Dwelling at the Margins, Action at the Intersection? Feminist and Indigenous Archaeologies, 2005

Margaret W. Conkey, University of California, Berkeley, California, United States

ABSTRACTS

Abstracto: Este artículo aborda los posibles interconexiones entre lo que podría considerarse arqueología feminista y arqueología indigenista. El ensayo pasa de una historia de intersecciones en la Escuela Occidental a una consideración de ambas arqueologías, sus diferencias y sus posibles intereses comunes, y pregunta "¿qué puede conseguirse a partir de un enfoque interconectado?" Existen dos dimensiones de la interpretación arqueológica que integran a los eruditos de ambas arqueologías, la feminista y la indigenista: (1) el lugar y el papel de "la experiencia," y (2) el uso de las narraciones de cuentos y las tradiciones orales. Se sugieren para la arqueología algunas metodologías que descolonizan y alguna contra-investigación. Finalmente, se discuten dos aspectos de la arqueología en los que la interconexión y la colaboración podrían ser especialmente fructíferas: en cómo se sobreentiende el papel del género y en la arqueología espacial. Sugiriendo que ambas arqueologías trabajan hacia la transformación de las prácticas arqueológicas, esta revisión se propone promover el desarrollo adicional de conciencias de coalición transformativas.

Résumé: Cet article se situe à l'intersection de ce qui pourrait être considéré comme les archéologies féministes et autochtones. Cet essai va de l'histoire des intersectionalités » dans la pensée occidentale à une considération de ces deux archéologies, leurs différences et leurs préoccupations communes et pose la question suivante: que pouvons-nous apprendre d'une approche intersectionelle. Deux dimensions de l'interprétation archéologique sont intégrales aux modes de pensée des chercheurs féministes et autochtones (1) la place et le rôle de l'expérience et (2) l'utilisation de la tradition orale et de la petite histoire. Des méthodologies décolonisatrices et une contre-recherche en archéologie est suggérée. Finalement, nous discutons deux aspects de la recherche en archéologie où l'intersectionalité et la collaboration sont particulièrement enrichissantes: celui de la compréhension des rôles sexuels et celui de l'archéologie de l'espace. En suggérant que ces deux archéologies travaillent à la transformation des pratiques archéologiques, cette révision

désire encourager le développement futur d'une conscience coalitionelle transformative.

> "Voyager, there are no bridges, one builds them as one walks."
>
> —Anzaldúa (1983)

This paper is a fledgling attempt to explore the intersections between feminist archaeologies and Indigenous archaeologies. Archaeology, especially that practised in Anglo-American contexts, has not often explicitly considered the ways in which different approaches and practises might inflect upon each other and might constitute some shared spaces for mutually informed work. Rather, archaeology has more often preferred an either/or stance when it comes to the intellectual and scholarly standpoints of its practitioners: Are you a processualist or postprocessualist? Are you a Marxist or a feminist? Are you a cultural ecologist or a symbolist? By taking a look not just at two different "archaeologies" but at their histories and possible common grounds, we might not only learn something we have not previously considered but also perhaps intervene into the implicit and yet still-pervasive structures of power in the production of archaeological knowledge. Certainly both of these archaeologies would be considered more marginal than not. But while we might think at and from the margins, we can truly act at the intersections.

I am writing from a particular position: I am committed to the feminist practise of archaeology, am securely employed in what is considered to be a prestigious research university in the United States, and "do" my field archaeology in southwestern Europe, where it may seem that relations with colonised Indigenous peoples are not a pressing concern. However, working with the local community and the farmers whose fields we survey and test trench, obtaining permissions and dealing with issues of patrimony and heritage are, nonetheless, central to our everyday archaeological practise. I am white, married, and from a middle-class background. As has been pointed out for many years, these attributes carry with them a range of probable biases and blinders (e.g., Alarcón 1990; Anzaldúa 1990; Bannerji 1992; Mihesuah 2003), especially when it comes to engaging with the situations, positions, and perspectives of people of colour, colonised, and Indigenous peoples. However, I do not claim to speak *for* any other archaeologists or other peoples, and many may object to what I am doing here. Nonetheless, to discuss the intersections seems worth the possible reverberations.

