THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Archaeology, Entitlement, and Indigenous Bodies

By

Mia Pardel

August 2023

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in the Master of Arts Program in the Social Sciences

Faculty Advisor: Hannah Moots
Preceptor: Mary Wilhoit

Abstract

The history of archaeology is shadowed by genocide, dispossession, and appropriation. However, many archaeologists have worked hard to begin decolonization and challenge the colonial ideas the field is grounded in. These ideas are based in the history of the colonization of Indigenous Americans which was maintained in early US legislation; however, more recent legislation has challenged these ideas due to the work of Native activists and archaeologists' changing perceptions. This thesis dissects the arguments for continued access to Ancestors of three authors, Holm (2011), McGhee (2008), and Weiss (2021). I highlight two case studies, the Ancient One and the Chaco Canyon Ancestors, to demonstrate how these attitudes of entitlement and colonial ideas are seen in the field. Through the tenets of decolonial archaeology, which include methods such as increased rates of repatriation, community-based research, and enhanced aDNA ethics, archaeologists can challenge claims of entitlement to Native bodies and continue the decolonization of the field.

I. Introduction

Since the colonial period, Europeans have robbed the graves of Indigenous peoples, dispossessed them of their ancestral homelands and interred Ancestors, stolen ancestral and funerary objects, appropriated Native histories, denied Indigenous peoples basic human rights, and employed tactics of genocide and assimilation (Atalay, 2006:281; Ojala, 2022:105; Riding In, 1992:15). These practices have been devastating for past and present Indigenous communities and have resulted in unethical attitudes of entitlement to Indigenous bodies within academia. Western scientists have stolen hundreds of thousands of Ancestors from their resting places for the sake of collection and study, and have often mistreated, lost, or destroyed them. This has severely impacted the well-being of tribes, nations, bands, communities, and individuals throughout the United States and other Indigenous communities. Native peoples, however, have always fought for their Ancestors and have prompted change in US legislation that reflects their demands for equal human rights in death and opposition to the colonial attitudes in archaeology.

While researchers have recently worked to honor Indigenous peoples by accepting responsibility for their forebearers' actions and calling upon other archaeologists to do the same, others maintain attitudes of entitlement and unethical behaviors toward Indigenous bodies in the name of Western science. First, I will explain the terminology I use in this thesis and examine my positionality and its influence on my interpretations. I will then investigate the historical grounding of this attitude and how it has been supported or challenged in US legislation about Indigenous bodies in death. Next, I will examine how this academic attitude of entitlement is seen within the field of archaeology today, investigating the colonial root ideas that arguments against decolonial methods are based on. I will highlight two case studies as examples of this entitlement, recounting the events and the colonial ideas within the arguments of Western scientists. This will also entail

the examination of decolonial methods to resolve these attitudes. Finally, I will briefly reflect on ways Indigenous peoples have been reclaiming their bodies.

A. A Note on Terminology

Within this paper, I use the terms Indigenous American, Native American, Ancestors or ancestral human remains, and funerary objects. Most Native peoples identify with their tribal affiliation and do not think of themselves as "Native American" or "Indigenous American," these are colonial terms that have been opposed upon them. I use Indigenous American here to describe this large group of varied peoples who are indigenous to anywhere on the American continents and have experienced similar colonial abuses. This is generally a broad term that includes Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, Native Alaskans, and other communities and in this paper is used to illustrate attitudes, history, and legislation in the United States as it pertains to these communities. However, whenever possible I refer to communities or individuals by their tribal affiliation. I use 'Ancestors' or 'ancestral human remains' instead of 'remains' because these remind the reader that Ancestors are human beings who are related to descendant communities and whose humanity was often stripped of them throughout history. Finally, I use 'funerary objects' instead of 'grave goods' because this acknowledges their importance to burial rituals and does not commodify them. Words are important, and by using specific ones, I hope to make my research more inclusive and decolonial.

B. My Positionality

I am a white, queer, gender-queer, female-bodied person with a Bachelor of Arts in anthropology and currently completing a Master of Arts in social sciences. As a student, I have access to the resources necessary for my research. This privilege shapes my positionality and I am

careful to not make assumptions based on my experiences and opinions. I actively seek to listen to and understand those with lived experiences in Indigenous communities to create research that is holistic and decolonial.

II. Historical Foundations and Legislation

Attitudes of entitlement are based on the 16th-century colonization of Indigenous Americans in tandem with colonial ideas of racial inferiority and superiority which developed as the wealthy, white, educated elite began collecting artifacts for curiosity and profit. Their religious perspective considered Indigenous peoples inferior and less than human, making the spread of Christianity and civilization imperative. Due to this, they easily broke treaties and stole land, bodies, and objects with no remorse for the humans harmed by disinterment. This perspective justified the desire of the educated elite to study "inferior" Indigenous cultures and peoples and their collection methods of grave robbing to obtain objects of study (Watkins, 2005:433; Atalay, 2006:281; Tsosie, 1997:67). These colonial religious ideas separated Indigenous people from their humanity, eventually giving way to the Enlightenment's scientific and secular beliefs of racial superiority which continued this separation, genocide, and dispossession (Riding In, 1992:14).

With this change, Western scientists began to collect bodies to prove racial superiority or inferiority. Bodies were beginning to be conceived as legible and measurable where class, race, intelligence, gender, and the potential for civilization or degeneration were inscribed into peoples' bodies (Bieder in Mihesuah, 2000:20; Riding In, 1992:14). The creation of unilinear social evolution in the late 1700s allowed for easy description and categorization of cultures and societies. This is a process of stages that began in savagery, moved to barbarism, and developed into civilization (Bieder in Mihesuah, 2000:19). Western science ascribed civilization to European peoples and savagism or barbarism to non-European peoples, justifying the genocide of Native

peoples and the collection of their bodies. Burial mounds became popular excavation sites and many Western scientists refused to attribute them to Native peoples, insisting that a previous race had to have existed on the continent and been exterminated by Indigenous Americans (Atalay, 2006:286; Hinsley Jr. in Mihesuah, 2000:39). This separated Native peoples from their interred Ancestors, funerary objects, and ancestral homelands, allowing settlers to appropriate them and Indigenous histories. In 1784, Thomas Jefferson, the regarded "father of American archaeology," performed an excavation of burial mounds in the Rivanna River Valley, Virginia; he destroyed the entire complex to satisfy his curiosity and published his findings about the Native peoples he disinterred (Atalay, 2006:287, 288; Hinseley Jr. in Mihesuah, 2000:39; Riding In, 1992:15). Due to his fame as a leader of the newly founded United States, Jefferson ascribed grave desecration with the illusion of morality and embedded it into Western science as people began to follow his example, robbing Native graves as a means to provide human remains and funerary objects for scientific study and collection.

During the 1830s, Euro-American ideas of racial inferiority shifted toward phrenology and craniology, but the theft of Native bodies and Ancestors was still warranted to prove inferiority theories. Samuel G Morton performed extensive studies to prove racial superiority and inferiority through bone measurements; he enlisted settlers, traders, and military and civilian physicians to gather Indigenous crania in return for payment. This incentivization increased the rate of grave robbing and while Indigenous Americans tried to prevent this and protect their interred Ancestors, military personnel were often part of these grave robbing parties, and violence or threat of often dissuaded protection efforts or resulted in the deaths of those protecting their deceased relatives (Bieder in Mihesuah, 2004:23-4). Morton and other Western scientists created "cranial libraries" of Native American skulls for comparative research. The creation of these libraries included the beheading of fallen Indigenous warriors on battlefields and those executed by settler authorities.

