

# The Role of Archaeology in Teaching the Native Past: Ideology or Pedagogy?

Heather Devine  
*Provincial Museum of Alberta*

Native culture and history as portrayed in some school curricula is a narrow, often stereotypic portrayal of events based on the research of non-Native anthropologists, museum professionals, and historians. Despite the useful role that archaeology can play in supplementing and validating historical information, archaeology receives little attention from Native educators. The reason for this disinterest lies in a mistrust of the motives and ethics of archaeological researchers whose irresponsible practises in times past have served to exploit and to alienate Native communities. New developments in the field of archaeological research policy may provide new opportunities for Natives and archaeologists to collaborate in the creation of culturally and pedagogically sound school programs in Native history and prehistory.

## *Introduction*

Anthropology, the study of humankind, is one of the key disciplines on which any social studies program is based. The various fields of endeavour within anthropology trace the development and diffusion of human lifeways across space and through time. Anthropology should contribute to education, for without a rudimentary understanding and appreciation of how human cultures develop and change, it would be difficult for an individual to develop the sense of tolerance and understanding needed to be a citizen of a multicultural society.

Archaeology, a field within anthropology, is arguably one of the most misunderstood professions in the social sciences. The public is fascinated with the romantic, but often erroneous, notions of archaeology portrayed in books and films. Archaeologists have been variously portrayed as adventurers and treasure-hunters in the style of Indiana Jones, or as doddering British academics in pith helmets and khaki. The popular public conceptions of archaeological sites are characterized by exotica of all sorts, from pyramids with secret mazes and trap-doors, to burials, jewellery caches, and the like (Fagan, 1984, p. 177). For most people, archaeology is an esoteric, rather exotic pastime that is practised in faraway places and used to interpret the lifeways of long-dead civilizations.

Although these misconceptions are innocuous enough in themselves, they can become obstructive and harmful when they distort our understanding of what archaeology is and why it is practised. These stereotypic notions can cause curriculum developers to limit archaeology content in the school program, because qualities are ascribed to archaeology curricula that may make it appear unsuitable at best, frivolous and harmful at worst. When this occurs it is always unfortunate, but it is particularly distressing in light of the significant role that archaeology plays in helping us to learn more about the Indian and Métis past.

Archaeological evidence indicates that human beings have lived in what is now North America for at least 11,000 years, and perhaps much longer. These early people developed effective hunting, gathering, and subsistence agricultural techniques which enabled them to successfully exploit their environment for this lengthy period without, of course, European technology. The first Europeans, the Vikings, reached North America within the last 1,000 years. In the centuries that followed subsequent European visitors relied primarily on hunting and gathering to survive. This survival strategy did not alter appreciably until the establishment of permanent European agricultural settlements.

Despite the fact that the human history of North America is largely a chronology of indigenous lifeways, it is European history, and European historic practice, that dominate and shape our understandings of the North American past. As a result, precontact Indian history as portrayed in school textbooks may be, as Dent (1982) points out, a largely ideological past.

### *Historic Practice and the Issue of Validity*

Most social studies programs rely primarily on historical records, secondary historical sources, and pictorial representations to interpret North America's human past. Oral history—despite its preeminence as the principal means of transmitting the past in indigenous societies—gets short shrift in most social studies curricula. One reason for this is the relative unavailability of this material to educators. Native oral historians generally confine their activities to the Native community, with the exception of those who may occasionally share their histories with researchers. The few examples of oral history to reach the classroom usually consist of decontextualized Indian myths and legends; other oral information of interest is usually limited to research-oriented publications that may be difficult for educators to obtain.

Native oral history may also be excluded from school curricula due to the perceived difficulty in establishing the historical veracity of oral information. Because of the supposed susceptibility of verbal transmission to distortion, because of the tenuous links to the past that are broken when elders die or when generations are separated by language or cultural differences, oral history has come to be viewed as not having the same degree of credibility as written history. This point of view continues to prevail in the face of Native land claims cases presently before the courts, which have admitted oral historical accounts as evidence.

