I have been working within the field of cultural resource management (CRM) since 1988. As a Northern Paiute woman, working in this profession has been both challenging and rewarding. My experiences include working for various Federal and state agencies, state and university museums, and my own tribal community. From these experiences, I have gained a relatively broad understanding of the complex relationships guiding the interactions between CRM personnel, academic archaeologists, and Indigenous descendant communities. Over the course of the last two decades, I have watched and participated in the various interactions my tribal community has had with cultural resource managers working for Federal and state agencies. These cultural resource managers now control the majority of my Tribe’s traditional lands. I have monitored the manner in which my Tribe has been able to negotiate protections of our traditional landscapes with the State Historic Preservation Office and other state and Federal agencies. Although many Federal and state land and “resource” managers have worked diligently to find ways to incorporate tribal needs, often the understanding of both what tribal needs entail and the means to incorporate those needs effectively are absent. Because of this, the success of adequate protections for my community’s important places has been limited. For the most part, CRM law has not developed inclusive of Indigenous perspectives (Tsosie 1997), and discussion addressing the concerns of descendant communities is often never initiated beyond the cursory consultation that Federal law requires.

In this chapter, I discuss some of the primary points of misunderstanding and miscommunication among cultural resource managers, archaeologists, and Native American descendant groups within the Western Great Basin of the United States. From this discussion, I hope to further illuminate some of the landscape issues cultural resource managers and archaeologists working in the Great Basin and elsewhere should consider as they continue to work in the homeland of Indigenous descendant communities. My continued goal within my community is to find ways of incorporating our Tribe’s traditional values and concerns into the Federal and state holders’ cultural resource management practices. From this discussion, it is my hope that further efforts conducive to improving collaborative working relationships between cultural resource managers, archaeologists, and Indigenous descendant communities will be fostered. As a professional archaeologist, my ethical responsibilities include working to improve efforts toward greater collaboration between Native American Tribes and archaeologists, both in CRM and academic research. Although a majority of my work as an
archaeologist has included working with tribes of the Pacific Northwest, the issues I discuss are general enough in content and scope to be applicable for archaeologists and cultural resource managers working anywhere there are incongruent and/or competing values guiding land-use practices.

**Land-Use Theory in the United States**

A primary issue of contention between mainstream American culture and at least some North American Indigenous communities is the manner in which relationships between people and the landscapes they inhabit are perceived and evaluated.

Policies guiding land use in the United States have developed from early notions of America as an untamed wilderness along with ideological assertions about land and land ownership founded in Western philosophy. Prevailing ideas such as the “right of discovery,” “eminent domain,” and, later, “manifest destiny” allowed the majority culture to justify the appropriation of Indigenous people’s lands. Under American land-use policy, lands were for the most part parcelled and deeded to individual land owners. Individual land ownership was a primary factor in the status given to any person, and group ownership was not usually socially acceptable or legally possible. Race and gender were primary factors guiding access to land ownership in early America; because of this, the rights of Native American peoples were seldom considered. As a result of prevailing early land-ownership and -use policies guiding efforts to take control of land in North America, all tribes Indigenous to the United States lost some of their land base, and some tribes lost control and access to their homelands entirely. Forced removal and relocation of Native Americans in the United States began in earnest with the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and continued until all “hostiles” were effectively silenced in the late 19th century (Higham 2003; O’Neil 2003). In the aftermath of such turmoil, surviving Indigenous communities have rallied to work toward repatriation of their traditional homelands, as well as working toward greater control and consideration in land-use policy and practice. Within these struggles, misconceptions about the unique relationships Indigenous North American cultures have with their homelands prevail. In time, however, increased communication will allow for achievement of increased understanding of the importance of place to this country’s first peoples.

