

# Chapter 11

## NATIVE AMERICAN ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES

Mark D. Varien, Tito Naranjo, Marjorie R. Connolly, and William D. Lipe

### INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the single largest change in southwestern Colorado archaeology—in fact in all of American Archaeology—since the 1984 context document was published is the inclusion of Native American perspectives and influence in how archaeology is practiced and interpreted. Many changes have come about through the passage of new federal and state legislation and the modification or reinterpretation of existing laws; these changes give Native Americans a legal basis to address their concerns. This legislation resulted from decades of political and legal pressure from Native American advocacy groups. Archaeologists have considered Native American concerns for decades (see Sprague 1974; Winter 1980), but the greatest changes have come with the adoption in 1990 of NAGPRA and the 1992 amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The growth of tribal archaeology programs was well underway before 1990; these programs have continued to grow and have contributed a great deal to Native American involvement in archaeology. Today, Native Americans have become increasingly active, as individuals and through their tribal governments, in the practice of archaeology.

The primary purpose of this chapter is to help archaeologists<sup>1</sup> do a better job of asking for Native American perspectives and then dealing properly with the responses they get. This objective is addressed in three main sections. The first section, by Mark Varien and William Lipe, is a review of the growing body of literature related to Native American involvement in archaeology and to the laws and regulations that to some extent govern it. Native American involvement in archaeology is an issue that has been debated throughout the nation, and the literature review extends beyond the boundaries of southwestern Colorado; however, the issues raised in this national debate directly affect the practice of archaeology in southwestern Colorado.

The second section of this chapter summarizes the answers to a questionnaire that was circulated to four Native American consultants. These consultants preferred to remain anonymous, and their answers have been summarized by Marjorie Connolly, the coordinator for Native American issues at Crow Canyon Archaeological Center.

In the final section of this chapter, Tito Naranjo, a Santa Clara Pueblo writer and educator, examines the differences between oral and literate societies. He describes how modern

---

<sup>1</sup>For the remainder of this paper, the term “archaeologist” is frequently used to reference any professional who works with Native Americans about issues related to the archaeological record. This may include physical anthropologists, ethnographers, and museum curators as well as archaeologists per se, plus cultural resource specialists who carry out CRM responsibilities on behalf of federal and state agencies. A distinction is made between “agency manager” and “archaeologist” in contexts where it is clear that a federal agency has a specific responsibility under the law that requires an agency manager to act on the agency’s behalf, and a distinction is made between “cultural anthropologist” and “archaeologist” in situations where this is relevant.

Native Americans live in both worlds and discusses the implications for Native Americans who work with archaeologists and anthropologists, and vice versa.

### **NATIVE AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN ARCHAEOLOGY: A REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE AND LAWS**

The literature that deals with issues related to Native American involvement in archaeology has grown rapidly over the last 15 years. T. J. Ferguson (1996) presents one of the most current overviews and perhaps the most complete bibliography available. Just as archaeologists accept that it is their professional responsibility to read archaeological reports, reviewing the literature on Native American issues is a part of our basic professional commitment.

#### **Archaeologist-Native American Relations**

Several sources, written from a variety of perspectives, review the history of relations between archaeologists and Native Americans. These include Deloria (1992, 1995), Downer (1997), Ferguson (1996), Layton (1989), McBryde (1985), McGuire (1989, 1992), and Trigger (1980, 1989, 1990), among others. Sprague (1974) and Winter (1979) provide early, and prophetic, statements about Native American concerns and the need for archaeologists to address these concerns. The overview presented here is meant to highlight some of the main points raised by these accounts.

On a national scale, speculation about the origin of archaeological sites began with the first colonists. An all-too-frequent tendency of these early interpretations was to deny the relationship between archaeological sites and living native people, usually on the grounds that the archaeological monuments were simply too magnificent to have been produced by the modern Native American tribes. Such arguments were explicitly racist. Within the field of anthropology, the unilineal evolutionary schemes of the late 1800s (Trigger 1980, 1985, 1989) were sometimes (though not always) linked to racist theories to account for why some societies occupied higher levels than others in the unilineal scheme. Several authors have demonstrated the connection between these early perspectives and the ideology of manifest destiny that justified the westward expansion of American settlement and the appropriation of native land (Ferguson 1996:64-65).

In the late nineteenth century in the northern Southwest, there was a popular tendency to identify large Puebloan archaeological sites with the Aztec and Toltec civilizations of Mexico, perhaps on the presumption that they were too grand to have been the work of contemporary Southwestern native people. Robert and Florence Lister (1990:4-5) suggest that Prescott's (1843) "History of the Conquest of Mexico" was influential in spreading the Aztecs' own legends that their ancestors and those of the earlier Toltecs had come from far to the northwest of the Valley of Mexico. Lewis Henry Morgan (1965:218-223), a leading anthropological theorist who was also influenced by Prescott, argued that the archaeological sites of the Four Corners area represent an ancient population that underwent rapid growth and spun off not only the ancestors of both the historic Pueblo people and the Aztecs, but the "Mound-builders" of the midwestern United States as well. Lister and Lister (1987:3) attribute the naming of Aztec Ruin in northwestern New Mexico to Prescott's influence, and also note that the city of Prescott, Arizona is named after this prominent nineteenth century historian. Presumably the naming of Montezuma County, and Cortez, Colorado reflects the same impulse to see a connection between the Four Corners area and central Mexico, although the notion of "Montezuma's treasure" may also have contributed. This popular legend is widespread in the West and is based on liberal interpretations of early Spanish

accounts. The legend holds that the Aztecs moved a large treasure of gold and other precious items to a secret place far to the north before their capital fell to Cortez (Probert 1977:xiii; Dobie 1930:230-233).

By the early nineteenth century, Montezuma was also considered to be an important figure, usually with supernatural hero qualities, by a number of Southwestern native groups—including some of the Pueblos (Parmentier 1979; also see Morgan 1965:165-167 and Dobie 1930:230-233). This belief evidently arose independently of the “Montezuma’s treasure” legends common in the Anglo-European community. Parmentier (1979) thinks it most likely was introduced from Mexican sources in the nineteenth century.

The “Aztec connection” may have characterized early popular opinion about Puebloan archaeological sites in the northern Southwest, but most archaeological and historical research during the late nineteenth century attempted to refute this perspective. Newberry (1876), who visited Chaco Canyon in 1859, had no difficulty in relating the buildings there to the Pueblo communities he had just visited in the Rio Grande area. The historian Hubert Bancroft (1875:682-683) systematically listed numerous ways in which Southwestern archaeological sites differed from those of the Aztecs, as well as the ways in which they resembled contemporary Pueblo dwellings. Archaeological fieldwork by Holmes (1878), Jackson (1876a, 1878), and Nordenskiöld (1979) in southwestern Colorado, and Mindeleff (1891), Cushing (1886), and Fewkes (1896) elsewhere on the Colorado Plateau, established a firm connection between archaeological sites and modern Pueblo people (Lipe, Chapter 3; Downer 1997:28; Ferguson et al. 1997:247). Southwestern archaeologists working in the early twentieth century also actively used (and sometimes misused) archaeological evidence to support Puebloan land claims (Ferguson et al. 1997:247; Johnson 1973; King 1972; Lekson 1988, 1990).

The diffusionist and cultural-historical approaches that arose in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in reaction to the excesses of unilineal evolutionary theory tended to assume (to varying degrees) that cultural change was most commonly due to outside influences and that local innovation was rare. These assumptions influenced early Southwestern archaeologists, who tended not to expect much cultural change through time, so that archaeological cultures were often viewed as essentially the same as the ethnographically recorded cultures. Working from a broader international context, Trigger (1980, 1985, 1989) and others have taken this “no change” perspective as evidence of a crypto-racist assumption that Native American cultures were inherently noninventive. For example, Fewkes (1896) interpreted ancient Mesa Verde society in terms of direct Western Pueblo analogs, assuming there had been little or no historical change and that all Puebloan cultures, both historical and ancient, were basically similar.

Although the American school of cultural-historical ethnology as promoted by Franz Boas and his students did not emphasize innovation, it was explicitly antiracist, and provided a framework for viewing the historical formation of particular cultures as the outcome of processes of diffusion, migration, drift, innovation, and loss, as constrained by the environment and by vaguely defined psychological tendencies of the human mind (Aberle 1960). When archaeologists working within the Boasian paradigm began to concentrate on developing methods for building chronological sequences, they found increasing empirical evidence that cultural change had occurred (Lyman et al. 1997). The Pueblo Southwest was one of the first places in America where systematic empirical archaeological studies began to overturn the “no change” model. The rancher-turned archaeologist Richard Wetherill recognized the Basketmaker to Pueblo sequence in

the early 1890s (Blackburn and Williamson 1997), and professional archaeologists such as Kidder, Morris, and Nelson developed fairly detailed regional chronological sequences in several parts of the northern Southwest in the first third of the 1900s (see Lipe, Chapter 3).

Increasing methodological sophistication was correlated with increasing professionalization of archaeology after about 1910. In many ways, this has resulted in positive changes; archaeologists have gotten better at learning directly from the archaeological record, and not just projecting ethnographically derived conceptions on the past as Fewkes had done (and continued to do through the 1920s). The unfortunate consequence of archaeologists no longer practicing both ethnography and archaeology is that it further distances archaeologists from living Native Americans. The adoption of a highly inductive research methodology also led archaeologists to focus on constructing chronologies and artifact typologies and to postpone attempting to trace historical connections between archaeological units and living cultures until some indefinite time in the future when more evidence had been accumulated. Oral histories, which had been employed perhaps too enthusiastically by Fewkes and some of the other early Southwestern archaeologists, also fell into general disfavor as aids for interpreting the archaeological record. The treatment of archaeological materials in formal, rather than functional terms, and the focus on the cultural rather than the social aspects of early sites kept archaeologists from writing accounts of past societies as dynamic entities populated by real people.

From the perspective of Native American relationships, a different set of “mixed blessings” emerged when the field shifted from a cultural-historical to a “processual” theoretical stance in the 1960s and 1970s (Ferguson 1996:65). Processual archaeology explicitly recognized that native cultures were as creative as European cultures of similar social, technological, and demographic scale, and attempted to treat past societies as dynamically functioning systems. On the other hand, the law-based and generalizing goals of this paradigm denied the utility of studying the specific histories of specific Native American peoples (Trigger 1980, 1985). Individual early societies and cultural traditions were seen as “cases” to be used in a comparative search for cross-cultural generalizations. This type of “scientific” archaeology is typically seen as dehumanizing by native peoples because findings are presented in universal terms with no connection to specific tribes or tribal histories.

The conflicts between archaeologists, who believe they pursue a discipline that benefits humanity, and Native Americans, who argue that the discipline strips them of their humanity, is also present in the larger field of cultural anthropology. The work of ethnographers has often been seen as intrusive and exploitive by native people, and the field of anthropology continues to wrestle with the ethical implications of how the study of living societies affects the people who are being studied. On the other hand, twentieth century anthropology—as exemplified by the work of scholars from Boas to Mead to the present—has fought long and hard to defeat popular racist and imperialist assumptions. Anthropologists and archaeologists have often been in the forefront of efforts to support native land claims and the preservation of traditional cultural practices. In a broader sense, anthropological and archaeological research has paved the way for reductions in ethnocentrism among the general public, and for the increased acceptance of the intrinsic value of cultural diversity. This work has helped to create a present-day social context where tribes can assert an agenda that promotes tribal identity-building, sovereignty, and self-determination. In this manner, archaeological and anthropological research has made contributions to the development of a political environment where the consistent and insistent voice of Native Americans was finally heard, resulting in federal and state legislation that has forever changed how archaeology is practiced.

However, most problems between archaeologists and Native Americans do not stem from differences in general philosophical stances; they stem from specific concerns held by native people. In this regard, three points are very clear when reviewing the history of relations between archaeologists and Native Americans. First, archaeologists have assumed that the problem was that Native Americans did not understand what archaeologists do and that the conflict would disappear if the profession could only educate native people about archaeology. Second, although there is great diversity among Native Americans, they have been remarkably consistent in their primary concerns about archaeology. Chief among these is the treatment of human remains and sacred objects by archaeologists. Time and again archaeologists have tried to explain the value of studying and curating these materials, but native people have held firm in their belief that this is a desecration that causes direct harm to living people. Third, for many years, archaeologists either ignored or resisted Native Americans in their efforts to change archaeological practice with regards to the treatment of human remains; the behavior of archaeologists only changed when it was eventually mandated by federal law. As Zimmerman (1997:46) points out, archaeologists have consistently underestimated the intensity of Native American sentiment, overestimated their own political power and public influence, and misjudged public opinion with regard to these issues.

