
INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: Well, good morning everybody. Let's turn to our content for this week. Before I do I want to mention I haven't looked at but seen all the position papers coming in I will get to them this week was my intents. Might take me to the weekend but I will reply to you as promptly as I can. If you have any questions don't hesitate to ask. I've seen a few requests for concession and I have a number of standing requests for concession which I always honour. I'll be in touch if I need to. I haven't taken a closer look at all of them yet. Been a busy couple of days.

But don't hesitate to reach out and if you have any questions I'm happy to walk you through my thinking.

Of course on this assignment don't forget this is step 1 of 4. Goal here is to help you understand more I think I don't want to be patronising but to understand more how academic products and activities are conducted to take us in a step-wise fashion through an endeavour to end up with an essay and you've all written essays you've all taken the task of jumping in I could have done that but I thought it would be helpful for us to think of it in this four steps partly to invite you to follow along what many my colleague and I think I engage in as we embark upon a project of scholarship. I typically don't know the answer when I start. Where do we start we start with what we did brainstorming scoping kind of

endeavour. And at the end of this step we have some ideas perhaps some potential what we call hypotheses or explanations that you want to explore, certainly a subject likely I Lou say to most of you great idea let's find a way to narrow it down a little bit because many of us I think appropriately so think broadly towards the large implications of our work and our discipline in anthropology invites that very conversation. At the same time the task of doing something within the time frame and space that we have as you know from our conversation about ethnography and forms of anthropological thinking benefits of from a focus detailed space typically we'll do more with a deeper dive into less than if we tend to a range of ideas in official way. I will be saying something along those lines to many of you. Not all. The next step will be to do that dive take a look at literature look at others have said scholarship is a cumulative task. Even when it revolutionizes itself and engages in critique. I don't expect any of you to be experts in the subjects that you've identified. The next task will be to explore those subjects based on the other scholars to understand their arguments and ideas, arguments in the sense -- academic sense. Not disagreement. Sometimes there are disagreements. And to understand more in more detail what the nature of those arguments are and then sort of build from them. That is the task we don't want to reinvent work that

has already been done we don't want to we want to give credit to people who come these ideas and be cumulative building our work on the scholarship of others.

It's a conversation I have in my mind with the other people who have done this kind of work and do they exist. A lot of scholarship out there and typically any idea I have had has been explored before. I'm curious to know when I search these projects who has said what, I don't want to lose their voice. Mine will be lesser informed so I go back and forth with the published literature as a corpus and ask who has done what, who might guide me in this endeavour, where do I go. I look for overviews, lit reviews of subjects. I'm attentive to key authors have had a considerable influence I think about the past but focused on the present. Ideas do tend to build. I'm working with sources that are decades old I will have missed scholarship... You have the benefit of modern digital systems to do so. Within a few moments you can find an enormous amount of literature. You find too much. The challenge will be to narrow it down. Find out set of sources that meaningful from which you can do an interesting study. I will assure you that if we had those 10, 20, whatever it is sources and you have now you would do a great job on your paper. So the next task is to find that set. Which sources will help you and that is a conversation with the subject because who says what will be influenced by

what the subject will be.

So the endeavour that you embark upon will be influenced by what people said about things. You may change your tack a little bit to benefit from the scholarship that has already been done. You may look at subjects scholars have not looked at very closely. You may find there's a facets of the subject that you have identified that are well developed and that might be a good platform upon which to build. Our next task is to do that, really to do a lit review. Annotations of the sources that you find meaningful. Don't need a lot of analysis other than to understand what people are saying much the third piece then is to do that analysis, ask what makes sense what conclusions can I draw to do the intellectual thinking at the heart of any academic project hopefully by then you've scoped it out, done your research on relevant sources continuing that into your third paper you can then tell me about what you are thinking. What the scholars you've encountered are arguing and how you are evaluating them.

The final paper, fourth one ties it all together and presents the complete coherent space with a attention to a broader view how it fits issue fit noose a broader landscape what its implications might be and refinement of the analysis that you are conducting where you might present a thesis. This is what I think is going on. Theses don't have to be

complicated. They can be profound by being modest. We'll get to those steps down the road. I am happy to support you as you do sew some of you have reached out to me and have numerous conversations with me on this assign. I encourage you to do that send me a note. Happy to chat via Zoom or usually easier by Zoom, sometimes in person. And I can assist you and your thinking and I think I can be of support. So I encourage you to reach out. It's not inappropriate. It's not cheating to ask a professor to help you, I'm happy to do so. I won't write your paper for you, but I'm interested in what you are doing and happy to provide you with my thoughts not only in a general academic sense how you might improve this work obviously I am the person marking it with sometimes help to know ideas that I have. Not that you should write somethings that are simply pandering to me. I will be reading them down the road. I am happy to be a in a conversation with you on all of your papers.

Let's move on to the subject of this week and as you know thus far we've been considering archaeology from a range of points of view and last week we look at the positionality of what I would frame as orthodox archaeology and it's sources some of its arguments and we identified some of its limitations. Prior to that we looked at a number of critical positionalities that reviewed archaeology and this week we are going to attend to one that informs much of what we do in

this class and in contemporary archaeology and that is Indigenous points of view. We've encountered a number of them. In Canada as you know much of the archaeology content of the discipline focuses on Indigenous history and typically not exclusively but largely done by non-Indigenous peoples such as myself. That creates for us this tension but also a space of conversation, a richness and evaluation, and we've referenced it in the past. This week I want us to spend a bit more time focusing on what that might say about the archaeological project. We've looked at it in part through the lens of evaluation I would like us to think what would this endeavour look like if we attend to the voices that come to us from Indigenous communities and Indigenous archaeologies. A positive vision if you will. Not just an evaluation of the shortcomings of the task. But rather a sense of its possibilities and what those might look like and how we can think of archaeology in a context of that this underwrites what a lot of archaeology is today we are speaking of it but I would like to give it more attention. And take a look at some of the readings that I think are relevant. Last class we talked about revolutions in archaeology and I suggested that some of the greatest revolutionary interpretations of archaeology come from new forms of data which I think is true. New ideas come from evidence. And that suggests to me that archeological

