

Decolonizing Indigenous Archaeology: Developments from down Under

Author(s): Claire Smith and Gary Jackson

Source: *American Indian Quarterly*, Summer - Autumn, 2006, Vol. 30, No. 3/4, Special Issue: Decolonizing Archaeology (Summer - Autumn, 2006), pp. 311-349

Published by: University of Nebraska Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4139017>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of Nebraska Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Indian Quarterly*

JSTOR

Decolonizing Indigenous Archaeology

Developments from Down Under

CLAIRE SMITH AND GARY JACKSON

The past is never dead. It's not even past.

William Faulkner, *Requiem for a Nun*

If the past is never dead, as Faulkner asserts, then its fragments must pervade the present. The shards of the past insinuate themselves into what we see, and don't see, value, and don't value, subtly informing every gaze, every movement, every decision. The privileges we enjoy, or don't enjoy, the inequities we fail to notice, or rail against, are the individual legacies of our shared pasts. Thus, a proper acknowledgment of history is basic to an understanding of the present circumstances of our societies. If we are to create a better future, the past has to be embraced, in both its accomplishments and its failures. Humphrey McQueen addresses this issue in terms of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians:

For white Australians to cut ourselves off from the destruction of Aboriginal society is also to sever the ties that bind those born this century to the pioneers or the Anzacs, since none of us nurtured grain at Parramatta, discovered gold at Mount Morgan or held the Germans at Amiens. By what measure of fair dealing can one generation lay claim to the virtues of its forebears but erase any stain from their vices?¹

As individuals inherit traits from their parents, so a discipline inherits traits from its practitioners. It inherits assumptions, theories, methods, and values. And so it is with archaeology, though we are some way from

understanding the full implications of this. As Fredrik Andersson states, archaeology travels with an historical perspective that has not yet been made visible to the fullest possible extent.² Archaeology has inherited a legacy that is deeply colonial. Archaeologists, the Indigenous peoples with whom they work, and the increasing number of Indigenous archaeologists all inherit shared and overlapping legacies from the past. Each one has to decide how much of these legacies they will accept, what parts they will question, and what, if anything, they will change. Above all, the decolonization of archaeology depends on a commitment to change. In this process of change, archaeologists and Indigenous peoples must not only face the complicated and varied histories that constitute their shared present but also consider how they intend to shape this ongoing relationship. There is no alternative to action, even if this is what people should desire, since a decision not to act is a decision to preserve the status quo, the inherited legacies of colonialism. Far better to pursue a vision of a more equitable archaeology though it will take reflection, energy, and commitment. The decolonization of Indigenous archaeology is a considerable task, and it is a task that must be shared by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. This is not a task that Indigenous people should be asked to undertake alone. Since archaeology underwrote many of the stereotypes of colonialism, Indigenous peoples have a right to expect archaeologists to assist with the decolonization of archaeology.

The colonial expansion of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was intertwined with the notion of researching far-flung lands and their peoples. The discipline of archaeology emerged from and articulated with a colonial desire to conquer unknown worlds, with artifacts as material proof of a nation's conquests, establishing what Edward Said calls the "positional superiority" of the colonizers.³ Encounters with a cultural "other" was theorized as "exotic" and, as such, worthy of scholarly attention.⁴ The collections of colonizers represented the paradox of unknowable, yet known, worlds. When placed in museums, each new display was transformed by its context into a symbol of the European ability to know and control the uncharted worlds of the colonial exotic. Integral to this process was the appropriation of Indigenous cultures, achieved through research and representation. Complicit in this was an anthropological process that sought to delve into the most private and secret sanctuaries, without divulging that these confidences would be openly shared with the wider world. For anthropology and archaeology, interest was always

in the “other,” not the “self.”⁵ And yet “self” is conceptualised in relation to “other.” The concept of “civilized” gains meaning only in relation to that of “primitive.” “Like” exists in opposition to “difference,” “advanced” to “primitive,” “worthy” to “unworthy.”

In this article we discuss recent developments in the decolonization of Australian archaeology. From the viewpoint of Indigenous Australians, much archaeological and anthropological research has been nothing more than a tool of colonial exploitation.⁶ For the last twenty years, many have argued for greater control over research and for a shaping of archaeological practice to provide greater benefits for communities.⁷ Drawing partly on our research with the Barunga-Wugularr communities of the Northern Territory and the Ngadjuri people of Burra, South Australia (see figure 1), this article highlights trends in Australian archaeology, focusing on contemporary concerns with how language can disempower Indigenous Australians, current measures being taken to implement Indigenous control over Indigenous culture, and the implications of conceptualizing research outcomes as shared intellectual property.

THE POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

An understanding of the manner in which language has been used to underwrite colonial stereotypes and power relations is fundamental to the decolonization process. We need to understand the thinking behind the terms we use in order to determine whether they have a legitimate place in the present. People constitute each other and themselves through language, in the process establishing, normalizing, or challenging inequalities. As Said says in terms of “Orientalism,” words are ideas, emerging from a history and tradition of thought, shaped by associated imagery, and, in turn, shaping the realities of these concepts and the worldviews of the people who use them.⁸ This point is well understood by Indigenous Australians, and the politics of language has been a focus of their scholarship.⁹ These issues are pertinent to colonial domination in many parts of the world, as articulated by the Kenyan scholar, Ngugi wa Thiong’o:

But its most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonised, the control, through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world. Economic

and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control. To control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others. For colonialism this involved two aspects of the same process: the destruction or the deliberate undervaluing of a people's culture, their art, dances, religions, history, geography, education, orature and literature, and the conscious elevation of the language of the coloniser. The domination of a people's language by the languages of the colonizing nations was crucial to the domination of the mental universe of the colonized.¹⁰

Science, framed by the institution of natural science, is the dominant discourse of archaeology. Still largely informed by the myth that scientific language can be objective, archaeological terms are shaped by a colonial legacy that simultaneously reinforces the authority of the academy and the subservient positioning of Indigenous peoples. While the use of language and images has been critiqued extensively by cultural theorists in regards to stereotypes—such as that of Indigenous peoples as “children of nature,” as “primitive,” or as “noble savages”—it is only recently that Australians have given serious consideration of the manner in which the discourse of anthropology and archaeology reinforces the assumptions and inequities of colonialism.¹¹

Language can be used to injure people, not only through labeling and description, but also through silences and omissions.¹² The violence done by words, however, is to the human spirit, not the body. As Wendy Hanlen points out, in the colonial struggle, language is, and always has been, a weapon, capable of being used for both assault and defence. Judith Butler addresses this issue more generally:

When we claim to have been injured by language, what kind of claim do we make? We ascribe an agency to language, a power to injure, and position ourselves as the objects of its injurious trajectory. We claim that language acts, and acts against us, and the claim we make is a further instance of language, one which seeks to arrest the force of the prior instance. Thus, we exercise the force of language even as we seek to counter its force, caught up in a bind that no act of censorship can undo.¹³

Several scholars have pointed out that colonial discourse served the purposes of the dominant state.¹⁴ The British colonization of Austra-

lia, for instance, used the term “Aboriginal” to collapse the cultural and geographic boundaries of more than six hundred diverse Indigenous groups, each of which had its own political system, laws, and language, into the single category of “Aboriginal.” The homogeneity implied by terms such as “Aboriginal” facilitated implementation of the Australian government’s policy of transforming Indigenous sovereign nations into ethnic minorities within the dominant state and is reflected in titles such as Department of Aboriginal Affairs.¹⁵ Through language, diversity and vitality were replaced with an imagined homogeneity and an implied stasis, a factor in the loss of identity that occurred as a result of invasion, lamented by Indigenous scholars: “Our very identity is ‘determined’ by others through the use of language. Language has been used to rationalise Western ‘superiority,’ justify their actions, make legal the illegal, control, educate, ‘determine’ social order and position, and to ‘convert’ untruth into ‘truth.’”¹⁶

Names are used to bring people into social location, establishing them within geographic, temporal, and social webs.¹⁷ The homogenizing of their cultures was resented by a number of Indigenous people, especially those from the Torres Strait, who are ethnically and culturally very different than the Indigenous populations of the mainland. They have redressed this to some extent, as is evident in the naming of government bodies, such as the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. Many groups prefer to be referred to language name, for example, Jawoyn people; by community, such as Barunga-Wugularr community; or by region, for example, Kooris in New South Wales. When speaking more generally, the term “Indigenous” is often used, with a capital “I” to recognize sovereignty, though “Aboriginal” is still preferred by some people on the grounds that “Indigenous” reinforces the culture/nature divide that was integral to colonial systems of classification (Vincent Branson, personal communication, January 24, 2005). A similarly disparaging distinction resides in the opposition of natural history museums, which focus on Indigenous cultures, and history museums, which focus on European cultures. The connection of Indigenous peoples with nature and Europeans with culture simultaneously denies the complexity of Indigenous cultures and the place of Europeans in the natural world. Moreover, the Western separation of culture from nature was one of the mainstays of colonial arguments for *terra nullius* (land with no people),

which was the legal basis for the colonization of Australia. This assumed that the land was effectively without owners, simply because Aboriginal Australians did not have a system of land tenure or use that was recognizable to Europeans.

