

Indigenous Archaeology and Anti-Colonial Conversations for Cultural Resource Management Archaeology in What is Now Known as British Columbia, Canada

KAREN ROSE THOMAS AND SEAN P. CONNAUGHTON

University of British Columbia

Inlailawatash Limited Partnership

krthomas@student.ubc.ca

Abstract

How can archaeologists do archaeology in an anti-colonial way within Cultural Resource Management (CRM)? We explore this theme by first explaining why decolonial theory and practice is not enough, and then defining what we mean by anti-colonial practice, specifically within in CRM in British Columbia, Canada. All practitioners of archaeology must acknowledge many elements of Western archaeological practice which perpetuate harm to Indigenous communities. It is not enough to be intentionally decolonial in our approaches. Instead, we advocate for an anti-colonial practice: a mix of both seen and unseen work that archaeologists, whether Indigenous or not, can do to centre Indigenous heritage, the Ancestors and descendant communities. This practice requires a conscious effort and commitment to consistently critique our innate colonial bias present in day-to-day CRM. This paper proffers tangible constructive advice for archaeologists with the hope of engendering new, daily practices.

Introduction

“It’s easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism,” (Fisher 2009: 1)

From its earliest definition of “archaeology done with, for, and by Indigenous peoples,” (Nicholas and Andrews 1997: 3) Indigenous Archaeology has grown to encapsulate many different faces and iterations over the last 30 years (e.g., Lyons et al. 2022; Nicholas 2010; Rizvi and Lydon 2010; Smith and Wobst

2005; Watkins 2001; Yellowhorn 2006). Indigenous archaeology has traversed the entire collaborative continuum (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008) from critiques of token involvement in projects (Connaughton and Herbert 2017; Connaughton et al. 2014; De Paoli 1999; Klassen 2013; Robinson 1996; Steeves 2015) to Indigenous-led research (Angelbeck and Jones 2019; Armstrong et al. 2023; Inlailawatash 2021, 2023). This paper offers an anti-colonial approach to archaeology as a means of doing better work for First Nations communities and the ancestors by subverting the colonialism inherent in our industry.

Cultural resource management (CRM), also known as commercial archaeology or consulting archaeology, is a faction of archaeology primarily concerned with the protection, preservation and professional management of archaeological and historic sites in North America. In what is now known as British Columbia, CRM has grown to be a development driven behemoth, regulated by the provincial government but responsible for the identification, assessment, preservation and management of archaeological resources that are largely Indigenous heritage (Apland 1993; Klassen et al. 2009; Klassen 2013). Comprised of budgets, cost estimates, project timelines, critical paths, 'risk,' 'constraints' and mitigation it is, at times, difficult to see any archaeological, human or heritage component to CRM (Connaughton, no date). Birthed from capitalistic opportunity and sanctioned by the province under the *Heritage Conservation Act (HCA)* beginning in 1977, CRM has served to perpetuate colonial beliefs housed in archaeology and applied to both a bureaucratic and private sector context (Apland 1993; Dent 2016). Archaeology and belongings (i.e., artefacts) are treated as commodities within development driven projects and the resource extraction industry.

Colonialism is intrinsically tied to capitalism. In British Columbia, Indigenous heritage is managed and controlled by the province. By controlling the heritage of an already marginalised population, colonialism extends its insidious tentacles deeper into control of the land, extending capitalistic enterprises further into dispossessed Indigenous lands. Those who make management decisions about Indigenous heritage for the provincial regulator are predominantly non-Indigenous and sometimes non-archaeologists. This imbalance in power has led to First Nations devising and implementing our/their own heritage policies and permitting systems (e.g., Stó:lō Nation 2003; Tsleil-Waututh Nation 2009; see also Hammond 2009; Klassen 2013). Although Nations' permits are not rec-

ognised by the province as having legal merit, the “real issue is recognising the Indigenous right to exercise authority and jurisdiction over archaeological heritage” (Klassen 2013: 69).

Although CRM is inherently colonial, does it have to be? Can CRM archaeologists perform archaeology in an anti-colonial way within the context of Canadian capitalism? In turn, can we collectively disrupt the current state to be better allies and accomplices for the First Nations whose heritage is impacted by proposed developments which require archaeological work?