thinking is still in a very early developmental phase. They spend a lot of time thinking about theory. We encountered an opaque example last week... a lot of content. Most of our revolutions come from new evidence suggesting that our interpretive frame is relatively modest in its orthodox. I disagree inappropriately I think when it was suggested that revolution really is empathy in impositionality. I think that is true. I was thinking more in terms of data, but the revolution of archeological thinking comes from this attention that we bring to anthropology in a contemporary space from the critiques that emerge through positional frames. Archaeology as I mentioned include Indigenous points of view maybe because we are in a settler colonial context, but includes other domains. Issues of race, much of anthropological theory and social science comes to us through a lens of racism and also through a lens of feminism. Contemporary archeological theory is informed by the long and detailed history of scholars arguing that the orthodox endeavour of anthropology the traditional endeavour is influenced in undeclared ways by some of the assumptions that the people doing the research are bringing into the conversation. Often without being fully aware of that. So our contemporary space is one that is informed dramatically and richly so by positionalities. And that is with we sit today asking as we might how do we build on this. How do we

inform ourselves so that the work we do now and in the future will not fall into those same spaces of inadequacy. Spaces of limitation. We will not replicate our own assumptions on to the past. One way we can do that is by some of what scholars have encountered suggest, diversifying the discipline so that multiple positionalities are part of the conversation. I think that is a very rich and important way to do it. We can think in abstract way, what are the -- how does the discipline, how does its thought process, how do its toolkits change if we are attentive to the insights that come from those positions. This is, as I say, an analysis that you can take in all of the dimensions we spoke of, issues of race, issues of feminism and thus issues of gender and sexual orientation intercede with that one, and importantly as we are talking today issues of Indigenous focus on the archaeological task.

So Indigenous archaeology then is not just this critique but it is a positive vision forward and that is what I want to think about today. What do we gain from this insight. Not just an understanding of limitation but a positive vision forward.

So we know that it is archaeology by Indigenous peoples that this brings that important role into our conversation. And we have a couple of frames that we encounter partnership with sometimes for, by or with.

Different conjunctions that are used. I remember a conversation that I had with my colleague Leona Sparrow from Musqueam, the UBC's liaison to Musqueam, significant scholar graduate of anthropology, also a lawyer and honorary doctorate at UBC, accomplished individual. At one point I misspoke talking about archaeology in service she said, Andrew, we don't need your support or service. That is not what we are looking for we don't need you to do any of that stuff. What we need is somebody to help us and work in partnership. That is the space we are looking for.

I think there are different frames. I notice that communities around the province and indeed the country sometimes employ archaeologists who are not from their communities. Sometimes they hire archaeologists who are from other Indigenous communities and sometimes they train their own community members to be archaeologists and some communities argue that they aren't even as they do it. There are different versions of this space we want to be respectful all provide us with particular forms of insight. I am interested in conversation with my colleague Charles Menzies. He conducts archaeology. I've been with him while we do it together, but he is quite clear it's not archaeology. The kind of archaeology that he and the community that he is a member of they do archeological things but they are not archaeologist. I find that very rich. I'm still unravelling

what that means for him and for myself and for the discipline but I think it's an important space to build from as we proceed.

So there's this notion then of a reciprocal capacity building, notion that archaeology provides certain forms of insight but benefits from others this is the space I would like us to think about. Not just about teaching or sharing archeological vision with communities but gaining insight into what archaeology is and can be from the scholarship of Indigenous communities. Cognizant of the barriers and marginalizations that are implicit in the discipline and in the institutions that operate it such as the university. And I think it's expansion of archaeology in new and exciting scholarly directions. I want to remind you of this.

Unfortunate paper that I wrote which some of you have read in greater detail than others I apologize for those of you like to slog through it but my point here that is it it's already ongoing double standard within archaeology. When we look at the positionality of archaeology versus their relationship, the people who they define as the subject of their inquiry we find a range of forms including this one. Many times when the archaeology is studying archaeologists are studying the people they find they are a part of a community they identify, they are a part of historical or classical, these are non-Indigenous spaces frequently. We find a very rich

form of archaeology, an archaeology that occupies and broadens occupies different space and broadens the conversation from what many of us encounter as archaeology. Which is typically this more orthodox space. I think this is most common when the archaeologist are not of the community they identified as their subject of inquiry. Specifically across divisions of power and for our case colonialism. When you move outside of that space an extraordinary richness emerges it seems to be sanctioned in the archeological orthodoxies, I would suggest it's a positional shift. When people study their own ancestors they are far more willing to grant latitude to the subject to explore issues that we might think of as being beyond the boundaries of our inquiry. Emotion, religious, spirituality, abstract belief, agency. All the things that many archaeologists struggle to attend to we see richly in historical and classical archaeology.

When I go to conferences I typically go to these two sessions because these guys fight all the time. They tell fantastic stories. I love going to see the classical and historical archaeologist because they tell archaeology that I aspire to an archaeology that is rich in historical content, in anthropological content.

What we see then here, this is the world that I occupy, tends to be naive in the case that I recognize the importance of these relationships but I'm distant from it

what we see here the full form. Sonia Atalay and other Indigenous scholars say this is the big tent under which most forms of archaeology can be found. I agree with that. My point of this paper was we don't have to look very far to find the permission and insight about how to do archaeology that responds to Indigenous critiques envisions of archaeology. It's already being done. It's just not called Indigenous archaeology. It's called historical or classical archaeology. We don't have to ask can it be done. We simply have to ask why is it not being permitted or being sanctioned in certain quarters and encouraged in others. That is a division of power.

