website in its entirety: <http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/RepatriationIssues/SAAREpatriationPolicy/tabid/242/Default.aspx>.

Dumont continues his discussion with:

covering approximately 1,700 pages, the records of these hearings and the final report of the panel indicate consistent, determined, and nearly universal efforts by the archaeology, physical anthropology, museum, and art dealing industries to oppose and diminish the seven repatriation and burial protection bills being considered. More than forty scientific leaders representing more than ten professional institutions, some appearing multiple times, fought first to kill and then to weaken repatriation legislation. [2011:10]

There are a number of excerpts from Dumont's (2011) writing that are pertinent to this discussion. For the purposes of this dissertation, those which are the most germane to the topic have been extracted and are reproduced throughout this section on NAGPRA.

One of the most vocal opponents of repatriation legislation was the Smithsonian Institution, represented in meetings and hearings by then Secretary Robert McCormick Adams, Jr. From one of the early Senate hearings, Dumont reports

Adams claims that the new law is "unnecessary" because the Smithsonian and most museums "are sympathetic to the needs and concerns of Native

Americans.” He then describes our ancestors and their burial objects as “archeological reference materials” that are “available for loan...for both research and public display” in traveling exhibitions or maybe even for decorative depictions on postage stamps. [2011:14]

Despite Adams suggestion of sympathy on the part of the Smithsonian to American Indian concerns, nothing in their blatant disrespect of ancestral remains supported the claim; allowing for “research,” “public display”, and “traveling exhibitions” was perceived by Native people to be a major part of the problem. The Smithsonian ultimately became exempt from abiding by the mandates of NAGPRA. Tim McKeown reports the circumstances leading to this exemption.

A week after the House hearing, recently appointed National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) Director Richard West made two important calls. The first was to the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. West requested that the Smithsonian be exempt from the provisions of S. 1980. “My reasoning...is that the Smithsonian currently is in the process of considering on an institution-wide basis policies relating to the matters addressed in S. 1980, and that the (Senate) Committee is likely to get a more thoughtful and comprehensive response from us if we are not driven by the present legislative markup schedule.” Senators Inouye and McCain acquiesced to the Smithsonian request with an implicit quid pro quo that the Smithsonian would remove itself from further comment on the S. 1980. [2012:135]

Unfortunately, this exemption has resulted in no oversight of institutional decisions on requests by tribes to repatriate remains.

Referring to the July 1988 Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs second hearing on S.187, Dumont relates that “before the hearing concluded, [Michael] Fox [Director of the Heard Museum] suggested that a yearlong dialogue between Native Americans and the scientific community be held in an effort to resolve differences. The committee concurred with the suggestion...” (2011:19). The resulting panel was a continuation of the on-going debate with the scientific community arguing for continued control over human remains and cultural artifacts and contending that no federal

legislation was necessary (Dumont 2011:19).

As previously stated in this dissertation, one of the central divisions between indigenous people and Anthropology is the lack of value placed on oral tradition by anthropologists and ways in which knowledge is presented in university courses in departments of Anthropology. References have been made to the interconnectedness of all things in the ways in which knowledge is produced in the indigenous world. The bill that became federal law included passages describing ways in which “reasonable relationships” could be determined between tribes and ancestral remains; these relationships could be defined by “geographical, kinship, biological, archaeological, anthropological, linguistic, folkloric, oral traditional, historical, or other relevant information or expert opinion...” (Dumont 2011:21). The language of the legislation clearly indicated a validation of “Indian oral histories as a powerful source of knowledge for establishing cultural affiliations” (Dumont 2011:23).

Prior to the Senate Committee hearings that preceded the passing of NAGPRA, the acquisition, use, and disposition of the physical remains of American Indians along with grave goods and other cultural material remains were determined solely by Anthropologists and others in the scientific community. No input from descendent communities or individuals was sought nor were concerns of those communities given consideration. In fact, there is a conclusive presumption by Native people that this control on the part of the scientific community was protected by previous federal legislation such as the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979. The Antiquities Act provided for protection of sites on federal lands which held historical or scientific interest and prohibited the removal of human remains or artifacts

by collectors but allowed these same sites to be archaeologically excavated and items removed by professionals through a permit process. The ARPA of 1979 (amended in 1988) controls the excavation of archaeological sites on federal and Indian lands by permit along with the removal and disposition of materials collected from those sites. For Native Americans, these two laws explicitly translate to supporting the belief in the superiority of scientific worldview over indigenous worldview and that the looting of American Indian sites by anthropologists was sanctioned by the federal government. By law, anthropologists held control over Native American ancestral remains and material culture. Is it any wonder that anthropologists, museums, and educational institutions would balk at losing, or sharing with Indians, that control?

So on one side of the ideological table sat primarily anthropologists, anthropological and scientific organizations, and museum representatives with Indians positioned on the opposite side. As previously stated, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) was a strong opponent of NAGPRA. Portions of what is included in the organization's "Principles of Archaeological Ethics" was echoed in the narratives which argued for scientific privilege in controlling those items being discussed for repatriation; narratives which specifically stated that these items were "archaeological resources" holding great scientific value leading to understanding human behavior and culture, learning the history of the continent, and supporting migration theories. It was also argued that these items should be treated as national treasures belonging to the people of the United States collectively and held for safe-keeping by archaeologists, museums, and universities. I have heard a number of times, that the history of North America is a shared history between Euro-Americans and the people indigenous to North

America. Our shared history began only with the first European invasion; any history preceding that event is shared only by the various Nations inhabiting North America at that time, making scientific claims for ownership of materials that pre-date European contact invalid. This lack of understanding on the part of the oppositional forces may be considered a collective amnesia by those who represent, in many ways, a colonizing government; colonization and the continued complicity by some anthropologists is one of the central causes of the ideological divide presented in this dissertation.

The Indians were represented in the pre-NAGPRA hearings by the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), established in 1944 and representing over 850,000 Native people (Dumont 2011:14-15); the Native American Rights Fund (NARF) attorneys who, according to Greg Johnson “led this charge, making repeated arguments concerning the universal sacrality of the dead, and linking this argument to their assertion that common law historically has found no property interest in the dead” (2002:369); and, of course there were individuals such as Oren Lyons, faith keeper of the Onondaga Nation who, McKeown reports,

objected to using ‘scientific value’ as the basis for determining whether the remains should be reinterred. [in response to the Smithsonian and SAA arguments against repatriating ancestral remains] “There is a curious catch-22 with this process,” offered Lyons. “From what I understand, the value of remains for study depends immediately upon documentation. If there is no documentation for remains, then the remains become almost valueless in terms of study. So, it seems to me that the skeletal remains that can be identified would be the ones that would be of most value to be studied. (These) go home immediately, leaving this vast group that no one knows who they belong to and what sort of studies can be conducted...The question of whose they are is certainly a standing question, but there is one thing that we do know. We know whose they are not, and they are not the Smithsonian’s.” [2012:36]

There were many individuals in Congress and within the American public and

political world who supported NAGPRA. A sense of horror and disgust surrounded the knowledge that literally hundreds of thousands of Native ancestral remains were being held in museums and that those remains included not only ancient burials but also family members of many contemporary Native peoples. At the essence, this knowledge made this a human rights issue that most members of the general public agreed should be remedied by federal legislation. As noted, several states had already enacted policies and even laws to assure Native American protection and repatriation of burials by the time NAGPRA was passed in 1990. In my own Abenaki homeland the states of Vermont and New Hampshire, under pressure from a coalition of Abenaki Nation leaders, had already begun the repatriation and burial protection process by 1990.

Continued efforts to undermine NAGPRA by oppositional entities have elicited authorship of books and articles which maintain the original intent of NAGPRA was to balance Native American interests with those of museums and scientists. This is nothing less than an attempt by some individuals to misinterpret the law; however, as Dumont states, “the legislative history does not support their assertion that Congress was concerned with the needs or desires of scientists” (2011:29) and further that

it is instructive in this regard to detail the explanations affixed to the bills that were considered at congressional hearings during those years: “To Provide for the Protection of Native American Rights for the Remains of Their Dead and Sacred Artifacts” (S. 187, in July 1988); “To Provide for the Protection of Indian Graves and Burial Grounds” (S. 1021); “To Provide for the Repatriation of Native American Group or Cultural Patrimony” (S. 1980); “Native American Burial Site Preservation Act” (H.R. 1381); and “Native American Grave and Burial Protection Act” (H.R. 1646). Surely it is not unreasonable to accept that the title pages of these bills are solid indications of their authors’ intentions. [2011:29]

From personal experience, many of my friends who are archaeologists do not feel betrayed or disadvantaged by the enactment of NAGPRA. Also, not all archaeologists in the United States are white Euro-Americans. Dorothy Lippert has written,

I find that archaeologists who are also Native American seem to have similar views of the discipline, particularly when talking about prehistoric archaeological work in North America. This is mostly because we know these people as our ancestors and in the course of practicing archaeology it becomes our privilege and our responsibility to care for them and to speak about their lives. [2013:292]

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) provided the strongest organizational support for a federal mandate relating to indigenous remains by adopting a statement in 1989 titled *The Vermillion Accord on Human Remains*. As stated earlier in this chapter, WAC is concerned with global archaeologies; however, the organization most certainly exhibited a much more forward thinking ideology relating to human remains than did other professional organizations based in the United States.

The *Vermillion Accord on Human Remains* (<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>) consists of six articles:

- Respect for the mortal remains of the dead shall be accorded to all, irrespective of origin, race, religion, nationality, custom and tradition.
- Respect for the wishes of the dead concerning disposition shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful, when they are known or can be reasonably inferred.
- Respect for the wishes of the local community and of relatives or guardians of the dead shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful.
- Respect for the scientific research value of skeletal, mummified and other human remains (including fossil hominids) shall be accorded when such value is demonstrated to exist.
- Agreement on the disposition of fossil, skeletal, mummified and other remains shall be reached by negotiation on the basis of mutual respect for the legitimate concerns of communities for the proper disposition of

their ancestors, as well as the legitimate concerns of science and education.

- The express recognition that the concerns of various ethnic groups, as well as those of science are legitimate and to be respected, will permit acceptable agreements to be reached and honored.

Beyond the adopted 1989 Accord, WAC adopted a statement in 2006 which addressed the display of human remains and sacred objects, the *Tamaki Makau-rau Accord on the Display of Human Remains and Sacred Objects* (<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>).

This statement also consists of six articles.

- Permission should be obtained from the affected community or communities.
- Should permission be refused that decision is final and should be respected.
- Should permission be granted, any conditions to which that permission is subject should be complied with in full.
- All display should be culturally appropriate.
- Permission can be withdrawn or amended at any stage and such decisions should be respected.
- Regular consultation with the affected community should ensure that the display remains culturally appropriate.

If these 12 principles were the guiding norms for all professional archaeological organizations, and if organization members actually invested in adhering to them, the enormous breach between indigenous communities and individuals would most certainly be less expansive. Basic respect serves to bridge divides.

2. Section 10.11

Some of the opponents of NAGPRA have consistently devised ways to avoid compliance of the law and have worked to undermine the law. I have learned from several sources that one archaeologist, who actually was a NAGPRA Review Committee

member for a number of years, “loaned” ancestral remains to an entity in Canada to avoid repatriating the remains to their descendant tribe.

In his classic sardonic fashion, Larry Zimmerman wrote, “archaeologists and physical anthropologists are a clever lot. When one tactic fails, they try a new one. Many apparently are quite willing to fight rearguard actions” (1992:48). And of course Zimmerman’s analysis was correct. Rearguard actions were indeed engaged, and I have personal experience of these actions. As Repatriation Coordinator for the Abenaki Nation for almost 20 years, I accomplished the repatriation of ancestral remains through the NAGPRA process. In a collaborative effort involving the tribe, the Peabody Museum at Harvard, and the New Hampshire Division for Historic Resources, the remains of over 40 individuals were being petitioned for repatriation. One individual consisted of an Early Archaic cremation burial that was carbon dated at 8,490 years ago (+/- 60 years). A member of the NAGPRA Review Committee, who sat as a museum representative, separated me from my group the day prior to our presentation and strongly suggested that we hold back on all repatriation requests until we had compiled information on the location of all NAGPRA sensitive materials and human remains. This of course was not acceptable to me, nor would it be to those I represented. After further discussion, I learned that the true concern of this Review Committee member was the Archaic cremation; this repatriation, if avoided, would set a precedent for non-repatriation of the Kennewick burial, which was, and remains, a highly contentious case. When I refused to comply with this individual’s suggestion, he stated, “We will never repatriate those ancient remains to you. You will never get them back.” And my response was, “Oh yes we will.” And we did.

I had a similar experience two years later with this same committee member. An amateur archaeologist, who was a friend of this individual, was attempting to block the repatriation of five sets of ancestral remains (dated to approximately 600 years ago) in the possession of Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, New Hampshire. Upon arriving at the Review Committee meeting, I learned that our presentation time to the committee had been removed from the agenda. When I questioned a NAGPRA official, I learned that the Review Committee member, in collusion with the Department of the Interior Assistant Director for Cultural Resources, were responsible for that petition deletion. I requested the NAGPRA official return the allotted time for our presentation and, despite best efforts to the contrary by the committee member and Assistant Director, counted coup and accomplished the repatriation.

Christopher Green also reported a case which was brought before the NAGPRA Review Committee wherein the New York State Museum designated over 100 Onondaga ancestral remains as “unidentifiable” in an attempt to avoid repatriation. And Clayton Dumont explains the chicanery in this way:

given that these deceased relatives, designated by scientists and museum officials as “culturally unidentifiable,” total approximately three times the number of ancestors that they have returned, or agreed to return, to their closest living descendants thus far, it is not surprising that many prominent archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and museum personnel vehemently oppose the new rule. Indeed, the leaderships of their largest professional organizations have published scathing denouncements of section 10.11. [2011:5-6]

It becomes obvious why Section 10.11 became a necessary component of the existing NAGPRA. That portion of NAGPRA related to “unaffiliated” remains (or as Section 10.11 reads, Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains) needed to be clarified in order to eliminate various “interpretations” of NAGPRA, interpretations which allowed

those entities and individuals reluctant to comply with the law an avenue for creating loopholes. As the new rule was being constructed, the office of the National NAGPRA Program became the recipient of a flurry of comments and statements by professional organizations such as the AAA, SAA, AAPA, AAM, and the United States National Academy of Sciences (NAS). In April of 2010, a letter was created by the SAA and signed by ten past presidents of the organization, and a letter signed by 42 members of the NAS was written in May of 2010 (Dumont 2011:7).

Each document also asserts that its signatories and their professional organizations are part of a broad coalition of cross-cultural cooperation between Indians and scientists. As the NAS letter narrates, “The law’s history of cooperation and compromise among the major stakeholders has been a principal reason for NAGPRA’s success until now.” Finally, these scientists take credit for helping to get NAGPRA passed. The SAA past presidents assert that the law “was passed with SAA’s active support,” and the AAPA leaders declare that “we were part of the coalition of Native American and scientific groups that worked for the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.” [2011:7]

Dumont further states that “Native people who follow NAGPRA related disputes closely know quite well that a great many of our ancestors have been unilaterally labeled “culturally unidentifiable” by scientists, using science as the sole basis for determining whether there is a “demonstrable relationship” (2011:24). According to the National Park Service NAGPRA database (<http://www.nps.gov/nagpra/ONLINEDB/INDEX.htm>) there are 18,097 records describing 131,667 Native American human remains and 1,117,133 associated funerary objects inventoried by 752 museums and Federal agencies that have been determined to be culturally unidentifiable. Is it any wonder that a clarifying clause was viewed as being necessary by NAGPRA officials?

It has now been 25 years since the enactment of NAGPRA and more than five years since Section 10.11 was put into effect, yet dissenting organizations continue to

seek ways in which to challenge or undermine the law. As recently as December of 2014 the SAA Board of Directors distributed a questionnaire to its members regarding repatriation and NAGPRA.

The SAA survey consists of 19 questions, the first three are general questions relating to the respondents' education and focus of interest. Questions four through seven apply to repatriation and repatriation-related activities. Questions eight and nine are general questions regarding NAGPRA. Questions ten through nineteen, essentially fifty percent of the questionnaire consists of questions which address Section 10.11. Questions such as:

- How do you think the regulation has affected archaeological research?
- What has been the effect of the regulation on your own work? Should human remains from the Archaic period in the United States be considered Native American under NAGPRA?

The next question is the same but asks about those of the Paleoindian period.

- Do you agree that NAGPRA is a balance between science and Native American rights?
- Overall do you believe the impact of NAGPRA on archaeology has been positive, negative, or mixed?

On examining these questions, one might be led to believe that a new attack on NAGPRA in general and section 10.11 specifically is being devised and that it is imminent.

It is unfortunate that the members of the various professional organizations which are so very opposed to repatriation and the NAGPRA process are unable to recognize the positive results that have occurred since 1990. Prior to the enactment of NAGPRA, relationships between indigenous people and anthropologists were extremely hostile; and that hostility went both ways. Vine Deloria Jr. certainly had some scathing remarks about

anthropologists when writing *Custer Died for Your Sins* in 1969, remarks which were accurate reflections of how Indians viewed anthropologists; some of those remarks have been reproduced in this dissertation. In 1992 Larry Zimmerman wrote,

archaeologists are not devils. They can be self-delusive. They can be racist, not necessarily by intention but by the implications of their actions. At a 1985 meeting, it was appalling and shameful to hear a colleague, the editor of a well-known archaeology journal and former SAA executive committee member, say, "The only good Indian is an unrebursed Indian." [1992:53]

NAGPRA mandated that those with opposing ideologies, Indians vs. anthropologists and museum directors, work together through consultation in order to satisfy the requirements of federal law. NAGPRA also mandates a dialogue between conflicting parties and, in a number of cases those conversations have enhanced pools of knowledge. A number of Native people now work with museums as consultants on non-NAGPRA sensitive collections. NAGPRA has enabled some bridging, or at least understandings, of the ideological divide; Native worldview is at the very least being respected if not embraced. Through NAGPRA, federal legislation has resulted in the opening of dialogue, communication, consultation, and respect between what was once two competing and extremely antagonistic groups of people; these are all key elements to lessening conflict and division. From the focus group surveys in the last chapter, and private conversations, there is evidence that many archaeologists of a younger generation view the opposition to NAGPRA as a generational issue, that they recognize NAGPRA as law, and have no opposition to following the law.

E. Writing to Widen the Divide

Of all of the books reviewed for this dissertation, *Reburying the Past: The Effects of Repatriation and Reburial on Scientific Inquiry* by Elizabeth Weiss (2008) was by far

the most poorly written, obnoxious, and disrespectful diatribe against repatriation and NAGPRA in general and indigenous people specifically. However, reading this book provided me with rich examples of the pervasive ignorance, bigotry, and racism of which some persons in the anthropological community are capable.

Elizabeth Weiss is a physical anthropologist who, since 2004, teaches in the Anthropology Department at San José State University in California. Weiss earned her B.A. in Anthropology at the University of California, Santa Cruz (1992-1996), M.A. in Anthropology from California State University, Sacramento (1996-1998), and her PhD from the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (1998-2001). Weiss' doctoral dissertation is titled *A Cross-Cultural Study of Humeri: Environmental Causes of Morphology* (http://works.bepress.com/elizabeth_weiss/cv.pdf).