Written history, however, has its own inherent weaknesses. Written history is ideologically driven; it is always influenced to some degree by the value systems and the knowledge level of the writer. Aboriginal history interpreted by Europeans, therefore, may be full of errors and reflect a profound lack of understanding of the Native point of view, but may nonetheless be considered more credible primarily because it is written down. Unfortunately the task of discerning truth from fiction in these writings, particularly in the social studies classroom, is usually left to those who may not be well equipped to do so.

Indian and Métis history and culture have suffered a great deal at the hands of non-native historians and curriculum developers. The Native past as portrayed

in most curriculum offerings is a selective past that dwells primarily, if not exclusively, on Native political history and material culture of the last 250 years. This focus largely ignores topics dealing with interpersonal relationships and the nonmaterial aspects of day-to-day life. We learn very little about community values, social or family interaction, the daily activities of women and children, or subsistence behaviours not directly related to the hunting of large animals. As a result, the Native past transmitted to school students reflects a world populated by Indian and European men who hunt buffalo, trade furs, fight each other, sign treaties—and do little else.

This narrow vision of the past is further limited by the interpretation and evaluation of events from a distinctly non-Native perspective. We have all heard of the Riel Rebellion, but not the Riel Resistance, just as the notion of the Custer Massacre has taken precedence over the Battle of the Little Big Horn in the popular imagination.

The conventional historical record, whether it be written documents such as diaries and census records, photographs, paintings, or heirlooms passed down from Grandma, tends to present a rather skewed vision of the past. Few fur trade journals, for example, reflect the candor of Alexander Henry the Younger's journal; most were written as business documents rather than personal accounts. Census records may feature misspellings of surnames or unintentional omissions. Contemporary accounts of events are influenced by the observers' biases and level of knowledge, just as academic historians' ability to interpret the historic value of these accounts is predetermined by bias and access to pertinent information.

Photographs are also prone to manipulation. We can often be fooled by subjects who are represented perennially in their best clothes, or who were provided with props for the occasion. Vizenor (1990) cites the example of Edward Curtis, the well-known photo-chronicler of Native peoples from the early part of the century, who used the photographic medium to create idealized, mythic portrayals of Indian people. Through carefully constructed poses, and the retouching of original negatives in the darkroom to remove all vestiges of non-Native culture, Curtis wilfully manipulated contemporary reality to serve his own aesthetic purposes. In doing so he created a photographic record of an Indian "past" which was essentially fraudulent, but which presented the illusion of cultural credibility. Curtis was able to achieve this because of the power inherent in the medium of photography. To better illustrate this point, Vizenor quotes Susan Sontag's *On Photography* (1977), where she notes that "photographs are a way of imprisoning reality.... The primitive notion of the efficacy of images presumes that images are the quality of real things" (Vizenor, 1990, p. 85).

Paintings from the historic period also owe a great deal to artistic licence and less to actual experience. For every Karl Bodmer who actually travelled amongst the Indians pictured in his portraits, there is a Frederick Remington whose paintings relied primarily on imagination and less on his actual experience in the West, which consisted of life on a sheep ranch for about a year and a half (Dipple, 1982, pp. 8-9). Yet to see his paintings, which are full of Indian battles,

cowpunching, and days in the wilderness, one would think that he had experienced these events himself. Yet it is Frederick Remington, and not Karl Bodmer, who is most responsible for shaping the image of the American West that exists in the popular imagination.

The objects that survive in museums should also be viewed with a jaundiced eye. The headdresses, the pottery, the painted buffalo robes have survived to the present day because someone thought they were special, that they were "nicer," or perhaps worth more, than something else. The subsequent process of obtaining, preserving, displaying, and interpreting these items in a museum is not dissimilar from the selection process inherent in the historian's investigation and portrayal of human events. It is the curator (usually non-Native) who endows these objects with historic or cultural importance, a status which may or may not reflect the perspective of the Native community vis-à-vis these artifacts' appropriateness or utility in communicating aspects of cultural life.

Unfortunately, curriculum developers have determined that schoolchildren will learn about the past from written history, from archival photographs, and from the objects that find their way into museums. There is almost no opportunity for students to investigate the past from an archaeological or an ethnohistorical view. It is not enough to know that early Indian people and Métis used certain tools and weapons; what is important to know is how these tools came to be developed, how they were made and used, and what impact the use of these tools had on Natives' overall relationship with their environment.