We talked a little bit about this last class. I want to point out, talked about narrative and had fun with games and movies, these are popularization of the narrative that we see in evolutionary archaeology that we see what I refer to as orthodox archaeology in which nature is the opponent of and the driver of human history and the Jared Diamond has made a cottage industry out of what I would think of as a fetish much self-inflicted collapse of people constantly sabotaging themselves in the context of hostile lands. That is the story. Again we see this in video games more often than not. And I think this is a constructive vision of human nature, self-fulfilling perhaps but I don't think it's the reality of human nature. I think it's contemporary western

imagination of human nature that a lot of people see as truth and never able to subject to the kind of hypothesis testing or critique that we suggested last week was it the engine of a scientific inquiry. Where does that ability to do so come from. Positionalities beyond the cultural space within which this idea is assumed.

Anybody read Jared Diamond? I've read a few of them. Thoughts? Quite dramatic they tell exciting stories. But he is being criticized because he doesn't have evidence. He overstates the very qualities of the stories in archaeology he portrays but disagree with what the evidence would suggest in order to tell his tale. In order to emphasize size this narrative suggesting it's circular. There is a word for that, etiology which we are assuming the conditions of our conclusions without testing.

This is my navigation through voices that I have encountered. On Thursday we'll encounter some Indigenous scholars, we'll read their work and think about what their guidance is to add to those that we've already thought of. This is a bit a compilation that I have amassed. I'd like to suggest it's a good point of departure. Invite you to think it through. One of the first principles of the insight of Indigenous archaeology is that it's evidence based. And you might say isn't all archaeology evidence based. I would suggest no. It's not. It's often poorly sampled and in the

spaces between what we discard of past and what we say about the past is a great deal of opportunity for the projection of assumption. And undeclared ideas and so it's not as evidence based. There are some fantastic examples of that. This one is a commonly referred to one. Not too far from here. Perhaps you've encountered it the ancient one. Kennewick man. Discovered, ancestor was discovered in the 1990s in Washington State within an eroding space on federal land. And the dates came back over 9,000 years old. A fantastic discovery. The number of actual sites dating to before this time period are quite rare and to find actual ancestral remains within those spaces is even more rare. So a dramatic discovery. One that was found by accident as many of these are. It was because this was on federal land on Army Corp. Of Engineers and they went in and followed the protocols of the American law and US they have a federal law that applies to federal lands called *NAGPRA, Native American Grace Protection and Repatriation Act* and this allocates the be responsibility for any heritage data within federal land to the local nations which in the US refer to as tribes. There were five tribes part of an alliance within which this find was discovered. The Army Corp. of Engineers decided to give it to them and it was their jurisdiction to decide how to proceed to curate and care for the ancestor and to make decisions on the discovery.

The age the discovery caused a lot of interest among archaeologists and the discoverer brought in by the Army Corp. of Engineers first archaeologist on a scene was a man named James Chatters who was not an archaeologist, fancied that the individual discovered looked European. And that if you know anything about this example you know this story. In fact I still encounter this story whenever people find out I am a archaeologist people tell me wasn't there some European guy found in Washington State that showed that Europeans were here 10,000 years ago. The answer is no. Some fellow was found for sure but that he was European is not the case. However, in the early years of this conversation it became one that had considerable currency and it had currency because of this. Jim Chatters had a facial reconstructionist made of the ancient one and I gave the facial reconstructionist artist this picture. Our friend Patrick Stewart. And the similarity is hard to miss. Chatters was arguing that the shape of the skull had qualities because it was elongated that we finds more commonly associated with European ancestry but it's not absent from Indigenous North America so this is not a very evidence based argument. He skewed the results by picking the most European person in American consciousness Patrick Stewart and having a picture made of him and this went around the news feeds like lightning. It was all over the press. Everywhere it went.

Europeans discovered in North America before Indigenous peoples.

The evidence did not exist for that claim. That still resonates and years later biological anthropologist wrote a paper refuting the claim. It got very little mention. Didn't get the kind of press that the first claim had.

The second part of this story then is that there was a legal case. Archeologists and anthropologists from the Smithsonian Institute backed by powerful legal firms and funders took the five tribes to court arguing that even though *NAGPRA* applied, this individual was not their ancestor. And after many years they won. The ancient one was removed from the hands of the five tribes taken to Washington. I believe it was taken to Seattle where the researchers... Held in the Burke Museum for a very long time conducted a series of analyses and they wrote a book about it. And they argued and won in court that this individual was not the ancestor of contemporary First Nations, tribes in America and scholars such as they who were not Indigenous had a legal right to study this person independent of the *NAGPRA* and the associations and the rights this that piece of legislation provided. They would look... Kennewick man scientific investigations of ancient.

After this book came out and Doug Owsley was director

of Smithsonian at the time. After this book came out a group of Norwegian -- Danish scholars having access to the DNA of the ancient one demonstrated that in fact he was the ancestor of contemporary Indigenous peoples. Showing that this entire endeavour was built on absent of evidence and really a misunderstanding of the very evidence that was available. Many voices pointed out that this clearly was an Indigenous ancestor and they were all ignored in order to assert a jurisdiction over that person by academic scholarship and to make claim that is were unfounded. Evidence of biochemistry indicated that the ancient ones closest to the tribes upon which territories he was discovered which is the most obvious interpretation.

My point here is is that archaeologist typically do not do a very good job not always around being evidence based and the claim that Indigenous archaeologists ask of us is to be more attentive to this issue. Be more thoughtful. Evidence based analysis would long ago have concluded that the ancient one was the ancestor. You don't have to travel very far to learn that. It was a series of non-evidence based arguments that led to this dramatic law case and this traumatic history of dislocation.

So this is a common principle building arguments from evidence and my point to you is that arguments from evidence sometimes elude archaeologists, partly because they are ...

And partly because we have ambition, that is often intruded upon by our expectations and that brings us to an argument which we'll talk about on Thursday epistemic colonialism. Foundational form of knowledge.

I have met Jim Chatters who famously had that sculpture, and I saw him do a paper in which he apologized for it slightly but did a lot of work to try to save face that he hadn't made a mistake he was following the evidence. Most of us in the audience were I don't think you were following the evidence. You saw opportunity to make career step and get a lot of publicity. He did. He was interviewed all around the world and to assert a kind of jurisdiction over something that was not yours and I think that critique still has significance.