Globally, archaeology is at something of a turning point: transformations are necessarily emerging and there is both hope and substance in the very ways in which dimensions of feminist and Indigenous concerns and agendas ought to configure this transformational process. I will not argue that this intersectionality would be merely a "happy marriage," nor would it primarily

produce some acceptable and benign "hybrid vigour," because there are—and should be—enough differences between them (and even within each) to ensure there is always a tension. It is my hope that all archaeologists—not just those who find themselves increasingly working with Indigenous peoples or those interested in taking feminist practises more seriously—will find something of value in just the idea of where, how, and why something could be gained from probing the intersectionality of current feminist and Indigenous archaeologies.

This paper is intended to be a way station where we might pause and consider where we are located in contemporary archaeology. It is based on the premise that all archaeologists cannot seek relations or connections between each other and each other's projects unless we all remain vigilant about the multiple ways each of us is constituted.

In broaching this topic and in reading somewhat new literature (especially on Native American women's studies, Indigenous archaeologies, and decolonising methodologies), I myself have had to try to confront the extent to which we are implicated in the very systems we seek to challenge and how we tend to privilege our own narratives, especially when we think of them as emancipatory—they may not be emancipatory for some of the very people we think we are reaching.

This paper will address several issues before turning to the intersectional nexus. Yes, Indigenous and Native women scholars have been in dialogue and debate with feminisms (e.g., Mihesuah 2000; Smith 1999:165–168) and (some) non-Native archaeologists have been in dialogue with and often have very much "worked together" with (some) Indigenous groups and Indigenous archaeologists (e.g., Davidson et al. 1995; Dongoske et al. 2000; Nicholas 2001; Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Swidler et al. 1997). And yes, "aboriginal involvement" (e.g., Birckhead et al. 1992), "aboriginal perspectives" (e.g., Roberts 2002), and the production of "alternative histories" (e.g., Schmidt and Patterson 1995) have characterised the last decade of the twentieth century in ways that had previously not even been imagined (see also Ferguson 1996; Peck et al. 2003; Smith and Wobst 2005). But there are more connections to make.

First, I will consider what is to be gained from intersectionalities, as well as what is meant by "intersectionalities." I will try to characterise what I think constitutes "Indigenous archaeologies" and "feminist archaeologies," at least at this point in their histories. I will try to speak to some of the intersections (and tensions) already at play between Indigenous women's studies, Indigenous peoples, and feminisms. I want to consider what an intersection today might look like between these different archaeological approaches, and what might be gained from the dialogue. Can there be an intersection without necessarily privileging one approach over the other, sacrificing the goals of one to those of the other?

What Do We Mean by "Intersectionality"?

In a chapter that explicitly addresses intersectionality and scientific knowledge, Collins (1999) suggests that the concept of intersectionality references several types of relationships, which are not mutually exclusive:

1. That ideas and the social structures within which they occur are interconnected.
2. Within a discipline, with its own ideas and social structures, how do our own subsets and perspectives intersect?
3. That the hierarchies of gender, race, economic class, sexuality, nationality, ethnicity, and so forth, are intersected; there is an intersectedness of these hierarchies.

The primary thrust of this paper is to focus on the second relationships—how do different so-called archaeologies intersect, relate to each other? With regard to the extant and different "kinds" of archaeology (e.g., evolutionary, processual, feminist, Marxist, social, Indigenous), there are multiple relations of domination that have structured and informed the production of archaeological knowledge. Feminist critiques of science have shown the ways in which Western science is characterised not only by a certain worldview—one that is highly gendered and based on certain relational assumptions about males/females, nature/culture, and so forth—but also by what Dorothy Smith (1990) calls "conceptual imperialism." Archaeology is no more immune to its own history of "conceptual imperialisms."

But both the other two dimensions of intersectionality (numbers 1 and 3, above) are also implicated. It is not easy to separate them, especially when the disciplinary subsets of concern here—feminist and Indigenous—are themselves very much concerned with both the wider social and cultural settings within which they have evolved (such as patriarchy and colonialism) and are practised (relationship number 1). And, perhaps even more influential, both Indigenous and feminist archaeologies have a focus on the third set of relationships—the very intersectionalities of race, ethnicity, and gender, among other hierarchies. For example, in reference to the concept of gender, which may be taken as one of the "bottom-line" feminist concerns (Longino 1994), an intersectional approach would, by "viewing gender within a logic of intersectionality," *redefine* gender to be "a constellation of ideas and social practices that are historically situated within and that mutually construct multiple systems of oppression" (Collins 1999:263).