Differences of opinion or belief are valid, most especially when discourse is supported by fact. What I found in this reading was manipulation of facts, misrepresentation of facts, and blatant ignorance of Native American culture. Of the many pages of notes written while reading this book, I will reproduce a selected few notes which I consider to be the most egregious, the most vituperative, the most lacking in scholarship, and the most destructive to relations between Indians and anthropologists. The following extractions are included with the sole objective of assisting the readers' understandings of the on-going conflicts between Indians and some anthropologists. I will also provide counter-point narratives specific to some of Weiss' writing from my own knowledge or experiences and from other scholars.

Our progress in understanding the first Americans has greatly deteriorated already and will continue to do so. Finally, the penalties for not following the laws are steep and costs for repatriation and reburial almost always fall on the scientists. Why should anthropologists pay for funerals of Native

Americans who had no funeral the first time around? And, why should they be required to practice religious acts that are not their religion? [Weiss 2008:48]

Another important point that arises from [Dr. John Morris, Alchimia Consultants] Morris's comment is the fact that tax money is used in all of these repatriation and reburial endeavors. I have no qualms about tax money being used to support scientific activities; the search for answers is in everyone's best interest. Can we really hold religion to the same rigorous level? [Weiss 2008:60]

Counter Point: I know of absolutely no instance in which the "costs of repatriation and reburial" fell on any scientists. In fact, the only federal tax dollars dispersed have been as grants to institutions or (federally recognized) tribes for consultation, and in comparison with the number of consultations on a national scale, very few of those consultations were supported by federal grants. Costs for transportation and expenses accrued for consultation, costs of transporting ancestral remains, and costs of burials have, and continue to be, borne by the tribe or individuals; "...the federal law requires the victims, or tribal peoples, to bear the cost of reburying the remains, rather than those who committed and assisted the crimes: the archaeologists, museum curators, physical anthropologists, and others" (Riding In 1992:32). I also know of no instance in which *any* anthropologist has been forced to attend a reburial, and can't imagine how that would be accomplished. I know of no Native people who would even *want* anthropologists present, although I have personally invited (with permissions) an anthropologist who was highly regarded *and deemed worthy* to a reburial ceremony in which he had worked very hard to facilitate. Weiss provides no citation for her claim of "Native Americans who had no funeral the first time around." This statement is belied by the fact that "associated grave goods" found in burials total in the hundreds of thousands; they are rich in material culture and placed in graves as offerings of love, honoring, and deep respect. This would

suggest ceremonial interment of the deceased. Actually, she provides no citations for any of these spurious claims.

What I find most troublesome is that this attack is being supported by academics. By arguing that there is more than one way of understanding the world, we open up the door to *all crackpot ideas; including those such as the Native American creation myths...* Dr. Larry Zimmerman, an archaeologist at the Purdue University in Indiana, has gone native and supports the mythologies of the Native Americans with statements on how anthropologists need to understand how Native Americans view the past and how there is more than one past. And, thus, in turn more than one type of knowledge. More sensible anthropologists support the use of science in favor of the use of tradition. [Weiss 2008:65, emphasis added]

Native Americans have intentionally tried to stop scientific knowledge on the peopling of the Americas. Amy Dansie in 1999 published that in Nevada, Native Americans have attempted to stop studies on Spirit Cave and Wizards Beach Man (both Paleo-Indians with no affiliation to modern Native populations). Dansie further adds that Paiute tribes have even denied the right for anthropologists to finish studies on these remains and display facial reconstructions! [Weiss 2008:78]

Counter Point: In fact, the NAGPRA Review Committee meeting at Harvard Law School, Cambridge Massachusetts from November 17-19, 2001 made a final recommendation to repatriate the Spirit Cave ancestors to the Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe based, in large part, on the extensive expert testimony of Dr. Alan Goodman, Biological Anthropologist, and former President of the American Anthropological Association (2005-2007). For a full report on this repatriation see pages 14-26 at the following website: <http://www.nps.gov/nagpra/REVIEW/meetings/RMS022.PDF>.

But, it is about more than just religion. Repatriation is also about power shifts. There is no doubt that the Native American peoples were displaced with the arrival of Europeans. Natives were killed in vast numbers wither [sic] intentionally or through diseases that they had no natural immunity to. Then, the remaining Native Americans were marginalized and not made citizens until 1830. [Weiss 2008:87]

Counter Point: In fact, Native Americans were not made citizens of the United States until enactment of the 1924 Citizenship Act which stated in its entirety:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all non-citizen Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States be, and they are hereby, declared to be citizens of the United States: Provided That the granting of such citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property.

<http://www.archives.gov/global-pages/larger-image.html?i=/historical-docs/doc-content/images/indian-citizenship-act-1924-1.jpg&c=/historical-docs/doc-content/images/indian-citizenship-act-1924.caption.html>

Given all this, Native American ethical considerations are not based on honesty and truth (*as mine are*) [emphasis in original], but rather they are faith and power based; what tells them right and wrong are their creation myths and the acceptance of others to not challenge their beliefs...The Native Americans may feel insulted that anthropologists call their stories myths and point out that they are false, but to agree with these stories (and not try to educate those who we work with or for—as in the case of Native Americans and others) would be breaking the ethical code of a scientist. How can they be upset that *we would call them liars*, if their *ethical considerations do not even include honesty*? If they accept falsehoods as real and base what is right and wrong upon these falsehoods, then they cannot be considered truthful. Their passion, faith, and desire may be intact, but their ability to accept truth and honesty as being right is shattered. [Weiss 2008:87, emphasis added]

Counter Point: The issue of oral tradition vs. the colonial accounts of history and scientific theory has been discussed in several chapters of this dissertation; it has also been addressed in all of the focus group surveys in the previous chapter. Roger Echo-Hawk has addressed this by writing, “written words and spoken words need not compete for authority in academia, nor should the archaeological record be viewed as the antithesis of oral records. Peaceful coexistence and mutual interdependence offer more useful paradigms for these “ways of knowing” (2000:273). Greg Johnson also has expressed thoughts about the validity of “tradition” by suggesting that it is not static but oriented to the present; he makes reference to Jocelyn Linnekin and Richard Handler in

stating, “we can say that ‘tradition is a process of interpretation, attributing meaning in the present through making reference to the past’ (Handler and Linnekin 1984; see also Linnekin 1983, 1990, 1991, 1992; Handler 1985)” (2002:357).

An anthropologist colleague of mine who works in the public sector of archaeology has described to me the horror of reburying remains. She said that once the boxes are placed into the ground and dirt is placed on top of them, you could hear the bones starting to break and crack. This is especially true for baby and child remains that are so valuable to anthropologists to understand health of prehistoric populations. One can just imagine the sound of these little bones being destroyed by the ground that is meant to preserve their ancestral lineages. [Weiss 2008:90]

Counter Point: Throughout 20 years of working in repatriation, I have personally attended or performed reburial for approximately 200 Abenaki ancestors. Some of these ancestral remains have been placed in wooden repositories; some have simply been wrapped in fabric. *Not one single time has there been any sound of bones being broken during interment.* Not once. This sounds like a total fabrication, despite Weiss’ claim to “honesty and truth.”

And finally, one last example of this woman’s incredible ignorance relating to Native American cultural practices:

Most disturbing to me, a female, is that the Native Americans Lightfoot [Dr. Kent Lightfoot, archaeologist at UC Berkeley] works with have strict taboos involving the menstrual cycle. Women cannot work while they are menstruating, they also cannot participate in ceremonies, or prepare foods *since they are considered unclean during this time!* [Weiss 2008:95, emphasis added]

Counter Point: If Kent Lightfoot represented to Weiss that the reasoning attached to this taboo is because the women are “unclean” then his Native informants are misleading him or the women of the tribe are having a good laugh at his expense. It is widely known, understood, and accepted amongst Native American peoples that the

spiritual power of women, as the life-givers, is much stronger than that of men and even more so during a woman's Moon Time. To participate in ceremony where men are present or to prepare and serve food to men, which they take into their bodies, is believed to even more greatly reduce the power of men. This is an ancient belief (at least in the Northeast among the Wabanaki peoples). Villages actually had Moon Lodges to which women would retire for several days; other women would prepare food and serve the women in the Moon Lodge. Frankly, I would think any modern woman would welcome a break from work, child care, and responsibility for a few days every month!

Soren Blau wrote a book review for Weiss' (2008) *Reburying the Past* for the *Journal of Archaeological Sciences*. At the end of the review Blau wrote,

Weiss is dogmatic about her point of view but argues it in a simplistic, often naïve and derogatory manner: "scholars are often surprised at how similar oral traditions of unrelated groups are, which suggests that people put stuff in their oral traditions to suit their purposes." [2011:40]

This is the type of "scientific" ignorance with which American Indians encounter from not only the public, but also those who are supposedly highly educated. The most distressing conclusion regarding this book is the knowledge that Elizabeth Weiss has instructed, and continues to instruct, members of both past and future generations of anthropologists. As teachers, we all pass on not only our knowledge, but our personal views; it would be illogical to assume that Elizabeth Weiss does not do the same. Through passing on her biases in relationship to NAGPRA and indigenous worldview with such strong narrative, she contributes to the continuation of ideological divide and continued expressions of racist thought and action in this country.

It is unfortunate that Elizabeth Weiss is not the sole voice of contention in the conversation but representative of some individual archaeologists and organizations. In

2007 a letter was written to Provost Wyatt R. Hume of UC Berkeley by a group known as the Native American NAGPRA Coalition, self-described as “an association of federally recognized tribes, tribal people and social justice allies who have come together to protest UCB’s violations of both the spirit and letter of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)” <http://nagpra-ucb.blogspot.com/search/label/Letter%20to%20Provost%20Hume>. In this letter, UC Berkeley and the Phoebe Hearst Museum are taken to task for refusing to consult with Native tribes requesting repatriation of ancestral remains. It also charges that of the 12,000 sets of ancestral remains being held, UC Berkeley “classified less than 20 percent of its remains and artifacts as culturally affiliated and more than 80 percent as culturally unidentifiable” and further that most of the remains were looted from known homelands of federally recognized tribes (<http://nagprs-ucb.blogspot.com/search/label/Letter%20to%20Provost%20Hume>).

Formal position statements of opposition to the NAGPRA Section 10.11 were submitted to Dr. Sherry Hutt, Manager of the National NAGPRA Program by The American Association of Physical Anthropologists (AAPA) on May 2010 and signed by the President of AAPA, two past Presidents, and the chair of the Repatriation Committee of the AAPA. On May 17, 2010, a letter of opposition was submitted to Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Interior and signed by 42 members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (NAS) including such notables as Marshall Sahlins and David Hurst Thomas (Dumont 2011:7). The SAA submitted position statements to the National NAGPRA Office in opposition to Section 10.11 in 2005, 2007, and most recently in 2013.

Unfortunately it would appear that Elizabeth Weiss is well-supported by a number of her colleagues. All of the vituperative rhetoric and behind the scenes

machinations are strikingly reminiscent of colonial practices centered in hegemonic structures of power.

F. Conclusion

The goals of this chapter were to explore the attempts made in Anthropology to create a more inclusive discipline, one that is aimed at reducing the divide with Native communities and individuals. The areas examined were Education, Professional Organizations, and federal legislation (NAGPRA).

1. Education

From the previous chapter, we learned that indigenous graduate students in Anthropology are struggling to navigate a world, and worldview, that is often in direct opposition to their personal life experiences and their understandings of being in the world. Issues relating to knowledge production, covert and overt acts of racism, expressions of bigotry or prejudice, feelings of marginalization and silencing. We have also learned of the abysmally low numbers of indigenous students who have successfully navigated this world of academe and earned either a Master's or Doctoral degree in the Social Sciences.

Other perceived problem areas pertain to a lack of indigenous instructors, expectations to assimilate to a majority paradigm, Anthropology courses which do not include indigenous forms of knowledge production, and ridicule for engaging indigenous research methods. So the question remains, what actions have been established in academe to ameliorate these inadequacies as they relate to indigenous students? Apparently very little.

Many institutions have cultural centers that provide indigenous students social contact. However, no institutions (beyond tribal colleges) provide indigenous students

with counseling services administered by professional indigenous counselors. Educational institutions continue to teach Anthropology courses with either no indigenous instructors or only one or two. One logical reason might be that there are very few traditional indigenous anthropologists because there are so few indigenous people entering the field of Anthropology. This presents a “Catch 22” situation. Logically this would suggest more effort be invested which would attract, accommodate, and promote Native students.

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) convened a panel at the 2014 American Anthropological Association (AAA) meeting to address issues in graduate level programs of Anthropology, specifically those issues which marginalize anthropologists of color or exclude them from Anthropology. Suggestions for addressing the concerns presented included

better recruitment and retention practices for graduate students from underrepresented groups, increased availability of student resources such as graduate assistantships and research funding, copublishing opportunities, curricular changes that highlight diverse scholarship in anthropology; the use of ethnography as a tool to study the culture of anthropology departments themselves, and, at the level of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) and the SfAA, a rating system or diversity policy score for anthropology departments to raise accountability. [Yelvington 2015:388]

The session was poorly attended, signifying a lack of concern by members of the AAA, the very organization that has the potential to significantly change the institutionalized pedagogy of Anthropology.

2. Professional Organizations

Professional anthropological organizations were examined to determine what, if any, efforts have been made to present Anthropology as a more welcoming discipline to indigenous people. The organizations chosen to be included in the chapter are the

American Anthropological Association (AAA), Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), World Archaeological Congress (WAC), and the Society for American Archaeology (SAA). As noted above each of these organizations have some form of Statement on Ethics, some of which pertain specifically to “Diversity,” “Racism,” and “Human Remains” or “Repatriation.”

The AAA Statement of Ethics provides guidelines to protect indigenous communities and individuals through principles of “Do No Harm,” “Informed Consent,” and “Make Your Results Accessible.” The AAA has issued a number of statements on racism, the most recent in 2010 following the formation of a “Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA).” In researching racism within the academy, the CRRA in 2008 distributed a survey to minority members of the AAA to ascertain their experiences as graduate students. Many of the comments on the surveys mirrored those presented in the “education” section of this chapter and were also found in the focus group surveys in Ch.6. The CRRA presented a list of recommendations to address these comments, none of which are significant actions. “Data collection on enrollment, degree, and faculty trends in order to construct a website making the data available,” “undergraduate recruitment,” “providing information to admission committees about racialized minorities class and race advantages in standardized testing,” “increasing fellowship aid to graduate students of color,” and “constructing a website linking services, information, and funding assistance for minority anthropologists of color” do not address issues such as lack of indigenous professors, feelings of isolation, perceptions of bigotry, resistance to non-mainstream approaches to Anthropology, trying to navigate the world of community and home, and devaluation of opinions; all key issues expressed

by indigenous graduate students participating in the focus group. The full report may be found at: <http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1910>.

The Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA), a section of AAA, was also examined; the title indicated a venue that could possibly attract indigenous people to Anthropology. AIA was found to be extremely disappointing. The stated purposes of this section are tepid at best, holding no solutions or suggested action regarding the difficulties encountered by indigenous people engaged in Anthropology. In particular, there are no explicit initiatives to incorporate worldviews other than those of mainstream Anthropology or to alter the pedagogy by which students, indigenous and non-indigenous, become professional anthropologists. The effort to develop a section of the AAA for indigenous anthropologists as it is currently constructed appears to be a missed opportunity which, with focus and hard work, has the potential to lessen the divide.

The Society for American Archaeology (SAA) is concerned only with the field of Archaeology. The SAA has created a strong political lobbying group to oppose Native rights in relationship to ownership and to the determination of treatment and repatriation of ancestral remains.

After five years of consideration, the SAA released a statement on ethics in 1996. None of the eight “Principles of Archaeological Ethics” gives consideration to indigenous people. Rather, the SAA statement concerns itself more with what appears to be archaeological issues of ownership; ownership of documentation, artifacts, grave goods, and human remains. The SAA suggests adherence to practices of colonialism in continuing to privilege the superiority of Western science over other ways of knowing. It

would appear that the SAA has missed, or perhaps ignored, the conversations between Native attorneys, religious leaders, intellectuals, community members and non-indigenous anthropologists, government agencies and legislative bodies, and non-indigenous American citizens who have come to recognize the ethical and moral standards encompassed by legislative acts which mandate rights of descendent Indian communities, respectful treatment of human remains, and protection of the contents of unmarked graves.

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) is concerned with human behavior and ways in which contemporary problems faced by human communities may be addressed to benefit the community. The SfAA also has an established “Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities” which is significantly focused on the consideration and protection of informants or communities involved in studies or projects. The SfAA Statement is not as extensive or in-depth as is the AAA guide to ethics, but is nevertheless concerned with protection of those vulnerable communities and individuals with whom members work. The concern for indigenous communities expressed by the SfAA holds potential for more amicable relationships with those communities.

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) issued a statement regarding human remains in 1989, followed in 1990 by a code of ethics, and a statement regarding the display of human remains in 2006. All three statements are reproduced in their entirety in this chapter. The philosophy and methods of practice of WAC stand in stark contrast to other professional organizations due to the fact that all three documents are overwhelmingly constructed with consideration of global indigenous peoples’ well-being.

These statements present the best archaeological ethical standards to date, provide guidance to students in Anthropology, and most certainly construct a much needed bridge across the divide.

3. NAGPRA and Repatriation

Historical situations leading to the necessity for federal legislation which required museums, governmental agencies, or universities with an interest in Native American burials, ancestral remains, grave goods, and ceremonial objects to adhere to a formal structure of best practices mandated by law were presented in this chapter. The resulting legislation, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) was, and remains, fraught with opposition from some in the archaeological and museum communities, including some professional organizations, the most visible of which is the SAA. When the oppositional forces failed to prevent the enactment of NAGPRA, devious actions were engaged to circumvent the law, necessitating a clarifying statement, Section 10.11, to be added to the original document.

NAGPRA is perhaps the most singular action taken to assist in healing the centuries old wounds between Native Americans and anthropologists in the United States. While many anthropologists and museum workers feared that NAGPRA would empty museums and destroy American Anthropology, no such results have occurred. Roger Echo-Hawk wrote,

during the early 1980s...most archaeologists feared that Indian activism would result in academic censorship, and professional ethics were raised to justify a studious disregard of tribal concerns. By the end of the 1990s, however, the interfacing of the academic community with Indian country had borne very productive results, displaying real advancement of scholarship on ancient American history as a natural outgrowth of mutually beneficial interactions. [2000:288]

A great deal of good has occurred through the enactment of NAGPRA: individuals and

communities have gained spiritual healing by the return and reburial of their ancestors; centuries-old power inequalities between indigenous people and anthropologists have been more in balance; indigenous voices are finally being heard and are now federally supported in relationship to sacred sites and graves; consultation (for the most part) with museums and other entities has progressed in a respectful manner; and when museums learned that Native individuals possess an enormous amount of historical knowledge and knowledge regarding non-NAGPRA sensitive cultural materials, learning has been shared and sometimes jobs created.

A direct outgrowth of NAGPRA has been increased interaction, and in some cases collegiality, between Native people and anthropologists. Another outcome has been the strengthening of Cultural Resource Management Programs (CRM). Christopher Green recognizes that some CRM programs have produced positive actions since the enactment of NAGPRA.