This paper seeks to illustrate that even within the oppressive confines of colonialism and capitalism—there are approaches in which individuals can actively subvert against the common grain to engender local change. By making space for others, CRM archaeologists can contribute to new ways of thinking for those who partake in development on Indigenous lands. Is this easy? No. But nothing worth doing is and we need to start somewhere. The practitioners of CRM are positioned to be anti-colonial, if they can carefully examine the role they inhabit within the history and colonisation that continues in Canada today. This awareness, along with an acceptance of this history—and an effort to not continue it daily—is essential to changing the landscape of CRM in practice. To be clear, both authors understand that an anti-colonial approach alone does not automatically equate to being and becoming Indigenous archaeology. However, we feel that the collective dreaming of an anti-colonial future which builds upon Indigenous scholarship and relationships to Indigenous communities, the land and the Ancestors is enough to make the cut. Below, the authors present opportunities to encourage actions that archaeologists, as well as the First Nation members we work with each day in the field, can take towards building an anti-colonial archaeological future.

Situatedness

I (Karen) am a second year Indigenous PhD student in anthropological archaeology at the University of British Columbia. I am x^wəlməx^w (a person of the land), with family ties to the Sk̓wx̓wú7mesh (Squamish) and SEMYOME (Semiahmoo) Nations, but it is səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation) who claims me as their own. As an Indigenous archaeologist practicing archaeology within the asserted and unceded territories of səliłwətał and shared with our x^wəlməx^w

relatives, I consider myself a steward of our cultural heritage. This is an inherited responsibility. I have a genetic and cultural relationship to the creators of archaeological materials from the region I work in that few of my archaeologist colleagues can claim. I have been working in archaeology for the last 13 years, first as a field representative for *səlilwətał* and later as a professional archaeologist in CRM.

I (Sean) am an uninvited occupier living and working in British Columbia. I am a trained anthropological archaeologist. My in-field teachings have come from my experiences living and working in Indigenous communities in the South Pacific and throughout British Columbia. By making mistakes, making friends, listening, learning, sharing food and continuing to self-reflect on my archaeological practice, I have come to understand archaeology in a more profound way, one where theory and method can have meaningful applications with, for, and by Indigenous communities.

Together, we work in CRM for a small progressive Indigenous-owned company, Inlailawatash, in which we strive to exert Indigenous values and build community through education, teaching and leading by example. We are not perfect, and often make mistakes, but we hold ourselves and our team accountable in how we practise archaeology in this modern era. We recognise there is a plurality of Indigenous archaeology practised in different Indigenous landscapes and contexts throughout the world. Working within an Indigenous organisation, we are archaeologists that recognise the persistence of those Indigenous members who have come before us and continue to work and teach alongside us.

This paper builds upon foundational ideas in our discipline about Indigenous heritage, Indigenous archaeology, and how we can leverage our positions to do ethical work for communities (see McGuire 2008; Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Tax 1975; Trigger 1980). In a way, we are returning to “forgotten values” in our discipline (Connaughton, no date) and enacting praxis. However, we are also drawing upon a growing body of Indigenous scholarship to apply decolonial and anti-colonial theories to orthodox CRM archaeology practice to co-create an evolved and refined archaeological praxis.

Taking the example from Tuck and Yang (2012), as an Indigenous scholar and a settler/occupier scholar writing together, we will use forward slashes when necessary to identify the incongruous positionings in our pronouns.

British Columbia context

In British Columbia, Indigenous heritage is regulated by the Archaeology Branch. The Archaeology Branch is comprised of bureaucrats within the Ministry of Forests who oversee all provincially permitted archaeological work undertaken under the *HCA* (RSBC 1996, Chap. 187). Klassen et al. (2009) provide a detailed history of the rise of CRM within British Columbia, tied to extractive resource economies, where small business owners eventually gave rise to larger, transnational corporations engaging in archaeological services. From its inception, CRM has been a regulated industry largely centring the needs and values of both the client (typically not Indigenous owned) and the provincial government. A reaction to such heavy-handed provincial control has been for First Nations to attempt to exercise our/their sovereignty over heritage with several different strategies. These range from hiring in-house archaeologists, building archaeological capacity by training First Nation community members and writing heritage stewardship policies, to implementing Nations' heritage permitting requirements into our/their referrals and consultation processes (e.g., Stó:lō Nation 2003; Tsleil-Waututh Nation 2009). Each of the above strategies have been accepted by the CRM industry with varying degrees of resistance, but overall, CRM archaeologists have respected these processes in British Columbia.