After the American Civil War and the discredit of phrenology and craniology, Western science shifted toward evolutionary theory and away from unilinear social evolution. This change, however, did not lessen the collection of Indigenous bodies and Ancestors; Native bodies were now being used to examine claims of evolutionary theory including brain case capacity changes and physiological changes for walking upright (Bieder in Mihesuah 2000:28-9,31).

The desire to expand cranial libraries and the establishment of museums led to occurrences such as the Surgeon General issuing a memorandum to field surgeons in 1862 to collect the crania of Native peoples from battlefields, mounds, hospitals, burial grounds, and POW camps (Bieder in Mihesuah, 2000:24-5, 29; Riding In, 1992:19; Tsosie, 1997:67). Collection efforts went so far that in 1864, Colonel Chivington and his Colorado militia men "massacred an encampment of friendly Cheyenne, Kiowa, and Arapaho Indians near Sand Creek" (Riding In, 1992:19), some were beheaded and their skulls were sent off to be studied. Educational and governmental institutions continued grave robbing in the name of scientific inquiry, and soon degrees in archaeology became available, which increased the number of grave robbers legitimizing grave desecration and through systematic surveys and excavations disinterred thousands of Ancestors and objects to be stored and studied (Riding In, 1992:20, 21). Narratives of Native inferiority and appropriation of their histories and cultures were perpetuated in early mass media events, such as the World's Columbian Exposition held in Chicago, Illinois in 1893 (Bieder in Mihesuah, 2000:29, 30). These continued to spread the idea that Indigenous bodies were collectibles and data sources to support non-Native claims to land and history, eventually culminating in the Antiquities Act of 1906.

The Antiquities Act was created to protect archaeological sites on federal and tribal lands from looting due to the notion that Ancestors and ancestral objects were important resources for the cultural history of the American public (Tsosie, 1997:68; Watkins, 2017:269). This law defined

Indigenous bodies buried on federal lands as archaeological resources and objects of historic and scientific study (Tsosie, 1997:68). It operated on a permit system to control excavations and established criminal sanctions for unauthorized theft or destruction of "antiquities" that were owned by or under the control of the federal government (Watkins, 2017:269). This law was eventually replaced, but the definitions and procedures it set continued to permeate legislation.

After centuries of political weakening by the United States government, in 1934 the Indian Reorganization Act recognized the rights of tribes and nations to reconstitute their governments which revitalized resistance against archaeology and institutional collections and collecting (Kakaliouras, 2019:96). Decolonization movements spread throughout academia in the mid-1900s, confronting colonial legacies, epistemologies, and ontologies. In the 1960s, Indigenous protests changed archaeology's methods, collections, and displays of cultural objects and Ancestors, removing Ancestors and sensitive objects from display and even a few cases of repatriation (Wilcox, 2010:224; Atalay, 2006:288). Rights movements led by coalitions of tribes and nations led to more legislation, such as the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, which changed Native participation in archaeology, but did not resolve any objectification (Hudetz, 2023; Riding In, 1992:25).

ARPA was created to "protect irreplaceable archaeological resources" (Tsosie, 1997:69) found on both federal and tribal land from commercial sale and to encourage the professional and academic collection of these resources. This act defined Ancestors, ancestral sites, and objects over 100 years old as cultural resources and determined whose property they were based on which government (federal or tribal) owned the land they were found on (Tsosie, 1997:69; Josephy et al., 1999:211). This continued the consideration of ancestral human remains as important for scientific study to benefit the American public, increasing criminal sanctions to deter illegal grave robbing and trafficking. This act did, however, mandate consultation with tribes and nations that could

possibly be affected by the excavation of a site but gave them no power over excavation (Tsosie, 1997:69; Josephy et al., 1999:211).

After a great deal of conversation and debate in the late 1980s, Native American activists and legal scholars pushed for two acts that were passed into federal law, shifting away from the science-favoring notions of Indigenous remains as resources for public benefit toward that of human rights where all people deserve respect in death (Riding In, 1992:12, 25). The National Museum of the American Indian Act of 1989 (NMAIA) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) protected the human and burial rights of Indigenous Americans and recognized issues with institutional ownership of Ancestors and ancestral objects (Echo-Hawk in Riding In, 2004:182; Wilcox, 2010:224).

NMAIA created the National Museum of the American Indian which is dedicated to the storage, display, and research of Indigenous American cultures and required most leadership positions to be filled by Native Americans. It also mandated an inventory of all funerary objects both associated and unassociated and over 18,000 Ancestors held in Smithsonian Institutions to identify the origins of Ancestors and funerary objects (Trope & Echo-Hawk in Mihesuah, 2000:137; Josephy et al., 1999:230, 231; Bardill, 2018:384). Following the inventory, it was required that tribes and nations who may have a cultural affiliation with the Ancestors and funerary objects be notified, and upon request from these communities, repatriate them as quickly as possible. The inventory, identification, and repatriation of these was overseen by a special committee composed of five members, three of which must be chosen from the nominations of Indigenous tribes and nations (Trope and Echo-Hawk in Mihesuah, 2000:137-8; Josephy et al., 231).

NAGPRA mandated all agencies and institutions that receive federal funding inventory and report any human remains that could possibly be Native American Ancestors and objects that

are culturally affiliated with a tribe or nation. These agencies and institutions were then required to initiate consultations with tribes and nations who had culturally affiliated Ancestors or objects in their collections to begin repatriation processes (Gonzalez, 2006:393; Hudetz, 2023; Tsosie in Riding In, 2004:169, 170; Watkins, 2017:277). This extends to all archaeological excavations on federal and tribal land after the date of the act as well; if Ancestors are unearthed on tribal lands then they belong directly to that tribe or nation without the need for repatriation claims and if they are unearthed on federal land the tribe or nation must prove cultural affiliation to gain custody of them (Tsosie in Riding In, 2004:170; Watkins, 2017:277). These laws also changed how repatriation cases were considered; instead of case-by-case considerations in political and legal scenes where Western scientists held most of the control, Indigenous voices now have a bigger platform to make claims for the repatriation of Ancestors and funerary objects, but each claim still goes through months or years of consultations and negotiations before finding their way home (Kakaliouras, 2019:84).

Since the passage of these two acts, repatriation efforts within museums, universities and other institutions have grown considerably, enhancing consultation requirements and creating relationships with Native communities. However, there are still thousands of Ancestors held in institutions and despite growing decolonial sentiments, many museums and institutions have delayed, ignored, or refused to entirely fulfill the law (Balter, 2022; Hudetz, 2023; Shown Harjo in Riding In 2004, 181; Riding In in Riding In, 2004:174). Western researchers that oppose repatriation efforts often cite arguments and ideas based on this history of colonial dispossession, genocide, and grave robbing to continue their entitlement to Indigenous bodies.

III. Academic Opinions of Entitlement to Indigenous Bodies

Scientific colonialism and colonial perspectives of entitlement permeate the field and are seen in arguments against decolonial archaeology, which questions colonial versions of history and prehistory based on the idea that colonialism has severely impacted archaeology and communities. Decolonial archaeology explores ways to undo these histories and relearn decolonial ones using repatriation and collaborative research. The scientific colonialism that archaeological projects are often rooted in involves two specific colonial notions: that academic study is of more importance than Native peoples' human rights and that Indigenous peoples are illogical and incapable. This first notion includes the idea that Native peoples' physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being are unimportant and academic advancement and education take priority. This sentiment places Indigenous peoples as less than human and positions their bodies as tools for science which Western researchers are entitled to. It asserts that Western scientists' right to academic freedom should trump the needs and interests of Native communities. The arguments for academic freedom include the imposition of Western perceptions of relationality and religion onto Indigenous communities, deeming alternative definitions as illogical and irrelevant to the study of the past. This notion also assumes that the peoples connected to an Ancestor, ancestral object, or history are resources for knowledge extraction and are unable to hold any real power in research due to their political agendas or lack of qualifications.