The misconception...is that Native Americans dislike or disregard science when, in fact, many Native Americans work in all different fields of science, including archaeology. There are at least seven large tribes that now run their own historic preservation programs, as well as many others that operate their own CRM firms (Ferguson, 69). The Bannock-Shoshone, the Catawba, the Chugach, the Dakota, the Kodiak Area Native Association, the Narragansetts, the Mashantucket Pequot, and the Northern Cheyenne and Crow have all been known to work with Euro-American archaeologists to manage cultural resources or undertake archaeological research. There are even several tribes that have worked with archaeologists to create museums with accurate representations of the tribes and their ancestors, from both scientists and the Native Americans themselves....this type of collaboration is necessary to bridge the cultural gap between scientists and Native Americans. [2013:9]

Green further reports,

...a fantastic program, rendered by Northern Arizona University, has recently offered work-study opportunities in which Navajo and Hopi tribe members of the area can “earn income and gain experience while pursuing undergraduate and graduate degrees in anthropology and related fields”

(Ferguson, 69). These types of programs will bring Native Americans to the forefront of the study of their own ancestry, and further involved with Euro-American scientists. [2013:9]

As early as 1996, tribes were developing their own CRM programs. T. J. Ferguson reported at that time that,

many tribes now operate historic preservation programs, including the Colville Confederate Tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, the Hopi Tribe, the Mashantucket Pequot, the Mohegan Nation, the Navajo Nation, and the Pueblo of Zuni. Several tribes also operate CRM firms to undertake contracted archaeological research, including the Gila River Indian Community; a consortium of the Klamath, Modoc, and Yaahooskin tribes; the Navajo Nation; and the Pueblo of Zuni. In addition to providing needed archaeological services, these tribally based historic preservation programs and contract archaeology businesses provide substantial economic benefits to Indian tribes. [1996:69]

One more direct outcome of NAGPRA is the establishment of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO) under the Historic Preservation Act. The position of THPO mirrors that of State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) and conveys authority on tribal lands pertaining to issues of tribal historic properties and acting as consultant on Section 106 projects proposed for tribal lands.

Judge Sherry Hutt stated during her congressional testimony in 1990,

...rather than extending special rights to Native Americans (which would violate the 14th Amendment), NAGPRA awards an equal protection of property rights already extended to other Americans... (NAGPRA) is one of the most significant pieces of human rights legislation since the Bill of Rights. [Thomas 2000:214]

And so it is. To that statement I would add that the enactment of NAGPRA has been the most singularly significant act in U.S. history to provide American Indians fair and equal treatment under the auspices of the federal government. As noted in above paragraphs,

there are also tangible and intangible benefits to communities, individuals, and to those engaged in anthropological pursuits in museums and universities.

Through all of the extensive research in preparation for the writing of this chapter, I found very little at the institutional level other than the enactment of NAGPRA which would signify any substantive efforts contributing to bridging the ideological divide between indigenous people and the discipline of Anthropology. It would appear that there is a great deal of work to be done in order to effect positive change, and a strong commitment from all stake-holders will be necessary to realize that goal.

CHAPTER 8

IS RAPPROCHEMENT POSSIBLE?

Our goal is not to punish but to reconcile.

Kristin Doughty [2014:781]

A. Introduction

The dissertation thus far has identified areas of ideological conflict between Anthropology as a discipline, some anthropologists, and indigenous communities and individuals. The geneses of those conflicts, and the ways in which they have been perpetuated through practices of colonialism have been explored. Actions that have been taken by anthropologists to address the conflicts, sometimes in a concerted effort with Native people (i.e. NAGPRA), have also been examined; and yet, despite efforts made, conflicts between the anthropological community and indigenous peoples continue. This chapter will examine methods that have been utilized in resolving instances of conflict in other arenas and evaluate if similar methods might be effective in addressing the ideological conflict discussed in this dissertation. However, the arena which encompasses the methods available to arrive at peacemaking is, in and of itself, a specialized area of study and knowledge which I have barely begun to explore. I held no preconceived notions of which, or even if any, of the methods examined would be helpful in addressing the conflict. Inclusion of this chapter in the dissertation is by no means a definitive presentation but merely an acknowledgment that these methods should be further examined when seeking a path to rapprochement.

With a great deal of guidance, the literature examined for this chapter is representative of some of the leading scholars working in the area of Critical Conflict Resolution Studies; they provided me with insights into the strengths and weaknesses of

several methods of Conflict Resolution that might be considered in resolving the conflict at hand. The literature reviewed for this chapter is primarily concerned with modern conflicts in Ireland, Israel and Palestine, Rwanda, and South Africa; all of these conflicts are based in histories of colonization in much the same way as this dissertation has framed colonization as the root cause of the conflicts between indigenous peoples and the discipline of Anthropology. Literature review consisted of the writings of scholars such as Judy Barsalou (2008), Patricia Lundy and Mark McGovern (2008), Nadim Rouhana (1996; 2004 with Susan Korper), Michael Nielsen (1998), and Mari Marsuda (1995). Forms of addressing conflict were studied as were methods used in resolving conflict, methods known as Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice; the efficacy of engaging one or more of these methods was considered. And, of course, the wisdom provided by tribal elders who so graciously gave insight to peace-making ways was an invaluable contribution.

Acknowledgement that a conflict exists is the first step to seeking some form of resolution. The fact that anthropologists have been giving voice to, and writing about, ideological clashes between indigenous worldview and mainstream worldview for decades suggests that some awareness of the conflict exists. Dialogue is crucial to any understanding of successful resolution. However, for dialogue to be engaged, there must be a presumption of mutual respect between all participants in the discussion; personal respect but also “mutual respect...accorded to the contributions that each brings to the relationship” (Ray Barnhardt and Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley 2005:20). Z. D. Gurevitch describes this as “a model of action aimed at resolving conflict,” and that it is “deemed crucial for negotiation and for opening productive communication channels between

alienated and adversary identities” (1989:162). Dialogue is integral to any method which might be engaged in resolution of the multi-faceted, but very connected, conflicts between Anthropology and indigenous peoples.

A conference in November of 2013 at Yale University, New Haven CT titled *Indigenous Enslavement and Incarceration in North American History* featured keynote speaker Justice Murray Sinclair. Justice Sinclair is a First Nations lawyer and was the first indigenous judge appointed in the Province of Manitoba. Justice Sinclair was appointed Chair of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada in June 2009; at this conference, he spoke about the Indian Residential School System of Canada. Justice Sinclair stated, “reconciliation is about respect.” This statement is not surprising as all interactions engaged by traditional Indian people are based first in respect for, and between, all parties. Respect is a synthesis of listening, volition, understanding, caring, focus, and commitment to resolving conflict; all of which must be engaged to attain some form of resolution.

B. Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice

There are a number of methods that are used to ameliorate conflict between two people, between groups of people, between Nations, and even between a political majority and oppressed or ethnic groups of people within a country. If we are to determine a path to “Bridge the Divide” between indigenous people and Anthropology, it is important to first define the terms “Conflict Resolution,” “Reparations,” “Reconciliation,” and “Transitional Justice;” by understanding the meanings of these terms we can arrive at exactly how the ideological conflicts and all of the attendant consequences might possibly be resolved or even if any of these methods pertain to this

situation. Certainly the process engaged is crucial, although the ultimate goal is to effect change which will benefit indigenous communities, indigenous students and academics, and also prove to be of benefit to the anthropological community. The overarching result of attaining these goals is a beginning step in unravelling the tenacious hold of the lingering effects of the colonization process on indigenous people in this country, a hold built on and perpetuated by the oppression of Indian people.

1. Conflict Settlement, Conflict Resolution, and Reconciliation

Nadim Rouhana (2004) conceptualizes three processes toward reconciliation in a study of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He refers to these processes as “Conflict Settlement,” “Conflict Resolution,” and “Reconciliation.” Rouhana states that “these three processes are qualitatively different and, therefore, are not designed to achieve the same endpoint” (2004:34). He goes on to explain each of the three concepts:

Conflict settlement seeks a formal termination of conflict based on mutual interests, and is represented by an agreement between the conflicting parties that reflects the power relations on the ground. A settlement does not necessarily reflect equitably the needs of the parties, and often does not represent the weaker party’s long-term interests.

In conflict resolution...an understanding seeks to address the causes of conflict and accordingly to reach a historic compromise. The agreement is designed to address basic human needs of both sides, regardless of the power relations between them. The political needs of both parties are equally addressed, not in accordance with power relations between them but in the framework of a new relationship that promotes equality and reciprocity. The agreement...aims to achieve peaceful relations between societies and represents mutual acceptance between the parties.

Reconciliation...is a qualitatively different process and seeks to achieve a kind of relationship between the parties that is founded on mutual legitimacy. The open, public, and socially based granting of legitimacy—the culmination of the process—becomes the defining feature of the relationship and the cornerstone of mutual recognition and genuine security. As such, reconciliation, although it does not prevent strains in the relationship and future disputes between the parties, does guard against

reversal of the relationship to a stage in which the very legitimacy of each side is questioned again. In this sense, reconciliation is defined as a process that brings about a genuine end to the existential conflict between the parties and transforms the nature of the relationship between the societies through a course of action that is intertwined with psychological, social, and political changes. [2004:34-35]

In reading Rouhana's explanations of "Conflict Settlement," "Conflict Resolution," and "Reconciliation" in the context of societal and nation-state conflicts, it becomes obvious that Conflict Settlement has no utility in our situation; if Conflict Settlement does not ensure the long-term interests of the "weaker party," then there would be little advantage to that party (in this case Indians) engaging in this process. The conflict being addressed in this dissertation is most certainly seated in unequal power relations and it is the inequality of power that has prevented structural change within the discipline. Conflict resolution also may not be the optimal course to pursue. Conflict resolution essentially is designed to address "basic human needs" and deals more with peaceful coexistence than structural change. There is a possibility that further examination of Reconciliation may be of some use.

Rouhana (2004:35-36) emphasizes that reconciliation has four components that must be addressed to obtain the end goal; he lists these components as justice, truth, historical responsibility, and, finally, a restructuring of the social and political relationship between the parties in conflict. Ann Kingsolver references Christian Gade by stating that the term reconciliation "presumes a pre-conflict equilibrium (or community) that can be restored..." (2013:665). This statement by Kingsolver suggests that, through a process of reconciliation, indigenous communities could be healed, or restored to a condition that pre-exists the harm created by colonization, and by extension, Anthropology and anthropologists. While this may be a very attractive proposition, is it

based in reality? Is it not more realistic to believe that indigenous communities might undergo a transformation rather than a restoration to pre-European invasion life? Applied to the ideological divide between Western systems of knowledge and indigenous systems of knowledge, there is no basis for assuming a prior pre-conflict equilibrium as the two paradigms have never been given equal consideration in the discipline. So while reconciliation may be a useful tool, we should understand that we aren't seeking to restore a condition as suggested by Kingsolver but rather to restructure the relationship between the parties as indicated by Rouhana. Even if taken with Rouhana's criteria of "justice, truth, historical responsibility, and restructuring of the social and political relationship between the parties in conflict" (2004:35-36) were to be entertained, it remains uncertain that those who now hold power would be receptive to sharing that power. In an earlier article co-authored with Susan Korper relating to their research on intergroup problem solving workshops between Palestinians and Israelis, Rouhana addresses issues of power,

...regardless of other aspirations for intervention outcomes, the mere existence of a structural power asymmetry dictates that the larger societal goal of the higher-power group is to maintain the structural status quo and thereby preserve its own power, while the lower-power group's goal is to get a bigger share in the balance of power between the groups—that is, to change the status quo. It would not be surprising, therefore, if...participants from the higher-power group regard any significant discussion of change in the power relationship as fundamentally contrary to their interests. [1996:357]

The concept of reconciliation remains intriguing; a restructuring of the social, political, and certainly academic relationship is a major goal for indigenous people seeking a balance in power. Historical responsibility would be most welcome; the Vatican has issued acknowledgment and apologies for the role played by the Catholic

Church in the oppression and murder of millions of indigenous people worldwide, even though refusing to rescind Papal Bulls, but the U.S. government and the academic disciplines (most notably Anthropology) who participated in colonization have yet to acknowledge such responsibility. Whether these are reasonable expectations in the near future remains to be seen.

Rouhana clearly states “...the term of reference for reconciliation is justice, not the existing power relations between the parties or the basic human needs of the parties...” and that “achieving some kind of justice is thus central to the process of reconciliation and to the end state of reconciliation between groups in conflict” (2004:36). He goes on to caution that,

justice, which is central to reconciliation, is not a central part of the applied or theoretical conflict resolution discourse. Although those involved in official international conflict resolution often invoke the language of just agreements, in fact power relations, not justice, generally determine the outcome of agreements. [2004:35]

Even though Rouhana is speaking in this passage to an issue of international conflict (Israel and Palestine), this last statement brings us back to issues of power asymmetry which certainly exist in the conflict being discussed. The power in this situation is that which is held by institutions, professional organizations, and many times individuals. The power to change the intellectual landscape or to remain ensconced in Western paradigms that continue to exclude indigenous systems of knowledge and which ignore needs of indigenous communities and scholars presently resides in the hands of such entities.

The second of Rouhana’s four requirements for reconciliation is “truth.” On this subject, he is speaking to what he terms “historic truth” or “truth about wrongdoing” and identifies three levels of truth.

Crocker (1999) differentiated among three levels of truth: “forensic truth,” which refers to hard facts about human rights violations; “emotional truth,” which refers to psychological and physical impact on victims; and “general truth,” which refers to plausible interpretations. [2004:36]

Kristin Doughty touches on Rouhana’s perceptions of truth when she writes,

Rwanda’s mediation-based legal forums were extensions of the truth commission model, popular since the 1980s, which typically foregrounds victim narratives and eschews punishment in an effort to “heal individuals and society after the trauma of mass atrocity” (Minow 1998:57). For example, government billboards across Rwanda in 2004 and 2005 publicizing the launch of the *gacaca* process announced *Ukuri kurakiza*—“the truth is healing.” [2014:782]

And Rouhana posits “the argument here is that truth should be established and publicly disseminated, and that there are many reasonable ways of arriving at the truth” (2004:36). “The truth is healing” statement on Rwandan billboards contains an element of fantasy; the truth does not always initially serve to heal, it may also result in further expressions of anger before healing begins; experiencing conflict escalation is sometimes a necessary first step.

In speaking of historical responsibility as the third component of the reconciliation process, Rouhana (2004:36) cautions that discussions entailing historical truths hold the potential for escalating conflict but maintains this is crucial to the process.

...it is essential for reconciliation to have the parties agree on the historical responsibility for human rights abuses. The parties involved in mass physical and cultural violence such as colonization, occupation, genocide, ethnic cleansing, and state sanctioned oppression are expected to face their historical responsibility and their role in human rights violations.

Truth and historic responsibility are of utmost importance not only because they validate the experience of the victims, although this validation is essential for the victims’ transcendence of a history of domination and abuse. These processes are also critical to reassuring the victims that past wrongdoing will not reoccur and to determining future steps needed to rectify the past and plan the future. [2004:37]

Perhaps the utility to be found in engaging in some acknowledgement of historical responsibility, specifically the role of Anthropology in contributing to and perpetuating the oppression of indigenous peoples, would be the framing of the first conversation in an honest dialogue between anthropologists and Native people. Liza Overholtzer notes Elizabeth Brumfiel (1992) as writing “most often, dominant groups will overstate the historical importance of their own group and undervalue the contributions of others, legitimating current inequalities” (2013:482). From this perspective alone, accepting responsibility for historical truth could indeed prove a contentious endeavor for one side of the metaphorical table. This dissertation has provided examples of the complicity of Anthropology and some anthropologists in expanding colonization of the Americas; this has served to rupture relationships between anthropologists and Native people, and has served to support historical and present expansion of United States imperialism.

Examples have also been provided which substantiate the role of Anthropology in genocide and state sanctioned oppression by means of providing governmental agencies with information which resulted in the forced removal of children from indigenous communities to boarding schools, the seeking of Indian skulls from graves and battlefields, creating cultural genocide through federal policies of assimilation and/or removal to urban settings, and on and on. There are a good number of practicing anthropologists who recognize and acknowledge this history, there are some who do not, and many more who refuse to acknowledge that anthropology today continues to participate in the re-creation or perpetuation of similar circumstances both in the United States and globally; circumstances which continue the marginalization and oppression of indigenous peoples.

In examining Rouhana's fourth component of reconciliation, political and structural change, he notes these changes are guided by "some sort of justice" (2004:37). This fourth component follows seamlessly with the goals being sought by indigenous peoples who seek to remedy the inequalities in relationships with anthropologists and with the discipline of Anthropology. Without articulating specific goals, Rouhana is clear in stating the over-arching goals of political and structural change.

The structural changes can be dramatic and are determined by universal standards of equality and human dignity, international law, and international human rights agreements regardless of the implication for the acquired privileges and dominant identity of the perpetrators, who will inevitably have to lose some of the privileges they unjustly gained. *Restructuring takes the past wrongs and their inequitable consequences into consideration when establishing new political and social institutions. It is the political behavior, the institutionalizing, and the restructuring that become the focus of a future relationship between the parties based on equality and human dignity.* [2004:37, emphasis added]

All of Rouhana's components of Reconciliation resonate in some measure; justice, truth, historical responsibility, and, finally, a restructuring of the social and political relationship between the parties in conflict. However the ultimate goal being sought in the dissertation is a restructuring of the relationship. By that I mean that the relationship between Native peoples and the discipline of Anthropology (and anthropologists) needs to be decolonized. Structural change has been affected in the interactions between Native Americans and anthropologists through the enactment of NAGPRA; but this is only one small area in which conflict has resided. A significant change is needed in the structure of the discipline itself, in the manner in which Anthropology, anthropologists, and indigenous communities interact and in the ways in which indigenous students and non-indigenous faculty engage in the educational process. Where Rouhana's process of structural change falls short is in the area of relationship; in

Native peacekeeping ways, a method to repair fractured relationships is as important as the seeking of justice. Rouhana's statement that these changes are guided by "some sort of justice" (2004:37) does not encompass relational repair only some form of restitution.

In the context of anthropology and indigenous peoples, it is obvious that at the very least there is an ideological divide and a power structure in place that maintains and promotes such a divide, a power structure with a golemesque hold on the discipline. Power is both politically and structurally embedded within the discipline, and it is only from within the discipline that power shifts (or power sharing) and structural change can occur. The restructuring of Anthropology that would be necessary to result in indigenous knowledges being given equal value to Western scientific knowledge, and that would create for indigenous scholars a fully inclusive discipline would need to be recognized by members of the professional organizations and educational departments. Beyond acknowledging a need for restructure, a commitment would also be a necessary factor. These issues were the reason a federal law, NAGPRA, was created to address the issues of repatriation and site protection; archaeologists, cultural anthropologists, physical anthropologists, and museum directors were unwilling to acknowledge a need for change or make a commitment to change. Establishing a federal law in the conflict in question is, of course, not feasible so the onus for change or restructuring rests with the participants.

2. Reparations

Reparations are "payments or other compensation offered as an indemnity for loss or damage" (<http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/history/reparations.html>). Modern forms of reparations have been engaged as compensation following World War I and World War II, compensations sought by the victorious nations for material losses and

suffering; some of these reparations were also made in the form of “payments made to Holocaust survivors and to Japanese Americans interned during World War II in so-called relocation camps” in the United States and for material losses incurred while interned (<http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/history/reparations.html>).

