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1 OVERVIEW

Short description
It is only in the past twenty years or so that archaeology has become critically aware of the distinct factors relating to archaeology by and about indigenous populations. It has been demonstrated that minority populations in colonised countries have often shared very similar experiences and furthermore that they are beset by similar ongoing problems. At the heart of these matters lies their experience of colonialism. Post-processual archaeology has afforded the potential for a more successful engagement with indigenous populations and importantly has recognized that there are other legitimate means of reconstructing the past, beyond western empiricism. However, new forms of engagement between archaeologists and indigenous populations, including the training of indigenous archaeologists, are as yet in their infancy and have encountered a number of problems. This course seeks to explore these engagements with indigenous populations and to consider what directions may be taken in the future.

Basic texts
A number of important books have appeared helping to re-define indigenous archaeology. Of these probably the most accessible is:


For a highly critical text focused on decolonization and Australia read:


Finally if you want a lighter introduction to issues of repatriation and indigenous issues you could read the crime thriller (set in Norfolk!)


Methods of assessment

This course is assessed by means of:
two pieces of coursework, each of 2375-2625 words, which each contribute 50% to the final grade for the course.

Teaching methods

The course is taught through lectures and one concluding seminar. The first half of the course will explore general themes, whilst the second will focus on specific case studies and will be presented by regional specialists.
Week-by-week summary

TERM 1

6th October 2015 Andrew Reid
1. Introduction: defining indigenous archaeology - course organisation and objectives.

13th October 2015 Andrew Reid
2. Archaeology as colonial engagement

20th October 2015 Andrew Reid
3. The World Archaeological Congress and the post-colonial encounter

27th October 2015 Andrew Reid
4. Repatriation and reburial of human remains

3rd November 2015 Andrew Reid
5. Problems with the indigenous concept

READING WEEK (NO TEACHING)

17th November 2015 Rodney Harrison
6. Shared histories? Indigenous archaeology and heritage in Aboriginal Australia

24th November 2015 Dean Sully
7. Locating Hinemihi’s people; the care of a Maori space in a British place

1st December 2015 Manuel Arroyo-Kalin
8. Amazonian Archaeology and Indigenous communities

8th December 2015 Andrew Reid
9. Indigenous peoples and sub-Saharan Africa

15th December 2015 Andrew Reid
10. Seminar: the future for indigenous archaeology?
**Workload**
There will be 18 hours of lectures and 2 hours of seminars for this course. Students will be expected to undertake around 60 hours of reading for the course, plus 108 hours preparing for and producing the assessed work. This adds up to a total workload of some 188 hours for the course.

**Prerequisites**
There are no prerequisites for this course.

2 **AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT**

**Aims**
The main aim of the course is to make students aware of the issues that are involved in indigenous archaeology. The major issues tackled will include decolonization, ownership of the past and the recognition of alternative versions of the past. Exploring these themes will result in a broader and more sophisticated approach to the students’ own studies, whatever the context of their research.

**Objectives**
Students will gain an appreciation of the contested significance of archaeological materials and interpretations and the potential relevance of these to the social, political and religious concerns of people today.

Students will become aware of some of the ethical considerations of undertaking archaeological or curatorial work in different parts of the world and will be knowledgeable of the need to consider diverse interest groups in advance of any research or archaeological intervention.

Students will learn to give careful consideration to a range of divergent and deeply held beliefs, they will develop their ability to evaluate information and ideals reported by other people and, where appropriate, to develop clearly expressed opinions of their own.

**Learning Outcomes**
On successful completion of the course students should have developed their skills relating to:
- critical evaluation and reflection
- critique of sources and the application of acquired knowledge

Both assessed pieces of work will be essays which will require students to demonstrate skills of data acquisition and processing, critical reflection and the ability to generate an effective argument.

**Coursework**
This course is examined by means of two 2375-2625 word essays (each worth 50% of the total mark).
Assessment tasks
Choose ONE of the options for each of the essays below.

These questions ask you to express opinions on complex subjects about which there may not be general agreement. Your essays should demonstrate that you are aware of these debates and that you have read an appropriate selection of the relevant literature, examples of which are available in the lecture readings. You are expected to strengthen your discussion through the use of relevant facts and examples to substantiate your own arguments and to refute the interpretations of other people with whom you disagree. On account of the word limits, you must ensure that your argument is constructed effectively and efficiently.

1st Essay (Due Monday 23rd November)

To what extent is it correct to argue that archaeology is a colonial endeavour?

Is the repatriation of human remains good for archaeology as a discipline?

Are Indigenous Archaeologies legitimately postcolonial or do they merely pander to a “primitivist” agenda?

*     *     *     *     *

2nd Essay (Due Monday 18th January)

Choosing one part of the world in which you have an interest, critique the past engagement of archaeologists with indigenous populations and assess the prospects for interaction in the future.