The theme or concept of intersectionality emerged most notably out of developments in the 1980s and 1990s, especially in black women's studies, which focussed on exploring the interconnections among systems of op-

pression (see Lorde [1984] and especially Hull, Scott, and Smith [1982]; for one of the first uses of the term "intersectionality" see Crenshaw [1991]). The outcome of engaging with the intersectionalities among vectors of power and identity has been the recognition of the multiple relations of domination that have structured and informed the production of knowledge.

The feminist scholarship of the 1980s and 1990s—or "third-wave feminism"—has been consistent, pointed, and uncompromising in its critique of many dimensions of extant (predominantly white, academic, middle-class) feminist scholarship and even activism as essentialist, classist, and racist (e.g., Hull, Scott, and Smith 1982; Lugones and Spelman 1983; Mohanty 1991; Mohanty et al. 1991, Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Spelman 1988; Suleri 1992). Some of the titles alone are enough to make anyone sit bolt upright: *Sister Outsider*; *The Inessential Woman*; "White Women, Listen!"; "Have We Got a Theory for You!" Most of these critiques are centrally about power relations and are calls for radical reconceptualisations not just of "woman" and "women" but of "gender," which cannot be decoupled from the very intersectionalities among the multiple dimensions through which identities are constituted, produced, reproduced, and controlled. As stated so succinctly by Alarcón (1990), "there are other relations to be accounted for [than just gender]" (364). There are many webs of domination.

Although there is a much longer story to be told here, the 1990s saw not only continued critiques along these lines but also a flowering of concern and engagement with the politics of "difference." But here, too, there are problematic issues. For some, publications such as *This Bridge Called My Back* (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981) have fostered a veritable "shift in feminist consciousness" (de Lauretis 1987:10) and provided a pathway for the development of alternative feminist theories and discourses. But others (e.g., Alarcón 1990; Lâm 1994; Oyewumi 1999) remain unconvinced that the changes have been more than skin deep (e.g., Suleri 1992) or transformative. The very discussion and debate, the dynamic and passionately engaged voices grappling with the deeper implications of intersectionalities, have reframed not just feminist scholarship but the entire project of social analysis. That the "feminisms" of the past two decades have been contentious, conflicted, expansive, and challenging is not surprising. As Devon Mihesuah (1998b) writes, in response to an anthology of essays (Mihesuah 1998a) about the methodologies for research about Indians from and by Indians, "another goal of this book is to offer suggestions scholars might use to produce more critical, creative, and well rounded interpretations of Indian histories and cultures. *We are, incidentally, trying to take our own advice and are the first to admit that it is not easy*" (xi, emphasis added).

Why Consider Another Vantage or Standpoint in Conjunction with One You Already Hold? What Is to Be Gained from Intersectionalities?

The notion of intersectionalities, then, is integral to the development of a social analysis that is relational and concerned with the politics of representation, which is what archaeology is about. To think intersectionally, at this particular moment in scholarship and politics, is to promote a conscious critique of how embedded our assumptions and very categories of analysis are within specific historical contexts: "To begin the theoretical formulations of the discipline and to construe the actualities of people's activities as expressions of the already given is to generate ideology, not knowledge" (Smith 1990:48; see also Nicholson 1990). Even though archaeology came late to the study of gender and the doing of archaeology within feminist parameters, there has been increasing attention to intersectional approaches (e.g., Franklin 2001; Meskell 2002). In a relatively rare discussion of the possible intersection of black feminist insights with archaeological practise, Franklin (2001; see also Sterling 2003, 2004) pragmatically articulates how black feminist scholarship "provides potential models for framing questions of difference and inequality, and for critiquing the sociopolitics of archaeology, particularly where raced and gendered representations of the past are concerned" (Franklin 2001:108).