Another form of reparations was attempted at the end of the Civil War. On Jan. 16, 1865 William Sherman issued, with approval of the War Department, “Special Field Order #15 which sets aside land along the Georgia and South Carolina coasts for black settlement. Each family is to receive 40 acres, and sometimes, the loan of army mules” (<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~kmporter/reparationtimeline.htm>). However, the order was subsequently rescinded. Most recently, in 1997, “President Clinton apologizes and the U.S. government pays \$10 million to the black survivors and family members victimized by the syphilis experiment conducted in the 1930's by the U.S. Public Health Service” (<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~kmporter/reparationtimeline.htm>).

Treaties constructed by the United States for Indian Nations have been overwhelmingly concerned with reparations in the form of giving money or goods for land (with the language of these treaties privileging the United States), or the exchange of substandard land for traditional homeland. Congress ended treaty-making with Indian nations in 1871, with 370 treaties having been ratified by the United States Senate since 1788 and “at least 45 others that were negotiated with tribes” but never ratified (<http://www.bia.gov/FAQs/>). Treaties made with Indian nations in the 19th century provided for some form of compensation, however inadequate, but of the almost 400 ratified by Congress, not one was honored.

In the 20th century, reparations have been made by the United States to Indian

tribes for historic loss or taking of lands and to others as compensation for hardship and suffering. In 1971 the Alaska Native Land Settlement provided for \$1 billion dollars and 44 million acres of land; in 1980 the Klamath of Oregon were awarded \$81 million; in 1985 the Seminole of Florida received \$12.3 million, the Sioux of South Dakota \$105 million, and the Chippewa of Wisconsin \$31 million; in 1986 the Ottawa of Michigan gained \$32 million. Other reparations were paid to Japanese Americans in 1990 equaling \$1.2 billion, or \$20,000 each as compensation for being held in relocation camps during World War II, although no effort has been made to reimburse these families for material losses (<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~kmpporter/historyreparations.htm>).

The United States has also made monetary reparations to the inhabitants of Bikini, an atoll in the Marshall Islands, for damages caused through nuclear bomb testing conducted between 1946 and 1958. The nuclear testing necessitated relocation of the islanders and left Bikini uninhabitable. The reparation payments began in 1987 following law suits initiated by the Bikinians and have totaled approximately \$150 million dollars (<http://www.bikiniatoll.com/repar.html>).

Clearly reparations could not resolve any substantive ideological conflicts between Anthropology and Native people given that, in practice, reparations are a method engaged by governments as a form of making amends for past traumas, and reparations almost always are in the form of monetary rewards. While much may be accomplished with financial resources, money is not the vehicle that will transform the underlying foundations of colonial abuse of indigenous people and traditions and will not accomplish rapprochement. Money is typically thought to be the ultimate cure-all in Western capitalistic societies, but money cannot change long-held ideologies of colonialism. The

solution we are seeking is institutional change.

3. Transitional Justice

Transitional Justice (TJ) involves methods based in conflict resolution to resolve continuing social conflicts produced through historical trauma, and may be legally mandated. Transitional Justice may be seen as referring “...to the set of judicial and non-judicial measures that have been implemented by different countries in order to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses. These measures include criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations programs, and various kinds of institutional reforms” (<https://www.ictj.org/about/transitional-justice>).

Truth Commissions are one of a number of the methods of TJ and are often employed in communities trying to understand and heal the traumas of past war crimes and human rights abuses (http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/truth_com.htm). Argentina, Chile, El Salvador, and Guatemala are some of the countries that have established Truth Commissions following massive acts of genocide. Canada has formed a Truth Commission relating to missionary and governmental boarding schools; schools which indigenous children were sent to after being abducted from their families by agents of the Canadian government. The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established as a means to deal with the abuses that happened under apartheid.

Truth commissions are “inquiries established to determine the facts, root causes, and societal consequences of past human rights violations. Through their focus on the testimony of victims of atrocity, truth commissions provide acknowledgement and recognition of suffering and survival to those most affected” (<https://www.ictj.org/gallery-items/truth-commissions>). Results of commissions may contribute to penalties levied through the judicial system, reparations to victims, and the

structuring of institutional changes to prevent future occurrence. The term “Truth Commission” encapsulates a wide range of methods which have been created to address various issues of human rights violations; there is a great deal of flexibility in the design of the process and in the outcome. The ultimate goal is to heal and restructure a fractured society by creating a shared narrative which acknowledges the past and provides for a sense of accountability. A number of components of Truth Commissions fit well with Rouhana’s (2004) description of Reconciliation; most especially truth and historical responsibility which he lists as two of the four components necessary to effect reconciliation. Justice, as described by Rouhana, may or may not be a condition of a Truth Commission as in the case of Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission where no formal agreement has been constructed and no measures of restitution provided. Also in Canada’s Truth Commission, there is no political or structural change agreed to, although a number of proposals have been submitted by the Commission which, if enacted, would enhance relationships and advance reconciliation between the indigenous peoples (First Nations Peoples) of Canada and the Canadian government (<http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=890>).

Judy Barsalou describes Transitional Justice as a social reconstruction “defined by Eric Stover and Harvey Weinstein [as] a “process that includes a broad range of programmatic interventions, such as security, freedom of movement, access to accurate and unbiased information, the rule of law, justice, education for democracy, economic development, [and] cross-ethnic engagement...” (2008:31). Transitional Justice appears to be fraught with political concerns taking precedence during the construction and implementation of interventions, “truth telling, justice seeking and reconciliation

mechanisms are...heavily influenced by the nature of the societies emerging from conflict, conflicting interests and access to resources” (Barsalou 2008:31). However, in explaining Conflict Resolution, Rouhana (2004) clearly states that this process addresses the political needs of each party equally. The two seemingly conflicting statements of Barsalou (2008) and Rouhana (2004) give voice to the fluidity of methods used in processes of TJ.

Kristin Doughty (2014) examines the transitional justice movement as it has been applied to efforts of rebuilding communities in post-genocidal Rwanda. During a 100 day time period in 1994 between 500,000-1,000,000 Rwandan Tutsi and moderate Hutu people were murdered by the Hutu political majority. According to Doughty (2014), the government of Rwanda created what is known as *gacaca*, or genocide, courts in 2001 which were designed to bring perpetrators of the genocide before locally elected judges for the purpose of reintegrating people into their home communities. These courts also heard cases of civil disputes and other criminal charges. Doughty states that “the *gacaca* process hinged on mediated compromises that prioritized the collective over the individual good” and that the mediation committees emphasized, “our goal is not to punish but to reconcile” (2014:781).

Doughty’s analysis of using law-based, or legally sanctioned, mediation to effect reconciliation shows it to be a questionable process. She writes “that although law-based mediation was framed as benign and is often promoted by the transitional justice movement (within Rwanda and outside) on the basis of local culture, its implementation always involves coercion and accompanying resistance” (2014:780) and further critiques the process by stating,

by a decade after the genocide, many scholars argued that Rwandans “rehearsed consensus” (Ingelaere 2010:53) or “pretended peace” (Buckley-Zistel 2009), which papered over much deeper divisions (Thomson 2013), consistent with many scholars’ analyses that harmony “may be used to suppress people’s resistance, by socializing them towards conformity by means of consensus-building mechanisms, by valorizing consensus, cooperation, passivity, and docility, and by silencing people who speak out angrily” (Mattei and Nader 2008:77; see also Greenhouse et al. 1994:130, 141; Lazarus-Black 2007:139–157; Merry 1990:177–180; Wilson 2003:189). [2014:784]

State enforced compromise or directives, as we have seen in the NAGPRA process, does not necessarily guarantee compliance nor does it ensure lack of resistance. From a personal perspective I would argue that some crimes are so heinous that forgiveness is neither possible nor should it be a logical expectation; and when voices are silenced, the word “justice” becomes “just us,” a system that represents the collective majority rather than the collective minority or the individual.

Without engaging in an exhaustive research into the analysis provided by Doughty (2014) and other scholars she has referenced, it is not possible to ascertain if these conclusions are totally accurate or representative of differing worldviews. We can entertain the possibility that American scholars reflect Western values and definitions of what constitutes justice and that these values and definitions may not coincide with those of local cultural understandings.

A growing anthropology of transitional justice has similarly shown how coercion and silencing are core elements of many truth and reconciliation commissions. Wilson (2003:189) has argued that the South African TRC’s [Truth and Reconciliation Committee] invocation of ubuntu could “coerce individuals into compliant positions that they would not adopt of their own volition,” and Fiona Ross (2003) has shown how, despite its purported attempts to give voice to victims, the TRC silenced and depoliticized women in particular at worst coercive and at best irrelevant...Theidon has similarly illustrated how the “victim-centered” approach of the Peruvian truth commission inadvertently created “resentful silences” (Theidon 2010:110). [Doughty 2014:784]

As Laura Nader (1972) has encouraged us to “study up,” meaning to study the upper end of the social hierarchy where those with power reside and construct the socio-political and economic landscape, Mari Matsuda suggests we “look to the bottom” of the social hierarchy in designing legal solutions to conflict resulting in some form of justice:

those who have experienced discrimination speak with a special voice to which we should listen. Looking to the bottom—adopting the perspective of those who have seen and felt the falsity of the liberal promise—can assist critical scholars in the task of fathoming the phenomenology of law and defining the elements of justice. [1995:63]

Matsuda is essentially addressing racialized minorities in this writing, however the principle she is addressing is certainly applicable to gender inequalities. But once again, when we are evaluating the efficacy of Truth Commissions in other countries the cultural norms need to be recognized and understood. Male dominated societies are perhaps more prevalent than those which practice gender equality. Scholars in the Western world should be especially wary of practicing cultural imperialism or ethnocentrism when evaluating practices of other cultures, a frequent failing of anthropologists in relationship to indigenous people and one cause of ideological divide.

Entertaining thoughts of mediation or truth commissions in the resolving of the conflicts stated within this paper do not seem appropriate to the situation. While a Truth Commission, such as that established in Canada, would help in the healing of historical traumas through means of the U.S government finally acknowledging and accepting responsibility for all of the human rights abuses committed against indigenous people through the historical and on-going process of colonization, I cannot envision any structural change in the discipline of Anthropology as a result. However, any form of positive resolution would certainly provide a sense of justice, a sense of being able to

“right some wrongs.” Any other form of conflict resolution which might require compromise is not what I believe Native people are seeking. Compromise suggests that each party in a dispute “settle” or perhaps give up something. The majority of indigenous people believe they have collectively and individually given enough.

C. Conclusion

Despite the voices of indigenous people protesting the many ways in which Anthropology has historically, and continues to, contribute to on-going oppressions and marginalization and despite the fact that over the past several decades a number of non-indigenous scholars have sporadically added their voices in opposition to the on-going cultural hegemony within the discipline, the primary method of addressing these issues has been avoidance. Avoidance as a tactic cannot be considered a solution to any issue in which dissension exists; “avoidance reduces conflict at the expense of increased misperceptions—and increased risk of conflict—making avoidance a questionable strategy for dealing with conflicts” (Michael Nielsen 1998:186). Rouhana and Korper (1996) suggest that power asymmetry between two conflicting groups engaged in some form of conflict resolution may result in avoidance tactics due to a difference in the priority of issues or a difference in goals. While discussing the points of conflict which created and sustain the divide between indigenous people and anthropologists is the important first step in bridging the divide, the issues raised in dialogue need to be addressed with the idea of developing concrete actions as a path to resolution.

Methods of resolving intergroup conflict examined in these particular readings—Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice—have been determined to be inappropriate to resolving conflict between Anthropology and

indigenous communities or individuals in the United States. Aspects of Reconciliation hold the greatest resonance to resolution. However, as stated, Rouhana's (2004) model of reconciliation does not address repairing of relationships, which is a crucial step toward healing past and present wrongs in the indigenous model of addressing conflict.

I have been cautioned regarding use of the term "Reconciliation" and told it holds a number of various connotations and is used in a number of ways. It seems prudent to delve a bit deeper into Reconciliation before accepting or discarding it as a viable option.

The Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary defines "reconciliation" as:

- the act of causing two people or groups to become friendly again after an argument or disagreement
 - the process of finding a way to make two different ideas, facts, etc., exist or be true at the same time
- (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reconciliation>).

The Oxford dictionary definition is essentially the same as Merriam-Webster. The definition in the Macmillan Dictionary is worded similarly, but slightly differently:

- a new and friendly relationship with someone who you argued with or fought with
 - a way of making it possible for ideas, beliefs, needs, etc. that are opposed to each other to exist together
- (<http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/american/reconciliation>)

However, "reconciliation" as understood by the Catholic Church has a different meaning, is considered a sacrament, and is in fact known as the Sacrament of Reconciliation and has been known also as "penance" (meaning to show sorrow for a "sin"). Part of the sacrament consists of confessing sins or wrong-doing resulting in the penitent being reconciled with God and the church community. More information is to be found on the website (http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p2s2c2a4.htm). Ann Kingsolver points out that

the idea of a community ruptured and restored, or a bond broken and mended, comes from the Christian notion of putting an event in the past after confession, forgiveness, and erasure, which Julius Gathogo points out is at odds with remembering injustices as part of the ongoing hard work of reconciliation as recognizing “the humanity of each other” (2012:77). [2013:665]

This idea of “recognizing the humanity of each other” essentially echoes what is written in the introduction to this chapter: respect. Respect is the primary position of discourse in American Indian culture. Careful listening, not interrupting another’s speech, and deep consideration of another view are ways in which indigenous people show respect and recognize the other’s humanity. In my experience of contentious discussions with anthropologists during NAGPRA consultations, this basic practice of respect has not always been observed; my impression at these times is that I was being “talked down to” by someone who assumed a sense of superiority and considered himself or herself to be far more knowledgeable regarding the topic in discussion. These encounters are difficult and sometimes impossible to move forward to a productive ending.

Kristin Doughty weighs in on this discussion by writing and then referencing Laura Nader:

many have noted the imbrications of Judeo-Christian principles with postconflict reconciliation programming in other contexts and how, though harmony models often derive from local customary practices, they are simultaneously “part of systems of control that have diffused across the world along with colonialism, Christianity, and other macroscale systems of cultural control such as psychotherapy” (Nader 2002a:32). [2014:784]

This concept, most especially the quote taken from Nader, would simply exacerbate any reticence felt by Native people regarding the process; Native people most often view “systems of cultural control” as being a large part of the genesis of conflicts involving non-Native societies and institutions. Cultural control in the minds of Native

people translates to residential boarding schools, punishment for spiritual practices, removal of ancestral remains and material culture, forced migrations, economic and socio-political inequalities, genocide and erasure, and the silencing of voices.

Language is a powerful tool and as such, indigenous people have learned to be wary of inter-cultural discourse. As we see from the above examples with the many interpretations of “reconciliation,” words can have many different meanings. So what dialogical framework could be engaged which would result in having “the parties first acknowledge...otherness as the distance between them” (Gurevitch 1989:161)? I would argue that this “acknowledgement of otherness” is the first step to open dialogue and that dialogue is most crucial to rapprochement. Engaging dialogue as being crucial to arriving at the goal of restructuring the discipline of Anthropology is a reflection of indigenous forms of addressing conflict. A vital component of indigenous peacemaking is recognizing the humanity of the other person. As two disagreeing parties begin to embark on a conversation, it is impossible to not recognize each other as human and in that recognition understand that an element of difference in opinion, belief, or understanding is the distance that must be travelled to reach understanding and appreciation of the other view of the conflict. Once that understanding occurs, even in disagreement, a path to fully engage in some form of resolution appears. The final version of NAGPRA was preceded by literally years of conversation, often contentious, but dialogue nonetheless. From an indigenous perspective, as mentioned above, the use of dialogue with representatives of the existing power structures is often initially accompanied by suspicion. Even with initial wariness, we know that without conversation there will be no forward movement in effecting structural change.

Understanding that dialogue is necessary presents the question, who will engage in the process? As we learned in Chapter 7, a number of indigenous and non-indigenous scholars have given voice to various areas of conflict between the discipline and Native people, most especially in the failings of educational programs in which several case studies were presented. Earlier, in Chapter 6, Native students identified the obstacles they encountered in graduate school. The AAA has, in small measure, begun to address the issue: in 2008, a Commission of Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA) was developed to study some of the issues addressed in this dissertation in relationship to ways in which the discipline is practiced, along with better methods to enhance diversity in the organization; the CRRA also explored experiences of graduate students in order to address topics which negatively impact students of color; at the 2014 Annual Meeting of the AAA, two panels were presented, one titled *Beyond Statistics* by the SfAA (Yelvington, et.al 2015) and the second titled *Decolonial Feminisms and World Anthropologies* (Babb 2015). The AAA has issued a number of statements over five decades to be used as guidelines of anthropological practice. Should the AAA begin to seriously consider the deep fissures in relationships between anthropologists and indigenous people and make a strong commitment to addressing and closing the divides, then logically the AAA would be the venue for dialogue. Policies enacted by this organization would create new guidelines for ways in which anthropologists conduct research with indigenous communities and create an awareness of the specific needs of indigenous students to succeed in programs of anthropological study.

From an acknowledgement of different worldviews, an understanding of Anthropology as currently being a destructive and oppressive discipline in the experience

of Native people would logically be the next consideration in dialogue. If a level of consensus is reached in recognizing different worldviews and understanding indigenous perceptions of being oppressed by Anthropology, perhaps a partnership of sorts can be entered into which removes issues of politics, history, and power from the discussion and focuses instead on the common humanity of both groups of people. A format for engaging in such dialogue and a process needs to be developed. An agenda which identifies the desired outcomes would also need to be agreed upon.

John Omohundro states that “dialogue provides insight into other cultures and into the process of learning about other cultures” (2008:384). From an indigenous perspective, there are a number of salient points that need honest dialogue and resolution; issues such as incorporating indigenous knowledge systems and ways in which indigenous knowledge is reproduced in educational programs; incorporating indigenous oral tradition into the theory and praxis of Anthropology and that these areas be afforded value equal to those of mainstream anthropology; understanding that indigenous people require not only input into, but control of, the ways in which their knowledge systems are disseminated; indigenous people and ideologies being provided room at the anthropological table in order to construct a true Indigenous Anthropology, one that is acknowledged as being equal to all fields in the discipline. Omohundro identifies six dialogic procedures in the ways in which Anthropology is practiced which could aid anthropologists in beginning to address some of these concerns:

- Share control of the process and product with your informants.
- Show your work with your informants in your reports.
- Couple participant observation in events with dialogue about those events.

- Create a three-way dialogue with your informant and a text or cultural artifact.
- Enter dialogue constantly and publicly about your findings with colleagues.
- Show your findings to your sources to elicit their responses; then report those too. [2008:399-400]

Other concerns that need to be addressed relate to recruitment and retention of indigenous students into the discipline, increased numbers of indigenous PhD instructors in undergraduate and graduate programs of study, and a professional indigenous anthropological association that consists of indigenous people who happen to be anthropologists rather than anthropologists who happen to be Indian.

None of the various methods examined in this chapter which are used to resolve conflicts appear to address resolution of the ideological conflicts between indigenous people, Anthropology and some anthropologists. None of the methods present solutions to the above stated issues indigenous people want to address. While Rouhana's (2004) basic goals for Reconciliation are met through the Four Processes, they apply to very different situations than that presented in this dissertation. Yes, acknowledging and accepting responsibility for much of the creation of conflict is necessary as is a relationship that is based in equal power and, as stated, the ultimate goal is structural change. However, the Western models of arriving at the goal vary from those of indigenous models; and the major flaw, or shortcoming, in Rouhana's process does not provide for repair of relationships, which is also an essential aspect of healing. Repair of relationships, healing, and justice are all necessary components of rapprochement, not only that which is based on force (legislation, mandates) or structural change.