The second colonial idea is that Indigenous peoples are incapable and illogical, whether it be the stewardship of Ancestors and ancestral objects, collaboration and resolution of conflict, or understanding Western science due to spiritualism. These are patronizing colonial sentiments that view Indigenous peoples as inferior, portraying them as needing to be saved from themselves. This sentiment deems that Western researchers know better than Indigenous peoples and are therefore

entitled to ownership and decision-making rights over Ancestors and ancestral objects. The collective American past or human history is a reflection of this attitude when it appropriates Native histories as its own and places Western scientists as the only stewards of this past. It implies that Western methods of preservation and curation are the best course of treatment and that Indigenous peoples are incapable of stewardship in this manner. It is also seen when Western scientists assume that all objections to the performance of Western research are due to Native spiritualism and illogicality, not historical dispossession and harm done by researchers. This section will examine the arguments against the necessity of repatriation and collaborative research put forth by three scholars, Holm (2011), McGhee (2008), and Weiss (2021), as they cover the main arguments that researchers cite to fight these efforts which exhibit an attitude of entitlement toward Indigenous bodies.

The first major notion that these arguments stem from is that Western science takes precedence over human rights. Some researchers, including the three examined in this section, take issue with repatriation and community-based research because they believe that the pursuit of scientific knowledge about the past is more important than affording human rights to Ancestors and Native peoples (McGhee, 2008:580; Weiss, 2021: 12:04; Holm, 2011:32). This notion is colonial because it removes the rights of Indigenous peoples and places them as inferior. This notion then extends to the education of Western scientists, which Holm illustrates when he states that as long as a display of human remains has a "valid purpose" (2011:30) it is not unethical or disrespectful. This argument not only upholds the colonial idea that the advancement of science and education is prioritized over human rights, but it also continues the objectification of Ancestors as learning tools and objects for scientific study.

Holm (2011:30) supports his argument by contending that as long as bodies are treated with respect, there is no need to worry about display or repatriation. This argument ignores the

colonial and unethical circumstances in which institutions procured Ancestors and also assumes that Indigenous bodies are treated respectfully when in these institutions even though there is overwhelming evidence that this is not the case (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:171, 172; Hudetz, 2023; Cortez, 2023; Balter, 2022; Bardill, 2018:384; Fox, 2019:582; Kakaliouras, 2019:83, 89; Kowal, 2022:4). Holm states "It is easy to come up with examples of actions that show a lack of respect, such as playing football with a skull" (2011:30). This dismisses the unethical actions and behaviors of Western scientists toward Indigenous bodies, e.g. using a skull as an ashtray (Shown Harjo in Riding In, 2004:179), upholds colonial attitudes of entitlement, and dismisses the emotional and spiritual well-being of the community connected to the individual.

Arguments for academic freedom often contain many of these colonial ideas but also impose Western definitions onto Ancestors and Indigenous peoples. Many cases, such as the Ancient One, include the imposition of Western notions of family and relationality. Holm (2011:30) argues against the repatriation of distant Ancestors back to descendant communities because the Western notion of family does not extend so far back in time and does not involve Ancestors as regularly. Native notions of family include ancient Ancestors and the disposition of their dead is critical. Imposing this Western definition onto Indigenous communities not only dismisses their claims for their Ancestors' human rights to burial but is a continuation of colonial legacies and supports academic attitudes of entitlement to Indigenous bodies.

Another Western definition that is often imposed onto Native communities and used to argue for academic freedom is religion. Weiss (2021: 6:42) argues that any repatriation under NAGPRA which relies on oral traditions as evidence of cultural affiliation should not be permitted. This is due to Western ideas about the composition of religion; her main argument is that Native religions lack written texts, therefore oral traditions are the only proof (besides religious objects) because they contain "religious themes." This is problematic and colonial because it centers

written texts, imposes Western definitions and ideas of religion, and dismisses the independence of Native religions which do not require colonial recognition to be valid.

Sentiments that Western researchers should have access to study Native bodies often include ideas that Indigenous peoples and their histories belong to Western science and that they are perfect knowledge sources to provide information about the human past that is not obtainable in any other way (Riding In, 1992:29; McGhee, 2008:580). This is unethical because Indigenous bodies do not provide some hidden insight into the human past; this idea is based on the dispossession of Ancestors and Indigenous histories when Euro-Americans were looking to reinforce their claims to Native land and resources, placing Indigenous peoples into the American past in efforts to remove their claims and to assimilate them into American society. The bodies and histories of Indigenous peoples do not belong to Western scientists and arguing that they do is a continuation of colonial legacies that view Native bodies as objects of study that researchers are entitled to instead of Ancestors in need of repatriation to their descendants.

McGhee (2008:589) and Weiss (2021: 9:34) argue that the inclusion of Indigenous peoples in community-based research and repatriation will result in archaeologists pursuing the political agendas of the people they work with (Wilcox, 2010:222). While taking a political stance may be seen as unscientific, American archaeology has been taking political stances since its beginning when it was used as a colonial tool of dispossession, genocide, and assimilation. Shifting to support communities and their alternative histories is no less political than archaeology historically has been and continues to be. This argument ignores the positionality that all researchers have. They also believe the qualifications of communities to participate in research are inadequate, ignoring their capabilities, traditional knowledge, and the capacity building that collaborative research provides.

The second main notion that these arguments are cemented in is the perceived incapability and illogicality of Native peoples. This is a colonial sentiment that is founded on ideas of racial inferiority which legitimized genocide, enslavement, and dispossession. These ideas place Western knowledge systems as supreme, Weiss even argues that Western science and the scientific method are the best and only way to perform research, stating they "can be most simply defined as logical thinking," (2021: 12:32). McGhee shares similar sentiments when he argues that including Indigenous communities in research will be unscientific and essentialize Native peoples (McGhee, 2008:589). This is a very problematic perspective; not only do they devalue other ways of knowing, but by defining Western science as "logical" and everything else as illogical, they continue colonial attitudes that valued anyone and anything that was different as lesser, which justified the atrocities carried out against Indigenous peoples and the theft of their Ancestors and histories. This maintains colonial legacies of the collection of Native bodies for study by demeaning and dismissing other truths, knowledge systems, and ways of knowing and placing Western science as a necessity and therefore entitled to study Indigenous bodies.

This perceived superiority of Western science is also perpetuated in the idea that Indigenous communities are incapable of stewarding their Ancestors and ancestral objects (Schneider & Hayes, 2020:139; Kakaliouras, 2019:86-7). This sentiment regards Western scientists as the best stewards for the past and assumes that there is a singular method of care that is proper for Ancestors and ancestral objects, which follows the curation and preservation practices in Western science (Holm, 2011:31; McGhee, 2008:580). This notion also concludes that Indigenous communities do not and cannot understand preservation or why Western scientists consider it important (McGhee, 2008:584). This perspective invalidates the sovereign right for tribes and nations to decide on the disposition of their Ancestors and continues colonial notions of

inferiority and incapability, dehumanizing Ancestors when their preservation is placed higher than their human rights to burial.

The Western attitude of superiority is also seen in consultation and conflict resolution where Western scientists take a patronizing or paternalistic role. Some Western scientists act as though they are in positions of power over Indigenous communities and treat their concerns and interests in research as unimportant or secondary to their own (McGhee, 2008:584; Schneider & Hayes, 2020:128, 130). Researchers can have a colonial perspective about conflict resolution that portrays tribes and nations as unable to have logical or progressive conversations about a conflict and find a compromise for all. This attitude is seen with the Chaco Canyon Ancestors when the curator received two different claims for the Ancestors and instead of putting the communities in conversation with each other to resolve the claims, they did not contact the tribes at all and marked the Ancestors as culturally unaffiliated (Balter, 2022; Cortez et al., 2021:163). This is an example of the colonial and patronizing attitude toward the capabilities of these communities to be able to compromise and resolve the possible conflict and entirely removed them from the discussion about their Ancestors altogether.