Many of the terms used in archaeology emerge from the colonial gaze, describing not objective reality but the subjective images of a particular worldview. They are part of the language of colonialism that reifies the administrative order of colonized countries, emerging from Eurocentric knowledge systems and marginalizing those of Indigenous peoples. Use of the term “prehistory,” for instance, has sparked heated debate in the archaeological literature in Australia. While some archaeologists argue that the term is neutral, others contend that it is Eurocentric and should be avoided.¹⁸ Based on a division between written and non-written history, the word “prehistory” is problematic in several ways. In Australia and many other parts of the world, this is a false dichotomy, masking the co-existence of written and unwritten history in many parts of the country and privileging written histories above oral histories. Though history brushed Australia via the logs of maritime explorers, it did not arrive until 1788, when Captain Phillip arrived in Sydney Cove with the first British settlers. The extended contact of invasion occurred over a period of 150 years, from 1788 in Sydney to the 1940s in remote parts of the country, such as the Western Desert and Arnhem Land. Moreover, a distinction between “historic” and “prehistoric” archaeology creates an artificial boundary across a period of continuous transition and fractures the temporal reckoning of the continent into a patchwork of colonial encounters. That terms such as these are in common usage is no defense, especially if considered in terms of what Butler identifies as the “reiterated convention” of language.¹⁹ For a decolonized archaeology, the conventions, and the power structures they validate, need to be overturned: “The *common usage* of language appears to diminish the *sinister power* of words, orally or through written text, and how language determines and maintains Indigenous social positions within Australian society.”²⁰

Perhaps the most powerful argument for not using particular terms is that many Aboriginal people find them offensive. Rhonda Craven, for example, argues that the word “prehistory” denies the validity of Aboriginal experiences and knowledges, while Linda Burney states that “we find the term offensive, most particularly because of the related meanings of prehistoric, such as ‘primitive’ and ‘subhuman’—two of the most offen-

sive stereotypes imposed on Aboriginal people since colonization.”²¹ We would argue that it is especially important to use appropriate terms if you are dealing with the cultural material of another people.

Related to this is the characterization of written histories and oral histories in colonial modes of thought. The former are perceived as detached, objective, and reliable, while the latter are viewed as emotional, subjective, and changeable. The privileging of written histories over oral histories lies at the heart of recent controversy over the building of a bridge to Hindmarsh Island in traditional lands of the Ngarrindjeri people in South Australia. Some Ngarrindjeri women objected to the building of the bridge on the grounds that its construction would disturb an important women’s site, but other Ngarrindjeri women were unaware of this knowledge. Construction of the bridge was stopped, and a Royal Commission was called, with anthropologists supporting both sides of the debate. In 1995 the South Australian Hindmarsh Bridge Royal Commission concluded the claim of secret women’s business was fabricated.²² By interpreting the world from the Western perspective of relatively open access to knowledge, this decision failed to recognize that Indigenous knowledge often is segmented by qualities such as age and gender, creating a fine and intangible cultural web. Embedded in a Western tradition of dichotomized hierarchies, the commission consistently gave greater credence to historical and ethnographic records of European scholars than to Indigenous oral histories. As Christine Nicholls writes, the ranking of oral and literary traditions is so naturalized that it masks the ethnocentrism on which these rankings are based.²³ Elizabeth Grosz points out:

Dichotomous thinking necessarily hierarchises and ranks the two polarised terms so that one becomes the privileged term and the other its suppressed, negative counterpart. The subordinated term is merely the negation or denial, the absence or privation of the primary term, its fall from grace; the primary term defines itself by expelling its other and in this process establishes its own boundaries and borders to create an identity for itself.²⁴

That the Hindmarsh Island Royal Commission gave greater credence to literary rather than oral sources has serious ramifications, not just for Ngarrindjeri people, but for the process of decolonization in Australia. The most significant is that oral evidence is considered open to challenge

in situations of dispute, unless there is independent written substantiation of that evidence. As Diane Bell states, “no texts, no sites” was the mantra of the Royal Commission.²⁵ From this perspective, Indigenous knowledges only achieve legitimation when oral evidence is transformed into written texts.

Ironically, deep antiquity can be demonstrated for oral histories in many Australian Aboriginal communities, including the Ngarrindjeri people, who have a Dreaming story of sea waters rising and cutting off land from the mainland, creating the island now known as Kangaroo Island, and scientists record that this event occurred around eight thousand years ago. Thus, the core of this oral history can be tied to a scientifically recorded event. In other parts of Australia, there are Aboriginal stories of megafauna—giant kangaroos, snakes, emus, and other creatures—estimated to have died out between thirty and fifty thousand years ago, depending on species.²⁶ The point here is that oral histories can have demonstrable antiquity, even longer than that of written histories, and that the privileging of the latter over the former emerges from colonial systems of knowledge.

Another way to approach the decolonization of language is to compare terms used to describe equivalent roles or situations in Indigenous and non-Indigenous societies. For instance, someone who teaches the anthropology or archaeology student at a university is known as a lecturer or professor, while someone who teaches the anthropology or archaeology student in an Indigenous community is known as an informant. Synonyms for “lecturer” include “teacher,” “coach,” “trainer,” and “mentor,” while synonyms for informant include “spy,” “mole,” “grass,” “informer,” and “sneak.” The former have connotations relating to respect and authority, while the latter have unsavory or subservient connotations and often key into pejorative stereotypes. Unequal power relations are implied: in one case, knowledge is bequeathed; in the other, it is extracted, and while the lecturer is elevated above the student, the informant is positioned below. And yet the importance of these roles, if anything, is reversed. While the university lecturer “advises” the graduate student, the Indigenous elder provides intellectual data that is critical to the dissertation. The university lecturer is a secondary source of Indigenous knowledge, while the informant is a primary source.

Another focus of concern is language that excludes Indigenous experiences and worldviews. This “racism of omission” occurs when language



FIGURE 1. Using language to reverse perceptions of colonization. © Didjshop.com.

overlooks Indigenous action.²⁷ The classic example of this is the statement “Australia was discovered by Captain James Cook in 1770,” which overlooks the occupation of Indigenous peoples for the previous fifty thousand years. Similarly, the term “colonization” implies the relatively smooth settlement of unpopulated lands, rather than invasion of previously settled lands. To transmit this message Aboriginal Australians have renamed Australia Day, the day that the first British settlers arrived, as Invasion Day or Survival Day, turning attention from a celebration to British settlement to commemoration of the past, present, and future survival of Indigenous Australians.²⁸

Language can be used for the empowerment of Indigenous peoples, rather than for the empowerment of the status quo (e.g., figure 1). Most importantly, it can be used to acknowledge and validate Indigenous authority. While some of the terms used in archaeology disempower Indigenous populations, there are always alternatives. Moreover, the choice of words can be augmented by simple measures, for example, by publicizing Indigenous authority in the captioning of published images, such as in the text “image used courtesy of Jawoyn community,” or by recognizing Indigenous values and knowledge systems in the presentation of material. Cultural sensitivity is evident in the Department of Education, Science, and Training’s website on Discovering Democracy, which has the following statement on the images of Indigenous people: “Curricu-

lum corporation is aware that it may be distressing for some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to view images of deceased persons. Material on this web site may contain such images.”²⁹

Copyright over Indigenous cultural and intellectual property is a topic of current debate internationally.³⁰ Recognition of the rights of Indigenous people to control their cultural and intellectual property is also apparent in the following statement on the website of the Australian Museum:

Permission to re-tell the “Stories of the Dreaming” can only be given by the custodian/s of each story, in consultation with their community. That permission has been granted to the Australian Museum, by the relevant custodians and/or communities. The Australian Museum only has the right to use these for this website only. The Museum cannot transfer this right to others.

If you want to use the stories in any other way than access through this website you will need to contact the relevant state or territory land councils to gain permission from the story owners. The Museum cannot give you this information.

Copyright in this site rests with the Australian Museum and **no part of this site may be reproduced**. The Australian Museum **cannot** grant permission for re-use of the stories in any form.