### **Federal and State Laws**

Since the turn of the century, the archaeological profession has fought to establish laws that protect archaeological resources; these laws have been summarized elsewhere (Fowler 1986; Green 1984; King 1998; Knudson and Keel 1995; Price 1991; Stumpf 1992). The principal historic preservation laws, most of which apply to archaeological sites, have been reprinted in a single booklet published by the National Park Service (NPS 1993). These laws and their implementing regulations can also be accessed through the NPS's cultural resources web site "Links to the Past" (<http://www.cr.nps.gov/>).

Tsosie (1997) provides an excellent overview of how each of these laws relates to Native American concerns, including a critique from her perspective as a law professor and Native American activist. From her perspective, the laws serve to protect archaeological resources, but they legitimize the interests of archaeologists and marginalize Native Americans (Tsosie 1997:68). Only with the 1990 passage of NAGPRA, which Tsosie (1997:70) terms "human rights legislation," were Native American concerns directly addressed.

Two points are central to Tsosie's critique of the Antiquities Act of 1906 and subsequent historic preservation legislation. First, these laws define historic preservation in terms of property rights, instead of human rights, which subordinates Indian concerns based on spiritual and religious criteria. Second, the laws establish archaeologists and anthropologists as the experts, thereby justifying their interests while disenfranchising native perspectives. Ferguson et al. (1997) find a great deal of merit in Tsosie's discussion of these laws, but they are critical of the subtext of her review, which pits Euroamerican values against Native American values. They acknowledge some truth to this clash of values, but they demonstrate that the real legal and ethical landscape is far more complex than this oppositional perspective. They conclude that current laws may be problematic from a Native American perspective, but they are better than no laws at all. Further, improvements to the current laws will require archaeologists and Native Americans to work together and not against one another (Ferguson et al. 1997:245; Zimmerman 1997:48).

### **National Environmental Policy Act (1969)**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an environmental impact statement (EIS) for large projects and an environmental analysis (EA) for smaller federal undertakings that have a significant impact on the environment, which includes historic and cultural aspects of the environment. NEPA prescribes a process by which federal agencies consult with other agencies and various groups on proposed projects, including Native Americans, if a project has the potential to impact aspects of the historic and cultural environment important to them. Through consultation, tribes can identify impacts during the initial stages of a project, which may result in the preservation of sites through avoidance (Northern Arizona University [NAU] and SWCA 1996:11). A concern for Native Americans is that successful avoidance often requires full disclosure, which can include specifying site location and describing the practices that occur at the site. NEPA provides an “umbrella” for considering impacts of federal projects on the environment, as broadly defined; Section 106 of NHPA, discussed below, provides specific requirements for federal agencies when they deal with historic properties under NEPA (King 1998). Ideally, compliance with Section 106 of NHPA will be integrated with NEPA compliance.

In practice, NEPA requires documentation of potential effects of federal projects on the human environment and directs federal agencies to consider reasonable mitigative measures to lessen those effects, but the act does not require federal agencies to adopt mitigative measures that will address the concerns of all parties. Because of this, NEPA provides only procedural protection to archaeological sites by requiring that historic and cultural values be considered in agency planning, and only partially addresses Native American concerns, including those outlined in the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), discussed below. Despite these limitations, the BLM and the Forest Service in southwestern Colorado have conducted successful consultations with Native Americans using NEPA as a vehicle for dialog; NEPA has also been used to involve Native Americans and address their concerns elsewhere in the Southwest (Jackson and Stevens 1997:140).

### **Archaeological Resources Protection Act (1979)**

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) seeks to protect archaeological resources on federal land. ARPA provides the mechanism by which federal permits are issued for archaeological studies and it requires that affected native tribes be notified and consulted as a part of the permitting process (Ferguson 1996). Further, the law stipulates that the remains and objects that are recovered from archaeological fieldwork on native land are the property of the tribe (Tsosie 1997:69). Tsosie (1997:69) correctly points out that the law does not give tribes the right to veto projects on public land, but tribal review of archaeological research designs does give Native Americans an opportunity to communicate their concerns to the federal agency issuing the permit before a project begins and hence can potentially steer the outcome toward avoidance of culturally sensitive sites or portions of sites.

### **National Historic Preservation Act (1966 as amended)**

The NHPA is the foundation our nation’s historic preservation policy, and most recent archaeological research conducted in the United States stems from provisions in this act. As noted above, Section 106 also guides agency compliance with NEPA, with regard to historic properties. The NHPA established the National Historic Preservation Program, the Advisory Council on

Historic Preservation (ACHP), the NRHP and SHPOs. It asserts a national policy favoring the preservation and stewardship of historic properties, and requires federal agencies to consider this policy in the conduct of their activities. The values expressed on behalf of the United States by this law are the same values held by native peoples with regard to historic resources.

Section 110 of the act gives federal agencies an affirmative responsibility for preserving historic properties under their ownership or control. This includes identifying and evaluating historic properties and nominating them to the NRHP where appropriate. Agencies are directed to consider cultural as well as historic, archaeological, and architectural values in managing and maintaining historic properties, and to consult with tribes as well as other federal, state, and local agencies and appropriate interest groups in carrying out their preservation activities.

Section 106 of NHPA and its attendant regulations establish a planning process by which federal agencies review and consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Undertakings include projects carried out, permitted, or assisted by federal agencies. Historic properties are defined in terms of NRHP criteria and can include historic buildings, archaeological sites, historic districts, historic places such as battlefields, and traditional cultural properties such as sacred places, plant-gathering grounds, and other areas deemed important to maintaining a particular, traditional way of life. Section 106 compliance requires that properties potentially affected by an undertaking be inventoried and evaluated to determine their eligibility for the NRHP. Also outlined in Section 106 are the processes by which federal agencies consult with the SHPO, and in some cases the ACHP, regarding the potential impact of projects on significant historical sites and plans for avoiding or reducing such impacts.

Section 106 requires that this review and planning process be initiated early in any federal undertaking to identify the direct and indirect effects of undertakings on properties listed on or eligible for the NRHP. The regulations for Section 106 mandate that federal agencies do the following when planning an undertaking that potentially can affect significant historic properties: identify relevant properties, evaluate their significance, assess potential effects, determine whether these effects are adverse or not, consult with the SHPO and other relevant parties, and consider ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to significant historic properties in the execution of the project. The regulations also describe circumstances under which the ACHP may become involved; ordinarily the ACHP will become involved only when serious conflicts cannot be resolved at the local level. The Section 106 process does not establish a class of "endangered historic properties" that must be preserved at all costs, and it does not prohibit federal agencies from destroying or assisting in the destruction of significant historic properties if they determine that the economic or other values of a project outweigh the historic values. It establishes a planning process within which historic values must be considered by the agency; it provides ways for states, tribes, and other interested parties to have input to agency planning; and it provides mechanisms that promote conflict resolution rather than litigation. A recent thorough explication of how Section 106 works (or should work) is provided by King (1998).

New implementing regulations for Section 106 (36 CFR part 800) were finalized by the ACHP on 12 February 1999. These regulations mandate Native American involvement in the Section 106 process that is consistent with the 1992 amendments. They direct federal agencies to recognize the expertise of Native Americans when assessing the religious or cultural significance of sites. The 1992 amendments, plus the new regulations for Section 106, give greater recognition to tribal sovereignty and promote government-to-government relationships between tribes and

federal agencies in historic preservation planning. They may also provide a framework within which the confidentiality concerns of tribes may be addressed.

The 1992 amendments to Section 101 of the NHPA are particularly important for addressing Native American concerns. These amendments recognize the potential eligibility of traditional religious and cultural properties (TCPs) for inclusion in the NRHP by specifying that Native American values be considered in the federal management and disposition of archaeological sites and historic properties (Ferguson 1996:67; Ferguson et al. 1995a:14-15; Parker and King 1990). The management of TCPs requires archaeologists to engage in expanded consultation with Native Americans and to learn how to integrate ethnographic and ethnohistoric data into their archaeological reports. It also encourages the gathering of ethnographic and ethnohistoric data on a regional basis, and establishes a network of face-to-face contact among federal agencies, Native American tribes, archaeologists, and other specialists. Archaeologists need to be aware that Native Americans often consider information about TCPs confidential and should expect to help ensure that this confidentiality is maintained. Finally, the management of TCPs presents a problem for both archaeologists and Native Americans when there are direct impacts to TCPs that cannot be mitigated.

The 1992 amendments to NHPA also allow tribes to implement tribal historic preservation programs and assume the management and compliance responsibilities for cultural resources on tribal land. This brings tribes in as partners in the National Historic Preservation Program, along with federal agencies, the states, and local communities. Many tribes have enacted tribal preservation legislation, have appointed tribal historic preservation officers (THPOs), and have created tribal historic preservation programs (Anyon and Ferguson 1995; Begay 1997; Downer 1990; Ferguson 1999; Klesert and Downer 1990). The two tribes in southwestern Colorado—the Ute Mountain Ute and Southern Ute—have not pursued this option, although both tribes have contact people to deal with cultural resource management issues. The Zuni and Navajo tribal historic preservation and archaeology programs have indirectly affected the practice of archaeology in southwestern Colorado. These programs have trained tribal members in all aspects of cultural resource management, have developed policies for consultation that serve as a model for archaeology, and have shown how the tribal perspective on cultural resource management, which emphasizes avoidance and preservation rather than excavation, can be implemented in full compliance with federal law (Begay 1997; Swidler and Cohen 1997). Archaeologists working in southwestern Colorado would do well to examine the operation of these tribal archaeological programs to gain a better understanding of the tribal perspective on CRM.

### **American Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978)**

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) seeks to protect the right of Native Americans to practice their traditional religious beliefs, which can include access to archaeological sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through traditional ceremonies and rites. Although it was not written specifically as a historic preservation law, Native Americans do see a direct connection between the preservation of archaeological materials and their ability to preserve and practice their religion. There are no implementing regulations and no official procedures that govern consultation under AIRFA, and Tsosie (1997:73) points out that the “courts have been less than charitable in assessing impacts on Native American religious interests under AIRFA.” Agencies have chosen to comply with AIRFA by consulting with appropriate Native Americans to determine how federally funded projects might impact Native American religious practice (NAU and SWCA 1996).



## **Executive Order 13007**

This order was issued by President Clinton in May 1996. Among other things, it requires federal agencies to take reasonable steps to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Native American sacred sites by Native American religious practitioners, to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sites, and to provide notice to native tribes of actions that might affect sacred sites. Agencies are required to maintain confidentiality of information about sacred sites where appropriate (King 1998:157). This order complements AIRFA and other laws designed to ensure the freedom of Native Americans to practice traditional religions. It is more specific than AIRFA with regard to ensuring protection of and access to sacred sites, which can include archaeological sites.

## **Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990)**

Tsosie (1997:70) regards NAGPRA as differing from other historic preservation legislation in being “human rights legislation,” written to address inequalities in treatment of Euroamerican and Native American human remains and funerary objects under existing laws. NAGPRA gives Native Americans ownership of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony if certain conditions are met. (These terms are defined in the law and in 43 CFR Part 10, the implementing regulations issued in December 1995). The law applies to human remains and specified types of objects that were in museums and federal repositories prior to 1990, and to the treatment and disposition of these remains and objects encountered inadvertently or in planned archaeological studies after 1990. The remains and objects covered by the law must be from federal or tribal land, or must be curated by federal agencies or in federally supported museums.

Assigning ownership of human remains and objects covered by NAGPRA requires that a claim be made by lineal relatives or tribes, and follows a hierarchy that gives highest priority to lineal relatives, then to the tribe on whose land the remains or objects have been found, and then to the most closely culturally affiliated tribe, if the remains or other objects are not from tribal land. Giving the landholding tribe priority over a tribe that may have a closer cultural affiliation is a recognition of tribal sovereignty over tribal land. That is, it leaves it up to the landholding tribe to set its own procedures for repatriating human remains and NAGPRA-covered objects to other tribes, should it wish to do so. This places the landholding tribe in the same position regarding its own land as is the federal government with regard to federal land.