This presumed illogicality is seen in the trope of Indigenous spiritualism versus Western science. This portrays Indigenous peoples and Western researchers as directly antagonistic, characterizing Indigenous peoples as ignorant and anti-science and Western scientists as the champions of the public (Wilcox, 2010:222; Schneider & Hayes, 2020:138; Weiss, 2021: 13:12). This not only overlooks the colonial past of Western science and dismisses the very real concerns Native peoples have, but it also ignores Indigenous sovereignty and authority over their Ancestors. Native peoples' feelings of protection of their Ancestors and their distrust of Western science do not reflect anti-science sentiments. Past experiences with Western researchers who dismissed their concerns and interests make trusting archaeology difficult, even though communities may want to

expand their traditional knowledge to include Western ways of knowing the past (Schneider & Hayes, 2020:139-140; Balter, 2022). This notion of spiritualism versus science is a continuation of colonial legacies as it places Native people as inferior to Western scientists, where their concerns are ignored and their feelings dismissed so researchers maintain access to Indigenous bodies.

The notion of a collective past is colonial and dispossessive and supported by all three authors (Holm, 2011:31; McGhee, 2008:589; Weiss, 2021: 7:42). The claim to a shared human history is a result of the genocide and dispossession of Indigenous peoples, in which Native histories and Ancestors were appropriated into the Euro-American past to legitimize claims to Native land and resources (Scheider & Hayes, 2020:139; Kakaliouras, 2019:86-7). The results from studying Ancestors are often portrayed as a social good and Holm (2011:31) contends that this knowledge benefits the public, and therefore must belong to Western scientists who can interpret them. While archaeological knowledge from Ancestors may benefit the American public, rarely does it benefit Indigenous communities, oftentimes remaining inaccessible to them due to scientific jargon or paywalls, and research may harm communities and cultures with non-inclusive research or destructive analyses (Riding In, 1992:34). This idea that Ancestors provide information that benefits the public and that this information should be obtained by archaeologists perpetuates the academic attitude of entitlement to Indigenous bodies.

While a majority of researchers support the methods of decolonial archaeology to create a more inclusive and holistic field, some scholars, such as Weiss (2021), Holm (2011), and McGhee (2008), view repatriation and community-based research as threats to archaeology that could possibly result in the end of North American archaeology and Western science in the US. Decolonial archaeology looks to demonstrate how colonial systems dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their land and identity by changing archaeological tenants to center Indigenous knowledge production and acknowledge Indigenous communities' primary rights and interests in

the stewardship of their Ancestors and research (Schneider & Hayes, 2020:128). Making these changes does not endanger the field or Western science, but instead makes it stronger by intertwining knowledge systems to interpret research, challenging colonial power structures within academia, and questioning the attitude of entitlement to Indigenous bodies. These scholars uphold colonial attitudes toward Ancestors when they defend ideas such as academic knowledge taking precedence over the human rights of Ancestors, Indigenous bodies are learning tools, Native peoples are incapable and illogical, and Indigenous histories belong to the American past or human history. The practice of these ideas implies that Native peoples are unable to steward their own past and that Western science and researchers are the only qualified people to preserve and interpret ancestral objects, Ancestors, and histories to benefit the American public. These ideas uphold colonial ideologies that categorized Native peoples as less than human, justifying the infliction of countless horrors. The colonial power structures that remove Indigenous people from their rights to control the disposition of their Ancestors and attitudes of entitlement that some Western scientists still have toward Indigenous bodies are exhibited in two case studies: the Ancient One and the Chaco Canyon Ancestors.

IV. Case Studies

A. The Ancient One

On July 28th, 1996, two students wading through the Columbia River on land under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corp of Engineers near Kennewick, Washington happened across a body that was partially unearthed due to riverbank erosion. Upon first examination, he was thought to be a 19th-century settler due to his apparent Caucasian-like cranial features (Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:211; Kakaliouras, 2019:80). The human remains were sent to the University of California in Davis for study and radiocarbon dating which found that he was over nine thousand

years old; he was dubbed the Kennewick Man by Western scientists and the Ancient One by Indigenous communities. After this, the Corp quickly began the repatriation process dictated by NAGPRA to five local tribes that filed a claim for him as their Ancestor, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla, the Yakima Indian Nation, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Wanapum Band, and the Colville Confederated Tribes. The Department of the Interior reviewed the case and decided there was enough evidence of cultural affiliation – including origin legends of the valley he was found in and treaty rights to the area for tribal hunting, fishing, and gathering – for him to be repatriated back to the five tribes (Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:211; Echo-Hawk in Riding In, 2004:182; Kakaliouras, 2019:81-2).

However, many Western scientists were upset by this decision due to their desire to study him and eight filed a lawsuit against the government to stop repatriation and reburial processes and obtain permission to study him. Their arguments were based on the idea perpetuated by some scholars that he was actually ancestral to Europeans, claiming early Europeans migrated into the Americas before Indigenous American Ancestors arrived on the continent. The eight scientists argued that due to the age of the Ancient One, the fact that he was found on federal land, and cultural affiliation claims relying on origin stories and treaty rights, he could not be Indigenous. They supported their claim with interpretations of his skull morphology and successfully introduced doubt to the case, resulting in the judge overturning the Department of the Interior's decision (Kakaliouras, 2019:82, 91; Echo-Hawk in Riding In, 2004:182-3; Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:211). The tribes that claimed him did not want any destructive analyses, testing, or studies on him to prevent further desecration and spiritual harm, but the federal Interior Department appointed independent scientists to determine cultural affiliation which included these analyses (Kakaliouras, 2019:89; Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:211).

The scientists that blocked the repatriation of the Ancient One believed that he could represent an earlier migration of a people unrelated to Indigenous Americans into the American continents. In considering this, the scientists that filed the lawsuit ignored archaeological features of his ethnicity – the stone artifact embedded in his hip and an associated stone point. Researchers created the category "Paleoamerican" for individuals that they believed represented this population through connections based on age and craniometry (Kakaliouras, 2019:91, 92; Balter, 2022; Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:212). This notion of a people living on the continent before Indigenous Americans is directly connected to the belief in the moundbuilder myth, the belief that Native peoples were incapable of creating the earthworks found across the nation. It reestablished the idea that Indigenous peoples were invaders and colonizers of the continent and continued dispossession and appropriation of their history and Ancestors. While many Western researchers did not take to the idea, support from a few well-known scientists perpetuated it, and it eventually exploded in the media spreading ideas of ancient Europeans as the first Americans (Kakaliouras, 2019:80, 81, 93). This debate over the origins of the Ancient One and Paleoamericans demonstrates how Western science looked to appropriate Native histories to validate their entitlement to Ancestors.

DNA analysis years later proved that the Ancient One was genetically close to members of the Colville Tribe who had volunteered DNA samples to prove their relationality. While their closeness was contested by some who relied on Western ideas of kinship and relationality, the evidence was enough for the US Army Corp of Engineers to transfer him from their custody in the Burke Museum in Seattle, Washington to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla, the Yakima Indian Nation, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Wanapum Band, and the Colville Confederated Tribes. The Ancient One was reburied on February 18th, 2017 in the Columbia River Basin (Balter, 2022;

Kakaliouras, 2019:82, 89-90). To the researchers who insisted on the study and destructive analysis of the Ancient One, he was a scientific object to be unraveled and understood for the benefit of humanity and his reburial meant the loss of this knowledge. This case highlights some of the extreme positions that Western scientists have taken as the "defenders of academic freedom and scientific objectivity" (Wilcox, 2010:222) to the detriment of the social, cultural, and spiritual well-being of Native peoples (Crawford in Mihesuah, 2000:215; Kakaliouras, 2019:87-8, 90).