Copyright in the individual stories rests with the owners of each story and the stories may not be told or altered in any way without their permission.

It can be very distressing for an Indigenous community to find cultural material, whether story, artefact, painting, etc., in the public domain without consent. As with the secret/sacred stories outlined above, each community places controls on who can have access to cultural information.

Intellectual property laws recognise the right of the owners to claim copyright over the stories on this site.³¹

A similar ethos is apparent in the wording used in many Australian television broadcasts when dealing with sensitive material. While they are not elaborate, measures such as these are powerful because they are based on respect for Indigenous values, and this informs the general public’s perceptions of Indigenous Australians.

One of the principle issues facing contemporary archaeologists working in Indigenous Australia is that of Indigenous control over research. If the outcomes of research are jointly owned, then it follows that they are also subject to joint control. This position is consistent with the United Nations' Draft Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (part 6, article 29), which affirms:

Indigenous peoples are entitled to the recognition of the full ownership, control and protection of their cultural and intellectual property.

They have the right to special measures to control, develop and protect their sciences, technologies and cultural manifestations, including human and other genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs and visual and performing arts.³²

After several years of conference debate, this issue became powerfully imprinted on the consciousness of Australian archaeologists when Ros Langford, a member of the Tasmania Aboriginal Community published her views in the mainstream journal *Australian Archaeology*:

You seek to say that as scientists you have a right to obtain and study information of our culture. You seek to say that because you are Australians you have a right to study and explore our heritage because it is a heritage to be shared by all Australians, white and black. From our point of view we say you have come as invaders, you have tried to destroy our culture, you have built your fortunes upon the lands and bodies of our people and now having said sorry, want a share in picking out the bones of what you regard as a dead past. We say that it is our past, our culture and heritage, and forms part of our present life. As such it is ours to control and it is ours to share on our terms.³³

As with Vine Deloria Jr. in the United States, Langford's views set one of the parameters of archaeological debate in Australia.³⁴ This paper is widely quoted in discussions of Australian archaeology: by writing within the discourse of the discipline, Langford engaged directly with its

practitioners, in the process shaping how Australian archaeology would develop.³⁵ In some ways, her paper laid a foundation for the level of control that Indigenous Australians now have over their cultural heritage.

The question of Indigenous control over research has simple and complex dimensions, according to whether the form of control depends on action by an Indigenous person or the researcher: while it is a relatively simple matter for scholars to accept that Indigenous people control their research through withholding certain types of information, the issue becomes more contentious when it enters the realm of intellectual property rights, especially those relating to dissemination of the results of research. Australian archaeologists take their guidance from the Code of Ethics of the Australian Archaeological Association, revised in 2004, and the First Code of Ethics of the World Archaeological Congress, which formed the original basis of the AAA Code of Ethics.³⁶ The World Archaeological Congress's Vermillion Accord on Human Remains also comes into play here.³⁷ All of these ethical codes contain various provisions that recognize the rights of Indigenous people over their cultural heritage. These codes are reinforced by guiding statements within the discipline, such as that on the cover page of *Rock Art Research*, which affirms the promotion of Aboriginal custodianship of sites as one of its principal objectives. While the rights of Indigenous peoples to control their cultural heritage are not supported by all Australian archaeologists, there is no doubt that this is the consensus view, and these values are reinforced by archaeologists who highlight relationships with Indigenous communities in their conference presentations and publications and by occasional books.³⁸ Recognition of Indigenous rights over Indigenous cultural heritage is an important factor in what is accepted as ethical archaeological research in contemporary Australia.

Obtaining Permission for Fieldwork

It is at the level of fieldwork that Indigenous people have the greatest control over archaeological and anthropological research. One of the biggest changes over the last thirty years involves the process of obtaining permission to work with Aboriginal communities. Prior to the return of lands to Aboriginal control with the Northern Territory Land Rights Act of 1976, researchers obtained permission to work in Aboriginal communities by applying to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. Permission

was negotiated between the non-Aboriginal researcher and the non-Aboriginal government employee, and Aboriginal power structures were unrecognized and circumvented. Today, permission for fieldwork in remote Aboriginal communities must be obtained directly from Aboriginal groups and organizations.

Obtaining permission to conduct research in Aboriginal communities is not a simple matter. Our own experience, undertaken initially in the early 1990s, involved a preliminary visit of ten days, followed by many months of waiting and written applications, which we still fill out every year. The preliminary visit was important because it gave people a chance to meet us and decide if they wanted to have us living in their community for a full year. During our initial visit, Phyllis Wijnjorroc, the senior traditional owner, gave us permission to return to conduct fieldwork the following year. Afterward, we submitted a formal application to the Barunga Council, requesting permission for extended fieldwork. After about six months without a response, we phoned Cyril McCartney, the council president, and he gave us verbal approval to conduct the research. After that, we also had to obtain a permit from the Northern Lands Council, which has to be signed by the community's permit officer, at the direction of elders, and after we had been in the community for some months, our stay was ratified at a community meeting.³⁹ It is also wise to contact the Jawoyn Association, though it does not formally ratify research in this region. In recent years, at the request of the community we have written a formal letter outlining the particular project and how community members will benefit from it.

The point here is that the contemporary process of obtaining permission to work on Aboriginal land is one in which the researcher has to negotiate with many levels of authority, all of which are composed of Aboriginal people. The intricacies of the process and the time it takes is one that empowers Aboriginal people since it demonstrates to the researcher the fact that he or she does not have an intrinsic or irrevocable right of residence. The process of renewing permits is an annual reminder of Indigenous rights over Indigenous lands.

Indigenous Control via Institutions

One of the most important changes that has occurred in Indigenous studies in Australia is that today Indigenous control over research is

exerted via institutions. Many institutions seek written proof of community support for research on Indigenous subjects, including university ethics committees, museums, government departments, and funding bodies. Aboriginal permission is needed for a permit to excavate Indigenous sites or conduct research on human remains that are still held in museums (though there are active repatriation programs in all major museums) and secret-sacred material held in museums can not be accessed, even by museum staff, without permission from Aboriginal elders. At the South Australian Museum, for example:

For sensitive areas of the collection, i.e. parts involving burials, ceremonial material, access to human biology records etc., the researcher must provide evidence of their consultation efforts with relevant communities (i.e. Indigenous Australians, Maoris, Papua New Guineans etc.). Without them demonstrating that they have gained at least some community support for their project, access will be declined.

For access to less problematic parts of the collection, we consider that most researchers who are already established in their field (or are at least externally supervised by someone who is) do not pose a risk to the Museum's collections or to cultural sensitivities in general. . . . When the situation is unclear I have even insisted that researchers approach state Aboriginal heritage committees and university ethics committees to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the intended research with our collections is not going to cause alarm in any quarters. Of course, access by people involved in court matters can legally truncate some of our demands.⁴⁰

Another important way in which Indigenous control over research is exerted is through funding bodies. In Australia, the major bodies that fund research into Indigenous subjects are the Australian Research Council, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS). The *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies* published by AIATSIS state:

1.8 Informed consent, community support, and ethical clearance
Refer to the AIATSIS Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies document, and the Ethical clearance checklist and Part 3

(Questions 9 to 11) of the AIATSIS Application Form. Applicants must provide evidence of community consent and support for their research project, and consider issues of private, personal, or cultural information. Failure to supply evidence of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander support may jeopardise the applicant's chances of being awarded a grant.⁴¹

Occurring across a wide range of institutions, measures such as these transmit a message that ethical research is that which is community supported and in which Indigenous people are fully cognizant of the implications, costs, and benefits of the research, the basis of "informed consent."

The "Selection" of Aboriginal Colleagues

The question of informed consent is not one that informs the anthropological literature on the "selection" and reliability of "informants" in field-based research.⁴² Generally, this relates to the ideal qualities of such people—reflective, articulate, and possessing formal or informal power—especially in terms of "key informants."⁴³ However, much of this literature does not appear to recognize the intrinsic power that individuals and social structures within the research community have over the choice of colleagues. Our own experience, for example, involved having the people with whom we might work selected for us by the senior traditional owner, Phyllis Wijnjorroc. Our first day of fieldwork was spent with Phyllis visiting each of the major population centers and being introduced to the appropriate people with whom we could work. Elsewhere, we have argued for a comparable process occurring when other researchers have conducted fieldwork with Aboriginal people and have thought about how this affects the kind of information that is collected.⁴⁴ Our point here is that the objective "selection" of Indigenous colleagues by field researchers is a scientific myth.