So evidence based is a very simple principle and when we look across the landscape of archaeology we don't see it in its most formal sense very often and we often see places where it is not applied to the convenience and benefit of the archaeologist. So a very key point I think. We can take a look at some of these principles on Thursday because we'll encounter Schneider and Katherine Hazel on this issue. You can see they have a number of points around the notion of where this colonialism idea exists in both the framing of narratives which we talked about a little bit but also in the ability to observe evidence which is really the foundation of

this. So very fundamental level of scholarship we have potential to see the vulnerabilities to colonialism.

Schneider I think gives us some considerable insight into how that is made manifest and where we might want to attend to. That is my first point Indigenous archeology guides us to be more evidence base.

If I may make a personal observation, I started working in Lax Kw'alaams community in 1994, so a long time ago. And I had some ideas about history and theory but since then now that I'm not a young scholar any longer I realized that my most useful role is description. I compile landscapes of inventory of material gesture, I collect things like radio carbon dates and do the mathematics show what the patterns of time and space are. I don't interpret. For two reasons I don't have the conceit or I've lost the conceit that I can say anything sensible about these data other than some basic material and behavioural things, and secondly I work in a landscape where the Tsimshian communities of Lax Kw'alaams and others have a rich archaeology of history of their own. I don't need to do the heavy lifting on history. It's all been accurately reported through the mechanisms of oral tradition. So I simply need to review the archeological landscape in the context of that history.

You might say how do you know. We have conducted formal tests and every time we find an example in the oral

records that speaks to a pattern on the material landscape the pattern is always there. It never fails. It is consistent. The records of oral tradition are historically correct which of course is what my colleagues and Lax Kw'alaams and Metlakatla tell me, and I believe them.

The second is a notion of respect around sovereignty around rights and the implications of the data that archaeologists collect, and there's a considerable volume of data and increasingly those data are being used in areas of the evaluation and assertion of legal rights. The ownership of data is a right around one's own data. It's a right defined by ethical principles in our institution and has been expanded to include heritage data of Indigenous communities through the governments passing of legislation in 2019 called the *Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People's Act* which is acts of all BC policies and legislation adhere to the United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples. These include statements about the sovereignty that nations have over their territories, their histories, and their knowledge. And this must be respected. Of course what is it that outside archaeologists do, they enter into the territories, study the history. They often study the people. And sometimes historically quite frequently they did not do so with any kind of cognizance. If you want to know more I point you towards the First Nations information governance

centre. It's a First Nation perspective Indigenous points of view that focuses on First Nations in Canada thus outside of influence by Inuit and Métis points of view, but they often guidance called OCAP on how to attend to sovereignty of scholarship in the context of research. You can take a course. It takes about six hours. Not a huge time commitment. I find it very meaningful a new version came out last summer so we all took it again. I thought it was quite expanded the argument and informed us even further. We require our staff at the laboratory of archaeology I don't think we require them that would be I don't think we can do that but we encourage them and they have all take be this course and if you are interested you can go to the website and learn more about it. OCAP stands for these four principles. There are other acronyms and ways of framing these principles. But data should be is owned by the people about who it regards. And of course within Indigenous communities not only about the individuals but the territories they came from. And we assert this rule for Canada probably for British Columbia, so we assert it in certain jurisdictions but it is absent often around Indigenous territory. We -- communities have control over the information and the nature of research. The research that is conducted. So that is where we get back to the notion of partnership or researched by you'll hear from the

scholars we encountered today that the research they embarked upon is different often from the research that ... Scholars might bring to them and say hey here is the thing we want to do their insight is often different.

In 2018 we got funding to work with four nations across Canada and the preps was we would ask them not tell them what archaeology might do for memory but ask them what kind of research questions they have. We got four questions, none of them we could do very well. The kind of research objectives the communities had were outside of the capacity of university-based scholarship which was cool. It forced us to think beyond our boundaries to not simply be content with the kind of data we were comfortable collecting and the kind of questions we were comfortable asking and asking but challenged us to explore the subject in the past in new ways.

One example this came from communities up north Metlakatla asked us is there any way to take the fish remains found in the villages across the territory and trace the fish to their natal streams. So most of the fish in these histories are what are called... they live in salt water for mature lives but migrate up the freshwater rivers to spawn, the great salmon runs which I'm sure you are familiar with they always go back to the same river that they were born, which is remarkable. They do it by a sense of chemical sense of smell. They can find their home river and reproduce in

the river which they were or place they were born. And so we know this relationship exists. Communities said can you sake archeological examples of fish bones and pin them back so we can build a better map of resource management they know where their territories are they know who fishes where but they need to convince the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and other government state bodies that they have those jurisdictions so they didn't need us to tell them their history they needed us to provide them with a defence against the encroachment on fishing rights. The answer was we couldn't do it. We got about a third of the way we have some pathways that might help us to including as you are probably thinking a DNA model. There is a possibility of a DNA model. There is one way to do it geochemically. Within the fish they have an inner ear bone that is mineralized. It's not a bone, it's a mineral growth and it helps them hear pressure detect. It's called an otolith. It grows throughout their biological lives in a spiral. If you take that spiral of stone material mineralization and go back to through the spiral to a beginning you get a geochemical signature of the environment the fish grew up in. Some chemistry across the landscape involving trace elements like strontium vary so dramatically you can find correlations. You may have heard of this in terms of the evaluations in human movements through Aztec or Roman cemeteries. People do this study on

teeth and other mineral deposits in human bodies that are deposited in childhood. They can begin to tell the biography of where these individuals grew up again mapping on to trace element patterns. So we think yes, you could do that if you had the otoliths. Sadly we don't have very many. We have millions of examples of fish bones but very, very few examples of otoliths. Either they don't get into the ontological record or archaeology accessibility standards don't recognize them for what they are and they are not collected or missed. So we have a few possibilities but the questions that communities have asked us recently are often beyond the ability of archaeologists and their geochemical and biochemical colleagues to fully answer and that indicates I think an sovereignty assertion over research.