The issues in this case study are due to the entitlement of a few Western scientists to Indigenous bodies for study; they supported their entitlement with arguments of academic freedom, placing their desire to expand their knowledge above the human rights of the Ancient One. This entitlement consisted of the colonial notions that Western scientists are the best stewards of the past, the preservation and study of Ancestors and ancestral objects are more important than human rights, and the past that the Ancient One represents belongs to all humanity, not descendent communities. If researchers had appraised their practice's colonial sentiments, employed decolonial theory and methods, and considered Native perspectives, interests, and sovereign rights, they could have approached the five tribes involved in the case to collaboratively ask and answer questions about the Ancient One and could have possibly performed non-destructive analyses and studies while respecting Native concerns and possibly built a relationship that could have led to further collaborative research instead of affecting emotional and spiritual harm to the tribes and upholding colonial histories and entitlement to Indigenous bodies.

B. The Chaco Canyon Ancestors

Before the publication of their findings in 2017, researchers performed destructive analyses on Ancestors from Chaco Canyon, in what is now known as the state of New Mexico, to determine hereditary succession in Chacoan society. These 14 individuals were held in the collections at the

American Museum of Natural History since the late 1890s after they had been stolen from the Pueblo Bonito crypt by archaeologists. Contemporary Pueblo and Diné (Navajo) peoples claim Chaco Canyon as their mother village and therefore the people there as their Ancestors, however, they were not consulted before destructive analyses were performed (Balter, 2022; Cortez et al., 2021:161; McNiven, 2016:31).

Furthermore, the tribes had not been notified of their Chacoan Ancestors being held at the museum and they were rightfully angered due to the lack of consultation before studies and destructive analyses were performed and the lack of notification from the museum required by NAGPRA. The scientists relied on the museum to have properly determined cultural affiliation required years prior by NAGPRA and to have obtained consent for research from descendent communities; the museum granted access without providing documentation of consultation or consent to the researchers. Later, museum officials argued that the research could provide a significant contribution to science and that there would be little impact on these Ancestors who had been categorized as culturally unaffiliated (Balter, 2022; Kowal, 2022:4; Cortez et al., 2021:161).

Additional investigation revealed that even though museum officials asserted that they had contacted the Puebloan tribes for repatriation claims and received no answer, their 1990 review held no evidence for such attempts, and when asked about who they contacted and how hard they tried, the museum officials refused to elaborate. Two communities asked to specifically be consulted about the Ancestors from Chaco Canyon when the museum began its inventory, but the curator did not know who to consult and supposedly did not want to start a conflict between the two and determined that the 14 Ancestors were culturally unaffiliated, which allowed for

destructive analyses without consultation and made cultural affiliation claims more difficult to prove (Balter, 2022; Kowal, 2022:4).

The behavior demonstrated by the American Museum of Natural History toward consultation with Indigenous communities and the fulfillment of NAGPRA requirements is not uncommon. This case demonstrates the entitlement to Indigenous bodies held by some Western scientists in several ways. Firstly, it does not take Native concerns seriously, both about destructive analyses and the request of two communities to be included in the repatriation process. This entitlement is also reflected in the colonial and patronizing attitude of the curator who categorized the Chacoan Ancestors as unaffiliated to prevent conflict, which portrays Native communities as illogical and incapable of collaboration and conflict resolution. The complete lack of consultation and collaboration is a demonstration of Western perceptions of Indigenous bodies and pasts as resources for scientific study, dehumanizing Ancestors and contemporary Indigenous communities, dispossessing Native peoples of their Ancestors and pasts, and appropriating Indigenous histories. These are exacerbated by the museum's refusal to take responsibility for the harm to Puebloan and Diné peoples caused by their decision to allow destructive analyses of the Chacoan Ancestors; downplaying the spiritual and emotional harm of the continued dehumanization and dispossession of Ancestors is colonial and continues sentiments of entitlement in the field.

V. Decolonial Methods

Archaeology has been an instrument of colonization that changed narratives to dominate Indigenous tribes and nations, steal their Ancestors and ancestral objects, and appropriate their histories, cultures, and heritages; moving forward from this colonial past to a decolonial field can be done with increased repatriation of stolen Ancestors, objects, histories, and heritages back to

the communities they belong to, collaborative research projects with Native communities, and improved ethics for aDNA research on Ancestors (Londoño, 2021:401). This section will investigate the difficulties archaeology encounters when employing these methods and examine the contribution of each to archaeology's decolonization.

A. Repatriation

When it comes to repatriation, a serious problem within archaeology is the treatment of Ancestors. There are tens of thousands of Ancestors in institutions throughout the US. Most are stored away and never used for research and those that are used for research often undergo destructive analyses like aDNA sequencing and carbon 14 dating to inform researchers of the Ancestor's genetics and age. This is largely due to NAGPRA's category "culturally unaffiliated;" when an Ancestors is deemed culturally unaffiliated, researchers are allowed to perform any tests without any legal requirements for consultation (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:174; Riding In, 1992:23). NAGPRA also does not extend to the Ancestors kept in private institutions that do not accept federal funding, leaving them vulnerable to destructive analyses. The care of Ancestors has no guidelines beyond what is necessary for curation and preservation, often resulting in situations where Ancestors are "...unceremoniously sorted by body part… a jumble of teeth. A drawer of clavicles. Separate bins for skulls," (Hudetz, 2023). There have been many instances where Ancestors have been mistreated by researchers, examples include being dropped (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:171), stored improperly (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:171; Hudetz, 2023; Cortez, 2023), lost or misplaced (Hudetz, 2023; Riding In in Riding In, 2004:172), or outright destroyed (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:171; Balter, 2022; Bardill, 2018:384; Cortez, 2023; Fox, 2019:582; Kakaliouras, 2019:83, 89; Kowal, 2022:4).

When the cultural affiliations of an Ancestor or ancestral object are being determined, considerations must be given for how Native communities have been affected by colonial processes of dispossession and displacement from ancestral homelands, the archaeological collection of Ancestors, and colonial practices of labeling Native peoples in ways that misnamed or merged distinct peoples. These impact how tribes and nations are geographically situated, in turn affecting how their relationships to their ancestral homelands, Ancestors, and ancestral objects are interpreted by researchers (Bardill, 2018:384, 385; Watkins, 2017:268). Researchers need to investigate history to gain a clear understanding of what tribes or nations were present in the area where an Ancestor was exhumed to be able to notify, consult, and collaborate with the right communities.

Repatriation is decolonial because it honors Native religious freedom, amplifies sovereignty through controlling the disposition of their dead, liberates Ancestors from institutions, and acknowledges the colonial and unethical actions of institutions to obtain them (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:171-3; Tsosie, 1997:67). Repatriation works toward ending archaeological study of Ancestors without Indigenous involvement and challenges the notion that archaeologists should always preserve past materials for future study (Gonzalez, 2006:393; Kakaliouras, 2019:85). When agencies, museums, and other institutions repatriate, they not only recognize Ancestors' intrinsic humanity, but also respect the fact that the descendant communities are where they should be instead of Western institutions (Bardill, 2018:384; Fox, 2019:582; Hudetz, 2023; Riding In in Riding In, 2004:175).