Access to Sites and Knowledge

Aboriginal people have always controlled the research process through restricting access to sites and knowledge. In cases where Aboriginal people assist researchers in the location of sites, they have power to di-

rect them toward some sites and to bypass others. In Australia, this is recognized by researchers as a legitimate and effective way of caring for country.⁴⁵ Moreover, Aboriginal people have always had control over the knowledge they impart. In the Australian situation, the classic paper on this is Neville G. W. Macintosh's revelation that when he and A. Peter Elkin each visited the Beswick Creek cave rock art site, near Barunga (then known as Beswick Creek), in the late 1940s, they were given different information by the senior traditional owner, Charlie Lamjerroc. Macintosh concludes:

Retrospectively I came to think of these two sets of explanations as being in the first instance a lay interpretation sufficiently satisfactory in his opinion for me. In the second instance an erudite interpretation for Professor Elkin, going much beyond the first, and appropriate to the depth of knowledge and length of association and understanding between Landerod [*sic*] and Elkin, on matters of Aboriginal inner lore.⁴⁶

This incident shows that information was given out according to the specific relationship between the researchers and the individuals with whom they worked. Even though they were working with the same person in the same place at the same time, Elkin and Macintosh were given substantially different stories. It is likely that a third researcher would have been given a different explanation again. This does not mean that one story is necessarily correct and another incorrect. They may all be true, each one accessing or emphasizing different aspects of a multi-faceted central story, which itself is not a single overarching truth. The point here is that Aboriginal people clearly used their ability to control Elkin's and Macintosh's research through restricting their access to information.

While the practice of withholding information from researchers is apparent in many ethnographic studies, it is recorded with particular clarity in Edward E. Evans-Pritchard's study of the Nuer people of Sudan. Resistance on the part of the person being interviewed as well as the use of professional lies to obtain information is apparent in the following conversation between Evans-Pritchard and Cuol, a Nuer man, during Evans-Pritchard's first field trip with the Nuer:

PRITCHARD: My name is Pritchard.

CUOL: What is your father's name?

PRITCHARD: My father's name is also Pritchard.

CUOL: No, that cannot be true. You cannot have the same name as your father.

PRITCHARD: It is the name of my lineage. What is the name of your lineage?

CUOL: Do you want to know the name of my lineage?

PRITCHARD: Yes.

CUOL: What will you do with it if I tell you? Will you take it to your country?

PRITCHARD: I don't want to do anything with it. I just want to know it since I am living at your camp.

CUOL: Oh, well. We are Lou.

PRITCHARD: I did not ask you the name of your tribe. I know that. I am asking you the name of you lineage.

CUOL: Why do you want to know the name of my lineage?

PRITCHARD: I don't want to know it.

CUOL: Then why do you ask me for it? Give me some tobacco.⁴⁷

That this conversation appears in a published book is testament that Evans-Pritchard was dissembling when he said he wanted to "do nothing" with the information he obtained by Cuol. The scholar's audience has traditionally been other scholars, rather than Indigenous people, and one premise behind Evans-Pritchard's actions is that the illiterate people he was studying would not be able to access his written admission of deceiving them. Indeed, Evans-Pritchard would not want his respondents to be aware that he used lying as a strategy for extracting information from them, as the result would have been even less cooperation. So why might he have decided it expedient to lie? One possibility is he saw considered the deceptions to be small and saw them as expedient. Certainly, not seeking informed consent can quicken the research process, though not the quality of the research. It is possible that Evans-Pritchard may have felt confident that if Cuol was able to appreciate the benefits of the information he was being asked to the accumulation of knowledge and how harmless the publication of the information would be to the Nuer people then he might willingly agree to giving the information but that Evans-Pritchard found it was too great an effort to explain this. Such an approach assumes that the researcher is more qualified than the respondent to judge the consequences that arise from publishing the research. Directly following his citation of the conversation mentioned, Evans-

Pritchard continues: “I defy the most patient ethnologist to make headway against this kind of opposition. One is just driven crazy by it.”⁴⁸

Evans-Pritchard seems unaware of the possibility that the information he sought may be used for harm. While the Nuer are unlikely to have envisaged the dissemination of information within a Western system of knowledge, it is possible that they had decided, with a history of conflict with their neighbours, the Dinka, that it was unwise to identify themselves to strangers, such as Evans-Pritchard, in case this information was made available to hostile communities. In fact, Evans-Pritchard’s work had been commissioned by the government of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and was later used to control the Nuer.⁴⁹ From this viewpoint, Evans-Pritchard’s challenge to ethnographers to make headway against the resistance of a population being studied is not one that would, or should, be taken up by contemporary researchers. Rather, we must assume that respondents have their own good reasons for keeping information secret.

As in other parts of Australia, access to information in the Barunga-Wuggularr region has become restricted through time. The first researchers in the region were given secret information relating to ceremonies. Apart from Elkin and Macintosh (discussed later in this article), the main researcher in this region was Ken Maddock, who based his doctoral research on analysis of a restricted male ceremony, the Jabadura in the late 1960s.⁵⁰ Since that time, Aboriginal people in the region have become wary of imparting secret information, at least partly because they are now more aware of how this information may be disseminated. Today, they protect secret sites by denying that they exist to researchers who are passing through; researchers who work there long-term are explicitly informed that they will not be given secret information. In a changed disciplinary environment that respects Indigenous rights to control their cultural and intellectual property, this restriction is accepted readily, if not with relief since the researcher does not have to take on the burden of keeping other people’s secrets.⁵¹ Conducting fieldwork on this basis actually enriches the research experience, alleviating tension and making it easier to establish comfortable relationships.

While Aboriginal people have much more control over field research than they did once, our main point here is that they *always* controlled field research through restricting access to information and sites. The major change is in that today they are much more cautious about im-

parting secret knowledge and feel powerful enough to outline their rules and be explicit about restrictions. A related development concerns the control they now seek over the content of published material.

Control over Publications

One of the major developments that has occurred over the last thirty years is Aboriginal people obtaining control over the publication of material concerning their culture. Much discussion has focused on Indigenous control over the publication of secret or sacred information, and this informs views of general publications on Indigenous cultures.⁵² Up until the 1970s, Indigenous peoples had virtually no control over the material that was published on their societies. Early research was conducted during a time when Aboriginal people were expected to either die out or be integrated in the dominant society. Based upon the assumption that information not recorded in writing would be lost forever, many scholars appear to have assumed the position that by publishing important (i.e., secret) information, they were caring for future generations of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people.⁵³ There was no notion that Aboriginal systems of knowledge could flourish or recognition that such flourishing would depend on control of Aboriginal cultural and intellectual property. There was also an assumption that Indigenous people would not see the published product (as is evident in the earlier discussion by Evans-Pritchard).

In Australia, a turning point was reached when the Pitjantjatjara people used a breach of confidence action to successfully contest publication of Charles Mountford's *Nomads of the Australian Desert*, which contained secret-sacred information that could not be viewed by women, children, or uninitiated men. In *Foster v Mountford*, members of the Pitjantjatjara Council obtained an injunction to prevent the book being distributed in the Northern Territory on the basis that the information it contained could only have been shown or exposed to the author in confidence. In addition, the plaintiffs successfully argued that the "revelation of the secrets contained in the book to their women, children and uninitiated men may undermine the social and religious stability of their hard-pressed community."⁵⁴ While this case was not argued on the basis of copyright, another major step occurred in 1988, Australia's bicentennial year, when the artist John Bulun Bulun and other Aboriginal artists



FIGURE 2. Claire Smith seeking permission for publication of the book *Country, Kin, and Culture: Survival of an Australian Aboriginal Community*, Barunga, February 2003. From left: Andrew Warner, Peter Manabaru, Nell Brown, Phyllis Wijnjorroc, Claire Smith. Photo by Gary Jackson, courtesy Barunga-Wugularr community.

from the Northern Territory brought an action concerning the unauthorized reproduction of their artworks on T-shirts. Throughout Australia, Indigenous designs and imagery are owned by Indigenous artists and are therefore subject to Indigenous intellectual copyright. A series of copyright cases was the subject of a groundbreaking exhibition curated by Vivien Johnson of Macquarie University, which brought enormous public attention to the matter, informing the views of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians.⁵⁵