In the focus group surveys of Chapter 6, all of the graduate students, all of the

indigenous anthropologists, and some of the non-indigenous anthropologists expressed support for a restructuring of the discipline that would result in full inclusion of indigenous worldview and full participation of indigenous scholars practicing and teaching within the philosophical framework of that worldview. In private conversation, the term I hear repeatedly is “decolonization.” Many times this term is used in reference to the return of tribal lands; but for the purposes of education and the practice of Anthropology it is seen as a method of restructuring ideas, of presenting and valuing indigenous knowledge systems in a manner equal to the presentation of Western knowledge which currently diminishes other ways of knowing. I hear this referred to as “decolonizing our minds.”

This concept of decolonization will be examined in more depth in the concluding chapter of the dissertation. However, for the purposes of this chapter it may be prudent to use the word “restructure” rather than “decolonize.” As noted earlier, words are powerful and the interpretations which words hold may convey meanings that produce discomfort or anxiety in the listener; such reactions could create barriers to any meaningful discussions.

When I speak of restructuring the discipline, I am referring to a paradigm shift that would make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline, one that is welcoming to ideas other than the mainstream ideas of the past that still hold sway today; a discipline that not only recognizes different cultures and ways of knowledge production but also incorporates the understandings of those cultures and knowledges into the academic canon. I also envision a discipline whose non-indigenous members conduct research in

tribal communities by incorporating indigenous protocols of respect in their field methods, respect for the community, individuals, and culture or belief system.

If indigenous systems of knowledge were to be incorporated into the pedagogy of academic programs in Anthropology, non-indigenous anthropologists would have a better understanding of how to conduct field research in indigenous communities much as in the way Sonya Atalay has by seeking to find “ways to combine our Indigenous systems of knowledge and traditional ways of understanding (*Anishinabek*) with those of Western Science” (2012: x). This has enabled Atalay to practice a model of Community Based Collaborative Research (CBCR) that would be in keeping with her traditional beliefs.

Native people do not proselytize, nor do they want non-Native persons as spiritual converts; believing in Native concepts is not necessary to understanding and respecting those concepts. One comment made by a non-Native anthropologist in the focus group surveys of Chapter 6 stated, “we don’t need to turn Indigenous peoples into anthropologists, and we don’t necessarily need to turn social scientists into Indigenous peoples.” I would reply to that by saying, “we also don’t need to make indigenous anthropologists into white anthropologists, there is a need for both, and space should be created within the discipline, equally, for both.” What we need to do is find a way to make that happen.

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

Indigenous Anthropology is an approach to Anthropology based on indigenous holistic philosophies embedded in traditional knowledge systems.

Donna Moody [2014:27]

The primary question posed in this dissertation consists of two parts: is ideological conflict within American Anthropology a manifestation of colonization and, if so, is some form of resolution possible? From these questions others naturally flowed, such as: how do the differences between traditional indigenous forms of knowledge conflict with mainstream anthropological thought? How have these differences affected efforts to make Anthropology a more inclusive discipline, for example, through graduate school programs for indigenous students, the formation of professional level organizations, and the development of critical areas of research? Is rapprochement possible and under what conditions could that occur? The questions were researched and answered using an indigenous worldview paradigm; all things are connected.

Throughout the dissertation, those connections are obvious: ways in which Anthropology is inextricably connected to colonization; ways in which Anthropology has, and continues to abet, United States imperialism and the military-industrial complex; continued resistance to change; and continued stagnation of professional organizations and educational institutions in understanding or addressing areas of conflict, especially those areas which create unnecessary obstacles experienced by indigenous students and conflicts which alienate them and indigenous communities from the discipline.

When examining the writings of intellectuals who have given voice to the conflicts between indigenous people and Anthropology (e.g. Vine Deloria, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Diane Lewis, Beatrice Medicine, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Bryan Brayboy, Larry

Zimmerman), it's evident that the conversation has been sporadically revisited for more than five decades. Forward movement in the discipline in devising solutions has been inexplicably slow. Several reasons for lack of action have been suggested in the dissertation: lingering beliefs in the superiority of Western epistemologies; control of institutional power structures; control of research funding; reluctance to conceive diverse worldviews as holding equal value to Euro-American worldviews; and perceptions of apathy of mainstream anthropologists.

There are indigenous and non-indigenous academics that hold concerns of professional repercussions and scholastic credibility when their research and writing cross the invisible boundaries of the discipline's dogma. Some scholars believe that, essentially, there are "gate-keepers" who set the standard and define what topics and conclusions are deemed acceptable; those who attempt to blaze new trails beyond the mainstream philosophical boundaries of the discipline become non-sanctioned, marginalized members of the community and their scholarship forever after questioned. Some have referred to this condition as "professional suicide." The fear of professional suicide may be a major reason these issues are not being addressed within the discipline. Perhaps there are simply not enough anthropologists engaging in the dialogic question, and perhaps this is a direct manifestation of the small numbers of indigenous anthropologists. The paucity of indigenous anthropologists brings us back to lingering effects of colonization...circular thinking and connections.

The struggles of indigenous people in obtaining a space in the anthropological world, as partners rather than subjects, reflect efforts relating to sovereignty and self-determination. Julie Kaomea puts forth a plea, and a suggestion to non-Native scholars.

Perhaps the most helpful role that can be assumed by non-Natives who are interested in assisting with Indigenous self-determination efforts—whether one is a classroom teacher faced with the task of teaching Indigenous studies curricula or an educational researcher working in Indigenous educational communities—is to work collaboratively with Native allies, listen closely to our wisdom as well as our concerns, interrogate unearned power and privilege (including one’s own), and use this privilege to confront oppression and “stand behind” Natives, so that our voices can be heard. [2005:40]

As stated, efforts made to include indigenous scholars in the discipline have been sporadic and slow to appear in practice. Through the voices of indigenous scholars (see Chapter 6), a review of educational efforts, such as graduate programs, is seen to be largely ineffective as methods of inclusion; in fact, the experiences expressed were more indicative of trauma, biases, efforts to assimilate, and exclusionary. Efforts within professional organizations have likewise remained ineffectual; for example, despite a strong Statement on Race issued by the American Anthropological Association (AAA) and the forming of a special committee designed to explore experiences of racialized graduate students, none of the core issues expressed by those students were, or have been, addressed by the committee. There are however a few actions that have proved to be effective in helping to address the conflicts experienced by indigenous people in the discipline, such as cultural centers on university campuses. The downside of cultural centers is that the activities and programs are most often attended only by indigenous students and faculty which may produce further feelings of marginalization; those who perhaps need to be there the most are conspicuously absent, missing opportunities to learn about the rich heritage of minority students.

A. Positive Acts of Inclusion

Positive actions taken to provide inclusion of indigenous communities and

individuals have ironically been initiated through the federal government, most notably the enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 which was explored extensively in the dissertation. Two other programs that are inclusive of indigenous peoples are Cultural Resource Management (CRM) and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPO).

1. Cultural Resource Management (CRM)

The term “cultural resources” was created by the National Park Services (NPS) in the 1970s. In 1974, the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act was enacted. This Act helped to create jobs in the federal government, academic institutions, and in the private sector for anthropologists, initially jobs for archaeologists. In the discipline of Anthropology, CRM has expanded into areas of Heritage Preservation and Cultural and Linguistic Anthropology.

While the majority of colleges and universities today have some form of CRM programming which, in the field of archaeology, bid on contracts to conduct field surveys for local, state, and federal construction projects along with those of private utilities, much of CRM resides in the private sector. The initial goal of these projects is to determine the risk of excavation negatively impacting potentially historic or indigenous sites that might fall under the protection of “heritage” or of NAGPRA. Many of the private CRM companies utilize, through collaboration, members of indigenous communities for knowledge of the site. In some cases, good partnerships have formed between the communities and the archaeologists working in collaboration to protect and preserve sites from potentially destructive projects, often resulting in the relocation of those projects.

Many tribal communities have developed their own CRM programs. T. J. Ferguson identifies some of these tribes:

Several tribes also operate CRM firms to undertake contracted archaeological research, including the Gila River Indian Community; a consortium of the Klamath, Modoc, and Yaahooskin tribes; the Navajo Nation; and the Pueblo of Zuni. In addition to providing needed archaeological services, these tribally based ...contract archaeology businesses provide substantial economic benefits to Indian tribes. [1996:69]

Of course, in the almost 20 years since Ferguson wrote these words, a number of other federally recognized tribes have developed CRM companies.

2. Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO)

Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, or THPOs, are the Indian counterpart to State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs). Paulette Steeves best describes the history of the creation of THPOs by writing,

in 1989, Congress directed the NPS to study and report on tribal preservation funding needs; the report was the foundation for the THP program within the NPS (NPS 2013). Two programs were created, the Tribal Historic Preservation Office Grants and Tribal Heritage Grants (NPS 2013). There are currently 565 federally recognized tribal groups in the United States (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2012, 278)...142 of the 336 eligible tribes have been certified as Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPO) (NPS 2013). [2015:126]

Before the creation of Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, all archaeological excavations on federal land and on tribally owned land came under the purview of the Parks Service, as did protection of those sites and artifacts considered as cultural heritage. The THPO office now has primary jurisdiction over any projects proposed on tribal land.

The creation of THPOs has made a significant contribution to issues of sovereignty and self-determination for Indian Nations within the borders of the United States. Along with tribal CRM programs, tribes have regained control over their tribal

lands, resources, and intrusions of outsiders while also providing economic benefits to the tribe and individual community members. Utility companies and any government or private agency proposing projects on tribal lands are required to contract with the THPOs office and provide financial recompense for the privilege of tribal consultation, just as they provide monies to any independent contractor, consultant, or CRM company.

B. Is Rapprochement Possible? Under What Conditions Could That Occur?

In order to contextualize a process that would narrow the divide between anthropology and indigenous people, we would first need to know if anthropologists and indigenous people *want* a change in the structure of Anthropology. I believe indigenous people have been desirous of full inclusion in the discipline, as equal partners or members, without assimilation to hegemonic anthropological doctrine for generations. Since the inception of American Anthropology, the discipline, the academy, and the mainstream practitioners have held total control of the materials, the theories, and the methods. Control equals power. Are anthropologists and Anthropology willing to relinquish that control and power to indigenous people, or at the very least provide an equal share? In what may be considered a positive response to this question regarding anthropologists Diane Lewis wrote,

anthropology...must redefine traditional roles. It should now include, on an equal footing, those who reflect the interests of the people among whom they work, along with those who represent the government in power; insiders, in addition to outsiders. [1973:586]

Edward Said, in a far less optimistic view stated, “perhaps anthropology as we have known it can only continue on one side of the imperial divide, there to remain as a partner in domination and hegemony” (1989:225).

The conflict resolution I envision encompasses assignment of equal value to be given to those knowledge systems, spiritual beliefs, and oral traditions as that afforded their mainstream Western counterparts; for research in indigenous communities to be conducted using an indigenous model; and for indigenous students entering the field to have the indigenous worldview incorporated in their programs of study, to not be expected to assimilate to Westernized paradigms of Anthropology, and to not be treated as the “Other.” An important consideration in answering this question is whether it is even possible for such divergent worldviews to find common ground, or mutual respect. Respect is a recurring theme throughout indigenous philosophy and ways of being in the world: when Linda Tuhiwai Smith is speaking of ethics in anthropological research she writes, “community and indigenous rights or views in this area are generally not recognized and not respected” (1999:118); Sonya Atalay writes that she has sought to find “ways to combine our Indigenous systems of knowledge and traditional ways of understanding (*Anishinabek*) with those of Western Science” (2012:x) in order to practice a model of Community Based Collaborative Research (CBCR) that would be in keeping with her traditional beliefs.

C. Approaching the Conflict

There are other considerations in beginning to conceptualize an approach to answering the dissertation questions. The history of colonization and indigenous people has yet to be fully understood and acknowledged. Long-term effects of colonization continue to manifest in poverty, disparities in health and education, and oppression of belief systems.

Consideration must be given to the connection in the historical and recent

practices of all four fields of Anthropology which have continued the colonial oppressions of indigenous peoples. Those oppressions reach to the highest levels of the discipline; they reach to the programs of study that train indigenous people to be anthropologists, but do not include in that training the works of indigenous academics who disagree with anthropological dogma, do not include traditional knowledge in a respectful manner (if at all), and programs that only train indigenous people by indoctrinating them into Western thought processes. Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology continue to interpret for us our histories and practices and contest our origin stories as seen in Mignolo (2003) and Smith (1999); David Harrison (2007) unwittingly makes an indigenous case for illuminating the ways in which Linguistic Anthropology dissects and interprets our languages including what is written without words; Biological Anthropology discards, discredits, and disrespects our creation stories as mere folklore or myths replacing them with theories of evolution, as seen in numerous writings that espouse scientific theory, all while continuing to study ancestral remains.

As indigenous people continue to be the subject matter for academics in the fields of History and Anthropology, there are other disciplines where indigenous lives have been erased; disciplines involved in subjects such as health care. In reading health reports and statistics, or evaluations of national poverty, or in attending medical conferences, I have noticed that indigenous peoples are most often not included in the demographic studies which address issues such as income levels, HIV/AIDS, and diseases with the highest morbidity rates. Indian people are often a minority, even among studies on minority communities. Nevertheless, indigenous people have provided important opportunities for academic research.

A number of methods to resolve conflict were presented in Chapter 8, such as Conflict Resolution, Reconciliation, Reparations, and Transitional Justice. After careful consideration, it was determined that none of those examined would be of benefit to resolving the conflict(s) identified in the dissertation. If members of anthropological professional organizations were attached to addressing the issues which have been identified through special sessions at conferences, articles in professional journals, books, or through surveys such as that distributed to minority graduate students by the AAA Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA), perhaps a serious dialogue could be initiated. A respectful dialogue would necessitate the development of a format to include an agenda agreed upon by all participants which defines terminology, acknowledges the historical genesis of the conflict, identifies the ideological conflicts, and clearly identifies the desired goals; goals may initially be different for diverse factions, but eventually common goals would be agreed upon by all participants. Such discussions could be initiated at the annual AAA meeting which attracts an attendance of approximately 6,000 members; initiatives could be conceived by special sessions; and those members who are educators could bring those initiatives back to their academic departments for further consideration and action.

In considering a dialogic exchange, we might turn to Nicholas Burbules, Professor of Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, who defines dialogue as “an activity directed toward discovery and new understanding, which stands to improve the knowledge, insight, or sensitivity of its participants” (1993, p. xii). We could also examine the work of Martin Buber (1878-1965), a well-known existentialist philosopher of the 20th century who, through what may be his most well-known work *Ich*

und Du (I and Thou 1971 [1923]), suggests that dialogic communication is a human relationship in which those who engage in dialogue carry no preconditions to the conversation, but fully accept the other. According to Jean Forward, in any dialogue between anthropologists and indigenous people, anthropologists “can’t bring the Exotic Other into the discussion as an “Other,” there has to be a level playing field” (personal communication November 11, 2015).

Clearly, there is a great deal of work needed to pave the way for a conversation to even begin to address the issues. How can people be brought together to work on issues when only one side acknowledges a problem? What methods could be entertained to help the group not recognizing the problem to come to an awareness of a fractured relationship that is vitally important to the discipline? Hopefully others will pick up this banner and move the issue to the forefront of awareness of practitioners in Anthropology with a goal of healing and restructuring the discipline for the good of all.

D. Decolonizing the Discipline

Words and terms undergo transformations, from concept to common usage to falling into a state of oblivion. Language is not static but always fluid, with meanings that change over time and accommodations made in language to reflect changes within a culture or society. The word “decolonization” has been used to describe or define a number of circumstances, coming into common usage after World War II when global empires which were established before World War I were deconstructed.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines decolonization as "the withdrawal from its colonies of a colonial power; the acquisition of political or economic independence by such colonies." However, decolonization not only refers to the complete "removal of the domination of non-indigenous forces" within the geographical space and different institutions of the colonized, but it also refers to the "decolonizing of the mind" from the

colonizer's ideas that made the colonized seem inferior.
[<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decolonization>]

Political theories of decolonization all concern postcolonial political thought and are always about someplace else, such as Africa or India, and hold little resonance for this dissertation. We know that the colonizers have not withdrawn from either our homelands or our institutions, and certainly one of the central themes of this dissertation involves the “colonizer’s ideas that made the colonized seem inferior” (Freire 2012 [1970]; Forbes 2008; Fanon 1967). In regard to the decolonizing of the mind, Rodolfo Stavenhagen writes, “in French-speaking Black Africa intellectuals and students tend to grade visiting foreign social scientists (particularly Frenchmen) according to their degree of mental decolonization before they begin to judge their professional capacities” (1971:337). So for the purposes of answering the question relating to the conditions of rapprochement, decolonization may be considered the undoing of the colonizer’s ideas.

I worry about the visceral effect of using this word, decolonize. The word has been used in so many instances by indigenous people, and so frequently, that it has become a “buzz word” producing two responses; fear by non-indigenous persons that something vital to their well-being will be taken away, or a diminishing of the intent of the word leading to apathy.

I did consider using the word indigenization in place of decolonization; indigenization in the sense of creating a more Native discipline through recruiting more indigenous people into the profession of Anthropology. It’s a good word, but it doesn’t quite capture the solution to resolving the basic problems in the discipline as viewed by indigenous people.

1. Practicing to Decolonize

I have entered into a new friendship this year with a man who lives in Oregon. This friendship evolved through his writing a small piece titled *Confessions of a Reformed Archaeologist or Ten Things Most Archaeologists Don't Seem to Know and Apparently Don't Want to Hear*. The following is a short preamble to his piece followed by “thing #5” on his list of “Ten Things...”

For several years I was a practicing archaeologist/anthropologist, but I have been clean and sober for nearly ten years now. How did I kick the habit? I did something unthinkably radical. I committed the greatest sin in American archaeology - I started listening to Native people. I am not Native American, and do not speak for Native American people. I'm just a white guy who tried to listen to Native American people. I tried to HEAR them.

5. Just because Native people don't come out to the site of your summer field school where you are digging - and kill you - does not necessarily mean they approve of what you are doing or how you're doing it.
[Roy Schroeder, personal communication, August 6, 2015]

In the years since Roy has left Archaeology behind, efforts have been made by some archaeologists to alleviate these types of negative experiences between Indian people and archaeologists. Archaeology has developed specialized divisions, such as Historical Archaeology, Ethnoarchaeology, Feminist Archaeology, and now Indigenous Archaeology. George Nicholas describes Indigenous Archaeology as “an important and long-overdue aspect of contemporary archaeology, carried out by projects in which archaeologists work together with Indigenous peoples” (2012:216). Nicholas identifies one result of Indigenous Archaeology as challenging “existing power relations, as well as to shift the frame of reference in archaeological practice to foreground community needs and values—in effect, decolonizing the discipline,” but he also identifies opposition from within the discipline by writing, “many archaeologists are uncomfortable with Indigenous

archaeology, claim it is non- or anti-scientific, and question its theoretical premises, political goals, and privileging of local values” (2012:216). My personal response to those who are opposed to Indigenous Archaeology would be, “if you don’t like Indigenous Archaeology, don’t practice it, but do check out Roy Schroeder’s *Confessions of a Reformed Archaeologist* (contact me for a copy).”