One means to strengthen and empower archaeological practitioners is to direct project managers on CRM projects (i.e., clients) towards Point 43 from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's (TRC) *94 Calls to Action*. It states, "we call upon federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments to fully adopt and implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) as the framework for reconciliation" (TRC Commission 2015). Most relevant to CRM archaeology work is UNDRIP article 11, which names the right that Indigenous people have to "maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites," and article 12, which names the right that Indigenous people have to "maintain, protect and have access in privacy to their religious and cul-

tural sites; the right to the use and control of their ceremonial objects; and the right to the repatriation of their human remains.”

Articulating with UNDRIP is British Columbia 2019 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act (DRIPA) (SBC 2019, c. 44), which establishes UNDRIP as the Province’s framework for reconciliation, and requires that the province bring all provincial laws into alignment with UNDRIP. The average British Columbian has no knowledge of DRIPA, and our experience in client meetings has been that this extends to most, if not all, developers and governmental planners that we encounter.

Introducing clients to these (policies, declarations, recommendations, documents) in our earliest conversations allows us to clearly identify our commitment to respect First Nations’ heritage stewardship goals from the outset. A part of this commitment includes educating clients on the ways that the TRC’s *94 Calls to Action*, UNDRIP and DRIPA guide our work. We think clients will find this upfront explanation and education of value (that is, if relationships matter to them and their respective entities). From our position, centring Indigenous communities and our/their heritage first is an anti-colonial stance that we believe can engender meaningful change and education within our local world.

Why anti-colonial?

The last few decades have seen an increase in calls to decolonise and Indigenise: structures, spaces, methods, theory, systems and thinking based on earlier scholarly works (Atalay 2006; McNiven and Russell 2005; Smith 2012). The terms decolonisation and indigenisation are often used interchangeably, and by extension, incorrectly. Tuck and Yang (2012) have called attention to the transformation of decolonisation into an ineffectual metaphor in theoretical discourse. Both decolonial and anti-colonial theory and practice share the common goal of a better world beyond colonialism, but where decolonial efforts in archaeology call for collaboration with Indigenous communities beyond consultation and centring an Indigenous worldview (Atalay 2006), anti-colonial efforts call us to subvert the colonial regime with both a critical interrogation of colonial discourses and the development of alternatives which undermine colonial theory (Hingley 2013). Some thinkers categorise both decolonial and anti-colonial theory as ‘post-colonial.’ However, we do not believe that we live in a post-colonial world.

As Wolfe (2006: 388) explains of settler colonialism: “invasion is a structure, not an event.” Canada exists firmly within the colonial structure, and through colonialism (and by extension capitalism) Canada continues to both exist because of and benefit from the ongoing oppression of Indigenous peoples and our/their dispossession from the land.

Indigenous scholar Max Liboiron’s *Pollution is Colonialism* (2021) is a powerful text to draw from and think with relative to archaeological practice. Their approach to anti-colonial practice in their lab has many protocols from which it is good to read about and good to think on that possess cross-over for archaeologists in terms of methods, accountability, relationships and outputs. What is it that we are doing each day? What are we making by being and doing in the field? What do we say about ourselves and our guild in how we act on the land in front of others? Anti-colonial thinking is not purely theoretical—there are practical decisions, questions concerning “method-and-ethics” that make up each day (Liboiron 2021: 113). To paraphrase Liboiron (2021: 119), how will we do archaeology in an anti-colonial way, rather than merely with anti-colonial intent? We think of this phrase often, and how Liboiron conducts their research while maintaining respect and accountability to all their relations (i.e., land, fish, Elders, community). While thinking from Liboiron (2021), other scholars like Atalay (2006, 2012), McNiven and Russell (2005), Steeves (2015), Wilson (2008) and Yellowhorn (2006) shine through illuminating a body of work for which archaeologists can turn inward and re-imagine archaeology (Connaughton, no date).