One might assume that archaeology, which focuses so heavily on interpreting the material record of the aboriginal past, would be a logical topic for study by Native students, and one would assume that developers of Native education programs would concur. However, this is not the case. In fact, some factions within the Native community have expressed considerable ambivalence towards archaeological research. Why has this occurred?

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to identify the issues at the root of the controversy over archaeological research into the Native past, and to debate their validity. These concerns fall into the following general categories:

- archaeological research practices;
- validity of archaeological data.

### *Archaeological Research Practices*

For the most part, the general public has an incomplete and somewhat distorted vision of what archaeology is and what archaeologists do. Because much of their knowledge of the field is derived from the popular media depictions of archaeological work, it is little wonder that it is assumed that archaeological research consists of diving for underwater treasure and burrowing into tombs on land. The "typical" archaeologist is a white male—a gentleman academic in a pith helmet or a swashbuckling soldier of fortune.

Native people are consumers of popular culture like the rest of the population; they too absorb and integrate these media images of archaeology. However, when Native people see Indiana Jones at the movies or watch Jacques Cousteau on television, they do so from a particular experiential perspective.

Unlike the rest of society, indigenous people have been the subject of much of the anthropological research conducted in the last century. The sometimes-questionable practices employed by anthropologists in the context of this research activity have compelled Natives to bring into question the underlying motives and ethics of social science research. The fact that much of this research is conducted under the auspices of museums or government agencies has also brought these organizations under scrutiny.

It has been estimated by some Native advocates that as many as 300,000 Indian skeletons and skeletal fragments currently reside in American museum collections and laboratories (Vizenor, 1990, pp. 62-63). While many of these remains are retained by museums ostensibly for research purposes, in a few instances some human remains have been placed on display as exhibits (Cheek & Keel, 1984; Ford, 1984; Meighan, 1984). The material culture collections featured in some museums, which may include artifacts of considerable personal and spiritual value to Native people, have in past instances occasionally been acquired through legal expropriation or outright fraud. In other instances, researchers have abused the trust of Native communities by photographing and recording sacred rituals and publishing culturally sensitive information without the knowledge or consent of the individuals involved (Adams, 1984, p. 236).

It has also been observed that archaeological research into the indigenous past is conducted largely by non-Natives (University of California [UC], 1983; Vizenor, 1990). The few Natives who are involved are not in a managerial or policy-formation capacity but serve as field labourers or in a limited capacity as informants on Native culture (Froese, 1987, pp. 14-15). Finally, there is the complaint that academic investigations do not appear to embody an ethic of responsibility towards contemporary Native communities (Trigger, 1980, p. 671). Research projects, for the most part, are not applied research; that is, they have not been directed towards the enhancement of Natives' cultural, spiritual, or economic lives. It has also been noted that archaeologists and anthropologists have been largely delinquent in their responsibilities to report their findings to the Native communities involved, in a manner accessible to the members of those communities (McGhee, 1989, pp. 17-19).

These intermittent, often negative contacts with the anthropological community have served to sensitize Native peoples to the activities and motives of archaeologists to the point where they are unable and/or unwilling to revise their opinions of archaeologists, despite the fact that many of the unethical "research" practices carried out by cultural anthropologists and archaeologists are products of the late 19th and first half of the 20th century, at a period when the discipline of anthropology was still in the throes of definition (Trigger, 1980, pp. 663-672) when academic certification standards, historical resources legislation, and excavation methodology were minimal or nonexistent.

#### *Utilization of Archaeological Data*

Because of their lack of significant influence over archaeological research practices, Natives question the validity and subsequent utilization of the archaeological data derived from research. They argue quite persuasively that



archaeological information is interpreted largely from a non-native perspective (UC, 1983) and that Natives might have a different interpretation of the evidence. They also challenge the validity of standard archaeological interpretations of past events, such as the Bering Land Bridge migration hypothesis (McGhee, 1989). Many Natives have adopted a spiritual (and conveniently pragmatic) stance specifically in regard to such issues. They will not accept archaeological research findings that might in some way appear to jeopardize their legitimate claims and rights in other spheres, that is, land claims. Despite the fact that archaeological data often provides compelling support for Native claims, there is a tendency to reject archaeology altogether because of the threat that the information will be employed in a manner contrary to Native interests.