The repatriation of objects is different from Ancestors as funerary objects are critical to reburial, which cannot be completed until the objects are reburied with the individual they were originally interred with (Riding In in Riding In, 2004:174; Tsosie in Riding In, 2004:169). By repatriating ancestral objects, archaeology begins to decolonize because the items' importance in

reburial, religious, or ceremonial processes is recognized by researchers and shows their respect for Indigenous religions and cultures. Repatriation can go beyond Ancestors and objects, many institutions hold ethnographic records, items, and information that were collected from Native peoples when archaeologists thought Indigenous peoples were vanishing (Hudetz, 2023). The repatriation of these could benefit tribes and nations in language and tradition revitalization efforts and work to build a stronger relationship between institutions and Indigenous communities where knowledge systems can complement and include each other for more holistic interpretations of the past. Moving forward from archaeology's colonial roots requires an increase in repatriation efforts from institutions that hold Ancestors and ancestral objects, including funding for any traveling the tribe or nation needs to make to reclaim their Ancestors, covering any reburial costs, and respectful and proper care and stewardship of Ancestors before their repatriation.

B. Community-Based Research

Community-based research is the collaborative relationship between researchers and the communities involved in research projects acting as partners to integrate different knowledge systems to bring together scientific and community knowledge for a more holistic interpretation of the community's past. Community-based archaeology is the performance of archaeological research where the community interests and goals are incorporated into all aspects of research from conception, to design, to the presentation of research (Atalay, 2019:515; Gonzalez, 2006:392; Londoño, 2021:388; TallBear, 2014:2; Watkins, 2017:270). However, when community-based research is not practiced, archaeology is maintained as a colonial process of knowledge production with archaeologists in control, extracting knowledge from communities and excavations with no concern for possible benefits or harms to the community, and the assertion of authority over material culture and heritage (Gonzalez, 2006:397).

Without consultation and collaboration, archaeological research may politically impact involved communities, leading to negative outcomes. While many archaeologists believe that their work is not harmful to communities, they may fail to consider the implications of research or may view themselves as the bringers of enlightenment about Ancestors or as champions of impoverished Indigenous communities (Zimmerman, 2004:304; Schneider & Hayes, 2020:138). This portrayal casts Native peoples as savage, primitive, or warlike, which has greatly influenced and continues to influence public perceptions of Indigenous communities, cultures, and histories (Watkins, 2011:53, Watkins, 2017:271, 266, 279; Wilcox, 2010:224). This politically disempowers them, may endanger legal negotiations (e.g. treaty rights and land claims), and dismisses community concerns about research; all of which are the continuation of colonial power structures.

Some scholars refuse to recognize research performed with and knowledge produced from community partnerships as equal to non-collaborative peer-reviewed research (Schneider & Hayes, 2020:141). Community-based work is often not considered high-profile in institutions like other archaeological research, which makes career advancement, funding, and publication of community-based research more difficult and it often goes unrecognized or unaddressed (Atalay, 2019:520; Cortez, 2023; Schneider & Hayes, 2020:129-130).

Community-based research creates more inclusive histories, holds researchers accountable to the communities they work with, and empowers communities in interpreting and presenting their culture and history; which often can work toward achieving social change or eliminating social disparities the community experiences (Gonzalez, 2006:392; Watkins, 2017:270). Knowledge production is decolonized with community-based research and leads to more robust and ethical science and interpretations through consultation and collaboration (Fox, 2019:583). When communities are included in research, they provide input from an insider perspective or

knowledge system and when this is added to Western scientific methods of research, histories become more inclusive. Community-based research holds researchers accountable to involved communities because the community's interests, concerns, and values are central to the research process as well as community participation in all aspects of research (Bardill, 2018:384-5; Fox, 2019:583; Kakaliouras, 2019:89). When researchers distribute funding for their projects and ensure they can travel to the communities they are working with, transport community members to research spaces for greater involvement in research, support capacity building in the community, and compensate community members that take time away from their jobs to participate in research, they empower the community to be part of the research process (Cortez, 2023; Kakaliouras, 2019:96). This challenges power structures and decolonizes research processes where researchers' interests are not the focus and communities maintain some control in research done about them, their culture, or their past, research which has historically excluded them. This practice decolonizes the knowledge production process through the combination of Western and community knowledge, greater accessibility to research products, and capacity building in the community.

C. aDNA Ethics

Ancient DNA research has intensified in recent years and for the most part, is outpacing ethical concerns associated with the field. The destruction of ancestral remains without consultation is one of the primary challenges the field of aDNA research faces. Ancestral remains are often not given respect on par with that given to a living relative and researchers must consult with the descendant community about aDNA analysis (Fox, 2019:582; Bardill, 2018:384; Balter, 2022). Institutional Review Boards do not cover aDNA studies because they focus on protecting living human subjects who are directly involved in research (Cortez, 2023). It is significant that IRBs have not considered the potential harm that may be done to a descendant community from

aDNA research because this centers Western definitions of family and relationality, continuing the imposition of Western definitions onto Indigenous communities.

Lack of proper oversight, such as that from an IRB, can lead to unethical research or improper care of Ancestors and samples; samples may be forgotten, lost, mislabeled, mistreated, or found in improper places (Cortez, 2023). Oftentimes, researchers, no matter their position on a team, are not knowledgeable about the community's ethical behavior requirements, the community's culture and concerns, how consent and samples were gathered, and the risks the community takes in the research. This can result in improper care of Ancestors or samples or the performance of research the community did not approve of. A challenge for labs and institutions is recognizing they do not own the samples they are working with, they are only temporarily housing them to perform research (Bardill, 2018:385; Cortez, 2023).

Within the field of aDNA research, projects generally start with sampling and are then guided by the immediate interests of the few researchers in charge, instead of choosing a question they want to answer and present the question to involved communities to obtain feedback and improve or change the question to fit the community's needs before any sampling (Fox, 2019:582; Cortez, 2023). This is critical because once a sample is broken down for chemical analysis, it cannot be used again, which may lead to continued destructive analysis at the expense of the well-being of the related community and may limit the knowledge that could be gathered from an individual (Fox, 2019:582). This especially becomes a concern when considered alongside the limitations of NAGPRA; its statutes are limited to public and federal lands and institutions that accept federal funding, meaning private property and private institutions have a greater chance of performing destructive analysis on Ancestors without consultation. Another limit is the term "culturally unaffiliated," Ancestors labeled as such are at risk of destructive analysis without

consultation despite amendments to the law that allow for the repatriation of culturally unaffiliated Ancestors (Cortez, 2023).

Enhancing aDNA ethics is decolonial because it places Indigenous concerns and rights at the center of research. Collaboration is an integral part of the research process, and by making community members equal partners in projects with a focus on the community's questions and needs, research can begin to undo colonial power structures in academia and rewrite decolonial histories (Cortez, 2023; Fox, 2019:583). Consent from and consultation with the community is important because individual consent does not address the broader impacts of research on the community and the decision should be communal (Cortez, 2023; Kowal, 2022:5; Fox, 2019:582). All levels of research should be created with Indigenous communities, where they guide research because they bear the most benefit and risk.

The main considerations when researchers are contemplating aDNA research are community involvement, community recognition in research products, engagement after the project ends, and the storage, handling, return, or reburial of any remaining samples. These are crucial to collaboration with a community as historically Indigenous communities' needs and the possible positive and negative outcomes from the study of their histories or cultures were not considered (Kowal, 2022:2; Bardill, 2018:385). The results of aDNA testing can be used to the benefit of an Indigenous community by aiding in the repatriation of an Ancestor, corroborating oral histories and archaeological evidence, and supporting land claims and treaty rights (Bardill, 2018:384-5). Possible drawbacks include undermining or complicating repatriation claims, land claims, and treaty rights; possibly misconstruing or contradicting a community's history; possibly stigmatizing the community due to genetic disease susceptibility; and causing emotional harm to descendants who do not want their Ancestors' remains harmed (Bardill, 2018:384). An example of this is the legal battle over the Ancient One (or Kennewick Man) as destructive analysis was

required to prove relationality, causing people from the tribes that claimed him as an Ancestor pain and disruption (Bardill, 2018:384).