If students are unclear about the nature of an assignment, they should discuss this with the Course Co-ordinator.

Students are not permitted to re-write and re-submit essays in order to try to improve their marks. However, students may be permitted, in advance of the deadline for a given assignment, to submit for comment a brief outline of the assignment.

The Course Co-ordinator is willing to discuss an outline of the student's approach to the assignment, provided this is planned suitably in advance of the submission date.

Word-length
The two essays should each be 2375-2625 words in length. The following should not be included in the word-count: title page, contents pages, lists of figure and
tables, abstract, preface, acknowledgements, bibliography, captions and contents of tables and figures, appendices, and wording of citations. Penalties will only be imposed if you exceed the upper figure in the range. There is no penalty for using fewer words than the lower figure in the range: the lower figure is simply for your guidance to indicate the sort of length that is expected.

3 SCHEDULE AND SYLLABUS

Teaching schedule
Lectures will be held 11am - 1pm on Tuesdays, in room 412.

Syllabus

The following is an outline for the course as a whole, and identifies essential and supplementary readings relevant to each session. Readings marked with an * are considered essential to keep up with the topics covered in the course.

6th October 2015 Andrew Reid
1. Introduction: defining indigenous archaeology - course organisation and objectives.

The problems of “other” peoples or distinct ethnicities are not just a thing of the past (eg Ancient Egypt and its relationship with other societies), but also is a matter of considerable debate today. The notions of “indigeneity” and “ethnicity” are complex, and the issues presented by them are often contested. Such contested areas are not only matters of local significance, but may involve national politics, sometimes challenging the very nature of the nation state. This introductory lecture will set out the basic parameters and themes for the course as a whole, outlining the kinds of societies to be dealt with and the issues that are of most importance. The lecture will also set the course in its broader archaeological context, considering the development of archaeological theory and the outlook of the discipline.


Eriksen T. H. 1995 Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives London Pluto INST ARCH BD ERI


---

**13th October 2015  
Andrew Reid**

2. Archaeology as colonial engagement

Much of the political organization of the modern world has been defined by European expansion and colonization. Many colonizers identified differences between the indigenous peoples they met (based on social organization, language, dress, etc.) and these differences frequently intensified as they were demarcated and used as administrative units by colonizers. In some cases these ethnic divisions also influenced the boundaries of modern Nation States during their fight for independence. Does this mean that indigenism can only be identified in relation to colonization, and, if so, are Indigenous movements inherently a challenge to the sovereignty of modern Nation states? Is archaeology just an arm of this colonization process? There has been a move throughout much of the world to give legal status to the rights claimed by indigenous people. But, can such claims be endorsed when indigenous status remains contentious in many areas? Such tensions are particularly acute on the African continent where archaeological constructs of precolonial population movements are disregarded as colonially inspired theories designed to disenfranchise black populations from their land. Good examples of the latter disregard can be seen in the ideologies of Apartheid in South Africa and the ideologies which inspired genocide in Rwanda.

BON


Field L.  2004 Who are "We" and is that Dangerous for "Them?“ Anthropology News 45(1)


Lyons C. L. and J. K. Papadopoulos (eds.) 2002 The archaeology of colonialism Los Angeles : Getty Research Institute, INST ARCH AH LYO


Nash J.  2004 A Gendered View on Indigenous Autonomy Movements
**Anthropology News 45(1)**


---

**20th October 2015**

**Andrew Reid**

3. The World Archaeological Congress and the postcolonial encounter

Although isolated changes were already happening in the relationship between archaeologists and indigenous peoples, the formation of WAC with its specific agenda to meaningfully incorporate indigenous peoples into the archaeological process represented an important transformation within the discipline. The early years of WAC saw a range of publications identifying key issues and then tracking the resolution of conflicts. This was and perhaps is, by no means universal, but nevertheless helped to establish the credentials of a new archaeological practice that sought to engage with non-archaeologists and crucially that recognized ownership of the past by others. In very recent times this has been seen as a process of decolonization.


Layton R. 1994 *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions* London: Routledge **INST ARCH BD LAY**

One issue, the treatment of human remains, has come to dominate archaeology’s dealings with indigenous peoples over all others. The emotion naturally associated with the treatment of the dead, married with the denial of rights in other aspects of society meant that indigenous peoples developed a largely unanimous and unswerving demand for the return of their ancestors’ remains. This demand served to highlight the huge degree of deception and disrespect that had taken place in the past and in which archaeology had been complicit.