There are a number of publications that address decolonization within the academy, some of which have been referenced in the pages of this dissertation; for example, books by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Bagele Chilisa (2012), Shawn Wilson (2008), Margaret Kovach (2009), and Sonya Atalay (2012) (see also Faye Harrison 2010). Decolonization is not a new concept in academe, especially in the Social Sciences. According to Michael Wilcox,

since the decolonization movements initiated in the mid twentieth century, cultural and social anthropologists have had to acknowledge and confront the legacy of anthropology as a colonial practice—as a conceptual framework in which "Western" and "non-Western" peoples were geographically and temporally dichotomized, as a means of categorizing peoples and cultures as more or less "developed," "civilized " or "complex," and as a way of thinking about "self and "other" within these contexts (Trigger 1984). [2012:224]

Much has been written about the concept of Indigenous Research; Indigenous Archaeology has begun to make some gains as being recognized as a legitimate sub-division of Archaeology; but what is happening in the other Fields of Anthropology? If I look for Indigenous Linguistic Anthropology, there is nothing to be found except the fact that Linguistic Anthropology was initially conceived to study Native American languages that were endangered or extinct. If I explore the term Indigenous Biological Anthropology I find a rather lengthy list of specialized areas of study such as Paleoanthropology, Primatology, Human Biology, Forensic Anthropology, etc. If there is

any connection between Biological Anthropology and indigenous people, it is only to do with the fact of our ancestors physical remains being stolen and used to uphold “indigenous inferiority...rely[ing] on outdated scientific theories to justify assumptions that essentially glorify western superiority” (Killsback 2013:86) or to satisfy academic curiosity, or to construct a professional reputation.

And what of Indigenous Anthropology? I have been able to find no definition for Indigenous Anthropology, although Native American Anthropology is defined as the studies of Native American peoples. An expanded definition of Indigenous Archaeology includes “a form of archaeology where indigenous peoples are involved in the care of, excavation and analysis of the cultural and bodily remains of peoples they consider their ancestors,” and continues with “changes in practices under what is called indigenous archeology may range from Indigenous peoples being consulted about archaeological research and the terms of non-Native researchers, to instances of Native-designed and directed exploration of their “own heritage” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indigenous_archaeology).

In Chapter 7, Bridging the Divide, the Association of Indigenous Anthropologists (AIA), a division of the AAA, was examined. I have continued to research the AIA in hopes of finding some positive action or even statement that would address the indigenous struggles within the discipline. The Annual Section Report to the AAA for the years 2010, 2011, and 2013 were located. In 2010, the membership consisted of 233, increasing to 306 in 2011, and decreasing to 248 in 2013. The only program developed to date began in 2010; a formal mentoring program for indigenous students and junior faculty members to work with indigenous mentors. There is no section journal; members

stay in contact through a listserv site; there are no AIA awards; and an AIA sponsored panel is convened each year at the AAA annual meeting. Important questions each year on the Annual Report form submitted to the AAA include:

- What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the Section Assembly Executive Committee (SAEC)?
- What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the AAA Executive Board?
- What Initiatives does your Section have underway or planned for the coming year: membership, publication annual meeting, mentorship, other?

The answer to each of these questions for the three reports located online was either “unsure” or “not applicable.” However the annual reports did mention that there would be a “cash Bar for Indian Anthropologists and Friends at the 2011 meeting” and an “AIA mixer and reception” at the 2014 meeting.”

E. Indigenous Anthropology

In order to resolve or reconcile the ideological conflicts that keep traditional indigenous academics and mainstream anthropologists separated, what currently exists in anthropological theory and method must be, at least partially, deconstructed and reconstructed in a more balanced image. Leo Killsback presents a challenge to new indigenous scholars to

directly confront prevailing discourses that marginalize and ignore American Indian and indigenous rights to land, history, and humanity. By means of decolonizing concepts of time and world history, we can expose how mainstream research agendas continue to contribute to the exploitation and destruction of the last remaining pieces of indigenous identity. [2013:86]

In heeding these words of Killsback, I conceived a definition for Indigenous Anthropology: Indigenous Anthropology is an approach to anthropology based on

indigenous holistic philosophies embedded in traditional knowledge systems. The key components to Indigenous Anthropology are as follows:

- Indigenous Anthropology is a method of conducting research and interpreting data and material culture *from an indigenous worldview*.
- Indigenous Anthropology is a method of engaging the field of Anthropology that does not place indigenous communities or persons in the role of mere collaborator (with non-indigenous anthros) but rather as the ultimate project organizer with control over all phases of research and interpretation of data and materials based on understandings of traditional knowledge.
- Indigenous Anthropology is essentially a “power shift.”
- Indigenous Anthropology is a form of resistance to the hegemonic Euro-American worldview of Anthropology which has failed, for decades, to consider and place equitable value on indigenous understandings of knowledge systems and ways of knowing.
- Indigenous Anthropology is a form of resistance and decolonization.

Indigenous Anthropology is a response to the over-arching, long-term effects of colonization and how the colonization process has influenced and informed the discipline of Anthropology. From an indigenous perspective, the practice of mainstream Anthropology continues to contribute to the marginalization of indigenous voices and indigenous knowledge systems; essentially continuing the process of colonization. Indigenous communities and individuals continue to be negatively impacted by the field of Anthropology and the practitioners of the discipline; this is a topic which Vine Deloria (1960, 1973, 1992) clearly articulated in many of his writings and lectures. If Anthropology is to become a less traumatic location for indigenous scholars and their scholarship to reside, then it is crucial to include the voices and views of indigenous communities and individuals in the conversation between indigenous anthropologists,

non-indigenous anthropologists, and the discipline in order to acknowledge and afford respect to the concerns of those communities and of the elders.

F. Final Thoughts

At the end of an interview conducted with a tribal elder I asked, “can you even imagine this relationship between you, between your Nation, and anthropologists as being different? Is there a way that it can be different? What do you think that might look like?” The response from the elder was,

honestly, I don't care. It's not necessary; we don't need a relationship with anthropologists. We really don't. We have our own people who are trained in these things now, that are anthropologists. We have historians, we have Psychology PhDs. I have no interest in that work because it has never brought any benefit to us and so I can't imagine how suddenly, after half a millennium, there's going to be a benefit to us. Why would I even be so foolish, with all the evidence to the contrary, as to assume that suddenly this is going to change? What would it matter if it did?

[personal communication, October 23, 2014]

Those questions, and the response, have played over and over in my mind. It was the end of the interview, we were both tired, and we had covered a lot of ground, much of which was emotionally painful. Despite all of that I wish I had thought to say that those scholars need to be trained somewhere, they need to hold degrees by way of being credentialed. Isn't it important that there be institutions where they can be educated that are culturally, emotionally, and spiritually nurturing and which are safe places for Indian students to reside?

What other conclusions can be derived from the response given by this elder? Should this response be considered a warning to academic disciplines, and Anthropology specifically, that Indian Country is about to shut them out? If, as this elder reports, “we don't need a relationship” with non-Native academics or professionals, these disciplines

could be severely impacted; understandings and rich interpretations of linguistic, cultural, or historic knowledge could be lost to those outside of the community, as could medicines and ways of healing.

Continuing to consider this conversation and my “wish I had thought of that” follow-up questions, I brought the thought process a step further. In thinking about the fact that indigenous scholars need to have access to culturally appropriate education, I began to think of the Tribal Colleges in other areas of the United States. Why not on the East Coast or in New England? This would initially be an expensive endeavor, however there are now two federally recognized tribes with casinos and the Mashpee Wampanoag will soon be joining those ranks. It is not inconceivable that New England tribes which have attained some status of economic affluence join together in creating a Tribal College in New England. I broached that subject in more recent interviews and was told that this is already being talked about by members of at least one tribe. It’s an interesting and exciting concept; a New England Tribal College where indigenous philosophies would be welcome, indigenous instructors would be working, and indigenous students would feel welcome; and the potential for increasing the number of advanced degrees earned by indigenous people would be realized.

This dissertation was, by no means, conceived within a vacuum; it possesses a history of its own. My almost daily personal interactions with the Native peoples of New England, and with the elders who through their wisdom guide their communities, resulted in my being presented with a charge to create a dissertation that would illuminate the history of colonization, the struggles experienced with Anthropology and some anthropologists, and the obstacles to higher education constructed by the discipline itself.

I have received over-whelming encouragement from individual Native people and from Native communities in New England through the process of researching and writing this dissertation. I presented a paper from my prospectus at an academic conference in the Fall of 2014 in which there were a number of Native people present. Several days later I received an email from a friend who is an elder in a New England tribe. She reported to me that the following week one elder referred to the conference and my paper by stating, “I’m a Vine Deloria and a Donna Moody Indian.”

I am honored and humbled. Ktsi wlini.

APPENDIX A

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SURVEYS FOR INDIGENOUS GRADUATE

STUDENTS, INDIGENOUS PHD AND NON-INDIGENOUS PHD

ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Anthropological Survey

Research for PhD Dissertation, Donna Moody
dmoody@anthro.umass.edu

For Indigenous Graduate Students in Anthropology

1. Are you pursuing:
MA
MA/PhD
PhD
2. What is your year in the current program?
3. Do you follow traditional ways of thinking and being in the world?
Yes
No
4. Have you ever felt marginalized in your program; for example, culturally or spiritually?
Yes
No
If yes, please explain. Other side of paper may be used.
5. Are any indigenous worldviews presented in your courses of study in Anthropology?
Yes
No
If so, in which courses are they presented?
6. If the answer to #5 is yes, do you feel indigenous worldviews are imbued with equal value as are mainstream Anthropological theories?
Yes
No
If not, how are they presented differently (or unequally)? For example, as myth, folklore, or superstition?
7. Please describe any stressful factors you have experienced as an indigenous student living away from family and community. Examples could possibly include not being able to speak your language, or being separated from cultural and spiritual ceremonies. Please explain.
8. Please list any Native American organization on your campus?
9. Are there indigenous elders available to you to provide counseling in either your campus community or the surrounding community?
Yes
No

10. As an anthropology student and an indigenous person, what are some feelings that surface as you embody both identities? How might conflict between those identities manifest?
11. Do you consider Anthropology to be a tool of colonization? If so, in what way(s)?
12. What measures do you feel need to be enacted for Anthropology to be a more inclusive discipline?

Anthropological Survey For Indigenous PhD Anthropologists

Research for PhD Dissertation, Donna Moody

dmoody@anthro.umass.edu

1. Please describe some traditions you follow as an indigenous person. How do (or does) this affect your ways of thinking and being in the world?
2. Thinking back to your experience as a student in graduate school, in what ways if any, did you ever feel culturally or spiritually marginalized?
3. When teaching anthropology, or anthropological concepts, in what ways do you present indigenous worldviews? For example, do you present indigenous worldviews as carrying equal value to mainstream anthropological theories or are they presented as myth, folklore, or superstition? Please explain.
4. In writing professional papers/books for publication, have you ever avoided presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldview, or referred to traditional teachings?
Yes
No
If yes, please explain.
- 5-a. Have you ever experienced marginalization by your peers, your department, or professional organizations for presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldviews, or referring to traditional teachings? If so, please explain your answer.
- 5-b. Do you intentionally not present oral tradition, indigenous worldviews or traditional teachings out of fear of such sanctioning? Please explain your answer.
6. For traditional indigenous peoples, living away from family and community, separation from language and culture, or lack of participation in spiritual ceremonies can be a major stress factor non-indigenous Anthropologists do not normally experience. Are any of these factors a major concern or burden for you? If yes, please give a brief explanation.
7. If you teach in a college/university, is there an organization on campus that provides opportunities for social or spiritual gatherings?
Yes
No
8. Do you consider American Anthropology to be a tool of colonization? If so, in what way(s)?
Yes
No

9. Would you have interest in a restructuring of Anthropology which would result in a fully decolonized field that encourages traditionally minded Indigenous anthropologists to be viewed as full members of the discipline, equally respected, and whose work based in traditional teachings is given equal value as that of mainstream Anthropological thinkers?

Yes

No

Anthropological Survey For non-Indigenous PhD Anthropologists

Research for PhD Dissertation, Donna Moody

dmoody@anthro.umass.edu

1. When teaching anthropology, or anthropological concepts, in what ways do you present indigenous worldviews? For example, do you present indigenous worldviews as carrying equal value to mainstream anthropological theories or are they presented as myth, folklore, or superstition? Please explain.
2. What barriers to presenting indigenous thought or worldviews have you encountered? How have you over-come these barriers?
3. In writing professional papers/books for publication, have you ever avoided presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldview, or referred to traditional teachings?
Yes
No
If yes, please explain.
4. In writing professional papers/books for publication, have you ever been advised to avoid presenting oral tradition or indigenous worldview?
Yes
No
If yes, please share that experience here.
- 5-a. Have you ever experienced marginalization by your peers, your department, or professional organizations for presenting oral tradition, indigenous worldviews, or referring to traditional teachings? If so, please explain your answer.
- 5-b. Do you intentionally not present oral tradition, indigenous worldviews or traditional teachings out of fear of such sanctioning? Please explain your answer.
6. Do you consider American Anthropology to be a tool of colonization?
Yes
No
If yes, please explain (how?, in what ways?)
7. Would you have interest in a restructuring of Anthropology which would result in a fully decolonized field that encourages traditionally minded indigenous anthropologists to be viewed as full members of the discipline, equally respected, and whose work based in traditional teachings is given equal value as that of mainstream Anthropological thinkers?
Yes
No

APPENDIX B

**M.A. DEGREES CONFERRED BY DEGREE-GRANTING
INSTITUTIONS 2010-2011 AND 2011-2012**

Table 323.30. Master's degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and field of study: 2010-11 and 2011-12

Field of study	2010-11											2011-12										
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Pacific Islander	Indian/Alaska Native	Two or more races	Non-resident alien	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Pacific Islander	Indian/Alaska Native	Two or more races	Non-resident alien				
All fields, total	1,347	3,940	6,700	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247	1,247				
Agriculture and natural resources	5,773	4,166	218	222	233	229	4	30	53	843	6,390	4,699	194	255	261	253	8	37	79	865		
Architecture and related services	7,788	5,037	336	538	549	542	7	37	72	1,239	8,448	5,395	361	645	562	552	10	29	105	1,351		
Area, ethnic, cultural, gender, and group studies	1,914	1,071	213	200	115	109	6	26	34	255	1,947	1,057	181	245	119	104	15	32	60	253		
Biological and biomedical sciences	11,327	6,461	691	600	1,464	1,437	27	46	129	1,936	12,415	6,979	750	665	1,634	1,605	29	55	185	2,147		
Business	472	921	1,610	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472	472		
Communication, journalism, and related programs	8,303	5,134	868	577	365	359	4	30	104	1,213	9,005	5,444	982	641	388	374	14	35	164	1,349		
Communications technologies	502	234	46	23	27	27	0	2	0	190	491	211	35	36	19	19	0	5	2	183		
Computer and information sciences	19,446	6,501	1,417	688	1,924	1,893	33	56	125	8,733	20,917	6,947	1,648	857	1,834	1,814	20	60	209	9,362		
Construction trades	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		
Education	5,002	4,679	323	1,000	1,507	4,762	323	1,000	1,507	4,762	5,094	4,722	372	929	2,124	4,510	372	929	2,124	4,510		
Engineering	38,719	14,807	1,139	1,547	4,102	4,081	21	73	298	40,323	15,980	1,185	1,735	3,961	3,826	35	82	392	4,988			
Engineering technologies and engineering-related fields	4,515	2,190	372	220	373	372	1	29	44	1,285	4,769	2,313	372	286	328	318	10	32	51	1,387		
English language and literature/letters	9,476	7,529	462	564	347	334	13	69	148	355	9,939	7,824	598	591	343	329	14	61	185	337		
Family and consumer sciences/human sciences	2,918	2,054	412	152	77	76	1	17	22	182	3,157	2,204	440	166	106	101	5	19	38	184		
Foreign languages, literatures, and linguistics	3,727	2,114	79	592	166	143	3	21	36	719	3,827	2,133	101	637	148	137	11	9	59	760		
Health professions and related programs	75,579	52,288	8,452	4,547	5,023	5,089	134	481	545	3,443	83,893	57,582	9,684	5,105	6,500	6,255	245	464	980	3,570		
Homeland security, law enforcement, and firefighting	7,433	4,664	1,715	640	197	174	21	54	50	111	8,402	5,184	1,853	824	204	185	19	72	104	159		
Legal professions and studies	6,300	2,183	386	287	365	361	4	21	42	3,014	6,614	2,081	489	291	217	211	6	35	45	3,456		
Liberal arts and sciences, general studies, and human	3,971	2,859	378	204	187	181	6	24	56	261	3,791	2,467	412	237	151	150	1	28	81	215		
Library sciences	7,727	6,474	381	372	284	280	4	45	48	123	7,441	6,069	326	501	285	271	14	32	110	119		
Mathematics and statistics	5,843	2,634	171	220	521	517	4	16	37	2,242	6,245	2,757	190	232	501	495	6	11	62	2,492		
Mechanic and repair technologies/technicians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Military technologies and applied sciences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
Multi/interdisciplinary studies	4,748	4,574	543	495	374	356	18	39	84	637	7,745	5,305	603	561	407	395	12	42	133	694		
Parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies	6,555	4,982	631	334	174	154	18	38	73	421	7,047	5,208	749	347	166	151	15	34	116	427		
Philosophy and religious studies	1,833	1,400	121	79	54	52	2	10	30	139	2,003	1,448	191	103	91	89	2	9	31	130		
Physical sciences and science technologies	6,386	3,707	185	268	404	394	10	28	44	1,748	6,910	4,005	230	245	330	325	5	30	90	1,980		
Precision production	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
Psychology	25,051	17,066	3,425	2,255	979	928	51	151	292	883	26,834	18,063	3,726	2,378	1,146	1,084	62	139	495	887		
Public administration and social services	38,434	22,912	7,344	3,694	1,654	1,541	93	340	618	2,070	41,680	24,700	7,966	4,183	1,743	1,637	86	298	797	1,973		
Social sciences and history	21,084	13,469	1,404	1,362	1,020	997	23	108	301	3,420	21,889	13,750	1,488	1,541	1,053	1,025	28	105	402	3,550		
Social sciences	17,081	10,094	1,278	1,129	935	915	20	84	252	3,307	17,734	10,311	1,341	1,287	973	950	23	77	340	3,405		
History	4,003	3,373	126	233	85	82	3	24	49	113	4,155	3,439	147	254	80	75	5	28	62	145		
Theology and religious vocations	13,191	9,088	1,817	507	668	618	30	60	83	988	13,394	9,119	2,007	480	635	612	23	41	139	975		
Transportation and materials moving	1,390	1,103	92	85	41	39	2	8	18	41	1,702	1,340	124	114	66	61	5	9	8	41		
Visual and performing arts	16,277	10,897	880	904	879	869	10	62	183	2,472	17,331	11,397	837	1,053	911	885	26	58	299	2,776		
Other and not classified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

^Excludes "Construction trades" and "Mechanic and repair technologies/technicians," which are listed separately.