Ancestor and sample care should be one of the top priorities of aDNA researchers because by respecting Ancestors and samples, researchers can strengthen their relationships with Indigenous communities (Cortez, 2023). Some alternatives to the destructive analysis of an Ancestor that may avoid pain for descendants, if possible, can be the use of dental calculus, hair, coprolites, or soil. These analyses can only happen with proper consultation with the Native community as perspectives on the sacredness of bodily and earthen materials vary and consideration of the possible social, political, and legal consequences for the community must be given (Bardill, 2018:385).

Equally important is understanding Indigenous data sovereignty and open access principles. Indigenous data sovereignty is the right for tribes and nations to control access to information about their culture and history that could potentially be used to harm their people, culture, or sovereignty. Researchers need to honor community wishes regarding the limited dissemination of certain information about their history or culture (Cortez, 2023). This works to address power imbalances and extractive research processes that have historically ruled this field and other social sciences. Open access principles that align with academic freedom directly oppose this right and the argument that data should be publicly accessible runs the risk of being another form of colonial dispossession that prioritizes Western science instead of Indigenous communities (Cortez, 2023). By following Indigenous data sovereignty principles, researchers address power imbalances and extractive research processes which have historically ruled the field. They begin to decolonize aDNA research when they forfeit control of data and research products for the benefit of the community, challenging academic entitlement to information about Indigenous bodies, Ancestors, and histories.

VI. Conclusion

A very important aspect of the decolonization of archaeology is the recognition that it is not done by Western scientists alone. Many times, Indigenous scientists, activists, and communities are not mentioned when discussing historical events or changes in legislation, which eliminates their agency, continues the dispossession of Indigenous histories, and perpetuates colonial attitudes. This recognition is incredibly important because, since the colonial era, Indigenous peoples have opposed colonization, actively fought colonization efforts, and demonstrated resilience in the face of genocide and assimilation. One example of this activism I want to briefly overview is from the Luiseño artist, James Luna (1950-2018). Luna questions colonial authority over Indigenous peoples and bodies with his art; one such piece that I believe is very effective in demonstrating Indigenous resistance to museums and institutions that house Ancestors and ancestral objects is his performance work, *The Artifact Piece* (1987).

Luna performed this piece in the Museum of Man in San Diego, California (now known as the Museum of Us). He laid in a museum display case in only a breechcloth with didactic labels that identified the origins of the scars on his body. He was accompanied by a vitrine filled with his "Native artifacts" including his college diploma, divorce papers, a picture of Jimi Hendrix, and ceremonial rattles (Blocker, 2009:56). In this piece, Luna critiques the institutional collection and display of Indigenous Ancestors and the harm that they perpetuate onto Indigenous peoples through colonial interpretations and representations of Indigenous peoples, histories, and cultures. This is just a very brief example of Indigenous resistance against the institutional colonialism, dehumanization, and appropriation of Indigenous peoples and their histories, there are many more that I do not have the space to examine in this paper. Further investigations about academic entitlement to Indigenous bodies can include the examination of Indigenous art movements to

reclaim ownership of Ancestors and contemporary Indigenous bodies as well as an investigation of how Indigenous art movements have changed American perceptions of Indigenous bodies and histories. These topics can also extend to the examination of the epidemic of violence, Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG), which is a gendered continuation of this attitude of entitlement outside of academia.

In this thesis, I examined the history of Indigenous North American archaeology from the colonial era through today, focusing on the continuous acts of genocide, dispossession, and appropriation which maintained attitudes of entitlement in the archaeological field. US legislation reflected these colonial ideologies and upheld sentiments of entitlement to Indigenous bodies, as seen in my examination of acts such as the Antiquities Act of 1909 and the ARPA, which maintain that Indigenous bodies and Ancestors are archaeological resources of importance to the American public and cultural heritage. US legislation concerning Indigenous bodies changed in the late 1980s with protest and activism by Indigenous peoples, resulting in NMAIA and NAGPRA which challenged that entitlement, providing Indigenous peoples and Ancestors more human rights. This collection of Indigenous bodies and body parts is a horrific piece of archaeology's past which is maintained when Western scientists argue for their right to study Native bodies.

I examined academic opinions that are opposed to the repatriation of Ancestors and ancestral objects and the use of community-based research through the arguments made by Holm (2011), McGhee (2008), and Weiss (2021). Their arguments included two major notions: that Western science takes precedence over Native human rights and that Indigenous peoples are incapable and illogical. The first notion includes ideas that Native bodies are research tools that Western researchers are entitled to and that Indigenous communities connected to an Ancestor, ancestral object, or history are resources for knowledge extraction and unable to participate in research. This also imposes Western definitions onto Native peoples, continuing colonial legacies

and power structures to maintain access to Indigenous bodies. The second major notion is based on the colonial sentiment that Indigenous people are less than human and are incapable of logical thought, stewardship, collaboration, and conflict resolution. These patronize Native peoples and remove their rights to their Ancestors and histories, which are often incorporated into the collective human history. This is an appropriation of Indigenous culture and heritage that was used to legitimize non-Native land and resource claims and is now often used by Western scientists to claim Indigenous bodies. I explored these avenues the authors used to argue against repatriation and community-based research and explained how these perspectives are grounded in colonial legacies and maintain an attitude of entitlement to Indigenous bodies.

To support my analysis of these colonial attitudes of entitlement, I examined two case studies, those of the Ancient One and the Chaco Canyon Ancestors. These case studies presented unique situations that were complicated by these problematic attitudes; Western researchers did not take Indigenous concerns or claims seriously which negatively impacted the tribes and nations involved in several ways, including spiritual harm due to destructive analysis either against tribal wishes or without consultation. I used these two controversies to highlight how archaeology as a field has an attitude of entitlement toward Indigenous bodies, through a lawsuit to continue research by stopping the repatriation process and the performance of destructive analyses of Ancestors without consultation with related tribes, respectively. These are examples of the problems that archaeology faces today and the methods for addressing them include increased repatriation, collaborative research, and improved ethics to remove colonial attitudes and ideologies for the creation of a more responsible and engaged field of study.

I applied decolonial archaeology's tenants, which provide methods to address problems to begin its decolonization. The methods for creating a more inclusive and ethical field include greater rates of repatriation of Ancestors and ancestral objects to Indigenous communities,

community-based research where Indigenous communities are treated as partners instead of resources, and aDNA ethics where Indigenous concerns about destructive analysis of their Ancestors are seriously considered. By embracing decolonial theory, archaeology can challenge its colonial roots and begin growing toward a more ethical and inclusive practice. These methods of decolonization challenge the inherent colonial attitudes of the field and support its growth and change to decolonial attitudes to create a more holistic and ethical discipline that produces knowledge *with* communities.

Thesis Bibliography

Atalay, Sonya. “Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice.” *The American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2006): 280–310. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2006.0015.

Atalay, Sonya. “Can Archaeology Help Decolonize the Way Institutions Think? How Community-Based Research Is Transforming the Archaeology Training Toolbox and Helping to Transform Institutions.” *Archaeologies* 15, no. 3 (2019): 514–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-019-09383-6.

Balter, Michael. “The Ethical Battle Over Ancient DNA.” SAPIENS. SAPIENS, July 28, 2022. https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/chaco-canyon-nagpra/.

Bardill, Jessica, Alyssa C. Bader, Nanibaa' A. Garrison, Deborah A. Bolnick, Jennifer A. Raff, Alexa Walker, and Ripan S. Malhi. “Advancing the Ethics of Paleogenomics.” *Science* 360, no. 6387 (2018): 384–85. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaq1131.