As indigenous societies became increasingly vocal in the expression of their identity and in the demand for the recognition of their rights as indigenous peoples, from the 1960s onwards, the issue of human remains became increasingly important. Academia was shocked to discover that its own forebears had undertaken huge collecting trips in the late 19th and early 20th centuries explicitly targeting the human remains of what we would now call indigenous populations. This was clearly an exercise in European imperialism, with the design of establishing the racial superiority of European peoples. The fascination with anatomy ended but huge collections of human material remained in major museums and university collections.

As awareness of these collections grew in the 1980s, so also did understanding of the manner in which collections were made through theft, deceit and even murder. Moreover the continued retention of human remains by institutions, despite often never having been examined was considered to be a major source of trauma amongst indigenous populations, particularly when confronted by the very different treatment handed out to European remains. In a number of cases, particularly in the United States of America, it was established that routine impact mitigation work prior to development reburied European remains, but sent Native American remains to museums.

Faced with this situation indigenous populations in a number of parts of the world saw archaeologists as their principal enemies and sought to close down and prevent archaeological investigations. These confrontations led to the desire amongst some but by no means all archaeologists to sit down and discuss issues with indigenous
populations. Out of these negotiations a number of important initiatives have
developed. However, as the protracted Kennewick case has shown in the US, the
issues are by no means entirely resolved. What’s more there are still significant
collections of human remains of indigenous peoples in major institutions, including
Britain. Besides the reburial of ancestral remains there have been a number of
important developments ranging from the development of NAGPRA in the USA to the
Australian government’s efforts to repatriate human remains as a screen to their
efforts to undermine Aboriginal rights.

*Daehnke J. and A. Lonetree 2010. Repatriation in the United States: the current
state of NAGPRA. In Lydon J. and U.Z. Rizvi (eds) Handbook of Postcolonial
Archaeology: 245-256. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Byrne D. 2004. Archaeology in reverse: the flow of Aboriginal people and their
remains through the space of New South Wales. In N. Merriman (ed.) Public
*Fforde C. 2002 Collection, repatriation and identity. In C. Fforde, J. Hubert and P.
Fforde C. 2004. Collecting the Dead: archaeology and the reburial issue. London:
Duckworth.
*Fforde C. and J. Hubert 2006. Indigenous human remains and changing museum
write it down and bring it back…that’s what we want” – revisiting the 1948
removal of human remains from Kunbarlanja (Oenpelli), Australia. In C. Smith
and H.M. Wobst (eds) Indigenous Archaeologies: decolonising theory and
*Smith L. 2004. The repatriation of human remains – problem or opportunity?
Antiquity 78 (300): 404-413.
the conflicts between American Indians and archaeologists over protection of
cultural places. In C. Smith and H.M. Wobst (eds) Indigenous Archaeologies:
Hurst Thomas D. 2000 Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, archaeology and the battle for
Native American Identity New York: Basic Books. INST ARCH DED 100
THO
Veth P. 2010 Australian and International Perspectives on Native Title, Archaeology
Archaeology: 267-284. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Archaeologies: decolonising theory and practice: 189-203. London:
Routledge.
5. Problems with the indigenous concept

The term indigenous has been liberally applied, typically to societies marginalized by European settler communities and is now part of the global language commonly used by governments and multinational organizations. Yet, the seemingly innocent term is extremely difficult to apply in many situations. It is not so readily applied to colonization in non-European contexts. In African countries and also in China, for instance, governments will generally claim that all peoples were indigenous to their country, prior to the encounter with Europeans. Clearly the term “indigenous” is historically problematic in that it implies the selection of one episode in time as having primacy over all others. Other countries interpret indigenous peoples to be the most ethnically distinct or culturally non-European in visual appearance, directly appealing to European tourists and their notions of the exotic which they wish to encounter. At present there is also a huge debate taking place concerning the whole notion of indigenous peoples and whether they are a relevant theme for study or the very term “indigenous” reconfirms the alienation and marginalization of disadvantaged societies: is the very term itself valid or does it perpetuate the problems of exclusion we would like to address.

Herle A. and D. Phillipson 1994 Living Traditions: Continuity and Change, Past and Present Special Issue of Cambridge Anthropology 17(2) ANTH Pers
With the possible exception of the USA, the case of Australian Aboriginals represents the most advanced engagement with indigenous issues. This Australian situation has shifted from the outright exclusion of Aboriginals from the state, through the awakening of demands for equal rights and the consequent rejection of archaeologists, to qualified representation within the nation state and a subsequent conservative backlash amongst white politicians. The Australian situation points a way forward for indigenous populations to secure representation. More importantly, for archaeologists it serves to demonstrate how selective and irrelevant our supposedly objective discipline can be. Fortunately, in some situations aboriginal groups have recognized, defined and regulated the contribution they wish archaeologists to make, indicating that a rather brighter future may be possible.