Of even more compelling concern is the eventual disposition, display, and interpretation of archaeological materials in museums, and the utilization of anthropological data in the development of educational materials and school curricula dealing with the aboriginal past. The lack of sensitivity demonstrated by some museum curators in the utilization of sacred objects and skeletal material for research and display purposes has been discussed earlier.

Unfortunately, what is less publicized are the efforts now being made by interpretive facilities and museums across North America to involve the Native community directly in the development and implementation of museum policies and in interpretive programs dealing with aboriginal cultures, and to train and employ interpretive, display, and curatorial personnel of Native ancestry (Conaty, 1989, pp. 407-413; Brink, in press).

It should also be recognized that the vast majority of archaeologists and cultural anthropologists practising today find the research practices and ethics of the past as morally repugnant as do Native peoples. In fact, when confronted with the realization that the perception of the discipline amongst Native peoples is one that is somewhat negative, the reaction of the typical North American archaeologist is one of bewilderment and dismay. Professional archaeologists do not steal and sell artifacts or ransack burials for fun and profit, although they are often accused of these crimes. They also tend to view themselves as cultural relativists; if anything, they see themselves as advocates and supporters of Native peoples and their sociopolitical aspirations. While it might be correct to say that contemporary archaeologists have been overpreoccupied with research and less on applying archaeological data to the benefit of contemporary society, it is nonetheless unfair and inaccurate to accuse all archaeologists of malicious intentions and unethical practice. Ironically enough, it is professional archaeologists and anthropologists who have actively lobbied for, and endeavoured to see enacted, legislation to protect archaeological resources from the depredations of developers and private collectors. It is also archaeological research data that are invariably cited on behalf of Native groups in land claims negotiations.

Indeed, the last few years have been characterized by extensive soul-searching within the anthropological community, which has finally begun the lengthy process of transforming itself from a closed fraternity of researchers dedicated to serving narrowly defined academic goals to a profession that acknowledges its social responsibilities to the communities impacted by its

research. In the last half of the decade many of the major international and regional archaeological and museological organizations (e.g. The World Archaeological Congress, the Canadian Museums Association) have sponsored conferences and established working committees to investigate issues regarding archaeological research into the aboriginal past. Topics addressed have included the formulation of burial policies, archaeological resource management on Indian lands and public lands, development of legislation governing the ownership, and policies regarding the curation and interpretation of aboriginal antiquities.

Despite these encouraging developments within the archaeology profession itself, it is unclear to what extent the grassroots population within the Native community is aware of, or even concerned with, these major ideological shifts taking place.

### *Archaeology and History in the Native Classroom*

Concerns over archaeological awareness in the Native community may appear to have little relevance to Native education in general or classroom interpretations of the Indian and Métis past in particular. However, it is Native community leaders and educators who make the educational policies for the communities in which they live. It is their experiences with, and knowledge of, the practices of archaeologists and anthropologists that will ultimately determine whether the Native past will be explored from a social science perspective in Native cultural curricula.

The problems inherent in the standard approaches to the study and teaching of Native history and culture in schools have been well documented. The stereotypic, inaccurate, and often insensitive portrayals of Native cultures in school textbooks identified in numerous studies (McDiarmid & Pratt, 1971; Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, 1978; Decore, Carney, Urion, Alexander, & Runte, 1981) have compelled Native educators to develop alternative resources to replace the materials currently in use. In many cases, the Provincial and Federal school system itself has been replaced by Native-controlled schools or by specially developed programs for Native students in large urban school jurisdictions. While these steps have been taken to better serve the emotional, social, and cultural needs of the Native students they serve, the issue has been raised that may also serve to segregate students from the mainstream population, and from mainstream understandings of some issues. There is also the possibility that the programs may serve to present Native history and culture from an advocacy history philosophical stance that, in some respects, may serve to merely replace white stereotypes and inaccuracies with Native stereotypes and inaccuracies. The exclusion of archaeology study in Native cultural programs is both a function and a direct result of this ideological stance. But is the exclusion of archaeology/anthropology as a vehicle for exploring the Native past in the best long-term interests of Native or non-Native students? Is it the archaeological practices or data that are at fault, or is the question one of how this material has been utilized within school curricula?