In cases where a cultural affiliation cannot be determined for remains or objects found on federal land, ownership is given to the tribe that is considered to have been the aboriginal occupant of the location where the remains or objects were found, as determined by the Indian Claims Commission or the U.S. Court of Claims, unless a claim is filed by another tribe that has a closer relationship to the items in question. In the northern Southwest, most federal land has not been determined to be the aboriginal territory of particular tribes, so in these cases this provision would not apply. The law also recognizes a residual category of culturally unaffiliated remains and objects; the Act directs the NAGPRA Review Committee to compile an inventory of unaffiliated human remains that are in federal agency or museum collections and to recommend “specific actions for developing a process for the disposition of such remains” (Section 8(c)(5)). The NAGPRA Review Committee is in the process of carrying out this responsibility. The “ownership” section of the Act also provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Review Committee, Native American groups, and representatives of museums and the

scientific community, will promulgate regulations covering human remains and objects unclaimed under NAGPRA, which would include culturally unaffiliated materials. These proposed regulations, which have not yet been developed, would presumably apply both to the inventory and repatriation of pre-1990 collections, and to the disposition of remains and objects encountered on federal land after that date.

Although NAGPRA gives federal agencies and museums the primary responsibility for determining affiliation and repatriation, the law and its regulations permit tribes to bring forward their own evidence regarding affiliation and to challenge decisions with which they do not agree. Among its various duties, the NAGPRA Review Committee is authorized to review and make findings regarding questions of affiliation or repatriation, when asked to do so. It also is charged with facilitating the resolution of disputes among tribes, lineal descendants, agencies, and museums regarding repatriation of particular human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. The committee's membership includes tribal representatives, traditional religious leaders, and representatives of museums and national scientific organizations.

NAGPRA requires that after 1990, federal agencies must consult with the appropriate native tribe or tribes about the disposition of human burials, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony before such items are excavated from federally managed land. Particularly important for Native Americans is the principle that NAGPRA consultations constitute a government-to-government relationship that recognizes tribal sovereignty, and acknowledges the unique trust relationship between the federal government and tribes (Tsosie 1997:70; Rice 1997:218; White Deer 1997:41).

NAGPRA, along with the 1992 amendments to NHPA, has fundamentally changed the way American archaeology is practiced (Ferguson 1996; Goldstein and Kintigh 1990; Klesert and Powell 1993; Meighan 1992; Powell et al. 1993; Zimmerman 1997). The law has restructured the way archaeologists deal with human remains, and the consultation process has forced archaeologists and federal agency resource managers to address Native American concerns in face-to-face meetings with tribal representatives. For the most part, the profession has adjusted to NAGPRA and developed ways of treating human remains and other items covered by NAGPRA in ways that are consistent with Native American interests but at the same time meet the requirements of archaeological documentation. One of the greatest challenges faced in implementing NAGPRA is the determination of cultural affiliation; this is addressed below.

### **Act Concerning the Preservation of Historical, Prehistorical, and Archaeological Resources of Colorado (1990)**

This act governs the treatment of human remains on state land or on private land if the excavations are being conducted under a state permit. A state permit is not required for excavation on private land, but the SHPO encourages those who are excavating on private land to obtain a permit and abide by this law. The law specifies that archaeologists must notify the coroner if human remains are discovered, and the coroner must notify the state archaeologist. If the remains are Native American, the state archaeologist notifies the State Indian Affairs Commission. If the remains are disinterred, the archaeologist who conducts the disinterment assumes temporary custody of the human remains, for a period not to exceed one year for the purpose of study and analysis.

## Implications of Federal and State Laws for Archaeological Practice

Native Americans point out that tribes have had a preservation policy long before there was any historic preservation legislation (Begay 1997:162; Van Pelt et al. 1997:169). Such policy stems from deeply held cultural values that recognize an obligation to serve as stewards of ancient sites and sacred objects as a part of the ancestral legacy. Although there is great diversity among native peoples and their attitudes toward archaeology, there is a consistent theme in their viewpoints on the preservation of archaeological sites: whenever possible, preservation should be accomplished through avoidance, leaving the site intact (Begay 1997:162; Martin 1997:129). Archaeology has of course documented numerous cases prior to European contact where earlier sites were disturbed or modified by later Native American occupants, including the movement or disturbance of human burials. Such evidence of imperfect adherence to preservation values in the past does not mean that such values were not important in the past as well as the present. It should be remembered that in late twentieth century America there has been widespread and increasing public support for historic preservation, reinforced by numerous state and local as well as federal laws; nonetheless, destruction of historic sites of all ages has continued at a high rate, largely due to economic development and commercial and recreational looting. It also seems likely that Native American concerns regarding preservation of archaeological sites have been more frequently expressed in recent years, as the extensive loss of ancestral sites outside tribal land has become better known among Native American communities.

Federal and state law does not address every concern expressed by Native Americans (Tsosie 1997; Begay 1997; Ferguson 1996; Ferguson et al. 1997), and there have been explicit calls for legislative reform (Nichols et al. 1989; Klesert and Downer 1990). But current laws and amended regulations have increasingly provided Native Americans with a mechanism for participating in federal programs in archaeology and historic preservation. Problems in the implementation of these laws remain, and archaeologists and Native Americans must work together to resolve these issues.

One example of such a problem is the claim by Hopi and Zuni that archaeological sites are eligible for nomination to the NRHP as TCPs under NRHP Criteria A, B, and C (Dongoske and Anyon 1997:193; Dongoske et al. 1995:13, 39; Ferguson et al. 1995a:14-15). Some federal agency archaeologists have argued the definition of TCPs was not intended to be applied so broadly as to include all sites, and that most archaeological sites are eligible to the NRHP only under Criterion D, which is designed to recognize informational or research potential (Ferguson et al. 1995a:14-15; Sebastian 1995a, 1995b). Adverse effects on sites eligible only under Criterion D can be avoided or mitigated through "data recovery," i.e., archaeological study, so that eventual destruction of the site is not considered an adverse effect. This exception is not available for sites determined eligible under the other criteria; if they are destroyed by a project, it is an adverse effect.

The Hopi-Zuni position is the following: sites are eligible under Criterion A because they are associated with events important to Hopi and Zuni history (clan migrations); they are eligible under Criterion B because they are associated with significant persons (Hopi and Zuni ancestors); and they are eligible under Criterion C because they are representative of a significant and distinguishable entity (clan migrations). Sebastian (1995a, 1995b) provides a cogent rationale for why she believes most archaeological sites are only eligible under Criterion D, and discusses which sites would be considered under Criteria A-C. She argues that making sites eligible under

Criterion A and not D would not provide additional protection for sites, would not confer any additional consultation rights, and would add considerable delays to the Section 106 process, which could ultimately risk a political backlash that would weaken the legislation. Tribal archaeologists (Dongoske et al. 1995:13, 39; Dongoske and Anyon 1997:193) argue that consideration of whether archaeological sites are eligible under Criteria A-C is seen as a problem by state and federal agencies largely because it requires them to take tribal perspectives and values into account in evaluating the historic importance of these sites, whether proposed actions would have adverse effects on them, and whether these effects could be mitigated in any way other than avoidance. They believe that nomination to the NRHP under Criteria A-C would result in greater consideration of tribal values and in more avoidance of sites rather than their excavation under the “data recovery” exception.

King (1998) has long argued that this “research exception” for sites eligible only under Criterion D is an anomaly in Section 106, and that archaeological sites—whether Native American or Euroamerican—should be evaluated against the full set of NRHP criteria. He also points out that nothing in NHPA requires agencies to avoid every adverse effect on historic properties, and that the law simply requires agencies to weigh historic values against the other values embodied in a project. King believes that agencies should be prepared to make hard choices about which NRHP-eligible properties should be preserved and which should not be on the basis of weighing historic values against other values important to societies.

From the perspectives of the tribes, current implementation of laws regarding TCPs results in a conceptual and legal reduction of sacred sites to historic sites, which they view as a pragmatic management solution that is emotionally difficult for traditional native people to accept (Ferguson et al. 1995a:14). In southwestern Colorado, the ethnographic study for the Animas-La Plata Project did identify Puebloan habitation and ceremonial sites as TCPs under NRHP Criterion A (see Northern Arizona University and SWCA, Inc. 1996). The Native American consultants on the Mapco pipeline also identified all habitation sites as TCPs eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. For these two projects, agency archaeologists have viewed these sites as eligible only under Criterion D, and have currently opposed eligibility under Criterion A. Agency archaeologists do continue to consider the views of Native Americans and anticipate further dialog with them on the eligibility of habitation sites under Criterion A. Ferguson et al. (1995a:15) suggest that archaeologists and resource managers must realize that their interpretation of the language in federal regulations is not necessarily the only or best interpretation of the laws, and that native people will continue to press for an interpretation of these laws consistent with native values and perspectives.

Another problem is the issue of confidentiality with regard to TCPs, but recent consultations indicate that archaeologists and Native Americans can resolve these issues when they work together. For example, the ethnographic study for the Animas-La Plata project identified a Jemez collecting area as a potential TCP. Representatives of Jemez visited the site and determined that it would not be directly impacted by the Animas-La Plata project. Jemez officials decided they did not want to reveal the location of this area; because of this, its eligibility to the NRHP could not be evaluated. Instead, Jemez officials requested that they be updated on any changes in the project that might affect this TCP in order to monitor the potential for future impacts. Another example comes from Oklahoma where TCPs are only located to the nearest 26-52 km<sup>2</sup> (10-20 mi<sup>2</sup>) area (Brooks 1997). This meets the requirements of the cultural resource managers and addresses the Native Americans’ need for confidentiality.

There are currently two main thrusts to how the implementation of NAGPRA affects archaeologists working in southwestern Colorado. First, it provides a process for agencies to deal with planned excavations of archaeological sites and with inadvertent discoveries of archaeological material. A number of consultations have taken place in southwestern Colorado between agencies and tribes regarding disposition of NAGPRA-covered remains and objects if they are encountered in planned excavations. These consultations assist the agency in developing stipulations on ARPA permits for treatment of human remains and other NAGPRA-protected items should these be encountered. Second, NAGPRA provides a process for dealing with human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony that are covered by NAGPRA and that were in museums or federal agency possession prior to the passage of the Act in 1990. Here, full compliance has been slowed by the lack (until recently) of implementing regulations and by insufficient funding to enable agencies, museums, and tribes to expeditiously carry out the requirements of the law. Nonetheless, much work on existing collections has been done, and a number of repatriations have been completed. Regulations covering most aspects of the law were issued in December 1995 (43 CFR Part 10). As of this writing, the NAGPRA Review Committee has published for comment a draft of some general principles that could be used in developing regulations about disposition of culturally unaffiliated human remains.

The NAGPRA process has moved forward, but new problems have developed as agencies have reached the implementation stage. One such problem is the actual reburial of human remains, which many tribes choose to do once these remains have been repatriated. As noted, NAGPRA provides a process through which tribes can claim ownership of such remains (as well as funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony) and have them repatriated from museum collections or be turned over after recovery during post-NAGPRA excavations. Not surprisingly, if tribes decide to rebury human remains or other repatriated materials, they want this information to remain confidential. Agencies are concerned about being able to ensure this confidentiality in the face of requests made under the Freedom of Information Act. In addition, agencies are concerned about being able to protect these materials in perpetuity if they are reburied on federal land. Given the difficulties they have encountered in protecting archaeological sites from vandalism and looting, agencies are cautious about assuming responsibility to protect reburied human remains in perpetuity.

NAGPRA also stipulates Native American involvement on inadvertent discoveries on federal or tribal land of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony. It is possible for agencies to develop an advance plan of action regarding treatment of NAGPRA-related items inadvertently encountered on a project carried out on federal land (43 CFR Part 10(3)). Development of such a plan requires the agency to consult with relevant tribes to obtain their input. If no such plan of action is in place, inadvertent discoveries that take place on federal land as a result of construction or other land-disturbing activities require that the activity cease in the vicinity of the discovery, that efforts be made to protect the remains or NAGPRA-covered objects and that the appropriate federal agency or tribal official (in the case of tribal land) be notified.

Disposition of human remains or other NAGPRA-protected items from either planned excavations or inadvertent discoveries on federal land requires determination of ownership, following the hierarchy of ownership described in the introductory description of the law above. For planned excavations, presumably consultation will have taken place and a plan will have been developed for compliance with NAGPRA. In the absence of a plan of action, inadvertent

discoveries of human remains and/or NAGPRA-protected objects will require consultation to take place as part the process of determining ownership.