A residual problem facing some Indigenous people, one that has been virtually silenced by the legal process they must now use to gain greater control over their traditional lands. Unfortunately, the “experts” who now have greatest authority in speaking to the nature of the relationship between any given Indigenous community and their land are not the people themselves but the anthropologists who study their culture (Fuller 1997; Rosen 1977). Although every relationship between anthropologists and the Indigenous communities they study is unique, and some relationships are much closer than others, the question remains whether an anthropologist’s etic perspective can ever fully account for the cultural beliefs of a community that differs from their own. I offer an example from the Great Basin to further explore the differing ways anthropologists and archaeologists have interpreted relationships of Indigenous communities with their landscape, from that of how a member of one of those communities views those relationships.

**Through Another’s Eyes**

Palaeoecology has been an important aspect of archaeological interpretations in the Great Basin since the 1930s (Grayson and Cannon 1999; Steward 1938). However, since the 1960s, there has been an almost unyielding emphasis toward ecological and materialist models (Baumhoff and Heizer 1965; Bettiger 1977; Bettiger and Baumhoff 1983; Broughton and Grayon 1993; Christianson 1980; Fowler 1972; Zeanah 2002). Because of this, many of the archaeological and anthropological explanations of Great Basin cultures’ lifeways have a mechanistic quality about them. Predator/prey models, optimal foraging theory, and other such cost-benefit analyses of the subsistence strategies of Native American Great Basin cultures have diminished the primacy of the role cultural values play in guiding the actions of Indigenous Great Basin peoples.

Beyond ethnographic accounts portraying Indigenous peoples as informants, alternative discussions or explanations by Great Basin descendant communities are all but absent from archaeological or anthropological literature. Because of this, the voices of Indigenous Great Basin peoples have been silenced by the archaeological and anthropological interpretations of those peoples, and the intimate relationships between people and places have been for the most part overlooked (Brewster 2006).

Many problems have resulted from these oversights, including the present need for some descendant communities to fight against the archaeological
Looking beyond Subsistence Strategies: When Land Is Family

The landscapes of the Great Basin of the western United States are sometimes as harsh and foreboding as they are beautiful. The Northern Paiute peoples who have inhabited these spaces since time immemorial (Burns Paiute Tribe 1997) have honed their skills and practices to meet the challenges of this highly variable climate. A close examination of the Northern Paiute people’s interactions with the landscapes they inhabit would illustrate the complexity of that relationship, although ethnographic and archaeological literature often refers to our cultural system as “simple.”

The primary connection between Northern Paiutes and their homelands should not simply be seen as that of a culture existing on a geographic location as a backdrop. Nor should it merely be seen as a relationship of humans exploiting the resources available to them. Rather, the nature of the relationship between landscape and Northern Paiute peoples is more accurately described from my own emic perspective as familial. The people are the land and the land is the people. The reasons for this are numerous, but I highlight some of the most apparent.

Within the oral history of most Great Basin cultures, an era is recounted. There was a time when the relationships between Indigenous Great Basin peoples and the other beings of the land shared such a close relationship that all species could communicate with one another. Since then, it has been carried down from generation to generation so that we are today as, Great Basin peoples, related to the other animals who share our landscape. Likewise, other living beings, including flora and geographic places, are also given due consideration and respect. The reciprocal relationships observed by anthropologists between Northern Paiute peoples are also practiced between humans, animals, and other things and places in our Great Basin homelands.

A perusal of the ethnographic data from the Great Basin could support this claim, although the ever conclude an assertion of the existence of a familial relationship between humans and other species. The term animism is used to describe beliefs akin to the Northern Paiute practice I describe above, but defining a practice in anthropological terms or determining cultural beliefs as a “worldview” does not diminish the need to take such cross-cultural realities into account when considering appropriate land-use policy and practice.