There can be no doubt that these high profile cases influenced both Indigenous and non-Indigenous attitudes toward publication. In terms of our work with the Barunga-Wugularr community, elders exert control over our research in two ways: by encouraging us not to read early publications that contain secret information and by having direct control over the content of publications from our research.⁵⁶ When publishing a paper or book we seek formal permission for both text and images, firstly on the draft and secondly when we have proofs (figure 2). Permission is sought on return visits to the community, and copies of all publications

are returned to the community councils and associated organizations (such as the Jawoyn Association). Elders and community members are paid for any images used when the material is published, in recognition of their intellectual input into the publication and as a means of sharing the long-term benefits of research. We have found that the elders show particular concern about the use of information through photographs or other visual media such as videos. In a society that still has sectors that are nonliterate, photographs and other visual material are particularly subject to scrutiny.⁵⁷

The Dissemination of Results

A recurring criticism voiced by Indigenous peoples is that researchers do not involve them in the distribution of research results.⁵⁸ One problem for Indigenous peoples, as Price remarks, is that the researcher's necessarily selective written account of a system of knowledge, especially if it is supported by archival evidence to which people living in the society may not have access, has the potential to be established as a "canonical" or "authorized" version, even by individuals from within that society.⁵⁹ This issue articulates with concerns about the representation of Indigenous peoples, an issue under discussion globally.⁶⁰ Lynnette Riley-Mundine argues that Aboriginal people should have control over or, at the very least, involvement in the formulation and dissemination of results: "Aboriginal people, *as people*, surely have the right to be involved in what is said about them, how it is said and what research is carried out."⁶¹

There are many benefits of having Indigenous people involved in the dissemination of research results, and since 1992 people from the Barunga-Wugularr community have traveled with us to conferences in Australia (Armidale, Darwin, and Cairns) as well as overseas (Cape Town, South Africa, and Washington DC, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, USA). In addition, we have toured rock art sites and visited collections from the community held at the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of Natural History, in Washington DC. For the discipline, an obvious benefit is that people having direct access to Aboriginal views. Instead of asking the researcher, "What does Dolly think about . . . ?" as one of us heard at an American Anthropological Association conference presentation, it is possible to ask Dolly herself, obtaining an answer that is not skewed by the selective memory and the interpretative and cultur-

ally shaped lens of the researcher. For Indigenous peoples the value is not only in having their voices heard and their views discussed but also in obtaining an understanding of the ways in which information is disseminated within a conference environment. Conference participation illustrates what researchers actually do when they leave communities. As Peter Manaburu said while attending a conference in Cairns, they “go away and talk about us.” One outcome of this process of education can be the revocation of permission to use certain images or disseminate certain information, but this is due to consent becoming genuinely informed.⁶² As with non-Indigenous scholars, the Indigenous people who attend conferences obtain a deeper understanding of the research process and have an opportunity to participate in the shaping of the discipline. This has to be an essential element of decolonizing archaeology.

SHARING THE BENEFITS

Also fundamental to the decolonization of archaeology is recognition of Indigenous peoples’ rights to protect their cultural and intellectual property, to share knowledge on their own terms, and to share fairly in the benefits that derive from research.⁶³ The system inherited from colonial structures, however, is one in which academics accrue the long-term benefits of research, while Indigenous people get no benefits, or only short-term benefits. Yet much archaeological research is informed by Indigenous knowledge, and a great deal of it could not be produced without the assistance of Indigenous people. While researchers bring skills to a project, often they do not provide the primary data. It follows that both Indigenous people and archaeologists have rights in the intellectual property that arises from such research, since both were essential to the outcome. One way to conceptualize this is to think of research as a kind of soup in which different people provide essential ingredients. Though there may be a “chef” (the researcher, either non-Indigenous or not), that particular soup could not exist without the full range of ingredients (both Western and Indigenous knowledges), and all the people who provide those ingredients have rights in that soup. It seems logical, then, to assume that all people involved in the research should benefit from its outcomes.

In the past, often researchers have not paid Indigenous people at all,

partly on the assumption of scientific right to knowledge, but also due to an associated belief that all people have a responsibility to contribute to the “growth” of knowledge. More recently, researchers are likely to recompense Indigenous people for their time, though there are still many instances when Indigenous people are interviewed without financial compensation. Moreover, even when Indigenous people share in the short-term benefits of research, they rarely share in the long-term benefits, even though they contribute essential ingredients to the academic soup. There are several factors that have contributed to this: the time delay between fieldwork and publication and promotion; that the benefits of scholarship are acquired indirectly; the distance between fieldwork locales and universities; and that the research product has a different shape to what is created in the field.

The critical point here is that the benefits of research emerge some time after the fieldwork has been undertaken, sometimes many years afterward, and that the financial benefits of research are accrued indirectly. The time lapse between fieldwork and research outcomes contributes to researchers forgetting or minimizing Indigenous contributions to the research. This is facilitated by the fact that researchers normally live away from the communities they research. Regular visitation can be expensive, and as the ties of communication are loosened, so too is the researcher’s sense of obligation to the community. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that the benefits of research are accrued indirectly. While academics rarely get paid to publish an article, their publication record contributes to promotion and higher salaries. Each article that an academic publishes is an increment toward financial reward in the form of higher salary. That the reward is delayed, not immediate, does not mean that the Indigenous people who were essential to the process should not participate in it.

Certainly, Indigenous people are fully aware that academic careers are built on their knowledge and sometimes characterize anthropologists and archaeologists as “mining” Indigenous knowledge.⁶⁴ From this viewpoint, researchers extract knowledge from the community and take it back to the academy to turn it into something else, without further consultation with, or input from, the community. Often, the resulting product is not returned to the community but has a life independent of them. For instance, the anthropological research conducted by Evans-

Pritchard with the Nuer during the 1930s, whilst renowned and highly esteemed within academic circles, was unfamiliar to community members only twenty years later.⁶⁵ In a sense, the subjects of research are permanently commandeered into scholarly spheres, but the scholarly works are not integrated into Indigenous spheres. Disjunctions such as these are typical of the colonial process.

One consequence of recognizing Indigenous peoples' rights in research outcomes is that archaeologists will have to share the benefits that accrue from the Indigenous past. These benefits can be financial, such as salary and book royalties, or non-financial, such as travel and status. This need not be a difficult matter. For a start, it is a relatively simple matter to ensure that Indigenous communities get direct financial rewards from archaeological publications. For example, if society underwrites academic salaries for experts on Indigenous populations, it is reasonable for Indigenous populations to demand that part of that financial benefit is passed on to the primary sources of information, the Indigenous experts on those topics.⁶⁶ One way this can be done is through inviting Aboriginal elders to give university classes and paying them at the same rate as other expert guest lecturers. Another way is for academics to contribute a tithe on their salary to the elders who have taught them or to a community fund. This would have the benefit of being tax deductible as well as being tied to the promotion structure of the academy.

Archaeologists also get funding from publications—directly, from book royalties, and indirectly, through their publications contributing to their obtaining employment, tenure, and promotion. While the Indigenous people who contributed to the archaeological research normally do not receive these indirect forms of payment, they do have a right to receive remuneration. It is a simple matter to share the financial rewards that come from publication, simply through directly royalty payments and paying a fee permission to publish images or articles. If the book derives from work with one particular community, it makes sense that the royalties be directed to that community, which we have done with a video documentary and book based on our work at Barunga. However, if the research is situated in more general discussions, the royalties can be directed to an Indigenous fund. David Hurst Thomas for example, directs the royalties from *Skull Wars* (2000) to the Society for American Archaeology's Native American fund. Along similar lines, royalties

from the World Archaeological Congress's Indigenous Archaeologies Series with AltaMira (see <http://www.altamira.com/series/indigenous>) are used to support Indigenous attendance at meetings of the World Archaeological Congress.

It is also reasonable for an Indigenous community to receive payment whenever an image or article is published. In our research with the Barunga-Wugularr communities of southern Arnhem Land, Northern Territory, and with the Ngadjuri people in South Australia, we pay for each image that is published of the people, or their land. The amounts range from \$A100 (about \$US75) to \$A400 (about \$US300), with the lower rate for each photo of an individual or site and the higher rate for cover images for books or images of several people. Payment is made to the senior traditional owner, the senior traditional custodian, or the individuals in the images, and permission has to be resought any time we wish to republish the image. For an entire book, this can be expensive, but it is possible to apply for publication subsidies to cover these costs—and as a last resort, to pay this from the salary that derives from doing research with these Indigenous people.