The list of potentially affiliated tribes that might become involved in consultations varies from agency to agency, and which tribes are contacted in a particular circumstance depends on the agency's preliminary assessment of potential affiliation. An inclusive list of potentially affiliated tribes for southwestern Colorado would include the following tribes: Acoma, Cochiti, Hopi, Isleta, Jemez, Jicarilla Apache, Laguna, Nambe, Navajo, Picuris, Pojoaque, San Felipe, San Ildefonso, San Juan, San Juan Southern Paiute, Sandia, Santa Ana, Santa Clara, Santo Domingo, Southern Ute, Taos, Tesuque, Uintah-Ouray (Northern) Ute, Ute Mountain Ute, Zia, and Zuni. Consultations regarding NAGPRA compliance on planned archaeological projects would draw upon the same list. It is the agency's responsibility to assemble and evaluate evidence, determine affiliation and decide which tribal claim is best supported, if there are multiple claims. This must be done in consultation with potentially affiliated tribes, however, and tribes may offer their own evidence regarding affiliation. Procedures are also available under which tribes may dispute agency decisions and/or offer their own evidence regarding cultural affiliation.

An issue of concern for Native Americans is the disparity between NAGPRA and state burial laws. Native Americans would like to see uniformity in protecting the dead on federal, state, and private land (Ferguson et al. 1997:243). Brooks (1997) argues that NAGPRA should be extended to cover all land in the United States.

Finally, some have implied that NAGPRA simply provides a vehicle for militant Indian activists who use the issue of human remains to further a larger political agenda (Grossman 1993:9; Meighan 1992:709). Although it is clear that NAGPRA was designed to recognize tribal sovereignty, the authors believe that few archaeologists or managers who have been involved in NAGPRA consultations during the last decade would see these consultations as being political in nature. The face-to-face consultations required by NAGPRA quickly demonstrate how important this issue is to individual Native Americans as well as to tribes. These deep feelings are also conveyed in many articles by Native Americans which emphasize that treatment of the dead is a key issue that must be addressed by archaeologists (see Swidler et al. 1997). Archaeologists need to take the time to fully understand the attitudes of Native Americans toward treatment of the dead and guard against preconceptions that these attitudes are only motivated by a political agenda. Appreciation for the Native American position on this issue is critical to successful Native American consultations.

### **Affiliation**

In NAGPRA, "cultural affiliation" is a key concept for assessing claims for repatriation. The law (Section 2[2]) defines this as "a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced historically or prehistorically between a present day Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and an identifiable earlier group." For museum collections in existence prior to the passage of the act, agencies and museums are instructed to identify the cultural affiliation of items covered by NAGPRA in consultation with tribal governments, officials of Native Hawaiian organizations, and traditional religious leaders (Section 5 [b][1][A]). Also with reference to existing museum collections, the law states that cultural affiliation should be determined by "a preponderance of the evidence based upon geographical, kinship, biological, archaeological, anthropological, linguistic, folkloric, oral traditional, historical, or other relevant information or expert opinion" (Section 7[a][4]). These definitions are repeated and slightly

amplified in the regulations, which also state that claimants (to human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony) “do not have to establish cultural affiliation with scientific certainty” (43 CFR Part 10, Section 14[f]). With regard to the requirement that shared group identity be traced through time, the regulations state that “a finding of cultural affiliation should be based upon an overall evaluation of the totality of the circumstances and evidence pertaining to the connection between the claimant and the material being claimed and should not be precluded solely because of some gaps in the record” (43 CFR Part 10, Section 14[d]).

Ferguson (1996:66) points out that the determination of cultural affiliation following NAGPRA is a question of legal import, forcing archaeologists to think of old classifications in new ways. As a result, the question of affiliation has raised new methodological issues for agencies, museums, and archaeologists. NAGPRA requires agencies or museums to repatriate to a single tribe, but there is nothing to prohibit multiple tribes or groups of prospective lineal descendants from filing claims. In fact, the law anticipates multiple claims and tries to set up a process by which the most justified claim can be identified. For the northern Southwest, these issues have recently been discussed at a series of meetings known as the Affiliation Conference on Ancestral Peoples of the Four Corners Region (Duke 1999).

Determining cultural affiliation and deciding which of several present-day tribes is most closely affiliated are not easy tasks. At the heart of the problem is that the law appears to assume a likelihood that “identifiable early groups” have a one-to-one correspondence with “present day Indian tribe(s).” In fact, most archaeologically identified cultural units are defined on the basis of a few stylistic markers, the distribution of which may or may not correspond with anything resembling the boundaries of a biological population or an ethnic or language group, as it might have been conceived by the members of such a group. Furthermore, small-scale human sociopolitical groups such as tribes are very likely to grow, decline, split, disperse, combine with other groups, or even die out over time, and are equally likely to undergo cultural change. These processes universally affect human groups and almost ensure that a present-day tribe will be related to multiple “identifiable early groups”; that archaeologically recognized early groups will be represented in the present by from none to many present-day tribes; and that the relationships will be highly variable in character and strength. This perspective, which has long been established in anthropology, is not inconsistent with many tribal oral traditions, which see present-day groups as the result of many small groups such as clans having come together from different areas and cultural backgrounds at different times in the past.

Although NAGPRA specifies the kinds of evidence that can be used to evaluate affiliation, no guidelines are provided regarding how the evidence is to be weighed. For example, if oral tradition and archaeological evidence are both used in determining closest cultural affiliation, how are they evaluated when they contradict each other, or what happens when the oral tradition of two separate groups contradict each other? The concept that decisions should be based on a preponderance of evidence does provide some guidance, however, and anticipates that decisions about affiliation are likely not to be clear-cut.

Despite these problems, it is clear that the history of Native American culture traits, cultures, and populations is recorded in various kinds of evidence, including the distribution of genes in contemporary populations, the relationships among languages, the temporal and spatial distribution and patterns of association of archaeological materials, oral histories, and so forth. Systematic comparisons of ethnographic, environmental, and linguistic evidence in the western United States indicate that there often is a substantial correlation between languages, culture traits,

and geographic locations for groups of tribes (Jorgensen 1969, 1980, 1983). These relationships are most parsimoniously explained by inferring that the tribes in a group share a common, or at least closely related, culture history of considerable temporal depth. Thus, for example, the Western Pueblo tribes resemble one another more than they do the tribes making up the Eastern Pueblo cluster, and both differ in many ways from the Athapaskan and Numic-speaking groups. The anthropological evidence, at least, suggests that a relationship of “shared affiliation” might be appropriate in a number of cases—i.e., that a group of related tribes might be found jointly or equally affiliated to a particular archaeological entity such as a phase or tradition.

The NAGPRA regulations can be read as permitting tribes to file joint claims for repatriation of human remains and NAGPRA-related objects. In the explanatory background material published with the December 1995 version of the regulations, it is stated that the framers of the regulations believed that joint claims are not precluded. The regulations also allow tribes to resolve multiple conflicting claims among themselves (43 CFR Part 10, Section 10[c][2]).

In an ongoing case, the process by which the NPS determined a type of joint affiliation for remains from Aztec and Chaco has been challenged. The NAGPRA Review Committee has heard the evidence for this challenge and decided to reevaluate the determination of affiliation. At the time of this writing, the case was pending. Outside the Southwest, the “Kennewick Man” case is an inadvertent discovery of human remains that appear to be as much as 9,000 years old. The agency in question issued a notice of intent to repatriate it without further study to one of several tribes that had claimed it, but this decision was challenged in federal magistrate’s court by a group of archaeologists and physical anthropologists. Among the grounds for the challenge was this group’s assertion that the question of cultural affiliation could not properly be addressed without studies of the human remains and their context. The federal court placed a stay on the repatriation, and the Department of Interior has taken over the task of evaluating the question of affiliation. Studies and discussions are ongoing as of the time of this writing.

Although disputes over affiliation have occurred in other areas, to the authors’ knowledge, such disputes have not yet resulted from NAGPRA consultations in southwestern Colorado. For the most part, tribes have not been overly concerned with the methodological issues raised by archaeologists (see Duke 1999). Instead, Native Americans and agencies have worked together to achieve a pragmatic solution to the issue at hand. Their main priority has been the timely and appropriate repatriation of the human remains and associated grave goods. Tribes have consulted with each other to determine which tribe will make the claim and be responsible for the repatriation and reburial of these items. The problem is that these procedures work until there is a dispute over a claim; as noted, it was this type of mutual determination of affiliation in the Chaco/Aztec case that was the basis for the challenge noted above.

Despite various obstacles, including the complexity of the provisions of NAGPRA itself, a great deal of progress has been made. The largest pre-1990 museum collections in southwestern Colorado are at Mesa Verde National Park and at the Anasazi Heritage Center near Dolores, with smaller collections in other locations. For the most part, the inventory of these collections has been completed, consultations have begun, and there are cases where affiliation has been determined and material has been repatriated. Mesa Verde has completed its inventory and conducted seven consultations between 1993 and the present. Consultation is ongoing and repatriation of materials from Mesa Verde could begin by the end of 1999. The Anasazi Heritage Center and Forest Service have recently secured funding for the final stage of their consultations and hope to complete repatriation in the near future. For the record, it should be noted that the BLM San Juan Resource



Area conducted its first repatriation for reburial in 1987 before this was mandated by federal law because they recognized the importance of these remains to native groups in the Four Corners area.

With regard to planned excavations, federal agencies in southwestern Colorado have also established a pattern of advance consultation and agreement on NAGPRA compliance on projects subject to ARPA permitting or Section 106 review.

### **Consultation and Communication**

Native tribes take their responsibility to consult extremely seriously (Ferguson et al. 1995a, 1995b). Historic preservation legislation mandates consultation with Native Americans, but provides little guidance on how these consultations should be conducted. The pitfalls and promise that the consultation process entails have been addressed in a number of articles (Brooks 1997; Dongoske and Anyon 1997; Ferguson et al. 1995a, 1995b; Fuller 1997; Klesert and Downer 1990; Othole and Anyon 1993; Rice 1997; Roberts 1997; Swidler and Cohen 1997). Effective consultation is more important today than ever, given the expansion of regulatory laws covering TCPs, the new amendments to the NHPA, and the new regulations governing compliance with Section 106 of that act, and Executive Order 13007 regarding sacred sites.

There still exists a great deal of distrust and misunderstanding, given the history of relations between archaeologists and Native Americans (Carter 1997:152; Downer 1997; Forsman 1997:105-106; Jackson and Stevens 1997:138; Jemison 1997; Martin 1997; White Deer 1997:38). Native Americans continually stress that building trust is the basis for successful consultations (Kluth and Munnell 1997:118), and the increased frequency of consultation over the last decade has done a great deal to build trust and alleviate misunderstanding. Carter (1997:155) identifies tenets that he sees as crucial for archaeologists to follow in order to build trust. These include accepting responsibility for protection of cultural resources, acknowledging tribal sovereignty, and respecting traditional religious and spiritual beliefs.

A key to building greater trust is understanding the cultural differences between Native Americans and archaeologists, especially with regard to how each conceives of the past. The chapters in *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground* (Swidler et al. 1997) make it clear that Native Americans and archaeologists often view the relationship between the past and present in fundamentally different ways (see also Dongoske and Anyon 1997). In general, archaeologists tend to view the past in an objective and relatively unemotional manner. In contrast, Native Americans see themselves as spiritually connected to the past through oral tradition, ceremonial practices, and beliefs; they see this connection as vital to their cultural survival (Tsosie 1997:65; Begay 1997:165-166; White Deer 1997:38-43). Archaeologists tend to see archaeological sites as static sources of data, but Native Americans view these sites as being imbued with life and still inhabited by their ancestors (Dongoske and Anyon 1997:189-191; Ferguson et al. 1997:239).

Cultural differences between archaeologists and Native Americans go beyond a secular versus religious dichotomy. There are important differences in the way each group conceptualizes time and organizes meaning in their world. Native peoples tend to see time as circular, connecting living people to the past in an unbroken continuum. Archaeologists tend to view time as linear and characterize change in terms of evolutionary social progression (Anyon et al. 1997:82-83; Suzuki

and Knudsen 1992; Tsosie 1997:64). Archaeologists tend to organize their knowledge of the past through categorization, and this is foreign to the more holistic perspectives of Native Americans.

Bridging these cultural differences and accepting Native Americans as equal partners in our collective study of the past means that archaeologists need to broaden their paradigm for understanding the past (White Deer 1997:42-43). As Rice (1997:225) notes, archaeologists can bridge this gap by recognizing that archaeology is regarded as both a science and a humanity by the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Archaeologists have done a great deal to develop the scientific side of the discipline, but the humanistic aspect of archaeological study has not been equally developed (Rice 1997:225).