Traditionally, Native history and archaeology have been presented to students via time-honoured approaches generally considered to be culturally sensitive and

innovative. I am referring to those techniques respectively dubbed the "museum" approach and the "discipline" approach (Aoki, Werner, Dahlie, & Conners, 1984). The museum approach is most commonly used in the elementary grades, where students are exposed to an eclectic mix of activities designed to represent the salient points of a culture. This approach, however, may serve to perpetuate stereotypes and to trivialize customs and attitudes if the information is presented without a thorough understanding of the cultural context. Take, for example, a relatively common arts and crafts activity used in the elementary grades where students are encouraged to construct and decorate models of Indian tipis. Although this activity would appear to be innocuous, one might ask whether it is appropriate to have students mimicking an activity (for example, tipi decoration) that amongst Native groups is a direct outgrowth of spiritual activity.

The discipline approach, which uses the vehicles of social science and history to study culture, may result in students analyzing and classifying cultural groups only within the circumscribed confines of each discipline's conceptual and enquiry framework without arriving at a holistic understanding of the evolution of cultural practices (Aoki et al., 1984, p. 277). A teacher may selectively compare and contrast a hunter-gatherer culture and an industrialized culture without fully explaining the process of cultural development and diffusion. Without a contextual understanding of this process, students may make implicit value judgements which serve to classify one survival strategy as being somehow more "culturally evolved" than the other. Take, for example, the study of communal buffalo hunting by the plains Indians. To students raised in urban environments, and accustomed to consuming packaged products acquired from the sterile confines of the meat counter of the local supermarket, the process of stampeding, crippling, and butchering buffalo may appear barbaric indeed.

And while the conventional approaches to teaching culture are not destructive in themselves, the level of training that most teachers are able to acquire in anthropology or Native history is unlikely to provide them with the contextual understanding of Native lifeways necessary to develop culturally sensitive classroom activities. This lack of knowledge should not imply that teachers are racists (Price, 1978, pp. 270-271). However, there also does not seem to be any real desire, or interest, on the part of teachers to learn any more about Native cultures (Ferron, 1982). As a result, lessons developed to introduce students to the Native world view may implicitly show disrespect because of the use of inappropriate content and activities.

To be fair to educators, a too-full school curriculum and lack of inservice funding have not helped to ameliorate this situation. It is also important to remember that ethnocentric educational practice is symptomatic of North American mass culture, which only recently has recognized, and begun to address, the multiethnic diversity in the population. However, when one knows that the average classroom teacher is likely to devote approximately one week of class time to studying archaeology and/or Native people (Devine, 1985, p. 59), the probability that these topics will be presented in a superficial fashion is strong indeed.



*Pedagogic Responsibility and the Native Past*

The problems associated with classroom treatments of the Native past may in fact have less to do with the shortcomings of anthropology and history and more to do with a lack of a clearly defined rationale, or mission, governing the presentation of Native cultural content in the classroom.

At the present time, few educators appear to question exactly why they teach about Native people. Is Native content taught because there is an curricular obligation to cover a discrete period in the chronology of Canadian history? Is Native cultural content viewed as a means of satisfying some vaguely defined multicultural directives from head office? Or is Native studies taught because it has meaning and importance to both teachers and students?

In light of recent events at Oka and the larger context of Native land claims disputes across Canada, it becomes incumbent to ask ourselves how effectively schools are presenting the Native past to students. The problems inherent in training teachers to function in a cross-cultural context, the shortcomings of school curricula dealing with the Native past have all been exhaustively documented. Numerous cross-cultural programs have been instituted to improve the situation, but one would have to conclude that while a greater general awareness of Native concerns may exist, this awareness does not necessarily imply a deeper understanding of Native issues. In particular, there does not appear to be an understanding of the historical roots of the conflicts characterizing Native/non-Native interactions today.