With the commodification of Indigenous heritage in British Columbia, and the development-driven Canadian narratives which position First Nations desiring sovereignty over our/their own heritage as being ‘in the way of progress,’ we see that CRM archaeology performed under the auspices of the Archaeology Branch is thus an extension of the colonial regime, actively contributing to the disconnection of Indigenous people from our/their lands and heritage. But we do not need despair. We can think critically about how to enact change in the world we inhabit.

Where do we start?

We believe the practitioners of CRM are positioned to be anti-colonial, that is, if they are open to rethinking their training and practice. Archaeologists work-

ing within the CRM landscape must cultivate their understanding of the colonial context of Canada, the nature of unceded Indigenous lands and the ways in which provincial (i.e., the *HCA*) and federal (i.e., the lack of it) legislation governing the protection and management of heritage oppress communities. By beginning to understand the history of colonialism in British Columbia and especially of residential schools, and how both have affected communities and specifically individuals whom we work with today, CRM archaeologists must develop a desire to work against (rather than within) the ongoing oppression of Indigenous peoples. Cultivating this awareness and understanding of Indigenous experiences is an ongoing process that must be committed to by archaeologists who manage and work with Indigenous heritage.

Beyond this awareness of both the system we work within and the Indigenous landscape we are situated on, individuals must cultivate awareness of their own self. Acknowledging the ways in which we are colonised and by extension, the many ways our formal education as professional archaeologists perpetuates harm is essential to doing our jobs in an anti-colonial way. For example, our formal education as archaeologists includes much unspoken and subtle Western perspectives—by the very framing of the discipline as one which is about discovery—extracting data and knowledge for learning's sake. In British Columbia, we are all taught that archaeology is destructive and that we can only excavate once, but what is left out of this discourse is the fact that it is Indigenous heritage that is being destroyed, regardless of how much data we are able to capture first through systematic excavation and data recovery. Not to mention that 'permission' for destruction of Indigenous heritage was granted by the provincial Archaeology Branch by way of an *HCA* site alteration permit, and non-Indigenous people (sometimes, non-archaeologists) are making decisions about the nature of destruction and the percentage of sampling and recovery 'required.' Seeing and examining our inherent colonial biases allows us to recognise how colonialism permeates the CRM world we occupy. Recognising the colonial fabric of Canada will then help us when the time comes to unravel the systems that continue to do harm. Cultivating an understanding of the above puts CRM archaeologists in a good position to advocate for and champion Indigenous sovereignty, especially sovereignty over unceded lands and heritage.

What are some anti-colonial practices and actionable goals for CRM archaeologists?

We cannot speak about everything in this short article, but we can provide some ideas to think and act from in daily practice.

1) Cultivate humility and a readiness to lead by example, holding other non-Indigenous and settler folk accountable to a decolonial present and anti-colonial future. Doing so takes a self-awareness; an awareness of the privilege and power archaeologists (i.e., field directors and/or permit holders) hold within CRM and questioning that role in it each day. Self-awareness becomes action when we learn to spot biases and blind spots in our day to day. This can look like several things, including calling out racial micro-aggressions and questioning racial stereotyping rhetoric in the field and in project meetings. Prior to field-work, manage client expectations from project inception and build up Indigenous representation and sovereignty into the project plan and scope statement from the beginning with an emphasis on shared decision-making when it comes to Indigenous heritage. This includes explaining that an archaeologist's actions and decisions must also be vetted and approved by First Nations on a project through communications with local Nations. By holding ourselves and our archaeological peers accountable and demonstrating our commitments to an anti-colonial future, we make space to nurture relationships.

2) Building and maintaining relationships with the Indigenous peoples whose heritage and land we make a living from is critical if we are to advance a new way of being in the field (Connaughton 2020). This is a key opportunity to develop relationality in our practice, by being accountable at all phases in our work to our Indigenous colleagues (Wilson 2008). Being in good relations with communities allows for good relations to the land and subverts the colonial notions of separateness and compartmentalisation (Christie-Peters 2017; Morin 2014). The ability to recognise that the well-being of our Indigenous colleagues and our/their communities is intrinsically tied to the land, and also to the well-being of our non-human kin is essential to building communities in the field.