If we go the other way, if researcher brings scholarship to a community it's typically around areas that they can answer questions. Rarely challenge themselves. They sometimes show up with grant money, say hey can I work in your territory. We work on a different model bringing into the conversation what the next grant will be.

I am in the middle of conversations with to communities, two others we are thinking what our next grant will look like we are having conversations about what we should do together. That will inform how we apply for funding and guide the process and activities of our

endeavour. So control over information research. Access once the research a compiled access it them. This is actually remarkably poorly done in British Columbia. Most of the access to data is controlled by the government. Many of it never even leaves the offices of the archaeologists doing the work. It's really quite an imperfect endeavour. And there's very little support for communities to do this work. Some communities have rich heritage offices with staff to compile the data this their territory but others don't. And I was yesterday at a community who had encountered archeological sites they called me in to take a look they found a part of a site in a backhoe they needed to learn more about it part of the challenge archaeologists been on this territory before they don't access to those reports so building that inventory of information providing control but access to it is challenging even today. Even though it's a key principle. Possession, they lack the physical control over those data sets which belong to companies that have done the work, academics that have worked with them and compiled the data and governments which are busy creating inventories and archives of those results. Truly OCAP framed reality which we can aspire to and I think most of us would recognize as being valuable for our province and society and communities involved. Does not exist. It's a long way away.

So the reasons we know these are all based on the

projection of settler colonialism on to the landscape to remove people from the territory to disenfranchise them from their rights spoken of many of these ideas before we don't go into this too much other than to recognize why these standards of sovereignty are ignored. They are ignored for a purpose. Not just an oversight not just a mistake much not just out of habit. They exist because of a programmatic intent to disenfranchise communities from their rights and their lands. And it's part of an erasure of that history. Not just create that disenfranchisement but it erases that ...

This is part of an ongoing endeavour that we face in Canada around which archaeology is part of that project. We've spoken of this so I don't dwell on this slide.

It exists in this frame. This is what is it known as aboriginal rights. That is an older piece of language. Comes in this context from the Canada's constitution which was a document repatriated in 1880 and frames Indigenous rights within... laws as aboriginals right. Whenever you hear the word aboriginal right it's a Canadian legal frame building from section 35 of Canada's constitution which recognizes the rights of aboriginal peoples and what those rights are is part of ongoing legal debate.

In British Columbia which has been forefront of this conversation we see the definition of aboriginal rights

Indigenous rights defined in Canadian law with these three principles over a series which I will not belabour of you with of legal cases, current standing although it's a dynamically legal process is that nations must demonstrate occupancy exclusivity and continuity in order for Canadian courts to recognize the rights. Rights to resources fishing rights, and lands title resources. It's a valuable components of the contemporary landscape and of course territory including aquatic territories not just land is a key definition, a key form of right. Occupancy then, have to show the people lived on the lands. Seems to make sense but we don't require that of other people in Canada. You can own and not live on it you can have title to a piece of property and never go there. We have a legal framework that accommodates ownership in the absence of occupancy.

So too did many Indigenous communities. This entire conversation misses the prospect that Indigenous communities had their own legal systems. I don't know all of them. I am a fond reader of John Burrow's work on Indigenous law, book called Canada's Indigenous constitution. Recommended reading anybody interested in legal rights of Indigenous peoples in Canada. Arguing that Indigenous communities had laws. Tsimshian landscapes and Tsimshianic law anticipate all of the rights that Canadian law presents Including the right to own things that you don't live on. It's a standard form of

right but Canadian aboriginal law does not recognize it other than for non-Indigenous peoples, so clearly a double standard an oversight of sovereignty.

Exclusivity, evidence that the people claiming the right had control over it. They asserted control to the exclusion of others. Again, if you -- I've written an article years ago. This strikes me as a mid 20th century kind of early anthropological model of human. Very essentialized view of what culture is. One that we no longer subscribe to. People will visit you, you will have guests, sometimes they will stay for long periods of time, there's nothing wrong with that but if they do it appears to undermine claims of sovereignty and rights according to Canadian law. This is one of the ongoing debates. Sometimes rights of access to people's territory are intergenerational. Renegotiated every year. Forms of rights we don't have in Canadian law. Forms of privileged access based on relational spaces. These are encoded in Tsimshianic law. Don't exist in Canadian law. Not only does the idea of non-owners being on the lands complicate that issue, but legal rights of non-owners to be on the land is an extension of a legal principle that exists in certain Indigenous systems but not in Canadian law. Then the third piece is continuity. We have to show the people lived there, these rights existed or these occupancy and exclusivity existed from before through colonialism and then

after. And in BC the magical date is 1846. Because that is the date of the signing of the Oregon treaty between the British Crown and United States that defines the boundary of what would become British Columbia. A date largely meaningless in Indigenous history. That is the one the court requires that we focus on to demonstrate the right existed before, and demonstrate it existed through.

But of course history is dynamic, not static, it's complex. Everybody has complicated history so to ask us to ask Indigenous communities to freeze dry their past in these moments of time and that that will then anchor all rights for centuries ahead is a threshold very few people are required to meet. So notions of sovereignty and all of these are demonstrable people have tried through archaeology. This is the main interface by which archaeology and Indigenous rights intersect in Canadian law because archaeologists are interested in things like who lived there and who else -- who their neighbours are and how long they have done it for. Those are the main narratives of archaeology so you can see how archaeology is brought in and consumed by this conversation.

We can take a look at in the weeks ahead I wanted to point out here that an Indigenous archaeology asks us to be thoughtful about the complexities of this task, the sovereignty of information and rights around research as well

as the key principle of sovereignty and the role in this case archeological data in the conversations that precede that and you may disagree with these principles but they are the law. In Canada. I was involved in a court case that resolved in -- didn't resolve. It went to the BC Supreme Court in 2022 was called resilience versus Canada and I was an expert witness in that. Volunteered to provide contents. I wrote quite a lot and did a fantastic series of analyses, really satisfying endeavour and in this ruling 2022 BC Supreme Court the judge recognized that Tsimshianic law existed and that is spiritual landscape existed and included Indigenous law. We thought were important steps forward so the law is changing. Unfortunately the case law was rejected at the court of appeal which is the next highest body in BC so the supreme court of BC sounds like it's the top court but it's not, it's just the middle court. Then the higher court is court of appeal and then the next court is the Canadian supreme court. And that is probably where we are going. The reason we are going there you wouldn't be surprised is because the territory in question is acute around the issue of pipelines. Pipelines seem to bring these subjects into sharp focus for communities. So sovereignty on all it's dimensions. An important components of Indigenous archaeology.