Additionally, it is common knowledge among Indigenous Great Basin descendant communities that the landscape is the keeper of our history. The acts and events occurring on the landscape become part of it. A component of the people who were part of those acts and events is forever intermingled with those places; in effect, an action on a landscape is also an action on not only prior acts and events but also the people who were involved in those activities. Moreover, the actual physical remains of the ancestors of Indigenous Great Basin peoples are intermingled with the soil of the landscapes of our homelands. Because of this fact, we are the landscape from which we came and will each some day return. Our success at protection of important places is vital to this cycle of individual life and death, and the health and well being of our communities depends on our ability to actively participate in a healthy relationship with our lands.

The complex nature of the relationship between Northern Paiute communities and their landscapes is little understood by people practicing traditional anthropology. The near-exclusive use of standardized anthropological foraging models diminishes the value of the critical relationships between Northern Paiute people and their homelands to that of exploitation, or acts of instinctual animal response to the landscape, thereby dehumanizing the Indigenous people of the Great Basin. To correct this problem, many changes must occur within the way archaeologists, anthropologists, and cultural resource managers go about their business. Most pressing, however, is the need for incorporation of Indigenous cosmologies and epistemologies to that of current CRM land-use policies and practice, so that the concerns and needs of all affected communities are addressed. Until such issues are taken seriously, the cultural resource management of lands in the Great Basin will not meet the needs of Indigenous Great Basin descendant communities.

The Business of CRM

In the United States, Federal legal mandate requires cultural resource management inventories of all lands involved in Federal undertakings. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as it is commonly known, requires cultural resource management inventories of all lands involved in Federal undertakings. Although I offer only one standpoint from within Northern Paiute culture, I suggest what such an alternative interpretation of the relationship between the people of my community and their landscape should include.
106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is a primary tool for CRM evaluation, and this Act focuses principally on the tangible remnants of past human activity still available on the landscape. Federal and sometimes state protections for Native American human remains, funerary objects, objects of cultural patrimony, and sacred items, as well as places of significant religious importance to Native American tribes, also exist, although the application of these protections through the cultural resource management process is often difficult and highly controversial. Within Section 106 process, inventories, locations with tangible remains of past human activity, are documented. The cultural properties identified as a result of cultural resource inventories are then protected, usually by measures toward avoidance, until such time when they can be further evaluated. The process for providing permanent preservation protections to cultural properties requires an evaluation of a property’s eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). But most locations identified during the cultural resource management inventory process are never evaluated for their eligibility to the NRHP, because of cost and time constraints. This often leaves identified cultural properties in a legal limbo. Additionally, the NRHP evaluation process evaluates the importance of providing permanent protections to a property based on whether the property possesses one or more of the following criteria outlined in the NHPA: It (1) is associated with an important event; (2) is associated with an important person; (3) embodies distinctive characteristics; (4) has the potential of yielding important data for major research questions. But differences often exist between the import Northern Paiute communities place on particular locations on the landscape and the significance criteria of the Section 106 process.

CRM law has developed within a predominantly Western ideological system, and because of this, the land and the “resources” available on it are given a value based from within that particular cultural system. For instance, within the language and accepted meaning of CRM law, archaeological sites are viewed as “properties” (16 U.S.C. §§ 431–433) with an attached intrinsic value and rights of ownership (Tsosie 1997). This approach differs from the views held by Great Basin Indigenous communities in that, although a particular place may indeed have an intrinsic value for one or more descendant communities, the value is seldom related to Western “research” interests, unless a community has chosen to combat ideologically Western-based research with the same in support needed to effectively meet the needs of Indigenous descendant communities. Discussion of efforts to differentiate cultural resource management from cultural heritage management further exemplify differences between how the tangible remnants of past activities are defined cross-culturally.

### Cultural Resource Management vs. Cultural Heritage Management

Within mainstream American culture, it is popularly assumed that the “archaeological record” is America’s heritage and is, therefore, owned by all Americans (White Deer 1997). While this instilled attitude of “national pride” has been actively fostered both by initiatives to educate the public, and to gain public support for the protection of archaeological sites, the overall assertion of public domain and public dominion (White Deer 1997) of these sites often creates tensions between the understandings of the public, the needs of archaeologists, and the rights of Indigenous descendant communities.