The issue of enabling long-term benefit to Indigenous peoples is being addressed in the Australian art market. Senator Kate Lundy recently introduced a Private Member's Bill, the Resale Royalty Bill (2004) to the federal parliament. Resale royalties are paid by the seller of an artwork sold at public auction to the artist or their estate. The royalty is calculated as a percentage of the sale price. Supported by the Australian Labour Party (currently in opposition), this bill was instigated in support of the recommendations put forward in the Report of the Contemporary Visual Arts and Craft Inquiry:

A major issue for the Inquiry was whether Australia should introduce a *droit de suite* or resale royalty scheme that entitles the artist to royalties when a work of art is resold in the market. The Inquiry assessed the potential benefits for visual artists, the particular issues for Indigenous artists, and the likely impact the measure would have upon the market for contemporary art and craft in Australia, having regard to the international experience and local conditions. The Inquiry concluded that a resale royalty arrangement should be introduced.⁶⁷

There are two main justifications for a resale royalty. The first is that visual artists, who create a single work, are disadvantaged vis-à-vis other creators, such as musicians and writers, who receive an income stream through the copying of their work. The second justification is that the resale of art works unfairly enriches dealers and investors, to the complete exclusion of the creator of the work. While the benefits of this bill versus other methods, such as display or exhibition rights, are currently under discussion, the debate is framed around the principle that visual artists, especially Indigenous artists, should receive greater financial benefit from their works.

Another measure that can be implemented to share the benefits of research is that of obtaining funding for community members to travel to participate in, or co-present, conference papers. The benefits of travel are in addition to those regarding control of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property, outlined in the preceding section of this article. Travel is a high status activity in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures, as it broadens people's experiences and enriches their knowledge. When people travel to present their knowledge they accrue status in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous spheres. Apart from this, travel has long conferred status in many Indigenous cultures.⁶⁸ Also, there is an argument to be made for a reciprocity in which scholars return the hospitality of Indigenous people on Indigenous lands through hosting these people in the scholar's community.

We have attended several conferences with the people with whom we conduct fieldwork, as discussed earlier. The presentations have taken a range of formats: joint presentations, sole presentations by the researcher, and sometimes presentations solely by Aboriginal people. While there are many benefits, there also are substantial challenges in such collaborations. For us, this has ranged from helping people get birth certificates and passports to making certain that there are sufficient funds to cover their travel costs and daily expenses. When we are at conferences together, it means looking after people, as they are operating in a different culture, rather than networking with our own archaeological colleagues. It involves going to the beach or a market rather than a conference session or meeting—and sometimes this does feel like a sacrifice. But the most challenging aspect of this is that of helping people to succeed in a presentation environment that is unfamiliar. Giving a conference pre-

sensation is daunting to anyone who is new to it, and this is exacerbated for people who are from a different cultural environment. For Aboriginal people, especially people from small communities, there can be considerable stress involved in leaving the security of their country and in being judged by others in a formal situation, especially one that is shaped by the rules and cultural assumptions of the academy.

For the researcher, the overriding challenge is that of making certain that the format is structured so that Aboriginal people are able to present their ideas successfully. In our presentations with Barunga-Wugularr people, who come from small communities of around four hundred people in a remote part of Australia, we have experimented with a range of formats. We have found the formats that work best are those closest to their normal configurations. Outdoor settings, culturally informal to the Western scholar, are formal to many Indigenous peoples. In the Barunga-Wugularr region, for instance, community meetings, including important meetings with government officials (when those officials are not structuring the meeting format) are held outdoors. Moreover, elders sit on the ground when they engage in discussions of an issue of importance or gravity and which may take an extended time. Normally, they sit down for positive discussions; if they want somebody to go, the discussion is undertaken whilst standing as an indication that the decision is made and the conversation will be brief. It is possible to transfer an Indigenous format to a conference setting, and this has been done in several conferences in northern Australia, including the Kultja Business conference, held in September 1996, and the 1997 Fulbright symposium "Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World," where most of the discussions were held outdoors and accompanied by cultural demonstrations and workshops that showcased Indigenous expertise and cultural knowledge (see figures 3 and 4).⁶⁹ For conferences in less amenable climates, we have found that the format that works best for people from remote communities is one of small settings rather than large conference halls, which can be intimidating.

While implementation of the measures outlined in this section involves a commitment by the researcher in terms of time, funding, and organization, we do not feel that this is unreasonable. It seems only just to expect researchers to share the benefits of research fairly with the communities who provide the intellectual basis for their work.



FIGURE 3. Indigenous lawyer Terri Janke at the Fulbright symposium “Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World,” August 1997, Darwin, Australia. Aboriginal Tasmanian Michael Mansell in the background.



FIGURE 4. Larry Zimmerman participating in a cultural workshop run by Peter Manaburu and George Jungawunga at the Fulbright symposium “Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World,” August 1997, Darwin, Australia.

CONCLUSION

This article discusses developments in the decolonization of Indigenous archaeology in Australia. Two decades ago, the question “Who owns the past?” was the focus of a landmark symposium convened by Isabel McBryde and hosted by the Australian Academy of Humanities.⁷⁰ This symposium laid groundwork for the negotiation of relationships among archaeologists and Indigenous peoples and encouraged Australian archaeologists to engage with the political implications and the moral responsibilities of their work. Since then, the question of Indigenous control over archaeological research in Australia has played out. Today, Australian archaeologists recognize they are working with a cultural heritage in which living peoples have rights and responsibilities, and the majority have accepted that the Indigenous past is owned by Indigenous peoples. Indigenous Australians have substantial control over research conducted on Indigenous lands, including rights of access and tenure. Apart from this, their permission is needed to acquire university clearance for research projects, obtain excavation permits, research certain museum collections, and acquire funding. While this can

sound negative, or even frightening, to North American archaeologists, in the Australian scenario, the outcomes have been positive, producing generally tranquil and cooperative relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous Australians and an enriching of the archaeological imagination. Increasingly, the aims, rights, and agendas of both Indigenous peoples and archaeologists are shaping Australian archaeology. Graeme K. Ward addressed these issues in the early 1990s:

This has been the subject of discussion in Aboriginal studies for some time. In my observation, and I think it is the current consensus, many of the problems that were evident when researchers were conducting research for its—or rather for their—own sake are obviated once Aboriginal people have control over the conduct—the commissioning and oversight—of that research. This has been not just a matter of courtesy (although that is a major part of it), but one of empowerment. The result has often been as successful in the view of the researcher, and often more so, because the Aboriginal involvement has added further—often unimagined—dimensions.⁷¹

Finally, we would like to briefly consider the question, Why do Indigenous Australians appear to have more control over their cultural heritage than many Native Americans? It seems to us that Native Americans do not have comparable controls over funding, museum collections, or the issuance of excavation permits, unless the work is conducted on reservation lands. Moreover, it does not appear to be routine for North American archaeologists to consult with Native Americans when conducting archaeological research on lands owned by the government or on privately owned land. However, the difference between the two countries is perhaps most apparent when comparing the ongoing controversy over the return of the 9,200-year-old Ancient One from Kennewick with the much-publicized return to the Willandra Aboriginal community of Lady Mungo, originally dated to $24,710 \pm 1270$ years BP and recently re-dated to around 40,000 years.⁷² While the remains of the Ancient One are still a focus of bitter dispute, the remains of Lady Mungo lie near the site of her original burial, held in a velvet-lined wooden safe that has two keys, one held by archaeologists and the other by the Aboriginal community.⁷³ Both the Ancient One and Lady Mungo are powerful symbols of relationships between many archaeologists and Indigenous peoples in each country. In our view, differences in the control that can be exerted by In-

digenous Australians and Native Americans is due partly to the fact that the former have a more pervasive presence in the national imagination than the latter. While colonization has been equally destructive in both countries, in the United States there are other calls upon the conscience of the nation, particularly from African Americans. The difference in attitudes is also likely to be due to the influence of the different ethical codes that guide archaeological practice in each country, and this has to be a focus of concern for those who seek to decolonize archaeology.⁷⁴

In the late 1970s, Said made the point that Western discourse about the “other” has been perpetrated by institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines, colonial bureaucracies, and colonial styles.⁷⁵ In Australia, the decolonization of archaeology is addressing many of these factors, though there is still some way to go. If colonialism has meant Indigenous peoples living within a framework of non-Indigenous control, the decolonization of archaeology has to involve archaeologists working within a framework of Indigenous control, a framework in which research process, outcomes, and benefits are genuinely negotiated between researcher and community. Given that differential access to power is at the core of colonial relations, it follows that the decolonization of Indigenous archaeology involves a rethinking of power relations between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples. It must involve a movement from the colonial assumption of a right to acquire knowledge to recognition of Indigenous peoples’ rights to protect their cultural and intellectual property and to share knowledge on their own terms. It must move Indigenous concerns and values from the “outside” to the “center” and be committed to the survival and strengthening of Indigenous knowledge systems. The archaeological and anthropological practices outlined in this paper do not “empower” Indigenous peoples, they simply refrain from disempowering them.