The scholarship, Indigenous archaeology asks us to consider a broader understanding of scholarship. I made

reference to this briefly at the beginning slide when I talked about some of these qualities being present in historical and classical archaeology. But seemingly when people who do historical and classical archeology turn their attention to other people's ancestors they exclude some of those qualities. This then I think is some of the dimensions of that conversation we are hearing.

Sonia Atalay is a significant scholarly on this front. Read some of her work. We'll read some more. Arguing that archaeology is really a western cultural project of Indigenous history projecting a specific vision of the past and Indigenous peoples have their own scholarship of history. Colonization is about controlling those narratives and asserting one at the expense of another. These divisions then exist as practices of exclusion. So that is the point of departure. We've encountered that idea. What are some of the components of it. Activism of practice, focuses on control over heritage, increased representation in the endeavour, partnership with communities, recognition of inequalities both in the past and today familiarity or acceptance of interdisciplinaries around capacity building and scholarship. That is one I would like to dwell on. Interdisciplinary I would juxtapose against something that looks like it but it isn't. I would call that multidisciplinary. It's looking at the same thing from

different points of view. Interdisciplinary is asking what are the limitations of understanding any one point. If we ask the question what are the boundaries of our ignorance from whatever our position, the other position we are taking then we are I think engaging in an interdisciplinary. If we say this is how I see it from my point of view and then invite others to see how they see it from their point of view, without that are kind of vulnerability that exploration of omission, then we are engaging in something slightly different, a multidisciplinary. And the argument then is that these divisions, these omissions are things that we need to be attentive to. Here are some of the principles of this. That we've spoken. Evidence based respect for rights. Other key principles are notions of story work, narrative and importance of a storytelling within a scholarship.

Now, that may sound a little romantic and I think it probably is a tad but I want to point out that although the notion of storytelling has this sort of fictional or fanciful space. Anthropologists have argued that the human frame is largely about storytelling. We learn and we share and we understand through narrative. Narrative is key metric of any discipline. Sure when we present in publish, we use tables and evidence but the learning occurs through the stories we tell about those forms so the idea that story work is only found in Indigenous communities is the error.

I think it is underwritten or underwrites all of scholarship and we have encountered it. Jared Diamond is selling a story. The evidence for which may not be there but is he not talking about data he is not talking about interpretation. As much or method as much as he is telling a narrative. One that I think he already concluded is true. Then he goes about demonstrating his expectations. Story work then is at the foundation of all human knowledge and what Indigenous scholars are asking us is to be attentive to that. To think of it both as a way of understanding archetypical narratives that are brought to bear on archaeology through its orthodox frames but also that is it a key mechanism by which communities, your community, my community and of course Indigenous communities understand the phenomena of the world around them and their history. Most of us remember things through stories. If I were to ask you about where you understood things chances are you would tell me about events of your life people in your life experiences that you had. Then that would frame the insight the understanding that you gained. That is true I think of all of us. We frame our understanding through knowledge through storytelling. There is a philosophical principle at work which is called hermeneutic. I don't want to get too too far into the philosophy. How we understand meaning. Philosophers spend a lot of time unpack the principles of

storytelling and knowledge construction through ideas like Hermeneutic that is invite analogues to this concept. We can see what we are having here multiple lines of evidence braided together discussion question is one that we heard from Indigenous scholars, braiding knowledge is another framework another motivation where we see these different lines of understanding woven together in different ways to create something that by its product is richer than any specific point of view. That is the frame under which we think storytelling. It's not just telling stories but attention to fundamental way the knowledge is constructed and scholarship is ... We have seen with anthropology and archaeology. The next point is notions of relation... knowledge is mediated by the relationships which appear in stories but that frame our understanding. This is where we get patterns that we see a lot. I like to go to the evolutionary debates because they are so volatile. People argue and yell at each other typically you don't see that kind of animation in academic conferences which are usually dull. Part of the dynamic of that is that significant scholars recruit people to their allegiance and we have this notion that people are following in the footsteps of people they follow almost without critiquing their views. And many of my colleagues have entourages, intellectual entourages, people who follow them recruit to their idea and become

advocates to their vision. We see this in genealogy of thought in all disciplines. Resisted by evidence based critique. Resisted by evidence. You can be charismatic but if it's proven wrong you are not likely to succeed. In archaeology there's latitude you can be wrong and be wrong for a very long time before anybody points it out or before you realize it. This permits this relational space.

The second lens is that most learning occurs within relational spaces. These relationships mediate our understanding. They are significant and many Indigenous communities. ...this is the frame of scholarship this is the university. This is the academic endeavour. It is the curation of knowledge through systems relationality, the allocation of space or the people with expertise can learn it, share it, disseminate it, query it, build on it. This is the frame which by scholarship is mediated. We are engaged in that right now. I'm trying to recruit you to my point of view. Our understanding because we are here in person is relational basement. It's also philosophical, everything is related to each other, you can't do what science does which is break things apart and study them in isolation. You can. But relational ontology asks us to step back and look at the influences across the complex relational networks that they exist... Humans are of course historically part of ... Human ecology, land forms we both respond to circumstances

and generate the conditions of circumstance that change on a social frame a cultural frame, an ecological frame, political, economic, by almost every dimension we are activity mixing things up changing things building off of what has been in the past and tearing it down, and these place spaces are all relational. To separate a piece out and study in isolation is to lose that energy. A relational frame is something that Indigenous archaeology asks us to think about it. Not just looking at individual pieces of information but the broader conversation. Take a look at some examples on Thursday.