When we teach a topic because we feel it is important or necessary, we treat the material differently. We will spend more time mastering the content. We will devote more effort to developing activities. More importantly, we will base our content mastery and our learning strategies towards demonstrating a personally defined sense of commitment to the topic.

Educators have a responsibility to present Native prehistory curricula accurately and in a pedagogically responsible manner. To take pedagogic responsibility for our activities is to recognize that the content we are presenting will influence the values, attitudes, and modes of behaviour adopted by our students. Teachers who teach with a sense of pedagogic responsibility recognize that their educational tasks do not end with successfully meeting the measurable instructional and evaluation criteria of the school program. They end when the teacher has made a conscious and successful effort to sensitize students to the sociopolitical context of the material. This process of "values clarification" is appropriate and necessary to the study of history in general, and to the study of the Native past in particular.

Teachers also demonstrate pedagogic responsibility when they recognize that students in the class may already possess a specialized understanding of the content and that the content may therefore be endowed with considerably more significance to that individual. A mishandling of the content by the teacher due to poor preparation or a lack of interest may not only serve to give students an incomplete or inaccurate understanding of events, but may also cause psychic damage to children who already have a commitment to the material.

Some educators may consider the neglect or outright removal of certain types of curricula (for example, archaeology content) to be ideologically "correct" because these disciplines are seen to perpetuate a neocolonial, and essentially racist, view of the Native past that depicts Native people as primitive hunters and gatherers whose culture crumbled in the face of "superior" European technology. However, to remove archaeological research information on prehistoric Indian lifeways merely gives credence to the erroneous notion that hunting and gathering cultures, and precontact Indian cultures in particular, are unworthy of study.

In fact, the Native prehistorical record as revealed through archaeological research is a celebration of the successful and ecologically responsible subsistence strategies characteristic of the traditional Native way of life. The aboriginal peoples developed sophisticated sociocultural and technical systems that enabled them to exploit a harsh environment for several thousand years without destroying the resources it provided. The fact that the first Europeans' survival depended upon aboriginal technology, and that several traditional subsistence strategies continue to provide economic support to Native peoples today, testifies to the utility and validity of this way of life. At a time when the environment we live in is jeopardized by economic and social practices that do not embody a conservation ethic, the contemporary, historic and prehistoric relationships of Native peoples with the land acquire new importance.

It should also be noted that to ignore at least 10,000 years of hunter-gatherer culture and the world view it has engendered is to effectively remove the cultural context needed to interpret and understand the economic, social, and cultural issues affecting Native peoples today. The abrupt transition from several millennia of nomadic hunting, gathering, and subsistence agriculture to a non-nomadic, agricultural/industrial way of life was a profound and catastrophic event in the history of Native peoples. The disruption of the traditional way of life not only required an adoption of new and unfamiliar behaviours, but also severely impacted the symbiotic relationship with the land that engendered much of the philosophical, spiritual, and moral underpinnings of Native life. The significance of this cultural upheaval—and the social, economic and political difficulties that resulted—can only be truly comprehended when examined in the context of the rich and complex Native culture that preceded it—and survived it.

Excising topics such as archaeology from the Native cultural curriculum may also deny students access to information they may need to function later in life as community leaders and citizens at large. Today Native organizations and band councils are grappling with a number of heritage-related issues that range from negotiating land settlements and developing burial policies to the repatriation of artifacts and the hiring of consultants to conduct archaeological and ethnographic research on Native lands. To complete these tasks successfully requires not only a knowledge of archaeology and history, but a clear understanding of what archaeology and history professionals *do*.

### Conclusion

Archaeology is simply another process for understanding the past. It is a research tool, a means to an end. Archaeological research can be used to serve the best interests of the Native community. Or it can be misused to the detriment of both Natives and non-Natives. But rather than simply ignore the work of archaeologists, educators could take the opportunity to learn about and to understand the strengths and limitations of archaeological research as a tool for studying the past. This goal can best be realized by approaching individual archaeologists, archaeological regulatory agencies, and university anthropology departments to initiate the dialogue needed to establish a cooperative approach to developing culturally sensitive and educationally appropriate programs for the classroom.