The Department of the Interior has published general guidelines for how to consult with tribes regarding TCPs (Parker and King 1990), and these guidelines are useful for other types of consultations as well. Native Americans and archaeologists who work for tribal historic preservation programs have made specific and concrete suggestions on how to conduct successful consultations.

- It is imperative that consultations be initiated at the earliest possible stage in a project (Fuller 1997:186; Watkins 1995:15).
- The agency must clearly identify the nature of the consultation (Ferguson et al. 1995a:14).
- It is important to contact the right people in native communities and adhere to tribal protocol (Brooks 1997: 213-215; Fuller 1997:183). Brooks and Fuller note that historical and political factors can make identification of the correct and most knowledgeable consultants difficult. Nevertheless, consultations between tribes and federal agencies are government-to-government interactions and contacts should begin through the tribal historic preservation office or the contact person for historic preservation issues within the tribal government. In many cases, tribal historic preservation offices have established contacts with individuals and groups who have the specialized knowledge required for a specific consultation (Begay 1997:162; Ferguson et al. 1995a:13)
- Native American consultants are experts and should be financially compensated for their services (Ferguson et al. 1995a:13); the Navajo Nation has developed an explicit set of procedures so that the compensation process is not abused (Swidler and Cohen 1997:200-201).
- Locating the proper people and having the appropriate discussions takes time, and the 30-day period allotted by law is often insufficient. Federal managers should schedule a longer period for the consultation process if they want meaningful results (Brooks 1997:214; Ferguson et al. 1995b:12).
- Dignity and respect for the cultural and traditional knowledge of the tribe must be acknowledged (Begay 1997:165; Fuller 1997:184).
- Consultations should attempt to identify how the archaeological project can be made relevant to native people (Begay 1997:165).
- Ongoing communication during the course of the project is essential; the tribe should not be the last to know about important discoveries or a change in plans (Carter 1997:154).
- The agency should ensure that the results of archaeological investigations are reported to the tribes in language that is free of professional jargon (Begay 1997:165; Carter 1997:154).
- It is imperative that archaeologists consider the consequences that archaeological findings have for native cultural identity (Begay 1997:165).

- Finally, the authors would add that for project-specific consultations, it is desirable for the agency to involve to the extent possible the archaeologists who will be doing the fieldwork.

### **Appropriate Use of Oral Tradition**

The increase in consultation raises the issue of the appropriate use of oral tradition (Anyon et al. 1996; Anyon et al. 1997). Much of this information is sacred knowledge that many tribal people consider confidential. At the same time, incorporating evidence from oral tradition into archaeological interpretation holds promise for enhancing the scientific understanding of the past, expanding the presentation of ancient history to the general public, and making the interpretations of the past more meaningful (Echo-Hawk 1997). To realize this potential, archaeologists need to understand how knowledge in Native American oral tradition differs from knowledge in western society. Tito Naranjo discusses this topic later in this chapter. Anyon and others (1996, 1997) discuss the more specific issue of how information from oral tradition differs from information recovered from the archaeological record.

Oral tradition and archaeological research are separate but overlapping ways of knowing the past. Both exist in the present and furnish knowledge about the past, but they are fundamentally different in terms of how observations and measurements are made and interpreted (Anyon et al. 1997). Both deal with palimpsests of history—records where traces of the earlier events show through to the present. In the archaeological record, it is the traces of the material record of past human life that are only partially preserved. In oral tradition, it is the memory traces of how a specific culture defines its past and uses this knowledge to relate to the world in its present form (Anyon et al. 1997:79-80).

Oral tradition differs from the accounts that archaeologists write in its treatment of time and space: archaeology seeks to order knowledge in terms of strict temporal and spatial referents, but those are seldom as important in oral tradition (Anyon et al. 1997:80, 82-83). Archaeological and oral knowledge are also used differently. As scientists, archaeologists tend to look for universal and exclusive truth. As Naranjo (1995) points out, Native American oral tradition is often axiomatic, providing multiple levels of meaning. Anyon and others (1997:81-82) provide an illustration of this difference with an example from Zuni.

Oral traditions often function primarily to provide moral instruction or to justify the way society's institutions are structured. History, in the sense of a sequential account of events, may be present in the oral tradition, but will often be subjugated to its primary functions. The accounts that archaeologists construct on the basis of archaeological evidence cannot escape having implications for how both past and contemporary society is perceived and evaluated (Shanks and Tilley 1987). However, the primary goal of the archaeologist is to construct an account that relies on empirical evidence to identify past events or patterns, and that arranges these events or patterns in spatial and temporal order, usually with some kind of accompanying interpretive narrative that connects the elements.

A number of studies have demonstrated that empirical history in the sense that archaeologists ordinarily use the term is often embedded in oral tradition (Eggan 1967; Pendergast and Meighan 1959; Teague 1993; Wiget 1982). Methods for analyzing the historical content of oral traditions, usually in concert with other lines of evidence, have been developed by anthropologists (Vansina 1985). In a remarkable essay, Echo-Hawk (1997:93) discusses what he

terms “ancient Indian history,” which is the creation of historical models based on the integration of archaeology and oral tradition. He discusses his use of Pawnee oral tradition and the skepticism and hostility that his scholarship generated among some archaeologists and historians. Elsewhere, Echo-Hawk has argued that the information included in oral tradition contains details that go deep into the North American past, including insights into Pleistocene worldsapes (Echo-Hawk 1994). He identifies the categories of oral data that may have traveled into the present from the distant past (Echo-Hawk 1994, 1997:90). Acknowledging the inherent malleability of oral tradition (see Vansina 1985), he outlines an analytical method that utilizes science-based models and archaeological data to identify the presence of durable historical information in oral tradition (Echo-Hawk 1994, 1997:93). He illustrates this method with an example in which archaeological data are combined with Pawnee oral tradition to examine the origins of plains earthlodge architecture (Echo-Hawk 1997:96-100). Echo-Hawk recognizes that oral tradition deals with sensitive information, and he argues that it is the scholar’s responsibility to display maximum awareness to religious perspectives when working with oral data. He believes that the potential for creating a new, ancient, Native American history from oral tradition and archaeological data is so great that every archaeological research project should be evaluated for the potential contribution of oral tradition (Echo-Hawk 1997:102).

To address the problem of working with sensitive and potentially confidential information, Anyon and others (1997:83) argue for applying humanistic rather than scientific methods in the use of oral history. Archaeologists need to collaborate with tribal cultural advisers to determine which aspects of oral traditions are appropriate for use in scholarly research, to help interpret the results, and to guide decisions about what is appropriate for publication (Anyon et al. 1997:85). Standards for using oral tradition will likely vary from tribe to tribe, ranging from tribes that encourage the use of oral tradition so long as its use meets with tribal protocol, to tribes that discourage the use of oral tradition in scholarly research (Anyon et al. 1997:85-86). Thus, archaeologists need to follow these steps when seeking to include oral tradition in their research: consult with tribal officials to determine if the tribe wants its oral tradition used; work with these officials to determine the parameters of that use; compensate consultants for their time and expertise; make it clear in archaeological reports when a tribe does not want its oral tradition to be used for historical analysis; and encourage tribal reviews of archaeological research reports, especially if they have used oral tradition (Anyon et al. 1997:86-87).

### **Archaeologists and Native Americans: Conclusions**

#### **What do Native Americans Gain from Archaeology?**

Many Native Americans argue that scientific archaeology tells them little or nothing about their history, arguing that oral traditions are sufficient for understanding their origins (Tsosie 1997; Begay 1997). Others believe that there is a place for archaeology, and some suggest that archaeology can make a contribution to native peoples’ understanding of their own cultural history (Carter 1997; Cypress 1997; Echo-Hawk 1997; Forsman 1997; Fuller 1997; Kluth and Munnell 1997; Lippert 1997; Martin 1997; White Deer 1997). Aside from any potential intellectual benefits, archaeology has made tangible contributions to native tribes. This includes contributing supporting evidence for litigation of land claims and thus providing a vehicle by which tribes can promote their sovereignty and self determination (Ferguson et al. 1997; Ravestoot 1997). In addition, archaeology has contributed important financial benefits to some tribes through the development of tribal archaeological programs (Ferguson 1999:33-37; Ferguson et al. 1997:240). The development of these archaeological programs and the training of tribal members

as archaeologists has given Native Americans much more control over the archaeological resources on tribal land.

Archaeology has also provided educational opportunities for Native American youth through programs like those offered by the Crow Canyon Archaeological Center. These programs treat Native American history in considerably greater depth than is ordinarily done in schools, provide opportunities for students to understand how archaeologists use the archaeological record as a source of information, and put students in contact with educators and researchers who have dedicated their careers to learning about Native American culture and history. Thus, students can see that Native American history is a valued part of American and world history.

Many Native Americans have great interest in the sites and artifacts that comprise the archaeological record. Archaeologists can often help them access that record, particularly for areas with which particular tribal groups are unfamiliar. For example, many Pueblo people are not aware of the vast number of Pueblo sites in the Four Corners area, because they have not had the opportunity to learn about or visit sites that are outside the well-publicized national parks and monuments. In addition, Native Americans are sometimes unaware of the more subtle evidence of early sites, even in areas with which they are familiar. Archaeologists can help Native Americans learn more about the archaeological record by taking individuals or groups to sites, or giving them instructions on how to find particular sites. They should be willing to share their interpretations of sites that are visited, but need to recognize that Native Americans will often want to be left alone to form their own interpretations of these sites. Likewise, archaeologists often have information about past technologies that are of interest to present-day Native Americans who are working with the same technologies. For example, the kiln conferences held at Crow Canyon to explore early pottery-firing techniques provided opportunities for useful exchanges of information among archaeologists and contemporary potters, both Native American and Euroamerican.

As the interviews in the next section of this chapter indicate, Native Americans are likely to have questions that they would like archaeologists to address. Discussions between archaeologists and Native Americans prior to formalizing research designs provide opportunities for defining such questions, as well as identifying kinds of sites and contexts that Native Americans think should be avoided.

### **What does Archaeology Gain from Native American Involvement?**

Although archaeologists have lost some opportunities to study human remains since the passage of NAGPRA (Meighan 1992), archaeology has also gained in several ways from increased Native American involvement in archaeology. Collaboration with native people has the potential for directly helping archaeologists to interpret the past. As summarized above, the historical analysis of oral tradition can provide a fuller understanding of the past than can be obtained from using either archaeology or oral tradition in isolation. In addition, tribal archaeology programs are creating new protocols for conducting archaeology that can benefit the entire profession (Ferguson et al. 1997:241-242).

The goal of achieving a seamless integration of traditional and archaeological knowledge is almost certainly an unrealistic one. The field of archaeology is defined by the practice of using scientific and scholarly methods to make inferences from empirical observations of the archaeological record. Archaeologists cannot abandon the core goals and methods of their field to arrive at conclusions that are consistent with oral traditions. What they can do is learn from oral

traditions when these can provide historical evidence, and more importantly, respect the rights of the descendants of the people they study to view their cultural history in ways that are most meaningful to them. Archaeologists can share their conclusions based on empirical study of the archaeological record, but should not feel that they are in an adversarial relationship if these conclusions are not fully accepted.

Native American oral traditions and perspectives can sometimes provide substantive information about historical contexts and events, in the sense that archaeologists view history. More importantly, however, they may provide insights into the values and decision-making processes that may have operated in past societies. Contemporary Native Americans are of course functioning in contemporary society just as archaeologists are, but they are also participants in a culture history that may give them access to values and ways of thinking that resemble those used in related societies of the past, or at least resemble them more than do the ways of thinking that have become pervasive in western societies since the Enlightenment.

Archaeologists who are attempting to develop models of past decision-making would do well to study how knowledge is formed and communicated in “oral” societies, as discussed by Naranjo later in this chapter. This perspective will also help archaeologists understand how history is used in oral traditions. It may also be more informative for archaeologists to seek general patterns in oral traditions, rather than specific “facts.” For example, migration stories may not be easily interpretable in terms of specific dates or places visited, but they may show patterns such as whether small groups or whole communities were involved, whether stops were numerous or few, and how decisions to move were made. Analysis at this more general level may provide expectations for testing against the archaeological record, or an independent line of evidence for interpreting archaeological observations.