Key issues involving Australia’s indigenous populations include archaeological site protection and management; control of objects, human remains and records held by collecting institutions (museums, art galleries, research institutes); repatriation of human remains and sacred objects; intellectual property rights; and who should study indigenous subjects.


**24th November 2015**

**Dean Sully**

7. **Locating Hinemihi’s people; the care of a Maori space in a British place**

Creating heritage sites can help to promote a sense of history and identity, and have economic and social impact on local communities particularly when development and tourism are implicated. However, this frequently removes control of the sites to the care of state authorities. What is the role of the local population and or the cultural group(s) who previously identified and developed the site or constructed the monument in its management and presentation? To what extent do indigenous people wish to be "trained" to take part in archaeological research on and the management of their cultural sites? To what extent should research, conservation and site management be conditioned by indigenous control of those sites? Is there a sense of copyright or ownership, real or imagined that we should recognize?

As a specific example of these issues we will visit the National Trust’s ‘Maori House’ at Clandon (near Guildford). This building was first constructed as a Maori meeting house at Te Wairoa, North Island, New Zealand, where it’s completion in 1880 marked its becoming a living being in its own right, *Hinemihi*. It was originally planned to serve both traditional functions (e.g. for funerary rites) as well as a location for display and dancing aimed at visiting tourists. The surrounding
community was largely destroyed by a volcanic eruption in 1886, after which the building was dismantled and bought as a souvenir by Lord Onslow to take back to his estate at Clandon after he completed his time as Governor General of New Zealand. Since then the building has been used as a boat-house, a summer house, and a garden store. It was first ‘rescued’ by New Zealand soldiers billeted at Clandon during the first world war, and it has then acquired by the National Trust as part of the Clandon estate, and it has also become the meeting house for the Ngati Ranana London Maori association who have worked to reconstruct and honour the original function of the building. This example raises a number of issues as to what different stake holders think about which attributes of a site are the most significant and how, or if, they should be presented to the public. The complex history of the building, and changes to its material fabric, raises important issues about how and what can be conserved of its intrinsic, intangible and indigenous values.


Hanson, A. 1989 The Making of the Maori: cultural invention and its logic. American Anthropologist 91, 890-902


*Sully, Dean (2007), (ed.) Decolonising Conservation: Caring for Maori Meeting Houses Outside New Zealand. Left Coast Press Walnut Creek, US.


The definition of who may be regarded as indigenous is particularly problematic on the African continent, where processes of incipient nationalism work alongside continued or exacerbated ethnic exclusion. This is crystallised in the case of Kenya where the term indigenous is reserved in official circles for those populations who are either most remote or most non-western in their orientation. These interpretations were enhanced by the pronounced ethnic conflict in Kenya in the 1990s. Elsewhere the Khoisan speaking communities of the Kalahari would appear to represent an obvious indigenous population but their ability to establish their rights has been variously denied and eroded in different southern African countries.

To round up this course we must take serious consideration of the implications of all our study for the way in which archaeologists should develop their discipline. It is not simply sufficient to take notice of the above concerns, but rather it can be suggested that we need to change the whole orientation of our discipline, in the process recognizing the inherent inequalities and bias upon which the discipline was originally founded. The consequences of not recognizing these problems and changing the way the discipline is practiced are considerable and ultimately risk marginalizing archaeology throughout the world. At the same time it could be argued that these concerns should be fundamental to archaeology as a whole it should not be reserved simply for its treatment of and by indigenous populations.


4 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Libraries and other resources
In addition to the Library of the Institute of Archaeology, other libraries in UCL with holdings of particular relevance to this degree are in the Anthropology section of the Science library.

Information for intercollegiate and interdepartmental students
Students enrolled in Departments outside the Institute should obtain the Institute’s coursework guidelines from Judy Medrington (email j.medrington@ucl.ac.uk), which will also be available on the IoA website.

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY COURSEWORK PROCEDURES
General policies and procedures concerning courses and coursework, including submission procedures, assessment criteria, and general resources, are available in your Degree Handbook and on the following website: http://wiki.ucl.ac.uk/display/archadmin. It is essential that you read and comply with these. Note that some of the policies and procedures will be different depending on your status (e.g. undergraduate, postgraduate taught, affiliate, graduate diploma, intercollegiate, interdepartmental). If in doubt, please consult your course co-ordinator.

GRANTING OF EXTENSIONS:
New UCL-wide regulations with regard to the granting of extensions for coursework have been introduced with effect from the 2015-16 session. Full details will be circulated to all students and will be made available on the IoA intranet. Note that Course Coordinators are no longer permitted to grant extensions. All requests for extensions must be submitted on a new UCL form, together with supporting documentation, via Judy Medrington’s office and will then be referred on for consideration. Please be aware that the grounds that are now acceptable are limited. Those with long-term difficulties should contact UCL Student Disability Services to make special arrangements.
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