NOTE: Data are for postsecondary institutions participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. Reported racial/ethnic distributions of students by level of degree, field of degree, and sex were used to estimate race/ethnicity for students whose race/ethnicity was not reported. To facilitate trend comparisons, certain aggregations have been made of the degree fields as reported in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS): "Agriculture and natural resources" includes Agriculture, agriculture operations, and related sciences and Natural resources and conservation; and "Business" includes Business management, marketing, and related support services and Personal and culinary services.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2011 and Fall 2012, Completions component. (This table was prepared July 2013.)

APPENDIX C
DOCTORAL DEGREES CONFERRED BY DEGREE-GRANTING
INSTITUTIONS 2010-2011 AND 2011-2012

Table 324.25. Doctor's degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and field of study: 2010-11 and 2011-12

Field of study	2010-11											2011-12										
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Asian	Pacific Islander	Indian/Alaska Native	Two or more races	Non-resident alien	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Asian	Pacific Islander	Indian/Alaska Native	Two or more races	Non-resident alien		
All fields, total	9,223	3,215	2,650	348	947	1,291	1,291	1,291	1,291	1,291	9,223	3,215	2,650	348	947	1,291	1,291	1,291	1,291	1,291		
Agriculture and natural resources	1,246	610	25	48	40	39	1	7	6	510	1,333	637	42	47	41	41	0	9	4	553		
Architecture and related services	205	68	0	9	41	41	0	0	4	75	285	95	12	9	28	27	1	1	5	105		
Area, ethnic, cultural, gender, and group studies	278	141	38	16	27	26	1	7	2	47	302	134	42	29	28	28	0	8	4	57		
Biological and biomedical sciences	7,693	4,214	285	342	688	673	15	28	49	2,087	7,935	4,384	300	352	746	738	8	38	63	2,135		
Business	2,284	1,089	338	96	148	145	3	10	6	599	2,531	1,237	397	83	170	167	3	15	12	617		
Communication, journalism, and related programs	577	358	36	14	17	17	0	4	2	146	563	352	33	23	29	27	2	2	8	116		
Communications technologies	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Computer and information sciences	1,588	581	41	21	146	144	2	3	3	793	1,698	597	46	31	146	146	0	2	5	871		
Construction trades	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Education	9,623	6,172	1,743	593	326	310	16	81	43	645	9,990	6,345	1,901	478	361	346	15	72	71	542		
Engineering	8,369	2,599	155	200	644	640	4	15	36	4,720	9,722	2,775	185	198	623	621	2	11	43	4,887		
Engineering technologies and engineering-related field	56	32	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	19	134	74	9	2	5	5	0	2	2	40		
English language and literature/letters	1,344	1,044	59	54	50	50	0	5	17	115	1,427	1,085	64	71	49	47	2	11	10	137		
Family and consumer sciences/human sciences	320	189	30	7	11	11	0	1	1	81	325	191	41	3	17	14	1	1	2	70		
Foreign languages, literatures, and linguistics	1,158	625	23	84	48	47	1	1	3	374	1,231	657	17	117	60	59	1	2	12	366		
Health professions and related programs	60,153	41,177	3,480	2,875	9,933	9,799	134	340	430	1,918	62,090	41,820	3,771	2,942	139	344	550	2	1	19		
Homeland security, law enforcement, and firefighting	131	89	16	4	5	5	0	0	1	16	117	81	7	1	1	1	0	1	1	19		
Legal professions and studies	44,877	32,762	3,207	3,290	3,686	3,532	154	361	480	1,091	46,836	34,329	3,598	3,561	3,479	3,545	134	330	560	979		
Liberal arts and sciences, general studies, and humanistic studies	95	73	4	1	5	5	0	0	1	11	93	68	7	2	3	3	0	3	1	9		
Library science	50	26	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	21	60	32	0	1	6	6	0	0	1	20		
Mathematics and statistics	1,584	685	25	31	98	97	1	5	2	740	1,669	696	23	43	79	77	2	0	10	818		
Mechanic and repair technologies/technicians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Military technologies and applied sciences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Multicultural/interdisciplinary studies	660	372	71	34	38	38	0	3	9	133	727	432	67	38	34	32	2	5	6	145		
Parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies	257	163	19	5	6	6	0	1	1	62	288	187	17	8	8	7	1	0	3	65		
Philosophy and religious studies	805	550	54	25	23	23	0	1	9	143	778	541	36	27	33	33	0	2	9	130		
Physical sciences and science technologies	5,295	2,579	100	144	272	265	7	13	30	2,157	5,370	2,622	104	155	288	283	5	9	40	2,152		
Precision production	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Psychology	5,881	4,303	430	376	300	299	1	34	56	352	5,928	4,306	441	394	357	354	3	27	70	331		
Public administration and social services	851	458	145	50	45	45	0	3	6	144	884	493	140	50	44	43	1	0	9	148		
Social sciences and history	4,390	2,509	194	194	202	197	5	14	37	1,238	4,597	2,611	214	214	210	207	3	12	39	1,297		
Social sciences	3,482	1,846	148	152	175	170	5	11	25	1,125	3,628	1,918	149	172	179	170	1	10	30	1,170		
Rhetory	908	663	46	42	27	27	0	5	12	113	969	693	45	31	29	28	2	2	9	127		
Theology and religious vocations	2,374	1,417	362	74	167	165	2	1	8	345	2,447	1,468	386	65	155	149	6	7	19	347		
Transportation and materials moving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Visual and performing arts	1,644	1,047	35	61	108	107	1	7	9	379	1,728	1,077	40	63	102	99	3	2	10	434		
Other and not classified	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

\\Excludes "Construction trades" and "Mechanic and repair technologies/technicians," which are listed separately.
 NOTE: Data are for postsecondary institutions participating in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Race categories exclude persons of Hispanic ethnicity. Reported racial/ethnic distributions of students by level of degree, field of degree, and sex were used to estimate race/ethnicity for students whose race/ethnicity was not reported. To facilitate trend comparisons, certain aggregations have been made of the degree fields as reported in the IPEDS Fall survey: "Agriculture and natural resources" includes Agriculture, agriculture operations, and related sciences and Natural resources and conservation; and "Business" includes Business management, marketing, and related support services and Personal and culinary services.
 SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2011 and Fall 2012, Completions component. (This table was prepared July 2013.)

APPENDIX D

DOCTORAL DEGREE PROFILES BY FIELD OF STUDY 2012

TABLE 22. Doctorate recipients, by citizenship, race, ethnicity, and subfield of study, 2012

Subfield of study	All doctorate recipients ^a	Temporary visa holders	Total	American Indian or Alaska Native
All fields	51,008	14,767	32,927	102
Life sciences	12,045	3,188	8,240	25
Agricultural sciences and natural resources	1,256	527	674	5
Agricultural economics	88	49	38	0
Agronomy, horticulture science, plant breeding, plant pathology, plant sciences-other	292	137	140	0
Animal breeding, animal nutrition, poultry science	85	37	46	1
Animal science, other	75	27	42	2
Environmental science	186	58	116	0
Fishing and fisheries sciences/management	51	11	39	1
Food science, food technology-other	142	89	47	0
Forest biology, forest management, wood science, forestry sciences-other	99	35	62	1
Natural resources/conservation	98	33	62	0
Soil chemistry, soil sciences-other	52	26	26	0
Wildlife/range management	39	5	32	0
Agricultural sciences, aggregated	49	20	24	0
Biological, biomedical sciences	8,440	2,182	5,870	15
Anatomy, developmental biology	196	46	145	1
Bacteriology, parasitology	52	10	42	1
Biochemistry	846	282	528	3
Bioinformatics	146	52	79	0
Biomedical sciences	366	118	219	2
Biometrics and biostatistics	174	79	84	0
Biophysics (biology)	194	62	123	0
Botany, plant pathology, plant physiology	153	50	91	0
Cancer biology	382	116	256	0

Cell/cellular biology and histology	373	100	255	1
Computational biology	94	41	52	0
Ecology	417	48	359	0
Endocrinology, human/animal pathology	120	24	89	0
Entomology	120	37	79	0
Environmental toxicology, toxicology	146	36	105	1
Evolutionary biology	203	37	159	0
Genetics-human/animal, plant genetics	378	99	260	0
Immunology	455	103	342	1
Marine biology and biological oceanography	100	15	84	1
Microbiology	454	91	348	0
Molecular biology	624	188	407	1
Neurosciences and neurobiology	1,055	187	828	0
Nutrition sciences	183	44	131	1
Pharmacology, human and animal	307	80	200	0
Physiology, human and animal	256	54	192	0
Structural biology	57	19	37	0
Virology	162	42	119	1
Zoology	51	10	39	0
Biology/biomedical sciences, general	228	64	135	1
Biotechnology, biology/biomedical sciences-other	148	48	83	0
Health sciences	2,349	479	1,696	5
Environmental health, public health	418	68	311	0
Epidemiology	365	58	286	1
Health policy analysis	41	5	34	0
Health systems/services administration	49	10	33	0
Kinesiology/exercise physiology	228	46	167	0
Medicinal/pharmaceutical sciences	295	127	136	0
Nursing science	553	64	466	4
Rehabilitation/therapeutic services	81	22	54	0
Speech-language pathology and audiology	119	28	84	0
Health sciences, aggregated	200	51	125	0

Physical sciences	8,952	3,602	4,767	7
Astronomy	275	70	191	0
Astronomy	88	17	67	0
Astrophysics	176	50	116	0
Astronomy, other	11	3	8	0
Atmospheric science and meteorology	205	71	129	0
Atmospheric physics, meteorology	69	26	42	0
Atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric sciences-general, atmospheric sciences-other	136	45	87	0
Chemistry	2,418	878	1,382	1
Analytical chemistry	372	139	220	0
Inorganic chemistry	307	99	201	1
Organic chemistry	664	261	393	0
Physical chemistry	362	121	222	0
Polymer chemistry	125	65	55	0
Theoretical chemistry	78	36	40	0
Chemistry, general	292	77	130	0
Chemistry, other	218	80	121	0
Computer and information sciences	1,845	887	817	2
Computer science	1,484	772	611	1
Information science and systems	173	52	106	0
Robotics	50	16	33	0
Computer and information science, other	138	47	67	1
Geological and earth sciences	462	133	307	3
Geochemistry, mineralogy	87	18	64	0
Geology	112	29	79	1
Geomorphology, geological sciences-general, geological sciences-other	111	29	74	0

Geophysics and seismology	95	43	48	1
Paleontology, stratigraphy	57	14	42	1
Mathematics	1,702	745	839	0
Algebra	149	43	105	0
Analysis and functional analysis	133	60	72	0
Applied mathematics, computing theory	474	224	225	0
Geometry/geometric analysis	111	56	55	0
Logic, topology/foundations	89	24	64	0
Number theory	63	22	40	0
Operations research, mathematics/statistics-general, mathematics/statistics-other	318	114	139	0
Statistics (mathematics)	365	202	139	0
Ocean/marine sciences	174	62	102	0
Oceanography, chemical and physical	70	27	41	0
Ocean/marine sciences, aggregated	104	35	61	0
Physics	1,871	756	1,000	1
Acoustics, optics/phototonics	175	70	97	0
Applied physics	139	57	67	0
Atomic physics, polymer physics	135	51	75	0
Biophysics (physics)	130	55	74	0
Condensed matter/low temperature physics	388	213	171	1
Medical physics/radiological science	81	28	52	0
Nuclear physics	91	33	57	0
Particle (elementary) physics	284	117	161	0
Plasma/fusion physics	66	13	52	0
Physics, general	242	70	115	0
Physics, other	140	49	79	0
Psychology and social sciences	8,353	1,586	6,181	20
Psychology	3,614	254	3,045	7

Behavioral analysis	43	3	39	0
Clinical psychology	1,229	46	1,077	4
Cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics	198	35	156	0
Counseling	395	16	336	1
Developmental and child psychology	206	25	174	1
Educational psychology (psychology)	67	5	51	0
Experimental psychology	134	14	114	0
Family psychology	42	2	33	0
Health and medical psychology	45	5	38	0
Human development and family studies	137	13	115	0
Industrial and organizational psychology	222	26	182	0
Neuropsychology/physiological psychology	101	7	91	0
School psychology (psychology)	120	2	106	0
Social psychology	245	13	216	1
Psychology, general	229	16	152	0
Psychology, aggregated	201	26	165	0
Social sciences	4,739	1,332	3,136	13
Anthropology	546	74	442	4
Economics, econometrics	1,195	641	484	0
Natural resource/environmental economics (social sciences)	48	15	33	0
Political science and government	726	150	535	1
Sociology	631	85	510	1
Other social sciences	1,593	367	1,132	7
Area/ethnic/cultural/gender studies	115	13	90	3
Criminal justice and corrections	80	16	58	0
Criminology	86	6	79	0
Demography, gerontology, statistics, urban affairs, social sciences-general, social sciences-other	272	46	208	0
Geography	271	70	188	1
International relations/affairs	123	34	81	0
Linguistics	260	88	147	1
Public policy analysis	265	54	205	2

Note: Pages have been modified so as to eliminate all Race or Ethnicity categories other than American Indian or Alaska Native in order to comply with formatting requirements.

REFERENCES CITED

AAA Censorship of Boas

<http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/Uncensoring-Franz-Boas.cfm>. Accessed: May 21, 2015

AAA Code of Ethics

<http://blog.aaanet.org/tag/aaa-code-of-ethics/>. Accessed: February 1, 2015

<http://ethics.aaanet.org/ethics-statement-0-preamble/>. Accessed: September 17, 2015

AAA Final Report 2010 Commission on Race and Racism in Anthropology (CRRA)

<http://www.americananthro.org/ParticipateAndAdvocate/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=1910>. Accessed: January 29, 2016

AAA Home Page

<http://www.aaanet.org/about/>. Accessed: September 13, 2015

AAA Racism in the Academy

<http://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2639>.
Accessed: January 29, 2016

AAA Statement on Human Terrain System/Teams

<http://www.aaanet.org/issues/AAA-Opposes-Human-Terrain-System-Project.cfm>.
Accessed: June 9, 2015

<http://www.aaanet.org/about/Policies/statements/Human-Terrain-SystemStatement.cfm>. Accessed: June 9, 2015

AAA Statement on Torture

<http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-Torture.cfm>. Accessed:
June 17, 2015

(Aberle) Gough, Kathleen

1968 Anthropology and Imperialism. *Monthly Review* 19(11):12-27.

Aberle, Kathleen Gough

1967 Correspondence. *Anthropology News* 8(6:10-11).

Ahmed, Nafeez

2014 Earth Insight. *The Guardian*, 6/12/14.

<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-sight/2014/jun/12/pentagon-mass-civil-breakdown>. Accessed: June 13, 2014

AIA Home Page

<http://www.aaanet.org/sections/aia/about/>. Accessed: April 7, 2014

- Atalay, Sonya
2012 *Community-Based Archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Babb, Florence E.
2015 *Decolonial Feminisms and World Anthropologies: Diverse Perspectives at the AAA Annual Meeting*. *Anthropology News* 56(5):27.
- Baird, Jessie Little Doe
2012 *The Long-Dead Native Language Wopânâak is Revived*.
<http://www.yankeemagazine.com/article/features/wampanoag-language/2>.
Accessed: April 13, 2014
- Barnhardt, Ray
2002 *Domestication of the Ivory Tower: Institutional Adaptation to Cultural Distance*.
Anthropology & Education Quarterly 33(2):238-249.
- Barnhardt, Ray and Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley
2005 *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Alaska Native Ways of Knowing*.
Anthropology & Education Quarterly 36(1):8-23.
- Barsalou, Judy
2008 *Managing Memory: Looking to Transitional Justice to Address Trauma*. *In: Peacebuilding in Traumatized Societies*. Barry Hart, ed. Pp.27-47. New York: University Press of America.
- Bennett, Robert L.
1970 *Review of Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. *Wash. U. L. Q.* 218(2):218-219.
- Bhattacharjee, Yudhijit
2007 *Pentagon Asks Academics for Help in Understanding Its Enemies*. *Science, New Series* 316(5824):534-535.
- Blau, Soren
2011 *Review of Reburying the past: the effects of repatriation and reburial on scientific inquiry*. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38(2011):482-483.
- Brandt, Carol
2008 *Scientific Discourse in the Academy: A Case Study of an American Indian Undergraduate*. *Science Education* 92(5):825-847.
- Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones, with K. Tsianina Lomawaima, and Malia Villegas
2007 *The Lives and Work of Beatrice Medicine and Vine Deloria Jr.* *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 38(3):231-238.

- Brayboy, Bryan McKinley Jones
 2005a Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education. *The Urban Review* 37(5):425-446.
- 2005b Transformational Resistance and Social Justice: American Indians in Ivy League Universities. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(3):193-211.
- Browman, David L.
 2011 Spying by American Archaeologists in World War I. *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 21(2):10-17.
- Brown, Gordon G, with Eliot D. Chapple and Margaret Mead
 1949 Report to the Committee on Ethics. *Human Organization* 8:20-21.
- Brumfiel, Elizabeth
 2003 It's a Material World: History, Artifacts, and Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32:205–223.
- Buber, Martin
 1970 [1923] *I and Thou*. Walter Kaufman, trans. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Burbules, Nicholas C.
 1993 *Dialogue in Teaching: Theory and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Burton, Charline L.
 1980 *Counseling Native American High School and College Students*.
<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED190330>. Accessed: October 16, 2015
- Castañeda, Quetzil, E.
 2005 The Carnegie Mission and Vision of Science: Institutional Contexts of Maya Archaeology and Espionage. *In Histories of Anthropology Annual*, 1. Darnell Regna and Frederic W. Gleach, eds. Pp.27-60. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha
 1995 Nationalism and Modern Historiography in Bengal. *In Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Societies*. Peter R. Schmidt and Thomas C. Patterson, eds. Pp. 229-254. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Chilisa, Bagele
 2012 *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Clemmer, Richard O.

1972 Resistance and the Revitalization of Anthropologists: A New Perspective on Cultural Change and Resistance. *In Reinventing Anthropology*. Dell H. Hymes, ed. Pp.213-247. New York: Pantheon Books.

Collier, James

1905 The Theory of Colonization. *American Journal of Sociology* 11(2): 252-265.

Connolly, Paul, and Romana Khaoury

2008 Whiteness, racism and exclusion: a critical race perspective. *In Northern Ireland after the troubles: A society in transition*. Colin Coulter and Michael Murray, eds. Pp.192-212. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Davenport, Frances Gardiner, ed.

1917a The Bull Romanus Pontifex (Nicholas V.), January 8, 1455. *In European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648*. Pp. 9-26. Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Institution of Washington.

1917b Treaty between Spain and Portugal, concluded at Tordesillas, June7, 1494. Ratification. *In European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648*. Pp. 84-100. Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Decolonization

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decolonization>. Accessed: November 21, 2015

Deetz, James

1967 Invitation to Archaeology. New York: The Natural History Press.

Deloria, Philip

1999 Indians in Unexpected Places. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Deloria, Vine, Jr,

1988 [1969] Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

1997a Anthros, Indians, and Planetary Reality. *In Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. Thomas Biolsi and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds. Pp. 209-221. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

1997b Red Earth, White Lies. Golden: Fulcrum Publishing.