Values, beliefs, and world views that are widely held across numerous Native American communities are likely to have considerable temporal depth, and these patterns may serve as starting points for archaeological hypothesis building or interpretation. For example, there is a widespread belief among Puebloans and some other peoples across the Southwest that their ancestors emerged from a world or worlds below the present ones. The importance and wide distribution of this belief, and its integration with other aspects of culture, suggest that it has substantial antiquity. This is evidence in support of archaeological interpretations that certain architectural elements and features that are hundreds of years old probably symbolize aspects of the emergence story. Traditional beliefs in the present can thus serve as a source of hypotheses about archaeological materials that can be tested against contextual and other lines of evidence from the archaeological record.

For example, the finding of *paho* (prayer-stick) marks around cylindrical holes north of firepits in A.D. 800-era pit structures in the Dolores area (Wilshusen 1989) supports the long-established interpretation of those cylindrical holes (usually called *sipapus* by archaeologists) as symbolizing the place of emergence, an interpretation based on early twentieth century archaeologists’ understanding of similar features in Pueblo kivas (Lipe and Hegmon 1989). The process can also start with an interpretation derived from contextual evidence in the archaeological record, and then turn to information from contemporary Native American beliefs or practices as another line of evidence to evaluate the interpretation. Using evidence from present or historical cultures does not commit either archaeologists or Native Americans to interpret the archaeological record as static or unchanging. For example, Lipe (1989) has argued that the *sipapus* and small kivas of Pueblo II and III sites at Mesa Verde probably symbolize the belief in emergence from a

lower world, but that these early kivas were part of residential households and housed domestic as well as ritual activities; hence, they were not functionally equivalent to historic or contemporary Pueblo kivas, which generally serve larger groups and are more specialized for ritual uses.

Although the amount of discussion among archaeologists and Native Americans regarding interpretation of the archaeological record has increased greatly since 1990, there remains a need for broad-based systematic studies along the lines discussed above. More research of the sort conducted by Teague (1993) and Echo-Hawk (1994, 1997) is needed. Dongoske et al. (1997) provide some useful suggestions regarding how such studies can be productively developed in collaboration with Native Americans.

Ferguson (1996:70) argues that responding to the requirements of NAGPRA and to criticism from Native Americans has forced archaeologists to examine the epistemological and ethical bases of their profession. For Zimmerman (1997:53), the epistemological shift requires that archaeologists abandon the notion that they are the sole arbiters of truth about the past and recognize that archaeology is one among several methods for constructing an account of what happened in the past. Archaeologists need not give up the scientific method as a means of knowing the past, but if they are unwilling to give up the notion that there is only one correct view of the past and that it can only be known archaeologically, then they will continue to have strong and unproductive disagreements with native people.

Clark (1998, 1999) has outspokenly criticized NAGPRA for giving traditional religious perspectives equal weight with those based on a "science-like" archaeology. He thinks that this is not only bad public policy, but that it is likely to force archaeologists "to compromise their beliefs (or keep silent about them) for the sake of political expediency" (Clark 1999:45). The authors agree with Clark that scientific and religious perspectives are in philosophical opposition in terms of how they account for the phenomena of the world, including human culture, society, and history. However, the authors do not see that the increased level of dialog between archaeologists and Native Americans in recent years has caused archaeologists to be less committed to a scientific (or for some, a scholarly humanistic) perspective, or Native Americans to be less committed to preserving traditional belief systems.

Native Americans are generally more used to considering multiple "ways of knowing" than are archaeologists. Although there have been a few calls for development of a kind of "Indian creation science" to replace current scientific approaches (Deloria 1995), most Native Americans appear primarily to want their traditional belief systems to be given respect, to have the opportunity to voice their interpretations of the archaeological record in circumstances where they feel this is appropriate, and to have some control over what is done with the remains and certain important classes of artifacts of people they consider to be their ancestors. Native Americans seldom appear to feel that their beliefs about the past are threatened by the findings of archaeologists. Naranjo (1995) argues that among Santa Clara Pueblo people, the migration stories illustrate general truths, and understanding these truths does not depend on being convinced by external evidence and arguments.

...all of these [archaeological] findings are of interest, yet the primary concern is not with specific data but with the larger issues of movement, place-making, breathing, and dying. I think the basic difference is that archaeologists seek specific and detailed truths. Santa Clara people tell generalized stories that connect us to the east, to the south, to the north, and to the west [Naranjo 1995:249]. ...we speak with certainty without accepting

exclusive truths. Knowledge, for the Indian person, is something that comes from within the person and community. It arises from consensus. Movement is a part of us. Explanations are not necessary—only stories which remind, acknowledge, and honor the power and force of movement [Naranjo 1995:250].

It seems clear that as a result of encounters with Native Americans, Southwestern archaeologists have become more reflexive in their approach to their studies. They are more aware that archaeological studies have political implications, which is also true for studies of history, and any activities that affect the locations, remains, and materials that particular peoples associate with their history. As a result, archaeologists have had to rethink the ethical codes that guide the practice of their discipline (Ferguson 1996:73-74; Lynott 1997). Increasingly, archaeologists are starting to see how the opposing world views of scientific archaeology and Native American traditions can coexist and in some cases, be reconciled (Ferguson 1996:70; Trigger 1980, 1985, 1990). Among the evidence for this are several successful collaborations between Native Americans and archaeologists during the last 15 years.

### **Examples of Successful Collaboration**

There are many examples of successful collaboration between Native Americans and archaeologists; some of these have been publicized in the column “Working Together,” which appears regularly in the Society for American Archaeology *Bulletin*. There are several good examples from southwestern Colorado. The Anasazi Heritage Center has recently sponsored production of *People in the Past: The Ancient Puebloan Farmers of Southwest Colorado*, an interactive CD-ROM that successfully incorporates both archaeological data and Native American perspectives on the interpretation of Lowry Pueblo. In addition, the Anasazi Heritage Center has recently presented a Navajo Basket Exhibit and developed a Special Exhibits Program that focuses on historic and contemporary Native American culture and perspectives.

The Ute Mountain Tribal Park is perhaps the largest program that interprets archaeological sites for the general public that is run entirely by native people. The Tribal Park is the result of more than two decades of successful collaboration between the Ute Mountain Ute tribe and archaeologists. In addition, the Ute Mountain Ute tribe recently collaborated with archaeologists to complete one of the largest contract archaeology programs in the region: the Ute Mountain Ute Irrigated Lands project.

Mesa Verde National Park has conducted a series of successful NAGPRA consultations, and the Park has increasingly incorporated Native Americans in their public interpretation programs. Fort Lewis College, where many Native American students take courses in anthropology, has teamed with the Park Service to conduct a series of meetings that have brought archaeologists and Native Americans together to discuss NAGPRA consultations and the issue of how to determine cultural affiliation.

Collaboration between Native Americans and Crow Canyon Archaeological Center takes many forms. The Center has two Native Americans on its board, ensuring that Native American perspectives are represented when this group meets to oversee the ongoing operation of the Center. In 1995, Crow Canyon established a Native American Advisory Group (Hammond 1999). This group meets twice a year to consult on the educational curriculum and ongoing research. Of particular importance is the committee’s advice regarding the aspects of planned research that might be of concern to particular native communities and the research questions that are likely to



be of greatest interest to Native Americans. In addition, the advisory group reviews the Center's educational programs, resulting in the revision of existing programs and the development of new programs. A Ute Mountain Ute tribal member is a full-time employee of the education staff. Among her contributions is the ability to communicate to participants in Crow Canyon's public programs her perspectives as a member of a tribal community who has studied archaeology academically and has had extensive fieldwork and museum experience. In addition, more than 34 Native Americans participated as educators and scholars in Crow Canyon programs in 1998, and even greater participation is planned for 1999. More than 380 Native American students attended educational programs at Crow Canyon in 1998. These programs are supported in part by scholarships provided by Crow Canyon; Native Americans have actively contributed to this scholarship fund through the Native American Advisory Group's annual auction and through benefit concerts by R. Carlos Nakai.

### **The Search for Common Ground**

Archaeologists, Native Americans, and the American public share a passionate interest in the past and an intense commitment to preserving archaeological sites and other material remains that provide a direct link to that past. The fact that archaeologists and Native Americans view the past from sometimes opposing traditions can make each lose sight of this common ground. Fortunately, the increased pace of consultations over the past decade have forced better definition of that common ground and how it can be shared on a more equitable basis.

Zimmerman (1997) discusses the process by which archaeologists and Native Americans have attempted to redefine this common ground. He points out that the parties began reconciling their positions as they recognized the intensity of each others' views (Zimmerman 1997:46). Native Americans and archaeologists—and the positions they hold—have been portrayed as polar opposites in many characterizations of the debate over their differences, but Zimmerman (1997:47) argues that this characterization is both erroneous and damaging. The debate has forced everyone involved to better understand the complexity of the issues and work toward solutions. In the process, extreme positions have begun to be rejected. Archaeologists have come to realize that their work need not come to a screeching halt if it takes native concerns into consideration; to the contrary, the benefits of this collaboration have become increasingly apparent.

For Native Americans, the process of redefining their relationship to archaeology and archaeologists may be more difficult. Many have gone to great lengths to distance themselves from archaeology. It can be argued that archaeologists have more to gain from this new partnership and that the benefits to Native Americans are still not clear. Zimmerman (1997:52-55) suggests that a new, "covenantal archaeology" is called for, where research questions and methods are negotiated to develop mutually agreed upon goals. These goals include research and the interpretive and educational programs that are developed from this research. These mutual goals will likely include different interpretations of the past, generated from the different knowledge bases of archaeology and native traditions. One cannot, however, disregard power relationships. Multiple ways of knowing the past must be crafted and presented in an environment of mutual respect.

Although the consultations over the last decade have enabled archaeologists and Native Americans to redefine their common ground, White Deer (1997:38) warns against "the worst kind of common ground: an enormous landfill that will be made almost entirely of official communications." He encourages archaeologists and Native Americans to craft a true common

ground that bridges the gap between all concerned parties. He characterizes this as the gap between spirituality and the scientific imperative. He argues that this true common ground will be a balance between the sacred and the secular. He points out that Native American tribal governments have already accepted secular science in many forms, and that archaeology must accept Native American spiritual beliefs, especially with regard to burials and sacred objects (White Deer 1997:43). The true common ground will be claimed through an interdisciplinary approach that integrates science and tribal traditions, achieved through parity of esteem and parity of accountability (White Deer 1997:43).

Most archaeologists are currently trying to decide where they stand with regard to the challenge that White Deer raises. Most are probably not convinced that a true integration of scientific and spiritual viewpoints can be achieved, and are more comfortable with a space where some aspects of Native American tradition and some aspects of archaeology remain separate, some reinforce or assist one another, and some are truly integrated, with the most important definition of common ground being that it is defined by the willingness of all the parties involved to talk with one another. That represents a significant change from the state of affairs 15 years ago, when most archaeologists did not “see what the problem was.” Undoubtedly, what is defined as common ground, and what goes on there, will continue to evolve in the coming years.

## INTERVIEWS

In the fall of 1998, members of Crow Canyon Archaeological Center’s Native American Advisory Group were asked for their perspectives on archaeological research and archaeological sites for this chapter. A questionnaire was developed, and four members of the group answered the questions. People responded to the questions with the understanding that they were speaking as individuals and not as official representatives of their tribal government. The responses are summarized in a descriptive manner without identifying the specific individuals.

The Native American Advisory Group was mentioned as a model for improving relationships between Native Americans and archaeologists. The Center’s staff has worked hard to develop long-term relationships with native peoples based on mutual trust and respect. People work together not only to avoid conflict but to add new perspectives to the world.

### ***1. Do you feel a sense of connection to the archaeological sites in southwestern Colorado? What is that sense of connection based on?***

All of the individuals responding to this question said that they feel a strong sense of connection to this area. This sense of place is based on the migration stories told to them by elders and tribal leaders. People feel a connection to southwestern Colorado’s archaeological sites because their ancestors once lived in the area. They return to these places to unite with the ancestors and spirits who still occupy the area. Even though non-native people think that they are gone, the spirits are alive and well.

### ***2. Does the archaeological research that you know about tend to support or contradict your own views about early Native American culture and history?***

The answer to this question brought a variety of answers. Some people felt that archaeological research supported the idea that their ancestors lived in the area, but that some of the information also contradicted their views of Native American culture. They felt that the

scientific approach can be too academic and technical. The entire Four Corners area connects people to their religion. The classifications that archaeologists put on specific regions like Fremont, Anasazi, and Mogollon contradicts the traditional knowledge that Native Americans all used to be one culture.