The term *cultural heritage management* (CHM) is currently causing controversy among some Great Basin communities because of who is using the term and what cultural heritage management means in relationship to cultural resource management. The descendant communities tied most closely to the physical remains comprising “archaeological” sites often feel their heritage is being appropriated by archaeologists and others who profess legal and other claims of ownership to the material remains from such places. The notion that tangible materials from the precontact era are claimed as belonging to anyone’s “heritage” beyond that of the descendant community or communities Indigenous to that particular region is offensive. Because of this, some indigenous descendant communities propose to define cultural resource management and to clearly separate it from cultural heritage management. Further awareness of the implications of the adoption of this term is sure to cause additional tension between Indigenous communities and the agencies now claiming to be “heritage” managers. The use of the term *heritage* as part of program management also implies that the agency using the term is aware of all aspects of the heritage of the landscape they are managing, which is arguably not the case in terms of nontribal agencies managing the homelands of Indigenous communities.

CHM is a term that has been adopted by some tribal agencies combining deference for CRM law, while practicing the culturally appropriate treatment of landscapes for the communities the office serves.
program but represents only a small subset of considerations for these communities. However, Howard (2002) cautions that use of the term heritage, even for tribal agencies, may lead to misconceptions of exactly what is valued and deemed worthy of protection, because heritage narrowly defined most commonly refers only to tangible items.

There are several primary differences between traditional CRM practice and the CHM methodologies being implemented by some Indigenous descendant communities. Although also bound by Federal law in evaluating the significance of places the law considers cultural properties, tribal communities often consider the same landscapes either more or less important or significant for very different reasons. For example, Indigenous descendant communities may not necessarily value the tangible attributes of a cultural property for its potential to yield Western scientific data, especially if the data and the knowledge yielded fall outside the bounds of that culture’s cosmological and/or epistemological system. Additionally, the value of a particular landscape for Indigenous communities may or may not be identifiable through the inventory of tangible evidence associated with that particular landscape: lack of visible physical remains on or within a particular landscape does not necessarily equate to lack of value for Indigenous descendant communities. In fact, it is often just as likely that the value of a landscape could not be assessed by anyone outside the particular Indigenous community that values it. But often because of the current lack of meaningful communication between CRM personnel and Native American tribes, descendant communities have little or no voice in defining the “value” of most places within their own traditional lands. Because cultural resource management law has primarily concerned protecting places and things of importance to majority culture without regard for or understanding of the Indigenous and Indigenous descendant worldviews, frustrations frequently arise when Indigenous Native American communities try to use the existing legal system, most usually CRM legislation, to protect those landscapes important within their own communities.

Recent attempts to incorporate Indigenous perspectives within state and Federal CRM laws have had mixed success, especially when conflicts arise between the desires of Indigenous communities and the public and/or archaeologists. Conversely, these communities have sometimes had great success at working together to protect important landscapes. Occasionally, because of other factors, such as the Federal legal primacy of historic mining claims, no amount of lobbying, negotiating, pro-

1996; In the Light of Reverence 2001). When an issue arises pitting some within the archaeological community against descendant communities, problems increase exponentially. Nowhere is this more apparent than in cases involving human remains and/or sacred sites (Van Pelt et al. 1997).