3) Archaeologists can refuse normative practice by engaging in deep listening by stepping aside to be facilitators rather than experts on Indigenous heritage (Connaughton, no date; Connaughton and Herbert 2017). This can be

achieved by valuing the contributions of First Nations representatives in the field and making space for their voices. We do this in many ways: honouring their knowledge by elevating them above the title ‘monitor,’ teaching respectfully, asking them to join us in project meetings with clients, seeking their interpretations and genuinely valuing their contributions. These conscious choices lead to a more robust and fulfilling experience for all. By consciously avoiding any form of gatekeeping—whether that is gatekeeping knowledge, access to knowledge or client intentions—we are refusing the structure of bureaucratic, regulatory archaeology that we are all trapped within. This approach of radical inclusion is also a means of refusal: we are refusing the narrative that First Nations’ representatives do not contribute to CRM archaeology beyond the superficial, participatory way.

4) Actively choosing refusal as a method in our archaeological practice; for us this looks like incorporating an explicit rejection of the structures and rules of settler societies (Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2014; Simpson 2017). We do this in multiple ways, first with a refusal to engage in the Western science versus Indigenous spiritualism trope that has problematised Indigenous relationships and scholarship within archaeology (Schneider and Hayes 2020: 138). Next, we refuse the label of ‘artefact’ generally used by archaeology, choosing instead to use the terms ‘belongings,’ ‘lithic objects’ and ‘ancestral objects.’ As explained by xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam) scholar Jordan Wilson, using the word ‘belonging’ to refer to ancestral objects in the fields of archaeology and anthropology offers “a generative ambiguity” by simultaneously inviting us to think about the contrast between possession (Western legal framework) and ownership (Indigenous Law) and by acknowledging that the ancestors are still the owners of their belongings (Duffek and Wilson 2021: 47). We also refuse to prioritise capitalism over the destruction of Indigenous heritage. And if a site must be impacted, with no other alternative, we work closely with the impacted First Nations communities to ensure the archaeology is done well, with full support, and a story is told of a place and its peoples.

5) Finally, remembering that the work we do is on behalf of the ancestors. We are privileged to facilitate relationships to heritage for Indigenous descendant communities, privileged to make our living within extractive capitalism, seeking, documenting, protecting, stewarding and fighting for Indigenous heritage.

We do this work with intention, with the knowledge that enacting all of the above elements daily—making hard, conscious decisions about our praxis—brings us into relationship with the ancestors. The very nature of our work and the way we approach it brings us into community with generations of spirits extending backwards and forwards throughout time and includes the Indigenous people alive in the present, sharing space with us in the field and lab. If you choose to work within British Columbian CRM archaeology, this must be seen for what it is.

Conclusion

An anti-colonial approach does not require hostility, rather it centres Indigenous heritage and descendant communities through good relationships with people, land, sea and spirit (Connaughton, no date; Liboiron 2021). It draws on humility and gratitude to be mindful of an archaeologist's privileged position and to stand with Indigenous communities to care for our/their heritage. This does require continuous personal effort and making conscious anti-colonial choices for archaeologists working with Indigenous heritage in capitalist frameworks to hold each other accountable. And there is strength in community to do so through education and by leading in the field.

Manifesting these ideas into more daily practice needs to be taught in university where most new archaeologists are taught theory and method, and how to operationalise archaeology. Developing an early education through anti-colonial pedagogy in archaeological academic programmes will extend this anti-colonial approach into the field when young graduates seek employment opportunities. Paulette Steeves (2015: 129–130) illustrates the problem of unethical practices she personally witnessed due to the lack of training in heritage laws and ethics in university. In addition to the academy, Connaughton (no date: 92) highlights how, post-graduation, most young practicing archaeologists are exposed to three 'teachers,' (1) the Archaeology Branch, (2) Corporations (especially corporate culture/archaeologists) and (3) Clients. He discusses how these three entities contribute to the miseducation of archaeologists in British Columbia despite the values accrued through life, university and Indigenous teachers in the field. It is obvious to see how an injection of anti-colonial science and pedagogy would slowly seep out and make change on a local and international scale. Until that injection comes, we can move towards change on the ground and hold each other

accountable.