Blocker, Jane. “Ambivalent Entertainments: James Luna, Performance, and the Archive.” *Grey Room* 37 (2009): 52–77. https://doi.org/10.1162/grey.2009.1.37.52.

Cortez, Amanda Daniela, Dorothy Lippert, Jenny L. Davis, George Nicholas, Ripan S. Malhi, Laura S. Weyrich, Katrina G. Claw, Alyssa C. Bader, and Chip Colwell. “Extracting the Practices of Paleogenomics: A Study of Ancient DNA Labs and Research in Relation to Native Americans and Indigenous Peoples.” *American Journal of Biological Anthropology*, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24714.

Cortez, Amanda Daniela, Deborah A Bolnick, George Nicholas, Jessica Bardill, and Chip Colwell. “An Ethical Crisis in Ancient DNA Research: Insights from the Chaco Canyon Controversy as a Case Study.” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 21, no. 2 (2021): 157–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605321991600.

Fox, Keolu, and John Hawks. “Use Ancient Remains More Wisely.” *Nature* 572, no. 7771 (2019): 581–83. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02516-5.

Gonzalez, Sara L., Darren Modzelewski, Lee M. Panich, and Tsim D. Schneider. “Archaeology for the Seventh Generation.” *The American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2006): 388–415. https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2006.0023.

Holm, Søren. “Removing Bodies from Display Is Nonsense.” *New Scientist* 209, no. 2803 (2011): 30–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0262-4079(11)60564-2.

Hudetz, Mary, and Graham Lee Brewer. “A Top UC Berkeley Professor Taught with Remains That May Include Dozens of Native Americans.” Berkeleyside. NBC News |

ProPublica, March 7, 2023. https://www.berkeleyside.org/2023/03/07/uc-berkeley-professor-native-american-remains-phoebe-a-hearst-museum-of-anthropology.

Josephy, Alvin M., Joane Nagel, and Troy R. Johnson. Red Power: The American Indians' fight for freedom. 2nd ed. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Kakaliouras, Ann M. "The Repatriation of the Palaeoamericans: Kennewick Man/the Ancient One and the End of a Non-Indian Ancient North America." *BJHS Themes* 4 (August 8, 2019): 79–98. https://doi.org/10.1017/bjt.2019.9.

Kowal, Emma, Laura S. Weyrich, Juan Manuel Argüelles, Alyssa C. Bader, Chip Colwell, Amanda Daniela Cortez, Jenny L. Davis, et al. "Community Partnerships Are Fundamental to Ethical Ancient DNA Research." *Human Genetics and Genomics Advances*, 2022, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xhgg.2022.100161.

Londoño, Wilhelm. "Indigenous Archaeology, Community Archaeology, and Decolonial Archaeology: What Are We Talking about? A Look at the Current Archaeological Theory in South America with Examples." *Archaeologies* 17, no. 3 (2021): 386–406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-021-09433-y.

Mihesuah, Devon A. *Repatriation Reader Who Owns American Indian Remains?* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

McGhee, Robert. "Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 73, no. 4 (2008): 579–97. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0002731600047314.

McNiven, Ian J. "Theoretical Challenges of Indigenous Archaeology: Setting an Agenda." *American Antiquity* 81, no. 1 (2016): 27–41. https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.81.1.27.

Ojala, Carl-Gösta. "Indigenous Archaeology." Essay. In "Critical Studies of the Arctic." Edited by Marjo Lindroth, Heidi Sinevaara-Niskanen, and Monica Tennberg. *Palgrave Macmillan*, 2022, 99–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11120-4.

Riding In, James, Cal Seciwa, Suzan Shown Harjo, Walter R. Echo-Hawk, and Rebecca Tsosie. "Protecting Native American Human Remains, Burial Grounds, and Sacred Places: Panel Discussion." *Wicazo Sa Review* 19, no. 2 (2004): 169–83. https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.2004.0022

Riding In, James. "Without Ethics and Morality: A Historical Overview of Imperial Archaeology and American Indians." *Arizona State Law Review* 24, no. 1 (1992).

Schneider, Tsim D, and Katherine Hayes. "Epistemic Colonialism: Is It Possible to Decolonize Archaeology?" *American Indian Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (2020): 127–48. https://doi.org/10.5250/amerindiquar.44.2.0127.

TallBear, Kim. “Standing with and speaking as faith: A feminist-indigenous approach to inquiry.” *Journal of Research Practice*, *10*(2), Article N17. 2014. http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/405/371

Tsosie, Rebecca. “Indigenous Rights and Archaeology.” Essay. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*, edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan Downer, 64–76. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1997.

Watkins, Joe. “Through Wary Eyes: Indigenous Perspectives on Archaeology.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34, no. 1 (2005): 429–49. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.34.081804.120540.

Watkins, Joe, Caroline Phillips, Harry Allen. “‘Wake Up! Repatriation Is Not the Only Indigenous Issue in Archaeology!".” Essay. In *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press, 2011.

Watkins, Joe. “Research, Representation, Redemption, and Repatriation: Archaeology and Community Relationships in 21st-Century America.” Essay. In *The Routledge Companion to Contemporary Anthropology*, edited by Simon Coleman, Susan Hyatt, and Ann Kingsolver, 1st ed. London: Routledge, 2017. https://www-taylorfrancis-com.proxy.uchicago.edu/pdfviewer/

Weiss, Elizabeth. “Has Creationism Crept Back into Archaeology?” YouTube. YouTube, April 30, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bZ5HNimJU08.

Wilcox, Michael. “Saving Indigenous Peoples from Ourselves: Separate But Equal Archaeology Is Not Scientific Archaeology.” *American Antiquity* 75, no. 2 (April 2010): 221–27. https://doi.org/10.7183/0002-7316.75.2.221.

Zimmerman, Larry. “First, Be Humble: Working with Indigenous Peoples and Other Descendant Communities.” *Indigenous Archaeologies*, 2004, 309–21. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203009895-38.

Supplementary Reading List

Atalay, Sonya. *Community-Based Archaeology Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012.

Byrd, Jodi A. The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism, University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Gonzalez, Sara L., Ian Kretzler, and Briece Edwards. "Imagining Indigenous and Archaeological Futures: Building Capacity with the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde." *Archaeologies* 14, no. 1 (2018): 85–114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-018-9335-0.

Kakaliouras, Ann M. "An Anthropology of Repatriation." *Current Anthropology* 53, no. S5 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1086/662331.

Mihesuah, D. A., Wilson, A. C., & Wilson, A. C. (2004). *Indigenizing the Academy Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. University of Nebraska Press.

Murray, Tim. "Coming to Terms with the Living: Some Aspects of Repatriation for the Archaeologist." *Antiquity* 70, no. 267 (1996): 217–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003598x00083137.

Nicholas, George P. *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists (Archaeology and Indigenous Peoples Series)*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc., 2010.

Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews. "Indigenous Archaeology in the Postmodern World." Essay. In *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*, 1–18. Burnaby, British Columbia: Archaeology Press, 1997.

Platzman, Steven. "Objects of Controversy: The Native American Right to Repatriation." American University Law Review 41, no.2 (1992): 517-558.

Seidemann, Ryan M. "Bones of Contention: A Comparative Examination of Law Governing Human Remains from Archaeological Contexts in Formerly Colonial Countries." *Louisiana Law Review* 64, no. 3 (March 2004): 545–88.

Wagner, Jennifer K., Chip Colwell, Katrina G. Claw, Anne C. Stone, Deborah A. Bolnick, John Hawks, Kyle B. Brothers, and Nanibaa' A. Garrison. "Fostering Responsible Research on Ancient DNA." *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 107, no. 2 (2020): 183–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2020.06.017.

Young, James O., and Conrad G. Brunk. *The Ethics of Cultural Appropriation*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.