UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century. Edited by Caroline Phillips and Harry Allen.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7km5q88q

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 36(2)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Fawcett, William B., Jr.

Publication Date
2012-03-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

reservations to White Earth. Hole in the Day set off for Washington to insist on a new treaty, but he was assassinated.

Treuer correctly concludes that a number of individuals feared the influence of the volatile, charismatic leader who could gather several hundred warriors to support his opposition. These individuals, prominent mixed-blood and non-Indian traders and profiteers, conspired against the Chippewa leader, abetted by American officials. According to Treuer, the traders staged a *coup d'état*, and he offers ample evidence to support his thesis (184). Treuer blames these "enemies within" for the terrible aftermath of the assassination of Hole in the Day. Ojibwa leadership declined, and the mixed-blood trader cabal took over the reservation, precipitating what Melissa Meyer has documented as *The White Earth Tragedy* (1994).

The Assassination of Hole in the Day is a major contribution to American Indian history. Treuer has provided an Ojibwa perspective in terms understandable to students of American history and that will enrich Ojibwa history. Perhaps he overemphasizes the importance of Hole in the Day as the last obstacle to the terrible exploitation that impoverished the Ojibwa, but it is only a matter of degree. After the death of Hole in the Day, there were no effective leaders who had a chance to counter the robber barons of Minnesota.

Gregory Gagnon
University of North Dakota

Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century. Edited by Caroline Phillips and Harry Allen. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2011. 290 pages. $79.00 cloth; $34.95 paper.

This edited volume is an outcome of the Second Indigenous Inter-Congress of the World Archaeological Congress held in New Zealand during 2005. Most of the chapters deal with indigenous peoples and, more often than not, nonindigenous archaeologists living and working in the Pacific. Questions examined include: Who has rights to assign meanings to the past? Why don't indigenous people embrace archaeology? Why are there not more indigenous archaeologists? What difficulties do indigenous archaeologists face? How can we change the way we approach and utilize archaeology, so that indigenous archaeology avoids becoming marginalized?

Don't read this book expecting to find answers. However, you will find many useful examples of how archaeologists and indigenous peoples are increasingly working together, while realizing that the pasts we discover, interpret, and tell about need to reflect and incorporate a multitude of diverse voices in order to capture the past, present, and our futures accurately.

With the aim to promote dialogues that strengthen relationships with indigenous communities and give them greater control over cultural heritage, in the preface and first chapter the editors explore factors that further and hinder dialogues about archaeology and cultural heritage. They focus on four central topics: cooperation for heritage preservation, decolonization of archaeology by making it more inclusive, more reflective/self-critical analysis, and the increasing joint efforts. The editors' review of the changing relations between indigenous peoples and archaeology describes the rise of cultural heritage management (CHM) in New Zealand, drawing parallels to the similar development of cultural resource management (CRM) in the Americas. Involving the vast majority of archaeologists, both CHM and CRM have similar legal mandates to involve indigenous or Native peoples in what are often industry- and government-driven efforts to manage, preserve, and investigate the dwindling number of cultural and heritage sites. Successful indigenous archaeologies must be relevant: engaging more people in more inclusive decisions that incorporate material and nonmaterial aspects of sites within landscapes, and utilizing more diverse and often-conflicting sources such as oral traditions. Subsequent chapters provide numerous, nuanced examples showing how richer, more open archaeologies are not only possible, but are also necessary; I single out a few examples here.

Joe Watkins, a Choctaw, discusses why he chooses to practice archaeology, which many indigenous individuals equate with grave robbing (chapter 2). His response, in part, is that archaeology is about more than repatriation and human remains, and is too important to leave to a narrow few. He argues that whatever their background, all archaeologists should pursue stronger relationships beyond the narrow, yet powerful academic community in which they are educated, and to which many continue to turn for theoretical guidance and standards of practice. To this argument I would add that decolonizing archaeology requires dealing with the dominance of academic institutions as core producers that both fuel and are fueled by the resources and raw materials from the presumed "periphery" of CRM.

As an archaeologist who is also Maori, Margaret Rika-Heke (chapter 10) presents a very personal history to examine the question, "why do Maori not engage in archaeology in New Zealand?" Since her childhood, other Maori have treated her fascination as odd, even though Maori are responsible for most of the heritage places recognized within New Zealand. As Bridget Mosley also writes (chapter 3), Rika-Heke describes how significant sites and objects are spiritually unclean, dangerous, and often associated with prohibitions. Maori reluctance to engage in archaeology arises in part from concerns about spiritual threats to their well-being if sites and objects are not dealt with properly. Moreover, intertribal politics of the recent past still shape decisions about the treatment of heritage resources, explaining why many Maori are uncomfortable dealing with similar resources outside of their personal tribal territory. Hence, while Maori engagement and participation in archaeology remains low, this should not be interpreted as disinterest in their heritage.

In chapter 12, George P. Nicholas proposes that we seek to end indigenous archaeology; that is, archaeologists and others must make indigenous archaeology part of the mainstream to avoid its marginalization. To make this happen, archaeologists must accept that indigenous-inspired methods, theories, and interpretations will not only differ, but are unlikely to agree with earlier, narrower, and more strictly scientific views. However, the resulting fully collaborative archaeology will be more representative, relevant, and responsible, thus creating a more open and even playing field for important ideas about which dialogues should continue.

Every chapter challenged my approach to my own work. Throughout my reading, I saw connections and occasionally gained insight into ways I might alter and enhance my work as an archaeologist collaborating with the Western Shoshone in northeastern Nevada in our efforts to recognize, investigate, and preserve important aspects of our shared and distinct cultural heritage.

William B. Fawcett Jr.
Bureau of Land Management (Elko, NV)

The Brothertown Nation of Indians: Land Ownership and Nationalism in Early America, 1740–1840. By Brad D. E. Jarvis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010. 358 pages. $45.00 cloth.

The name *Brothertown Nation of Indians* is not as familiar to most readers as other names of New England's Algonquian Indian nations. In fact, the Brothertowns were an amalgamation of members of the Pequots, Mohegans, Narragansetts, Tunxis, and Niantics of Connecticut and the Montauketts of neighboring Long Island, New York. Author Brad D. E. Jarvis writes that, beginning in the late 1600s and throughout the 1700s, white settlers who encroached on the villages and farmland of the Brothertowns pressured these Indian nations of southeastern New England. As hunting grounds also were gone, the Native Americans found it hard to survive. After many years of difficulties, families of these ancient, neighboring groups decided to join forces, sell their lands, and move West as one united nation to a remote location. The author has set himself the formidable task of unearthing and explaining the