1999 Spirit & Reason: The Vine Deloria, Jr. Reader. Golden: Fulcrum Publishing.

2004 Philosophy and Tribal Peoples. *In American Indian Thought*. Anne Waters, ed. Pp. 3-12. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

- Deloria, Vine Jr., and Daniel R. Wildcat
2001 *Power and Place: Indian Education in America*. Golden: Fulcrum.
- Dementi-Leonard, Beth and Perry Gilmore
1999 *Language Revitalization and Identity in Social Context: A Community-Based Athabascan Language Preservation Project in Western Interior Alaska*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1):37-55.
- Deyhle, Donna and Teresa L. McCarty
2007 *Beatrice Medicine and the Anthropology of Education: Legacy and Vision for Critical Race/Critical Language Research and Praxis*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 38(3):209-220.
- Doughty, Kristin C.
2014 "Our Goal is Not to Punish but to Reconcile": Mediation in Postgenocide Rwanda. *American Anthropologist* 116(4):780-794.
- Dowdall, Courtney
2014 *Graduates 2012 Report: As Anthropology Doctorates Increase in Number and Diversity, So Do Financial and Social Support Needs for Graduates*.
<http://www.aaanet.org/resources/researchers/upload/Anthropology-Doctorates-Increase-in-Number-and-Diversity-6-4-14-edit.pdf>
<http://www.aaanet.org/resources/researchers/upload/22-doctorate-recipients-by-citizen-race-ethnic-subfield-2012.xls>. Accessed: July 18, 2015
- Du Bois, W.E.B.
2005 [1903] *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Bantam Dell Publishing.
- Dumont, Clayton W., Jr.
2011 *Contesting Scientists' Narrations of NAGPRA's Legislative History: Rule 10.11 and the Recovery of "Culturally Unidentifiable" Ancestors*. *Wičazo Ša Review*. pp.5-41
- Dussel, Enrique
2003 [1985] *Philosophy of Liberation*. Aquilina Martinez and Christine Morkovsky, trans. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Echo-Hawk, Roger C.
2000 *Ancient History in the New World: Intergrating Oral Traditions and the Archaeological Record in Deep Time*. *American Antiquity* 65(2): 267-290.
- Eisenlohr, Patrick
2004 *Language Revitalization and New Technologies: Cultures of Electronic Mediation and the Refiguring of Communities*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:21-45.

- Fabian, Ann
2010 *The Skull Collectors*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Fanon, Frantz
1967 *Black Skin, White Masks: the Experiences of a Black Man in a White World*. Charles Lam Markmann, trans. New York: Grove Press.
- Feit, Harvey A.
1993 *The Construction of Algonquian Hunting Territories*. *In History of Anthropology, Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. Richard Handler, ed., Pp.109-129. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Ferguson, T. J.
1996 *Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 1996(25:63-79).
- Fine-Dare, Kathleen
2002 *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln:University of Nebraska Press.
- Fletcher, Alice
http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/people/d_h/fletcher.htm. Accessed: May 16, 2015
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn
2003 *Ethics and Anthropology 1890-2000*. *In Profession of Anthropology*. Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, ed. Pp.1-28. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

2008 *Anthropology and ethics in America's declining imperial age*. *Anthropology Today* 24(4):18-22.
- Forbes, Jack D.
2008 [1979] *Columbus and Other Cannibals*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Forward, Jean
1986 *Ethnicity and Education: The B.I.C. as Innovative Culture Broker*. Ph. D. Dissertation. UMass Amherst.
- Foucault, Michel
2010 [1972] *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. A. M. Sheridan Smith, trans. New York: Vintage Books.
- Freire, Paulo
2012 [1970] *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Myra Bergman Ramos, trans. New York: Bloomsbury.

- Galeano, Eduardo
1997 [1971] *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. Cedric Belfrage, trans. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Gallagher, Nancy
1999 *Breeding Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Gibbs, George
http://siarchives.si.edu/collections/siris_arc_217366. Accessed: May, 21, 2015
- Gonzalez, Roberto
2007 Towards Mercenary Anthropology? *Anthropology Today* 23(3): 14-19.
- Goodby, Robert G.
2006 Working with the Abenaki in New Hampshire: The Education of an Archaeologist. *In* 2006 *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*. Kerber, J.E., ed. Pp.94-111. Lincoln:University of Nebraska Press.
- Grande, Sandy
2004 *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Lanham:Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Green, Christopher
2013 Changing Perspectives on Repatriation. *Furthering Perspectives* 6:3-11.
- Gurevitch, Z. D.
1989 The Power of Not Understanding: The Meeting of Conflicting Identities. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 25(2):161-173.
- Harrison, Faye V., ed.
2010 *Decolonizing Anthropology*. Arlington: American Anthropological Association.
- Harrison, K. David
2007 A World of Many (Fewer) Voices. *In* *When Languages Die: The Extinction of the World's Languages and the Erosion of Human Knowledge*. Pp. 3-21. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvard Indian College
<https://www.peabody.harvard.edu/node/477>. Accessed: October 16, 2015
- Heidenreich, C. Adrian
1972 The Sins of Custer Are Not Anthropological Sins: A Reply to Mark E. Randall. *American Anthropologist, New Series*, 74(4):1021-1034.

Hill, Jane

2002 "Expert Rhetorics" in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who is Listening, and What Do They Hear? *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2):119-133.

Hymes, Dell H., ed.

1972 *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Indigenous Archaeology

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indigenous_archaeology. Accessed: November 21, 2015

Ismail, S. Masturah and Courtney B. Cazden

2005 Struggles for Indigenous Education and Self-Determination: Culture, Context, and Collaboration. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(1):88-92.

Jenkins, Melvin

1999 Factors Which Influence the Success or Failure of American Indian/Native American College Students. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education* 15(2): 49-54.

Johnson, Greg

2002 Tradition, Authority and the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act*. *Religion* 32(4):355-381.

Juzda, Elise

2009 Skulls, science, and the spoils of war: craniological studies at the United States Army Medical Museum, 1868-1900. *Studies in History and Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 40:156-167.

Kaomea, Julie

2005 Indigenous Studies in the Elementary Curriculum: A Cautionary Hawaiian Example. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(1):24-42.

Kehoe, Alice Beck

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

Ketchum, Scott

2014 Enculturation and the Social Contract: The Ontology of Imperialism *Anthropology News* 55(7-8): 31.

Killsback, Leo

2013 Indigenous Perceptions of Time: Decolonizing Theory, World History, and the Fates of Human Societies. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 37(4) 85-113.

- Kingsolver, Ann E.
2013 Everyday Reconciliation. *American Anthropologist* 115(4): 663-666.
- Kohn, Margaret
2012 Colonialism. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/colonialism/>.
Accessed: February 4, 2014
- Korea
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_War. Accessed: June 15, 2015
- Kovach, Margaret
2009 *Indigenous Methodologies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude
1966 Anthropology: It's Achievements and Future. *Current Anthropology* 7(2):124-127.
- Lewis, Diane K.
1973 Anthropology and Colonialism. *Current Anthropology* 14(5):581-602.

1976 The Multi-Cultural Education Model and Minorities: Some Reservations. *Council on Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 7(4):32-37.
- Lippert, Dorothy
2013 A Native American Archaeologist. *In* *Archaeology*. Kelley, Robert L., and David Hurst Thomas. Pp. 292-293. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Lorde, Audre
2007 [1984] *Sister Outsider*. New York: Ten Speed Press.
- Mabee, Carleton
1987 Margaret Mead and Behavioral Scientists in World War II: Problems in Responsibility, Truth, and Effectiveness. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 23(1):3-13.
- Macmillan Dictionary
<http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/american/reconciliation>. Accessed: October 26, 2015
- Matsuda, Mari
1995 Critical Race Theory and Critical Legal Studies: Contestation and Coalition. *In* *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas, eds. Pp.63-79. New York: The New Press.

- McCarty, Teresa L.
2005 Indigenous Epistemologies and Education—Self-Determination, Anthropology, and Human Rights. In: *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 36(1):1-7.
- McKeown, C. Timothy
2012 *In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Struggle for National Repatriation Legislation, 1986-1990*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Mead, Margaret
1979 Anthropological Contributions to National Policies during and Immediately after World War II. In *The Uses of Anthropology*. Walter Goldschmidt, ed. Pp.145-157. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Medicine, Beatrice
1988 Native American (Indian) Women: A Call for Research. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 19:86-92.

1998 American Indians and Anthropologists: Issues of History, Empowerment, and Application. *Human Organization* 57(3)253-257.
- Memmi, Albert
1967 [1957] *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reconciliation>. Accessed: October 26, 2015
- Mignolo, Walter
2003 [1995] *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, & Colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Misztal, Barbara A.
2004 The Sacralization of Memory. *European Journal of Social Theory* 7(1): 67–84.
- Moody, Donna
N.d. *Indigenous Anthropology*. Unpublished MS, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Muskrat, Joseph C.
1969 *Review of Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. *American Bar Association Journal* 55(12):1172-1173.

Nader, Laura

1972 Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. *In* Reinventing Anthropology. Dell H. Hymes, ed. Pp. 284-311. New York: Pantheon Books.

1997 The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology. *In* The Cold War & The University. Noam Chomsky, ed. Pp.107-146. New York: The New Press.

NAGPRA

http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/FHPL_NAGPRA.pdf. Accessed: March 21, 2009

NAGPRA Review Committee Meeting Minutes, November 2001

<http://www.nps.gov/nagpra/REVIEW/meetings/RMS022.PDF>. Accessed: September 21, 2015

NAGPRA Section 10.11

<https://federalregister.gov/a/2010-5283>. Accessed: September 21, 2015

<http://www.nps.gov/nagpra/ONLINEDB/INDEX.htm>. Accessed: October 17, 2015

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

1990 Pub. L. 101-601, 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq., 104 Stat. 3048. U.S Department of the Interior Public Law 101-601-Nov. 16, 1990.

Nicholas, George P.

2012 “Making Us Uneasy”: Clarke, Wobst, and Their Critique of Archaeology Put into Practice. *Archaeologies* 8(3):209-224.

Nichols, Johanna

1990 Linguistic Diversity and the First Settlement of the New World. *Language* 66(3):475-521.

Nielsen, Michael E.

1998 An Assessment of Religious Conflicts and Their Resolutions. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37(1): 181-190.

Nystrom, Kenneth C.

2014 The Bioarchaeology of Structural Violence and Dissection in the 19th-Century United States. *American Anthropologist* 116(4): 765-779.

Officer, James E.

1970 *Review of* Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. *Arizona and the West* 12(3): 292-294.

- Omohundro, John
2008 *Thinking Like an Anthropologist*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oppenheim, Robert
2008 On the Locations of Korean War and Cold War Anthropology. *In Histories of Anthropology Annual*, 4. Darnell Regna, and Frederic W. Gleach, eds. Pp.220-259. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ortiz, Alfonso
1971 *Review of Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. *American Anthropologist* 73(4): 953-955.
- Overholtzer, Liza
2013 Archaeological Interpretation and the Rewriting of History:Deimperializing and Decolonizing the Past at Xaltocan Mexico. *American Anthropologist* 115(3):481-495.
- Paradigm
<http://www.encyclo.co.uk/meaning-of-Nauralistic%20paradigm>. Accessed: July 22, 2015
- Paredes, J. Anthony
1997 The Influences of Government Policies and Academic Theories on the Practice of Applied Anthropology in the United States: Some Personal Observations. *Human Organization* 56(4):484-489.
- Patterson, Thomas C.
1995 *Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the United States* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

1999 *The Political Economy of Archaeology in the United States*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28:155-174.
- Paynter, Robert.
2011 *Theory and Method in Archaeology*. Class Lecture. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, October 18, 2011.

2011 *Theory and Method in Archaeology*. Class Lecture. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, December 6, 2011.
- Pinkoski, Marc
2008 Julian Steward, American Anthropology, and Colonialism. *In Histories of Anthropology Annual*, 4. Darnell Regna, and Frederic W. Gleach, eds., pp. 172-204. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Price, David H.

1998a Gregory Bateson and the OSS: World War II and Bateson's Assessment of Applied Anthropology. *Human Organization* 57(4): 379-384).

1998b Cold War anthropology: Collaborators and victims of the national security state. *Global Studies in Culture and Power* 4(3-4): 389-430).

2000 Anthropologists as Spies. *The Nation* 271 (16:24-27).

2003 Cloak and Trowel. *Archaeology* 56(5): 30-35.

2005 America the Ambivalent. *Anthropology Today* 21(5:1-2).

2007a Buying a Piece of Anthropology: Part 1. *Anthropology Today* 23(3:8-13).

2007b Buying a Piece of Anthropology: Part 2. *Anthropology Today* 23(4:17-22).

2011 *Weaponizing Anthropology*. Petrolia: CounterPunch.

Purcell, Trevor W.

1998 Indigenous Knowledge and Applied Anthropology: Questions of Definition and Direction. *Human Organization* 57(3):258-272.

Randall, Mark E.

1971 *Review of Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. *American Anthropologist, New Series*, 73(4):985.

Reconciliation

http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p2s2c2a4.htm. Accessed: October 26, 2015

Reparations

<http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/history/reparations.html><http://www.infoplease.com/encyclopedia/history/reparations.html>. Accessed: October 26, 2015

<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~kmporter/reparationtimeline.htm>. Accessed: October 26, 2015

<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~kmporter/historyreparations.htm>. Access: October 26, 2015

<http://www.bikiniatoll.com/repar.html>. Accessed: December 1, 2015

Riding In, James

1992a Without Ethics and Morality: A Historical Overview of Imperial Archaeology and American Indians. *Arizona State Law Journal* 24(1):11-34.

1992b Six Pawnee Crania: Historical and Contemporary Issues Associated with the Massacre and Decapitation of Pawnee Indians in 1869. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 16(2): 101-119.

Roemer, Kenneth M.

1970 *Review of* Custer Died for your Sins: An Indian Manifesto. *American Quarterly* 22(2): 273.

Rouhana, Nadim N.

2004 Group Identity and Power Asymmetry in Reconciliation Processes: The Israeli-Palestinian Case. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 10(1):33-52.

Rouhana, Nadim N.; Korper, Susan H.

1996 Case Analysis: Dealing with the Dilemmas Posed by Power Asymmetry in Intergroup Conflict. *Negotiation Journal* 12(4):353-366.

SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics

<http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>. Accessed: September 17, 2015

SAA Repatriation Policy

<http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/RepatriationIssues/SAARepatriationPolicy/tabid/242/Default.aspx>. Accessed: September 17, 2015

SfAA Statement of Ethics and Professional Responsibilities

<http://www.sfaa.net/about/ethics/>. Accessed: June 11, 2015

Said, Edward

1989 Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry* 15(2):205-225.

Sartre, Jean Paul

1957 Introduction. *In* The Colonizer and the Colonized. Albert Memmi. Pp.xxi-xxix. Boston: Beacon Press.

Schmidt, Peter R. and Thomas C. Patterson, eds.

1995 Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Societies. Santa Fe:School of American Research Press.

Sharman, Russell Leigh

2007 Style Matters: Ethnography as Method and Genre. *Anthropology and Humanism* 32(2):117-129.

- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai
1999 Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples. New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo
1971 Decolonizing Applied Social Sciences. Human Organization 30(4): 333-357.
- Steeves, Paulette
2015a Decolonizing the Past and Present of the Western Hemisphere (The Americas). Archaeologies 11(1):42-69.

2015b Academia, Archaeology, CRM, and Tribal Historic Preservation. Archaeologies 11(1):121-141.
- Stephenson, Richard M.
1978 The CIA and The Professor: A Personal Account. The American Sociologist 13(3): 128-133.
- Suina, Joseph H.
2004 Native Language Teachers in a Struggle for Language and Cultural Survival. Anthropology & Education Quarterly 35(3):281-302.
- Tachine, Amanda R.
2015 Native PhDs Bring Fresh Approach to Academic Study.
<http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/6/native-phds-bring-fresh-approach-to-academicstudy.html>. Accessed: June 14, 2015
- Tamaki Makau-rau Accord on the Display of Human Remains and Sacred Objects
<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>. Accessed: September 17, 2015
- Theory
http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/theory?q=THEORY. Accessed: October 31, 2015

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory>. Accessed: October 31, 2015
- Thomas, David Hurst
2000 Skull Wars. New York:Basic Books.
- Transitional Justice
<https://www.ictj.org/about/transitional-justice>. Accessed: February 13, 2016

Truth Commissions

http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/truth_com.htm. Accessed: October 27, 2015

<https://www.ictj.org/gallery-items/truth-commissions>. Accessed: October 27, 2015

<http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/index.php?p=890>. Accessed: January 9, 2016

Trigger, Bruce G.

2006 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf. Accessed: July 8, 2015

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/HRC18PanelIndigenous.aspx>.

Accessed: December 5, 2015

United States Citizenship Act of 1924

<http://www.archives.gov/global-pages/larger-image.html?i=/historical-docs/doc-content/images/indian-citizenship-act-1924-1.jpg&c=/historical-docs/doc-content/images/indian-citizenship-act-1924.caption.html>. Accessed: September 21, 2015

United States and Indian Treaties

<http://www.bia.gov/FAQs/>. Accessed: October 26, 2015

University of California Berkeley and NAGPRA

<http://nagpra-ucb.blogspot.com/search/label/Letter%20to%20Provost%20Hume>.

Accessed: January 7, 2016

Vermillion Accord on Human Remains

<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>. Accessed: September 17, 2015

Vietnam

<http://history1900s.about.com/od/vietnamwar/a/vietnamwar.htm>. Accessed: June 16, 2015

<http://www.archives.gov/research/military/vietnam-war/casualty-statistics.html>.

Accessed: June 16, 2015

<http://www.statisticbrain.com/vietnam-war-statistics/>. Accessed: June 16, 2015

WAC Code of Ethics

<http://worldarch.org/code-of-ethics/>. Accessed: September 17, 2015

Walker, Deward E., Jr.

1971 *Review of We Talk, You Listen: New Tribes, New Turf*. *Human Organization* 30(3):321.

- Weiss, Elizabeth
2008 *Reburying the Past: The Effects of Repatriation and Reburial on Scientific Inquiry*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Weiss, Elizabeth
http://works.bepress.com/elizabeth_weiss/cv.pdf. Accessed: October 18, 2015
- Wilcox, Michael
2012 Saving Indigenous Peoples from Ourselves: Separate But Equal Archaeology is Not Scientific Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75(2):221-227.
- Willis, William S. Jr.
1972 Skeletons in the Anthropological Closet. *In Reinventing Anthropology*. Dell H. Hymes, ed. pp. 121-152. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Wilson, Shawn
2008 *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Pub.
- Wylie, Alison
1995 Epistemic Disunity and Political Integrity. *In Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Societies*. Peter R. Schmidt and Thomas C. Patterson, eds. Pp. 255-272. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Yelvington, Kevin A., with Alisha R. Winn, E. Christian Wells, Angela Stuesse, Nancy Romero-Daza, Lauren C. Johnson, Antoinette T. Jackson, Emelda Curry, and Heide Castañeda
2015 Diversity Dilemmas and Opportunities: Training the Next Generation of Anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 117(2): 387-392.
- Yosso, Tara
2005 Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8(1): 69-91.
- Young, Lisa C.
2013 *Review of In the Smaller Scope of Conscience: The Struggle for National Repatriation Legislation, 1986–1990*. *American Ethnologist* 40(4):803-804.

Zimmerman, Larry J.

1992 Archaeology, Reburial, and the Tactics of a Discipline's Self-Delusion.
American Indian Culture and Research Journal 16(2:37-56).

1994 Sharing Control of the Past. Archaeology 47(6):65-68.

2014 World Archaeological Congress (WAC). Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology.
Clair Smith, ed. Pp.7865-7870. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.