And the last piece is advocacy that archaeology and Indigenous scholarship recognize as asymmetries but also seeks to confront them. Seeks equity. Which I think is something that we should all aspire to. These days it seems like we are in the minority that we say that I think it's something we should all aspire to part of the purpose of scholarship and university is to recognize when unfairness exists and think about work towards the amelioration of unfairness. We have scholars to draw on. Famous one Tuhiwai-Smith wrote the decolonizing methodologies book. Updated in 2013. A fantastic scholarly. Presents a critique of scholarship, not archaeology per se but social sciences but also guidance on how we do this. Ignorance within the research relationship, respect for the communities. They are

part of value and benefits for the Indigenous communities. If I show up as Musqueam, which I frequently do electronically and in person I say hey, here is something we can do. The first question is what is the benefit for us. Sure. It's a cool idea Andrew, why would we be interested, how are you going to help our community. In the context of Musqueam their territory sits within perhaps underneath the city of Vancouver and other urban centres so they have a lot of tasks in front of them so they ask that question. Attentive to power relationship these are things that we've been exploring. I have used this book in this class as a text, make reference to it without us diving into it because it's getting older but it still has an important foundation. Equitable partnerships are they really equitable the unpacking of power dynamics. I'm mindful of a point that Tuhiwai-Smith makes that other anthropologists have made, that anthropology... Are really about a lack of courage and interesting study of oneself but a fear of doing so. And so the anthropological motive is this goal to understand one's self but using other people as that proxy for fear of what it might reveal. Maybe it's a safer space anthropology is really trying to understand the truth itself, imperfectly perhaps rather than other people but using them and the key verb there is use using them for that purpose. And Smith is suggesting that an alternate vision is necessary in an

Indigenous frame. Indigenous frame actively has to decolonize the experience.

This is a little model. I like pictures. This is a nice picture that she provides us for the process of which decolonization. This endeavour of critique is part of it we see around the notion of self-determination or sovereignty all of these dimensions. In a circle. Nested circles going out from the centre to the periphery. Transformation of the community of the individual of the endeavour. Mobilization of the knowledge and sharing and recruitment to understand it. And then healing. The improvement in the context of trauma which of course a Maori condition is often a colonial space. Colonial trauma. These are guide posts that frame both the critique of what I call orthodox form of scholarship or colonial form with an Indigenous lens. To arrive at a more holistic and more appropriate space. If you ask archaeologists do with he do this, many would struggle to see I think. Perhaps I speak too soon. I think today many would recognize themselves in this fixture. But 20 or 30 years ago it would have been more difficult. Now I think we see a lot more of this although I think there's still resistance and still insight to be gained and ha is where he we want to leave space in our work for Indigenous scholars which we've been looking at throughout the course.

The last piece I wanted to knowledge construction as

I hear it from Indigenous archaeologists involves this notion experiential frame. Which by the way is one of the key pillars of university based pedagogy we are supposed to be conducting experiential forms of academics for you. That is why we have methods courses and experiential ... If you take other courses with me I have focus a fourth year GIS and mapping course if that is at all interests you and you are around we'll get all the condominium out fly the drones set up the tripods map stuff and the thinking there is that the doing will help you understand the scholarship also quite fun and I agree, I think the experiential frame is a space where we gain insight. Hard to arrive at just through the abstraction of listening. ... I wanted to just point this one out. We have talked about this before Eric Wolf and his points of power suggesting that one of the key frames of that power is institutional epistological frame. We talk more about this later with Schneider and Hayes, and these philosophical assumptions where do they come from, they come from the experiences of the people who hold them. So our knowledge forms and our power dynamics echo this idea that information and enforcement exists at a foundational level within human culture and society in part because of the experiences of people who live within them. And so this is a powerful quotient. Not just an avenue to learning, but it is an underwritten dynamic of the contemporary frame. He has

many examples, his capitalism.

One of the reasons Jared Diamond's arguments seem to make sense to him and others perhaps they are not subjected to the kind of critique that we would ask of science is because they are self-fulfilling they narrate Jared Diamond's world our world they are foundational to the contemporary frames of things like capitalism. The argument is we are inculcating ourselves in a framework underwritten by assumptions it's not surprising then if we see those assumptions every time we pivot around because the experiences of our lives are constantly replicating them, baking into us what we call non-discursive understanding or less conscious forms of understanding that are part of our vision. So Indigenous archaeology asks us then to be broadly experiential and if there's an insight because, I'll pause here and mention that the archaeology in Canada has a lot of flaws but it is been on a path of revolution. Maybe that is too strong of word of reformation it has done so fairly quickly compared to other domains. I ask myself why. So 20 or 30 years ago the kind of archaeology that is being conducted today the kind of statements we came out the BC Association of Professional Archeologists around denialism. Those kinds of voices would have been outliers to the archaeology practice two or three decades ago now they are at the centre. That happened quickly. Younger scholars and

practitioners not only within Indigenous communities but outside of it are cognizant of all the things that we've been talking about to a degree that was not common in prior generations, and I ask why. Part of it is because of conversations like the ones we are having which challenge the status quo which confront our understanding which give us intellectual tools to unpack the complicity of things like archaeology within the asymmetries of our society but I also think there is a more mundane and profound reason it and that is that archaeology is laborious and boring and when we do archaeology typically you can't go into a nation anymore appropriately so without working with people from the nation. I was at a nation yesterday and it's construction project the backhoe hits something all the crew are from the nation so we are working together. And we will continue to take steps together including I am not involved in house building but in the archaeology. That space of working side by side doing the mundane tasks of archaeology it is pretty mundane in places. Drone stuff is exciting but a lot of it is standing around looking at things gives a chance for people to build relationships with each other get to know each other as individuals and to gain a degree of respect for each other. I think if there is a revolution in the discipline of archaeology it's in part because of this transformation of practice of building within archaeology spaces for

non-Indigenous archaeologists and Indigenous community members to work side by side. It seems naive but I think it's had a profound influence on the non-Indigenous people doing archaeology such that they are more understanding more empathetic because of their experiences more cognizant of the kinds of statements that Eric wolf is making and others have been making. So it's a subtle issue a small observation but I think one that is profound. The experience of being archaeologist today brings scholars who are not ... Into communities in a way that fosters empathy and understanding.