Given the structure we are working within as archaeologists, it is easy to lose hope when confronted with the ways our industry training and education reproduces colonialism. However, we must remember that teaching also happens in the field—we are teaching junior archaeologists and simultaneously clients, First Nations representatives and the public about how archaeology happens on unceded Indigenous territories. First Nations representatives are teaching us all (i.e., archaeologists, clients, non-archaeological crews) about how to be in relation with heritage, the land and the ancestors. Enacting anti-colonial approaches to CRM archaeology is not going to end colonialism. But it can make space for change, and usher in a new era of Indigenous sovereignty and power over our/their heritage. This should give us hope, that we are here together using our voices and privilege to make things better. We recognise that this article is not a roadmap or recipe to post-colonial bliss (if only!)—and we think that that is what makes these ideas to think and act from palatable. Specifically, while they are not easy by any means, they are possible and achievable. How do we know they are possible and achievable? Because we are doing them. And you can do them too.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to our colleagues at Inlailawatash: Mariko Adams, Lyndsay Cooper, Anisa Côté, Devin Forbes, Ailidh Hathway, Kody Huard, Emma Lowther and Sarah Shaver who share along in this work with us. We are grateful to the Indigenous scholarship that guides our work and inspires us. We also have immense gratitude to our field families made of many First Nations including members from Da'naxda'xw/Awaetlala, Kwantlen, Katzie, K'ómoks, Mamalilikulla, scəwaθən məsteyəx^w, Semiahmoo, səlilwətał, Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, Stó:lō, Tlowitsis, Wei Wai Kum, We Wai Kai, x^wməθk^wəyəm and many others.

Finally, we thank our uncles and aunties of British Columbia CRM archaeology who have left this realm to join the ancestors: Mike Cook, Wayne Point, Terry Point and Eileen Thomas.

REFERENCES

- Angelbeck, B., and Jones, J. 2019. Direct actions and archaeology. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 5(2): 219–29.
- Apland, B. 1993. The roles of the provincial government in British Columbia archaeology. *BC Studies* 99: 7–24.
- Armstrong, C., Spice, A., Ridsdale, M., and Welch, J. 2023. Liberating trails and travel routes in Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en territories from the tyrannies of heritage resource management regimes. *American Anthropologist* 125(2): 361–376.
- Atalay, S. 2006. Indigenous archaeology as decolonizing practice. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3): 280–310.
- Ataly, S. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Christie-Peters, Q. 2017. *Anishinaabe art-making as falling in love: Reflections on artistic programming for urban Indigenous youth*. Unpublished MA thesis submitted to the University of Victoria.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh C. and Ferguson T.J., (eds). 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Connaughton, S.P. 2020. Relationship and being in the field. Archaeology online: A remote lecture series hosted by Musqueam Indian Band, British Columbia, June 18.
- Connaughton, S.P. (n.d.). *Unearthing Forgotten Values: Toward a Meaningful Archaeological Practice*. Vancouver: UBC Press (in press).
- Connaughton, S.P. and Herbert, J. 2017. Engagement within: An anthropological exploration of First Nations engagement and consulting archaeology within a transnational corporation. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 13(2): 306–343.
- Connaughton, S.P., Leon, M. and Herbert, J. 2014. Collaboration, partnerships, and relationships within a corporate world. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38: 541–62.
- Coulthard, G.S. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*, SBC 2019, c. 44.