**3. *What kinds of questions would you like to see archaeologists address when they do research in southwestern Colorado? What kinds of questions should they avoid?***

There was consensus that tribal input should be encouraged into archaeological research and designs *before* the implementation of a project. The majority felt that archaeologists should focus on the “common sense” questions. What people in their home communities find interesting about archaeology is how the tools are made, ancient farming methods, and animals that the ancient people utilized. There is a strong interest in experimental technology and learning how things were made in the past.

One person thought that archaeologists should focus on the communal setting of the sites and put a face on the people that lived there. This would help people gain a greater knowledge and appreciation for the sites and would help to preserve them. It was expressed that when results are published they provide knowledge, and with knowledge there is understanding.

Everyone agreed that any research questions that address human remains, burials, and associated funerary objects should be avoided.

The respondents reported that Native Americans are offended when they read that the Anasazi culture mysteriously abandoned the Four Corners area. The topic of abandonment should be discouraged because the people never really abandoned the area.

**4. *What types of archaeological sites do you think are the most important to protect? To study by means of archaeological research? To avoid studying by means of archaeology?***

Everyone agreed that all archaeological sites (prehistoric and historic) are important. They should be protected for future generations. The public needs to be educated on how to treat archaeological sites with respect. Large villages were mentioned as important to protect due to the probability that they contain human burials. Shrines should always be protected. The location of shrines should remain anonymous. Archaeological sites should not be excavated unless there are valid research questions to address and Native American input is sought at the beginning of a project. Human remains, burials, associated funerary objects, and shrines should be avoided by archaeologists.

**5. *What aspects of archaeology do you find the most interesting? The most useful? The most worrisome? (Note: we may want to combine these answers into other questions)***

The most interesting aspects of archaeology include the interpretations of the sites, the types of houses people built, the tools, and what types of food people ate. Archaeological sites can be useful in sorting out land claim issues. It is helpful when archaeologists survey the land so sites can be avoided when a new construction project is planned. Comparing the sites in southwestern Colorado to the oral histories can be very interesting.

The most worrisome aspects of archaeology include the excavation of human remains, disturbance of shrines and the misinterpretation of a site. The problems with repatriation were mentioned, especially when multiple parties claim the descendants.

It was noted that when non-native people ask tribal members about their religion, it puts them in an uncomfortable position. Non-native people also ask questions about the intellectual and cultural property of the tribe. This information is not to be shared with non-tribal members. Everyone has to find their own comfort level with these types of questions.

**6. What do you think archaeologists and Native Americans can do to avoid conflicts and find topics of common interest?**

Archaeologists need to hear from Native Americans, especially traditional people, about their concerns. Archaeologists could help by teaching the *entire* history of Native peoples. A complete history would help eliminate the stereotypes that native people live with today.

The best way to avoid conflict is to eliminate the study of all human remains and associated objects. People realize it is hard to stop this type of curiosity but it would eliminate a lot of conflicts. Noninvasive types of research should be encouraged.

The topics of common interests include tool and pottery construction, migration routes, petroglyphs, and pictographs.

## ORALITY VERSUS LITERACY

### Introduction

Persons whose world view has been transformed by high literacy need to remind themselves that in functionally oral cultures, the past is not felt as an itemized terrain, peppered with verifiable and disputed “facts” or bits of information. The past is the domain of ancestors, a resonant source for renewing awareness of present existence, which itself is not an itemized terrain either. Orality knows no lists or charts or figures (Ong 1996:98).

*Ko: o’* (term of respect for older lady), my family and I had arrived the night at *Gia’s* (mother) house before the Deer Dance, February 18, 1989 to watch the evening dance, the summoning of the animals, and the *Untege* Shade or Dawning Dance. *Ko: o’* said, “*Heri nanda Savee’ waga bipera powa, angkwosoge, hebo naimbe pivit’a aganode,*” i.e., “We arrived the night before the dance, like the Jicarilla Apaches, unlike them we forgot to bring gifts of dried meat.” There was a pause in the flow of her talk, a bit of reflection and then she said, “One day, all of this will be gone; we too will be gone.” Then she told a version of the end of the Tewa ways foretold by *Se’daa*, wise men, who said what would happen when the Santa Clara way of Being came to an end.

*Owe naimbe khu giin haandi ho gin en Sedaa dituun. Khaa’po Kwijo hone weh powa khema. Herahona sega nuua muudi, wen savana evikho enge ema, heri nain nanku etaain ho gin kipowa khema. Haho taki nain kuin e chakan howaba na kipowkhema. Weimbo khaap’po kwijo diin davan p’aa khema. Giko:se puwa khema naimbi khuin giin mendi. Khap’o Kwijo di ho diin savana hang khema, gikose puwa khema di. Nawadi gi phaemendi, p’okhingeh pii e. Naimbi khu weimbo e p’ochanu gi huwididi. Nain Tewa haa*

*ho e wihon. Nian P'ae Shade', Tewa khu taaki, howa na phade khema. Herihannapuwa kankhema hori tuu.*

K'o said, "Se'daa said sometime in the future, our language, our ways, will be thrown away. It is then that Old Lady Singing Water, the Spirit of Santa Clara Pueblo, will come dressed in a ceremonial manta, a folded colorful blanket draped over her left arm. Her coming will be seen by only those persons who know how to be Tewa and they will know that the Tewa way has ended. It will be like the chill of death coming over us. Old Lady Singing Water will hand a blanket to each Tewa to keep us warm in that transition. We will pass on into the Lake from where we came. As we enter into the Lake, each one of us who knows how to be Tewa will return the Tewa Being Way back to the Corn Mothers. That is where the spirit of our ways belong. So it was said by the Se'daa.

The telling of this story leads the reader into orality and Santa Clara Tewa Being. As Michael Foucault (1970:xx) wrote: "The fundamental codes of a culture – those governing its language, its schemas of perception, its exchanges, its techniques, its values, the hierarchy of its practices – establishes for every man, from the very first, the empirical orders with which he will be dealing and within which he will be at home."

*Kha:p'o*, the Tewa name for Santa Clara Pueblo, translates literally into "Singing Water." Santa Clara Pueblo, one of six Tewa Pueblos, is situated on the west bank of the Rio Grande. Located 40 km (25 mi) north of Santa Fe, 3 km (2 mi) south of Espanola, and 29 km (18 mi) north of Los Alamos, it is inundated by technology, and the population of more than 2,400 is switching from Tewa to English. Loss of native languages is a growing crisis for many tribes, including Santa Clara and all the Pueblos.

### Purpose

The purpose of this writing is to briefly address the following questions:

- What state of "consciousness" did Tewa orality reflect?
- What are the Tewa primary values that resist literacy and research?
- How does orality create a sense of time and space that affects anthropological and archaeological research?
- Is there a possibility of using literacy and technology to preserve Tewa orality?

A warning to readers is that capturing a group's spiritual essence resulting from synergistic activities is difficult to articulate in written form. Ong (1996:32) wrote, "The fact that oral peoples commonly and in all likelihood universally consider words to have magical potency is clearly tied in, sounded, and hence power driven. Sound cannot be sounding without the use of power."

A tribal principle and core value includes a demand for religious secrecy. Thus, the Santa Clara Pueblo value regarding religious secrecy has been violated by writing this paper. This is necessary because any pursuit of knowledge and inquiry into Tewa life illustrates that everything becomes an interconnected web and an inquiry into one aspect of Tewa Being leads to the underlying religious-philosophical foundation. The only alternative is an inquiry of a limited nature—one with *no depth* and lacking connections to substantive foundations of Tewa life. Tewa Being and orality are interlocking; a Tewa writer cannot discuss one without the other or discuss the effects of literacy on Being.

## What State of “Consciousness” did Tewa Orality Reflect?

There is much to learn about the past from primary orality, which is defined as that state when a person or culture is totally unfamiliar with writing, and uses speech, sounds and nonverbal communication as their mode of expression. Literacy and advancing technology change a tribal people from a state of Being to a state of changed consciousness. A crucial question arises: What was Being in the state of primary orality?

This paper is written from a Tewa perspective, since the writer is from Santa Clara Pueblo, and he experienced primary orality during his childhood and teenage years. The writing and examples cited are Tewa; however, the concepts are transferable to other Pueblos since the main concept discussed is primary orality. Total unfamiliarity with writing has pervasive implications in understanding the psychodynamics of a people and their Being. The manner in which a culture structures social organization, those important structures of kinship, government, religion, and economics, is profound to those who know only primary orality.

Most Puebloans who are middle aged or elderly have experienced primary orality. The trend in all of the Pueblos is toward literacy; however, writing can never dispense with orality because orality can exist without writing, but writing cannot exist without orality (Ong 1996:66). The tendency in the Pueblos toward use of English as the dominant language undermines teaching Pueblo languages, which means that a majority of Pueblo children cannot speak their native language. The loss of language is of major concern to most tribes, and the enlarging native urban populations, now about 60 percent of all Native Americans, exacerbates the feeling of loss of people, language, and lifeways. Literacy through education has changed the consciousness of Tewa peoples, a forced choice which in many ways is not a positive change.

Orality reflected a state of Being known in Tewa as “*Gi Woatsi Tuenji*” or “We are Seeking Life.” This raises the question of what is the difference between Being and consciousness. Ong (1996:79) wrote: “More than any other single invention, writing has transformed human consciousness.” He adds, “Oral cultures know a kind of autonomous discourse fixed in ritual formulas, as well as in vatic sayings or prophecies, for which the utterer himself or herself is considered only the channel, not the source.” Ong (1996:81) discussed the paradox of the written word: “One of the most startling paradoxes inherent in writing is its close association with death. The paradox lies in the fact that the deadness of the text, its removal from the living human lifeworld, its rigid visual fixity, assures its endurance and its potential for being resurrected into limitless living contexts by a potential infinite number of living readers.”

Conversely, arising from primary orality is Being, which is the fundamental nature of existence. Life becomes a cultural map upon which one travels, unfolding with oral truths. Ong (1996:39) states, “Traditional expressions in oral cultures must not be dismantled; it has been hard work getting them together over the generations, and there is nowhere outside the mind to store them.” Being, time, and space become a defined unity, one with clarity and certainty. Hall (1983:24) adds, “...peoples of American-European heritage—have some difficulty understanding sacred time or mythic time, because this type of time is imaginary—one is *in* the time. It is repeatable and reversible, and it does not change. In mythic time people do not age, for they are magic.”

Tewa orality assured that they had lived forever and they would live forever—this was the central message of Seeking Life. Tewas lived within this comforting cultural truth, the

timelessness of Being. There were no questions to ask, they were unending time, and death was merely a transition from a physical to a spiritual state of being. Orality assured Tewas that they were at the center of the universe which enabled them to borrow any facet of lifeway from any Pueblo culture with ease.

What is the Tewa philosophy of Seeking Life? Seeking Life is a religious-philosophical foundation of the Tewa spiritual nature of Being which unites each individual with all spirit forces operating in the Tewa universe. Seeking Life is a search for and achievement of this spiritual, transcendent Tewa Being during the human state, realized through prayer, meditation, and performance of ceremony and ritual. It is integral to and dependent upon the vitality of the Tewa language. Tewa Being is intrinsic to all aspects of Santa Clara life, for it is from Seeking Life that Tewa Being emerges, evolves over time, and impacts each person as a rich source of available cultural knowledge dependent upon language, knowledge, and use.

The primary component of Seeking Life is orality that reveals a “world view,” clarified by the late Alfonso Ortiz, a Tewa anthropologist, as “certain assumptions made about the nature of reality and about the nature of man, his relation to other men and his place in what he defines as his world” (Ortiz 1969:136). *Gi Woatsi Tuenji*, or “We are Seeking Life” is not articulated by the ordinary individual, nor is any Tewa consciously aware that this pervasive view of their life impacts the individual gestalt. In this society where traditional language is spoken, all lifeways, both secular and sacred, are defined by Seeking Life.

*Gi Woatsi Tuenji* is a spiritual group thinking, feeling, sensing, doing, and Being for all who hold the same sacred and power-imbued beliefs. Seeking Life enables an immediate, present connection to all past Tewa life; an immediate, present union with supernaturals from the Lake of Emergence; and an immediate, present integration with spirits in the physical environment of earth, sky, air, and water. The Tewa concept of spirit is expressed through the word *p'owaha*, which translates as the spiritual nature of “water-wind-breath.” It refers to the spirit being of people or a combining of the spirit being before life with the spiritual forces during the human state, and later, the spiritual being after death. *P'owaha* is the essence of Seeking Life. The natural world is thought to possess spirit and breath, and Tewa thought extends kinship terminology to the physical environment with kin words for *Gia* as earth and *Tara* (father) for sun and sky. This is concretely illustrated when Tewas take and give breath from human or nonhuman sources such as rocks, trees, and the physical environment.