I used to teach a course I've been talking about this lately but I'm not sure how it's going to work out for schedule in 2006 I started a course a field school course archeological we did it at Musqueam the premise was we would bring students from UBC some of them were Musqueam students to Musqueam and we would do a archaeological field school at Musqueam. My insistence was we had a coffee maker and generator and we had a series of archeological tasks set to us by the community through advisory economy that I worked into kind of course outline pedagogy we did things the community asked us to do that were archeological we brought in members of the community to speak to us, opening events by elders, closing ceremonies with the community. We were constantly in the community every day in a tent big tent on a field moving around. They asked us to wear hats of a

particular type every year so we would be visible. 12 to 15 students that came with me and I our crews all had hats that were diagnostic. And that signal to the community we are there. We were very well received. They asked me to go back and do one the point that I make is that it was of all the teaching that I've ever done it's one of the examples where people have said a lot of positives things about my endeavour. My teach Ng that class is recognized for its significance and skill and I didn't do anything. I just sat around drinking coffee. I brought students who had never been in many cases to Musqueam or indeed even to an Indigenous community into Musqueam. Some were Indigenous, one or two were from Musqueam but mostly they were non-Indigenous peoples who never had that experience and I had them communicate with meet work alongside and build some short term relationships with Musqueam people and they had an insightful experience. Community had benefit to it. We've been asked to go back. University thought it was fantastic and really despite everybody telling me how great it I didn't do anything. I stood around and let the magic happened because it was at experience of crossing those boundaries that we otherwise haven't been easily crossed and bringing people together so they got to know each other that was the magic. That was the pedagogy insight. If I do it again, I'm going to be a lot more conscious of these things and I'm not

sure I'm going to change the program. But it will depend on what the community wants us to do. So there's an example of the importance of this sort of experience in understanding all of the things that wolf is talking about. Another model for this is one that we get to from feminism that theories and positionalities are arranged in front of us as a range of points of view and Allison Wylie and others... suggest it's a weaving of these points of view together, the ability to see through different positionalities simultaneously our Indigenous colleagues refer to as two-eyed seeing that is where the insight arrives. The comparison across differences of epistemology to create these different... But sees simultaneously through different points of view to bring them together. That is the interdisciplinary rather than multidisciplinary. That is hermeneutic where we can triangulate differences and similarity between alternate points of view look at similar phenomena. We see an overcoming of orthodoxies and limitation and broadening of insight. If we want to understand a phenomena this suggests that not only is this a philosophically appropriate way to do so but it is the human way to do so. This is how we gain insight with each other. We share our positions. We share our stories. We help each other see our point of view and we are empathetic to other peoples and in doing so we not only recruit people to our vision and learn theirs but instead we

build a synthetic view that is larger richer than any one point of view. I have asked Allison who I know how is that happening. Why is it that if you array a series of positionalities together the sum that have endeavour is richer than just any of the positionalities by themselves and why can't I just sit back and imagine the positionalities, what happens when I -- what occurs philosophically or intellectually. Why can't I just read about it. We don't know. But I would suggest it's because of the complexities of culture and the frames with which we work and our ability to hide things from ourselves that is the barrier that is overcome. By getting to know somebody from a different point of view and building those relational spaces we gain insight that we would not otherwise have in way that is we can't otherwise recognize. You all kind of know this because you've all travelled around the world you've gone to new experiences you've ... You have learned about yourself and if you have gone for an extended period of time the weird part is coming back to what is familiar. It's no longer familiar. I see some nodding. You travel the classic example is the privilege of traffic to exotic locales you travel around you learn about difference and then you don't realize how different you have become how changed you are until you get back to the familiar where nothing makes sense on a fundamental level you have learned something you have

travelled you have gained insight and distance from what you were in ways that you may not be aware. This is the standpoint positionality that comes in. Feminism scholarship again a foundational pillar of contemporary social science thinking it echoes the relationship space Indigenous colleagues are asking for. There is an example of the power. And to build on our last conversation from last week one of the ways that insight into other positionalities I think is accessible to us is through the imaginative worlds of video games film, television, fiction. Yes this those spaces we often finds the stories that are assumed are replicated. Reinforce am of undeclared expectation but we also finds and didn't talk approximate this last week the challenges to that. The examples where the unfamiliar narratives are encountered and shared so that things don't make any sense. Played a video game that seems like it doesn't make sense. What are the rules. Read a book when I had children we broadened tried to find as many different points of view in the children's literature as we could. Sometimes we would encounter books that were familiar to us they had narrative format that I understand. Occasionally we came to books, this doesn't -- I don't know what the point of this book is and that was the point. The book had a point. It resonated with the cultural frame. I was not part of that frame so I lacked that insight. Many of them became my favourite

examples because they asked us to meditate upon this very issue.

So I think I'm about to wrap it up. Let me say here is our some summaries of some of these experiential space within our field. Notions of place based experience, narrative that are knowledge biographical, of who we be, hidden within us, less discursive mechanisms, mediated by the cultural frames that we engage in, part of our positional relational and I think the goal and this is last point in doing all those things it's more comprehensive. It allows us to do what it is that archaeology wants us to do which is to see complex phenomena in their breadth rather than to winnow it down it a self-fulfilling smaller space. It asks us to look at the past in the richness within which the past itself existed and of course I think if there is a purpose to archaeology that is it. Indigenous positionalities and scholars provide considerable insight into how to achieve that. We'll pick this topic up on Thursday and take a look at examples I will share one from my own with you. I will see you then.

Lana Grace Allen, RCR, RPR.

Accurate Realtime Reporting Inc.

(604) 685-6050

Uncertified (Draft) Verbatim Transcript

Accurate Realtime Reporting Inc. - (604) 685-6050