It is also the responsibility of the archaeological community to address Native grievances concerning archaeological research by instituting the changes to archaeological practice needed to facilitate increased Native understanding of, and, participation in, archaeological research. Providing assistance to Native education and cultural bodies is one step towards ensuring that Native participation in archaeology takes place. A willingness to work as equal partners towards achieving jointly defined goals is essential to this process. Equally important is the willingness of Natives and archaeologists to critically evaluate the nature of their dealings with one another, in order to reduce the divisiveness that has come to characterize so much of the debate concerning Native heritage issues.

The time has passed where archaeologists and Native people can afford to operate in isolation from one another. The archaeological resources that comprise the material record of the distant Native past are both fragile and finite, and will require the cooperative efforts of both communities to ensure their protection. Archaeology content in Native education curricula can serve to promote and support these protection goals, and this may be justification enough for a critical evaluation of the role of archaeology in studying the Native past.

### References

- Adams, E. Charles. (1984). Archaeology and the Native American: A case at Hopi. In Ernestene Green (Ed.), *Ethics and values in archaeology* (pp. 236-242). New York: Free Press, Collier-Macmillan.
- Aoki, T., Werner, W., Dahlie, J., & Connors, B. (1984). Ethnicity within Canadian social studies curricula. In J.R. Mallea & J.C. Young (Eds.), *Cultural diversity and Canadian education* (pp. 265-289). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Brink, Jack. (in press). Blackfoot and buffalo jumps: Native people and the Head-Smashed-In Project. *Alberta*.
- Cheek, Annetta L., & Keel, Bennie C. (1984). Value conflicts in osteo-archaeology. In Ernestene Green (Ed.), *Ethics and values in archaeology* (pp. 194-207). New York: Free Press, Collier-Macmillan.
- Conaty, Gerald T. (1989). Canada's First Nations and museums: A Saskatchewan experience. *International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship*, 8(4), 407-413.
- Decore, A. M., Camey, R., Union, C., Alexander, D., & Runte, R. (1981). *Native people in the curriculum*. Edmonton: Alberta Education, Curriculum Branch.

- Dent, Richard J. (1982, December). *Ordinary people: The role of historical archaeology in understanding American history*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 925)
- Devine, Heather. (1985). Unpublished report, Archaeological Survey of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Dipple, Brian W. (1982). *Remington and Russell*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Fagan, Brian M. (1984). Archaeology and the wider audience. In Ernestene Green (Ed.), *Ethics and values in archaeology* (pp. 177-182). New York: Free Press, Collier-Macmillan.
- Ferron, Ann S. (1982, December). *Field testing of the "American Indian Archaeology in the Middle School" program*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 124)
- Ford, Richard I. (1984). Ethics and the museum archaeologist. In Ernestene Greene (Ed.), *Ethics and values in archaeology* (pp. 138-139). New York: Free Press, Collier-Macmillan.
- Froese, Pat. (1987). Education committee questionnaire results. *CAA Newsletter*, 7(2), 14-15.
- Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. (1978). *The shocking truth about Indians in textbooks*. Winnipeg: Author.
- McDiarmid, Garnet, & Pratt, David. (1971). *Teaching prejudice*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- McGhee, Robert. (1989). Who owns prehistory? The Bering land bridge dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 13, 13-20.
- Meighan, Clement W. (1984). Archaeology: Science or sacrilege. In Ernestene Green (Ed.), *Ethics and values in archaeology* (pp. 208-233). New York: Free Press, Collier-Macmillan.
- Price, John A. (1978). *Native studies: American and Canadian Indians*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Sontag, Susan. (1977). *On photography*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Trigger, Bruce. (1980). Archaeology and the image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity*, 45(4), 662-676.
- University of California (Producer). (1983). *Science or sacrilege: The study of Native American remains* [Videotape]. Santa Barbara: Instructional Development, University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Vizenor, Gerald. (1990). *Crossbloods*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.