### Consultation vs. Collaboration

An additional issue that continues to plague the development of mutually respectful and mutually informed relationships between Native Americans and archaeologists is the limited amount of meaningful collaboration occurring between and among members of these respective groups. Current CRM law requires that formal consultation occur between Native American Tribes and the CRM offices overseeing protection of those tribe’s traditional lands. The legal protocol, however, requires only limited interaction between these groups, and at least some archaeologists and the land managers they report to don’t see a need for further interaction with descendant communities beyond what they interpret legislation to require (Coahran 2006). Because of this situation, and because of the fact that many CRM departments are operating with limited budgets and numerous time constraints, the level of open discussion that leads to relationship-building and cross-cultural understanding is often lacking. More often than not, the immediate tensions among archaeologists, CRM personnel, and Indigenous communities are due to the dysfunctional and disjointed relationships among these groups. At least some archaeologists and CRM personnel go about their careers oblivious to the cross-cultural mayhem they may be creating. Building collaborative relationships can also be very time-consuming, but those land managers and archaeologists who have taken the time and effort to seek collaboration with descendant communities have often found their efforts toward collaboration effective and most rewarding (Cannon 1996; Fuller 1997; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Burns Paiute Tribe 1992). The issues I now introduce are common within the Great Basin but are also points of consideration for anyone approaching the question of collaborating with Indigenous communities as conversations relate to “archaeological sites.”

### The Sacred, the Secular, and the Profane

Many descendant communities hold the greatest of
their people. Somehow, however, this relationship between Indigenous peoples and their traditional lands has been translated in the minds of the public and some archaeologists as a “sacred” relationship. While some Native Americans might speak of their relationship with the landscape of their people as “sacred,” others would not. To be certain, most if not all tribal groups have places within their homelands that hold great spiritual value, but the idea that every location within a given groups’ traditional landscape is sacred seems highly unlikely. The notion of “sacredness” as a constant companion to the identity of any Native American developed from age-old stereotypes of the supraspiritual Indian. Such stereotypes portray Native Americans as having a heightened mystical spiritual relationship with everything around them. Why Native Americans have been portrayed this way and why this stereotype has been perpetuated is somewhat unclear, but this preconception sometimes forces descendant communities to speak in terms of the sacred in order to be heard. Without support based in the public’s perception of a sacred relationship between Indians and nature, and sometimes even in spite of it, majority society does not feel much need to recognize Indigenous descendant communities’ rights to protect areas of importance to them. Support from the public for protection of places important to Indigenous communities, usually gains momentum only when the place also holds value for mainstream society. Of course, there have been exceptions, and it is within these exceptions that Indigenous communities and their supporters find hope for future change.

Conclusions: Bending without Breaking

Each of the issues I have introduced in this chapter can be effectively addressed by increasing meaningful communication among archaeologists, cultural resource managers, cultural heritage managers, and descendant communities. It sometimes seems impossible to hope for fulfilling collaborative relationships considering the present difficulties of even achieving mutually acceptable consultation from various agencies. The reality is, although effective collaboration is happening in some places, discussion leading to a paradigmatic shift toward collaborative work is occurring in academic and other settings (Ferguson et al 1997; Harrison 1997; White Deer 1997). Through continued efforts to increase awareness, the thought processes and practices that have emerged from early successful collaborations can and will even of cross-cultural differences will also, we hope, increase the breadth of considerations they are willing to give to the views of descendant communities, as well as allow land managers to see the value of advocating for collaboration with those communities. Although mutually agreeable compromises may not always be possible, it is important to at the very least make an earnest attempt at understanding the viewpoints of others. Nowhere is this truer than in cases wherein the traditional landscapes of descendant communities are being managed by others. It would be far easier to continue to buy into the environment of misunderstanding, thereby maintaining the status quo. But if cultural management is to survive as a method of protecting the places of importance for all communities within the United States, it must evolve in a manner that protects the interests of all citizens while giving proper due to this land’s Indigenous cultures.

Note


References


Brewster, M. 2006. Knowledge, power, and authority in Numic studies: From Yosemite to Eagle Lake, the erasure of Northern Paiutes from the Sierra Nevada. Paper presented at the 30th Biennial Great Basin Anthropological Conference, October,


In the Light of Reverence. 2001. A film directed by Christopher McLeod, produced by Christopher McLeod and Malinda Maynor, narrated by Peter Coyote and Tantoo Cardinal. A Production of the Sacred Land Film Project of Earth Island Institute, a presentation of the Independent Television Service in association with Native American Public Telecommunications.