NOTES

Our views on decolonizing Indigenous archaeology did not develop from a theoretical concern with decolonization but from the teachings and friendship of elders in the Barunga-Wugularr region, Phyllis Wijnjorroc, Peter Manabaru, Jimmy Wesan, Glen Wesan, and others, some of whom are now deceased. On their instruction, we try to teach others what they have taught us. In a sense, we are a conduit between you and them.

In addition, we have learned a great deal from working with Vincent Copley

and Vincent Branson, traditional owners of Ngadjuri lands in South Australia, and we are grateful to them for their honesty and trust. We thank the following for permission to publish images: Didjshop.com for figure 1; Andrew Warner, Peter Manaburu, Nell Brown, and Phyllis Wijnjorroc for figure 2; Terri Janke and Michael Mansell for figure 3; and Larry Zimmerman, Peter Manaburu, and George Jungawunga for figure 4.

1. Qtd. in Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, "Impact of the Past", 8.
2. Andersson, "Can We Look upon History?"
3. Said, *Orientalism*, 7.
4. Clifford and Marcus, *Writing Culture*.
5. Wobst, "Power to the Past," 220.
6. See Langford, "Our Heritage," 2.
7. See, for example, Birt and Birt, "Copley Coming Back"; Langford, "Our Heritage"; Isaacson and Ford, "Looking Forward."
8. Said, *Orientalism*, 5.
9. See, e.g., Burney, letter to the editor; Craven, *Teaching Aboriginal Studies*; Craven, *Using the Right Words*; Nakata, "Anthropological Texts"; Rigney, "Internationalisation."
10. Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Decolonising the Mind*, 16. See also Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Penpoints, Gunpoints, and Dreams*.
11. See, e.g., Craven, *Teaching Aboriginal Studies*.
12. Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 28.
13. Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 1.
14. See, e.g., Hanlen, "Decolonising Language," 3.
15. Wobst and Smith, "Unothering," 221.
16. Hanlen, "Decolonising Language," 1.
17. See Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 29.
18. E.g., Dortch, "Cultural Sensibilities," 66–67; cf. McNiven and Russell, *Appropriated Pasts*, 221–22; Tucker, letter to the editor, 66–67.
19. Butler, *Excitable Speech*, 33.
20. Hanlen, "Decolonising Language," 3.
21. Craven, *Using the Right Words*, 12; Burney, letter to the editor, 54.
22. Stevens, *Report*.
23. Nicholls, "Literacy and Gender," 62.
24. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, 3.
25. Bell, *Daughters of the Dreaming*, 34.
26. See Mulvaney and Kamminga, *Prehistory of Australia*.
27. Board of Studies New South Wales, *Teaching Aboriginal Languages*.
28. Australia Day Council of New South Wales, "Australia Day."
29. Australian Government, Department of Education, Science, and Training, "Discovering Democracy."

30. For an excellent recent review, see Nicholas and Bannister, "Copyrighting the Past?" For general trends, see Meskell and Pels, *Embedding Ethics*.
31. Australian Museum Online, "Copyright."
32. United Nations, "Draft Declaration."
33. Langford, "Our Heritage," 2.
34. See, e.g., Deloria, "Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future."
35. Hodder, *Archaeological Process*.
36. Australian Archaeological Association, "Code of Ethics"; the revised Code of Ethics (2004) can be found online at <http://www.australianarchaeologicalassociation.com.au/codeofethics.php>. World Archaeological Congress, "First Code of Ethics."
37. World Archaeological Congress 1989, "Vermillion Accord on Human Remains."
38. See, e.g., Beck et al, *Yarrawarra Places*; May et al, "You Write It Down"; Davidson, Lovell-Jones, and Bancroft, *Archaeologists and Aborigines*; Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*.
39. See Jackson and Smith, "Living and Learning."
40. Philip Clarke, head of anthropology and manager of sciences, South Australian Museum, e-mail communication, January 24, 2005.
41. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, *Research Grants Program*.
42. See, e.g., Becker and Geer, "Participant Observation," 241–42; Bernard, *Research Methods*, 179; Hammersley and Atkinson, *Ethnography*, 116–17.
43. See, e.g., Burgess, *In the Field*, 73–75; Whyte, "Interviewing in Field Research."
44. Jackson and Smith, "Living and Learning."
45. See, e.g., Lewis and Rose, "Some Ethical Issues."
46. Macintosh, "Beswick Creek Cave," 191.
47. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer*, 13.
48. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer*, 13.
49. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer*, 7.
50. Maddock, "The Jabuduruwa."
51. See Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, *Guidelines*; Jackson and Smith, "Living and Learning."
52. See, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, "Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Bill."
53. See, e.g., Mountford, *Nomads of the Western Desert*.
54. Australian Government, Attorney-General's Department, "Stopping the Rip Offs."
55. See Johnson, *Copyrites*.
56. See Jackson and Smith, "Living and Learning," 340–41

57. Clearly, this is not true for all of Australia. Literacy levels in this region are particularly low, especially for older people, many of whom have attended school only sporadically or not at all.

58. E.g., Everett, "Significance to Tasmanian Aborigines"; Willmot, "The Dragon Principle."

59. Price, *First Time*, 23.

60. See, e.g., Mihesuah, *American Indians*.

61. Riley-Mundine, "An Aboriginal Perspective," 13 (emphasis in original).

62. Jackson and Smith, "Living and Learning," 344.

63. See Blakeney, "Intellectual Property"; Janke, *Our Culture*; Janke, *Minding Culture*.

64. Isaacson, "Building for the Future."

65. Hutchinson, *Nuer Dilemmas*, 29.

66. Wobst and Smith, "Unothering."

67. Myer, "Report."

68. See Loring, "On the Trail"; Henriksen, *Hunters in the Barrens*; Shotridge, "Ghost of Courageous Adventurer."

69. See Smith and Ward, *Indigenous Cultures*.

70. See McBryde, *Who Owns the Past?*

71. Ward, cited in Burke, Lovell-Jones, and Smith, "Beyond the Looking Glass," 17.

72. See Smith and Burke, "In the Spirit of the Code"; Thorne, *Origins of the Australians*; Bowler et al, "New Ages for Human Occupation."

73. Sullivan, "Repatriation."

74. See Burke and Smith, 2003.

75. Said, *Orientalism*, 2.

REFERENCES

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. "The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Bill, 1998."
- Andersson, Fredrik. "Can We Look upon History without Seeing Europe?" Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group VII. Conference abstract, 2004. <http://www.arkeologi.uu.se/tag/abstracts/andersson.htm>.
- Australia Day Council of New South Wales. "Australia Day." <http://www.australiaday.com.au/indigenous.html>.
- Australian Archaeological Association. "Code of Ethics." *Australian Archaeology* 39 (1994): 129.
- Australian Government, Attorney-General's Department. "Stopping the Rip Offs." http://www.ag.gov.au/agd/WWW/securitylawHome.nsf/Page/Publications_Intellectual_Property_Stopping_the_Rip_Offs_Report.

- Australian Government, Department of Education, Science, and Training
 “Discovering Democracy: Civics and Citizenship Education.” <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/democracy/>.
- Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS).
Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies. Canberra: AIATSIS, 2000.
http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/research_program/grants.
- . *Research Grants Program 2005 Information Guide*. Canberra: AIATSIS,
 2005. http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/research_program/grants.
- Australian Museum Online, Indigenous Australia, “Copyright,” <http://www.dreamtime.net.au/dreaming/copyright.htm>.
- Beck, Wendy, Cheryl Brown, Dee Murphy, Tony Perkins, Anita Smith, and Margaret Somerville. *Yarrawarra Places: Making Stories*. Book 5 of *Yarrawarra Place Stories*. Armidale: University of New England Press, 2002.
- Becker, Howard, and Blanche Geer. “Participant Observation: The Analysis of Qualitative Field Data.” In Burgess, *Field Research*, 239–50.
- Bell, Diane. *Daughters of the Dreaming*. Melbourne: Allen and Unwin, 1988.
- Bernard, H. Russell. *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1988.
- Birt, Peter, and Vincent Birt. “Copley Coming Back to Country: A Conversation at Firewood Creek.” In Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 262–78.
- Blakeney, Michael “Intellectual Property in the Dreamtime—Protecting the Cultural Creativity of Indigenous Peoples.” Oxford Intellectual Property Research Centre (OIPRC) *Electronic Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*. WP 11/99 (1999). <http://www.oiprc.ox.ac.uk/EJWP1199.html>.
- Board of Studies New South Wales. *Teaching Aboriginal Languages: Case Studies*. Sydney: Board of Studies NSW, 2005.
- Bowler, James M., Harvey Johnston, John Olley, John Prescott, Richard Roberts, Wilfred Shawcross, and N. Spooner. “New Ages for Human Occupation and Climatic Change at Lake Mungo, Australia.” *Nature* 421 (2003): 837–40.
- Burgess, Robert G. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1984.
- , ed. *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1986.
- Burke, Heather, Christine Lovell-Jones, and Claire Smith. “Beyond the Looking Glass: Some Thoughts on Sociopolitics and Reflexivity in Australian Archaeology.” *Australian Archaeology* 38 (1994): 13–22.
- Burney, Linda. Letter to the editor. *Australian Archaeology* 48 (1999): 54.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performance*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

- Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. "The Impact of the Past." Module 5 of *Reconciliation Learning Circle Kit*. 1999. <http://www.reconciliationaustralia.org/resource/communityedu.html>.
- Craven, Rhonda. *Teaching Aboriginal Studies*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 1999.
- . *Using the Right Words: Appropriate Terminology for Indigenous Australian Studies*. Sydney: School of Teacher Education, University of New South Wales, 1996.
- Davidson, Iain, Christine Lovell-Jones, and Robyn Bancroft, eds. *Archaeologists and Aborigines Working Together*. Armidale: University of New England Press, 1995.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. "Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future." *American Antiquity* 57, no. 4 (1992): 595–98.
- Dortch, Charles E. "Cultural Sensibilities and Archaeological Actualities." *Australian Archaeology* 47 (1998):66–67.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Everett, Jimmy "Significance to Tasmanian Aborigines." Hobart: Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Symposium, 1990.
- Fourmile, Henrietta. "Who Owns the Past? Aborigines as Captive to the Archives." *Aboriginal History* 13, no. 1–2 (1989):1–8.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1994.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London: Tavistock, 1983.
- Hanlen, Wendy "Decolonising Language." Fourth Annual Indigenous Researchers' Forum. Perth: Curtin University, 2002.
- Henriksen, Georg *Hunters in the Barrens. The Naskapi on the Edge of the White Man's World*. St. John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1993.
- Hodder, Ian *The Archaeological Process. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Hutchinson, S. *Nuer Dilemmas: Coping with Money, War, and the State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 199.
- Isaacson, Ken. "Building for the Future." In Peck and Siegfried, *Indigenous People and Archaeology*, 245–50.
- Isaacson, Ken, and Stephanie Ford. "Looking Forward,—Looking Back: Shaping a Shared Future." In Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 352–66.
- Jackson, Gary, and Claire Smith. "Living and Learning on Aboriginal Lands: Decolonising Archaeology in Practice." In Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 326–49.

- Janke, Terri. *Our Culture, Our Future: Proposals for the Recognition of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, 1999.
- . *Minding Culture: Case Studies on Intellectual Property and Traditional Cultural Expressions*. Washington DC: World Intellectual Property Organisation, 2003.
- Johnson, Vivien. *Copyrites: Aboriginal Art in the Age of Reproductive Technologies*. Sydney: National Indigenous Arts Advocacy Association and Macquarie University, 1996.
- Langford, Ros. "Our Heritage—Your Playground." *Australian Archaeology* 16 (1983): 1–6.
- Lewis, Darrell, and Deborah Bird Rose. "Some Ethical Issues in Archaeology: A Methodology of Consultation in Northern Australia." *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 1 (1985): 37–44.
- Loring, Stephen. "On the Trail to the Caribou House: Some Reflections on Innu Caribou Hunters in Northern Ntessinan (Labrador)." In *Caribou and Reindeer Hunters of the Northern Hemisphere*, ed. Lawrence J. Jackson and Paul T. Thacker, 185–220. Aldershot, UK: Avebury, 1997.
- Macintosh, Neville G. W. "Beswick Creek Cave Two Decades Later: A Reappraisal." In *Form in Indigenous Art*, ed. Peter J. Ucko, 191–97. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 1977.
- Maddock, Ken. "The Jabuduruwa: A Study of the Structure of Rite and Myth in an Australian Aboriginal Religious Cult on the Beswick Reserve, Northern Territory." PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 1969.
- May, Sally K., Donald Gumurdul, Jacob Manakgu, Gabriel Maralngurra, and Wilfred Nawirridj. "You Write It Down and Bring It Back: Revisiting the 1948 Removal of Human Remains from Kungalanya (Oenpelli), Australia." In Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 110–29.
- McBryde, Isabel. *Who Owns the Past?* Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- McNiven, I., and L. Russell. *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. Walnut Grove CA: AltaMira Press, 2005.
- Meskill, Lynne M., and Peter Pels, eds. *Embedding Ethics: Shifting the Boundaries of the Anthropological Profession*. Oxford: Berg, 2005.
- Mihesuah, Devon. *American Indians: Stereotypes and Realities*. Atlanta: Clarity Press, 1999.
- Mountford, Charles. *Nomads of the Western Desert*. Adelaide: Rigby, 1976.
- Mulvaney, Derek John, and Johan Kamminga. *A Prehistory of Australia*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 1997.
- Myer, R. "Report of the Contemporary Visual Arts and Crafts Inquiry." Depart-

- ment of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, Canberra, Australia, 2002.
- Nakata, Martin. "Anthropological Texts and Indigenous Standpoints." *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2 (1998): 3–15.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey, 1986.
- . *Penpoints, Gunpoints, and Dreams: Towards a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews, eds. *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*. Burnaby BC: Archaeology Press, Simon Fraser University, 1997.
- Nicholas, George P., and Kelly Bannister. "Copyrighting the Past?" *Current Anthropology* 45(2004): 327–50.
- Nicholls, Christine. "Literacy and Gender." *Journal of Australian Studies* 48 (1996): 59–72.
- Peck, Trevor, and Eleanor Siegfried, eds. *Indigenous People and Archaeology: Proceedings of the 29th Annual Chacmool Conference*. Calgary: Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, 2003.
- Price, Richard *First Time: The Historical Vision of an Afro-American People*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Rigney, Irabinna-Lester. "Internationalisation of an Indigenous Anti-colonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and Its Principles." *Wicazo Sa Review: Journal of Native American Studies* 14, no. 2 (1999): 109–22.
- Riley-Mundine, Lynnette. "An Aboriginal Perspective to Australian Archaeology." Paper presented to the Department of Archaeology, University of New England, 1998.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage Books, 1978.
- Shotridge, Louis "Ghost of Courageous Adventurer." *The Museum Journal. University of Pennsylvania Museum* 11, no. 1 (1920):11–26.
- Smith, Claire. *Country, Kin, and Culture: Survival of an Australian Aboriginal Community*. Adelaide: Wakefield Press, 2004.
- . Editorial. *Australian Archaeology* 47 (1998): iii–iv.
- Smith, Claire, and Heather Burke. "In the Spirit of the Code." In *A Handbook for Ethics in Archaeology*, ed. Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, 177–200. Walnut Grove CA: AltaMira Press, 2003.
- Smith, Claire, and Graeme K. Ward, eds. *Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2000.
- Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst, eds. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2005.

- Smith, Linda Tuhawai. *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books, 1999.
- Stevens, Iris. *Report of the Hindmarsh Island Royal Commission*. Adelaide: State Print, 1995.
- Sullivan, Sharon. "Repatriation." *Conservation: The Getty Conservation Institute Newsletter* 14, no 3 (1999). http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/newsletters/14_3/feature1_6.html.
- Thorne, Alan *Origins of the Australians*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, 1976.
- Tucker, Adrian. Letter to the editor. *Australian Archaeology* 49 (1999): 66–67.
- United Nations. "Draft Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." <http://www.cwis.org/draft9329.html>.
- Watkins, Joe *Indigenous Archaeology*. Walnut Creek CA: AltaMira Press, 2000.
- Whyte, William F. "Interviewing in Field Research." In Burgess, *Field Research*, 111–22.
- Willmot, Eric "The Dragon Principle." In *Who Owns the Past?*, ed. Isabel McBryde, 41–8. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Wobst, H. Martin. "Power to the (Indigenous) Past and Present! Or: The Theory and Method behind Archaeological Theory and Method." In Smith and Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 17–32.
- Wobst, H. Martin, and Claire Smith. "'Unothering': Theory and Practice in Archaeology." In Peck and Siegfried, *Indigenous People and Archaeology*, 211–25.
- World Archaeological Congress 1989. "Vermillion Accord on Human Remains," http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/wac/site/about_ehi.php.
- World Archaeological Congress 1991. "First Code of Ethics," http://ehlt.flinders.edu.au/wac/site/about_ehi.php.