### **What are the Tewa Values that Resist Literacy and Research?**

Tewa people as a group believe in and place high value on the elderly, generosity, cooperation, religious secrecy, conformity, conservatism, and hard work or industry. Kinship and terms used for kin best apply the foregoing values to the dominant institution of the extended family and show how this part of orality becomes a powerful integrating force in the everyday life of an ordinary individual.

Cooperation through orality united people into a defined whole regardless of internal tension, conflict, and structural divisions within the social organization. Orality resulted in a communal nature, and this integration is an example of conformity, readily seen in the structure of kin terminology. Swentzell and Naranjo (1983) discussed the *Gia* (pronounced *jē ä*) or Mother concept in a Tewa Pueblo. The hierarchy from supernaturals to the ordinary Tewa was bound by this word. The word *Gia* is pervasive, used extensively in communication throughout every level

of how a Tewa community was perceived in the minds of all speakers. Thus, the personality of individuals became group oriented, and the importance of this knowledge was that individuals externalized thoughts and introspections, which were verbalized rather than rendered abstract and objective. Social control or patterns of behavior were internalized as soon as the language was mastered.

The word *Gia* referred to the two supernaturals known as Corn Mothers who remained in the lake of emergence; *Gia e'* means "little mothers," which referred to male representatives or moiety leaders; *Gia* as a prefix referred to any female older than the speaker; *Gia* referred to extended family mothers, or focal mothers, and, lastly, *Gia* referred to an individual's biological mother. The meaning systems inherent in the high-contexted knowing of *Gia* created the foundation of Seeking Life.

The behavior expected toward one's own mother was extended to any other person whenever the term *Gia* was used. Respect, obedience, and reverence referred to as *Segikan-Sekane* were behaviors displayed to all mothers. Conversely, *Gias* at any level of the community emitted nurturing behavior, patience, and the right to request appropriate behavior or norms of the family and Pueblo. The consequences of misbehavior were applied immediately so that the entire community corrected unacceptable behavior. Kinship terminology was and is the most powerful means of social control in the Pueblo when individuals are socialized through primary orality as children. Kinship terminology and constant respect for older persons illustrates the Tewa belief in respect for elders.

Ironically, there was no Tewa name for the bilateral, extended family that centered around a focal mother, a *Gia*. This type of family will be referred to as a "*Gia* unit." Within this economic unit which included many families, the wealth of the whole became the wealth of the individual. Generosity played a key role in the distribution of food supplies as well as housing, land, and other property held by the family as a group. *Matú* is the word for bilateral kin within which an individual could not marry, or the exogamous unit. *Matú*, however, was separate from the economic unit of extended families which centered around focal mothers. This *Gia* unit also passed on religious-ceremonial knowledge through socialization of children within its influence. Inclusion was not through lineage by bloodline as commonly seen in clanship systems, because members of Santa Clara Tewa *Gia* units often adopted children and families who were unrelated by blood, but who belonged to the same moiety. Work demands, work roles, and how members of *Gia* units organized in response to demands often dictated who was included in the unit. Moiety membership and unit functioning expectations were the binding principle.

Religious conservatism played a key role in definition of these *Gia* units which structured the moiety. Within historical times, the Summer Moiety became the more conservative group in the Pueblo. Knowledge of ritual and ceremony belonged to moiety societies, and nonsociety members were not allowed to have and use knowledge, which was thought to have power and could be used only by the society. Literacy or the written word was perceived as violation of realms where power and knowledge belonged. As tribal secretary, The writer kept minutes of council meetings, and if discussion broached society matters, was told to stop writing by the group at large. One such event was to have tribal and administrative offices cleansed by the medicine society. Upon reading the minutes, the writer was chastised for violating rules and reminded that writing destroyed the "spirit of our way of life."



## How Does Tewa Time and Space Affect Archaeological Research?

There is no word for time in Tewa, so the word *tiempo* was borrowed with the arrival of the Spanish. *Payogedi* was summer, *Tenudi* was winter, *P'ō* was a cycle of the moon, and *Jadi* was the equivalent of a week. Times of day were reckoned by where the sun was located in the sky. Winter and summer caciques or *Gia e'*, i.e., “little mothers” were responsible for Tewa time, for seasonal communal work duties, and for the transition of leadership of the Pueblo from one to the other. Caciques accounted for time because they and the *P'atowa* (mature Tewa who belonged to one of the societies and were considered of the “middle”) were responsible for the ceremonial cycle and the unfolding of activities considered sacred. They lived in a world largely concerned with sacred time, while the ordinary Tewa lived in a world of polychronic time broken into personal time, synchronic time, and their personal interpretations of micro time. E. T. Hall (1983:16-26, 41-53) discusses polychronic time; his mandala of time discusses the various concepts of group and individual, cultural, and physical time.

Upon retirement at age 52 one of the goals of this writer was to search for the “Tewa time,” which had been lost in the process of education and acculturation; I wanted to understand the sense of loss of the treasured sense of timelessness which I had known as a young adult. I read E. T. Hall's (1983) *The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time*, and simultaneously read Martin Heidegger's (1962) *Being and Time*. In discussion with friends, Walter Ong's (1996) *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World* and Morris Berman's (1981) *The Reenchantment of the World* were recommended to me along with other writings. Literacy now guided my search for analysis and understanding from a changed consciousness. Edward T. Hall and Allen Vince of the University of New Mexico, both cultural anthropologists, became talking and discussion friends.

From personal reflections, I realized that I had left the context of Being in Santa Clara Pueblo, and literacy had changed my consciousness which would not allow me to enter Tewa Being without abstraction, analysis, and questions regarding the components of social organization and world view. Weekend sessions with *Gia*, my own mother, and speaking only Tewa, eventuated in the conclusion that cultural isolation, and the institutions of kinship interrelated with Tewa native government, and economy were necessary for the continuation of what Hall (1983) refers to as mythic and sacred time, which along with the Tewa personal time and the absence of an analytic approach were necessary for continuation of “Tewa time.” Once time became “meta” and profane or linear, Tewa cultural time was lost to me personally—and what a loss! Ned (E. T. Hall), my friend, reassured me that I could recreate mythic and sacred time at a personal level; however, “Tewa time” was lost and I grieved for the loss at the inability to join with my ancestors into the unknown reaches of reversible time. And I could no longer transcend time and join with *p'owaha* through Being with sacred songs, dance, and ritual. During visits with *Gia* and on my morning runs, I observed that the cornfields along the Rio Grande toward Black Mesa were abandoned. Corn, the single symbol that gave life to Tewa Being and mythic and sacred time, had also been abandoned. Corn Mother Close to Winter (Winter Moiety)—I am a Winter man—and Corn Mother Close to Summer (Summer Moiety) belonged to those of Santa Clara who believed Tewa Being unquestionably and lived within it.

*P'okwin* is the secular word for the lake, any lake. To Tewa Being, *P'okwin* has many meanings. In sacred references, through the context of orality, *P'okwin* is the kiva. *P'okwin* also refers to abandoned Pueblo sites. Mythic and sacred time in Tewa is transcendent and reversible.

We may return to *P'okwin* both as physical beings and as spirit beings in the state of Tewa Being. *P'owaha* (the spiritual nature of all humans) live there, not in the past tense but in the present tense, which reiterates that we are *P'owaha* and we will return to the Lake or *P'okwin* upon death. Physical space is a nonexistent in the state of being *P'owaha*, and as with every entry to the Lake, symbolic or concrete such as the kiva or prayer shrines, prayers are required to address those who reside there and to be accepted with *Segikan-Sekane*, or love-respect, honor, and Being. Tewa beliefs dictate that *Teji* or ruins remain *P'okwin* and the only acceptable behaviors are offerings of prayer meal along with prayers. The Tewa word *P'owaha*, through mythic time and space, brings the present and the past into a singular continuum of space and time. For those who have experienced Tewa Being and when thoughts create orality, the process of archaeology is painful to observe from the Tewa perspective because archaeologists do not comprehend space, time, and Being of Pueblos.

Space joins time in Tewa knowing and being. From this basis arises the perception that any Pueblo dwelling once occupied by *Towa* or Pueblo peoples as a category continues to be a spiritual habitation. These places are termed *P'okwin*, and kivas are concrete examples of connections to places of origin. *Owingeh* is a Pueblo, and symbolically any Pueblo, contemporary or past Pueblo site, is also considered a "Lake". Orality fosters conservatism which, in Pueblo knowledge, holds a vast array of norms about how Pueblo sites are to be treated, the *P'owaha* whose presence remains there, the site which was sanctified as a Lake continues in perpetuity, and Tewa Being considers that all things merge into the place of beginning, *P'okwingeh*. *P'okwingeh* is the place of the perpetuator of the circular continuum of life. *P'okwingeh* automatically belongs to the North because migration occurred from North to South.

### **How Can Literacy and Archeology Help Preserve a Language?**

With the erosion of language and thus loss of primary orality, which occurs daily as younger generations speak more English than Tewa, the crack in the cultural shell surrounding Santa Clara life turns into a chasm. Both the Rio Grande and Arizona Tewa observe the loss. Paul Kroskrity (1993:83) stated that for the Arizona Tewa, "Many younger people admit they no longer know how to say a whole sentence in one word." When the break with traditional language occurs, young people have limited access to the rich storehouse of creativity found in oral tradition. The loss of ritual and ceremony means not only the loss of Tewa dance and music, but on a deeper level, the loss of symbolic and literal visual imagery, and knowledge of time and space. One cannot access Seeking Life, in a coherent and integrated manner, if the Tewa language is no longer available, which results in a basic creative shift from Tewa Being to a changed consciousness.

Paradoxically, literacy and technology are the only means remaining to retain the Pueblo languages in the future. Through writing and recording Tewa, the language can be taught to future generations. The computer is an example of a tool that will both record and return the language in written and oral form to teach Pueblo languages. Software is available now which will teach entire languages and pronounce words simultaneously.

Literacy through a similar method is capable of teaching Tewa and other Pueblo people their history, which is a part of the process of archaeology. Without the written word there is little hope of saving Pueblo languages, which are faced with extinction in the future. As elders die, ceremony and ritual die simultaneously; the matrix of what primary orality created for the culture through Being cannot be restored. A written history needs to be developed. Anthropologists and archaeologists have, maybe with foresight, captured the past through baseline ethnographies and

archaeological records to save the past through a historical record. Puebloans are able to help in producing historical records through cooperation with anthropologists and archaeologists. Those Puebloans who experienced primary orality are especially valuable in producing written records of that lifeway of Being.

### Summary

Ong (1996:175) summarizes orality as follows.

Orality is not an ideal, and never was. To approach it positively is not to advocate it as a permanent state for any culture. Literacy opens possibilities to the word and human existence unimaginable without writing. Oral cultures today value oral traditions and agonize over the loss of these traditions, but I have never encountered or heard of an oral culture that does not want to achieve literacy as soon as possible. (Some individuals of course do resist literacy, but they are mostly lost sight of.) Yet orality is not despicable. It can produce creations beyond the reach of literates, for example, the *Odyssey*. Nor is orality ever completely eradicable; reading a text oralizes it. Both orality and the growth of literacy out of orality are necessary for the evolution of consciousness [Ong 1996:175].

This section has defined how orality has created a state defined as Tewa Being in the Pueblo of Santa Clara. This was true for all Pueblo peoples who were enculturated in a place where primary orality was functional. If literacy creates a changed consciousness, the opposite question is equally relevant, “what is the consciousness of people from a primary oral tradition?” This state of consciousness was explored here and referred to as Seeking Life. It is difficult or impossible for individuals from a background of literacy to understand people who derive from primary orality. Written history is unknown, a dictionary is nonexistent, time and space are unique, mnemonics are important, nothing is ever remembered verbatim in different types of prayers and advice giving. As Ong (1996: 98) states about orality and the past, “It is the domain of ancestors, a resonant source for renewing awareness of present existence, which itself is not an itemized terrain either.”

Tewa classes in elementary grades are teaching the language; however, they will never replace what was taught through primary orality by the community. For the moment, Tewa language and philosophy are viable. *Hannamuni* or “May it be so” in the future, with the help of literacy, including anthropology and archaeology.