- Dent, J. 2016. *Accounts of Engagement: Conditions and Capitals of Indigenous Participation in Canadian Commercial Archaeology*. Unpublished PhD dissertation submitted to the University of Western Ontario.
- De Paoli, M.L. 1999. *Beyond tokenism: Aboriginal involvement in archaeological resource management in British Columbia*. Unpublished MA thesis submitted to the University of British Columbia.
- Duffek, K. and Wilson, J. 2021. Into the present. In Duffek, K., McLennan, B., and Wilson, J. (eds.) *Where the Power Is: Indigenous Perspectives on Northwest Coast Art*. Vancouver: Museum of Anthropology and Figure 1, 37-49.
- Fisher, M. 2009. *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* Winchester: Zero Books.
- Hammond, J. 2009. *Archaeology without Reserve: Indigenous Heritage Stewardship in British Columbia*. Unpublished MA thesis submitted to Simon Fraser University.
- Heritage Conservation Act (RSBC 1996) Chapter 187.
- Hingley, R. 2013. Colonial and post-colonial archaeologies. In Gardner, A., Lake, M., and Sommer, U. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Archaeological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (complete publication ongoing).
- Inlailawatash Limited Partnership. 2021. *Nanwakolas Guardians North Vancouver Island Cultural Heritage 2020 Field Program (authored by S. P. Connaughton)*. Submitted to Nanwakolas Council, Campbell River.
- Inlailawatash Limited Partnership. 2023. *Protecting the Ancestors on Berry Island. EdSp-75, Site Alteration Final Report (authored by S. P. Connaughton and Anisa Côté)*. Report on file with the Archaeology Branch, Victoria. SAP 2023-0008.
- Klassen, M.A. 2013. *Indigenous Heritage Stewardship and the Transformation of Archaeological Practice: Two Case Studies from the Mid-Fraser Region of British Columbia*. Unpublished PhD dissertation submitted to Simon Fraser University.
- Klassen, M.A., Budwa, R. and Reimer/Yumks, R. 2009. First Nations, forestry, and the transformation of archaeological practice in British Columbia, Canada. *Heritage Management* 2(2):199–238.
- Liboiron, M. 2021. *Pollution is Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lyons, N., Leon, R., Peone, J., Hazell S., Miller, D., Dent, J., and Hoffman, T. 2022. Decolonizing archaeology: Decolonizing CRM is about the power to decide. *SAA Archaeological Record* 22(5): 14–17.

- McGuire, R. H. 2008. *Archaeology as political action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McNiven, I. and Russell, L. 2005. *Appropriated pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Morin, P. 2014. My life as a museum, or, performing Indigenous epistemologies. In Brophy, S. and Hladki, J. (eds). *Embodied Politics in Visual Autobiography*. University of Toronto Press, 137–152.
- Nicholas, G.P. (ed.). 2010. *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Nicholas, G.P. and Andrews T.D. 1997. Indigenous archaeology in the postmodern world. In Nicholas, G.P. and Andrews T.D. (eds.). *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Archaeology Press, 1-18.
- Rizvi, U. and Lydon, J. 2010. *Handbook on Postcolonialism and Archaeology. World Archaeological Congress Research Handbooks in Archaeology Series*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Robinson, M.P. 1996. Shampoo archaeology: Towards a participatory action research approach in civil society. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 16(1): 125–38.
- Schneider, T.D. and Hayes, K. 2020. Epistemic colonialism: Is it possible to decolonize archaeology? *American Indian Quarterly* 44(2): 127–148.
- Simpson, A. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, L.B. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Smith, L.T. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, C. and Wobst, H.M. 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*. One World Archaeology 47. London: Routledge.
- Steeves, P. 2015. Academia, archaeology, CRM, and tribal historic preservation. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 11(1):121–141.
- Stó:lō Nation. 2003. Stó:lō Nation Heritage Policy. Website: <https://www.srrmcentre.com/chr> , accessed 27 September 2024.
- Tax, S. 1975. Action anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 16(4): 514–517.

- Trigger, B. 1980. Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45: 662–676.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], 2015. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation. 2009. *Tsleil-Waututh Nation Stewardship Policy*. Report on file with Tsleil-Waututh Nation Treaty, Lands and Resources Department. North Vancouver, BC.
- Tuck, E. and Yang, K.W. 2012. Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society* 1(1): 1–40.
- UN General Assembly, 2007. *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/61/295*.
- Watkins, J. 2001. *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Wilson, S. 2008. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wolfe, P. 2006. Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387–409.
- Yellowhorn, E. 2006. The Awakening of Internalist Archaeology in the Aboriginal World. In Williamson, R. (ed.). *Archaeology of Bruce Trigger: Theoretical Empiricism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 194–209.