Although not usually defined as such, there are intersectional approaches of the third sort within archaeology, that is, intersections of hierarchies and aspects of "identity" that take into account the convergences of several dimensions of difference (e.g., Delle et al. 2000; Mullins 1999; Rubertone 2001; Spector 1993; Wall 1999; Wilkie 1996, 2003), especially among historical archaeological studies. And although many statements of "doing archaeology" advocate an intersectional approach (e.g., Brumfiel 1992; Meskell 2001, 2002), often it is just one axis of difference or oppression that tends to be foregrounded, as Franklin (2001) points out for North American historical archaeology. This was one of the major concerns of those who saw an "unhappy marriage" between Marxism and feminism: "The marriage . . . has been like the marriage of husband and wife depicted in English common law, Marxism and feminism are one, and that one is Marxism" (Hartman 1981:2; but O'Donovan et al. 2001 attempt to recuperate the relationship of Marxism and feminism in archaeology).

An explicit engagement with intersections between Indigenous and feminist concerns, in archaeology and beyond, has the potential of contributing to building somewhat "common grounds," even if the "centres" of each approach are not the same. To the extent that a core focus of feminist archaeology is, as Brumfiel often points out, to understand how social inequality works in our own lives and in the cultural past (Wylie and Conkey n.d., b), there appears to be "common ground" with Indigenous archaeologies, and with Indigenous

feminisms and women's studies. All share the commitment to "the survival of us all" (Russo 1991:310). "Survival," writes Lorde (1981), "is not an academic skill. It is learning to stand alone, unpopular and sometimes reviled, and how to make common cause with those others identified as outside the structures, in order to define and seek a world in which we can all flourish" (99).

While we might think of feminist and Indigenous archaeologies as part of the "politics of difference" within both archaeology and society, and as occupying different parts of the academic/research/archaeological topography, it is yet critical that we recognise and engage with the "whole picture" of what archaeology is, and how it is that what is power for some is precisely someone else's powerlessness. Intersectionalities can be said to encourage a kind of "relational clarification"; that is, there is much to be gained in accomplishing self-clarification that can perhaps only be accomplished relationally: "[There is] no such thing as strict 'self-clarification' but only clarification in relation to something that is not exactly the self but that is at the same time not so far removed from the self as to provide no possible basis for discussion and illumination" (Lâm 1994:881). Not surprisingly, it has been the establishment and working out of *relations* between Indians and archaeologists in North America that has been central to the emergence of Indigenous archaeologies (Watkins 2000).

What Do We Mean by Indigenous Archaeology (Archaeologies)?

This is not a homogeneous "approach" to the practise of archaeology, nor should it be. There are many different Indigenous groups and settings in which an Indigenous archaeology comes into play, and each has its own history and emergent needs and goals, many of which are themselves shifting and evolving. The wider context for the emergence of an increasingly well-formulated concept and practise of Indigenous archaeologies includes some major "sea changes" in the climate for archaeological practise, for example, repatriation laws in the United States (e.g., Bray 2001), the end of apartheid in South Africa, and the Mabo decision and Native title in Australia (e.g., Lilley 2000). In general, the past decade has witnessed the emergence of the so-called postcolonial times, with postcolonial theory and, perhaps most significantly, decolonising methodologies.

These are not just concerns for archaeologists of "culture contact" or historical archaeologies: "All archaeology today is postcolonial" (Gosden 2001:241)—at least in the chronological sense. More importantly, archaeologists need to understand postcoloniality in the intellectual and political senses; we may be especially well positioned to insist on the historical specificities of "postcolonialisms." But many—especially Indigenous peoples—would hasten

to point out that this very term and framing reference of "postcoloniality" should be contested as "a convenient convention of Western intellectuals which re-inscribes their power to define the world" (Smith 1999:14). It has been rightly noted that archaeology itself "will not move beyond being a colonialist enterprise unless it actively seeks to understand the underlying issues of ownership and control of material and intellectual property as related to cultural knowledge and heritage" (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:329).

The term "Indigenous" is one that has appeared in a widespread manner relatively recently, and may have particularly emerged, Smith (1999) suggests, in the 1970s in North America with the American Indian movement and the Canadian Indian Brotherhood (Aga Khan and bin Talal 1987; Wilmer 1993). But despite these many decades and the long-standing research "on" Indigenous peoples, there are—even today—"few critical texts on research methodologies which mention the word Indigenous or its localized synonyms" (Smith 1999:5). No one would claim that there is a homogeneous entity known as "Indigenous people," but the plural ("Indigenous peoples") can be deployed strategically in certain contexts, as well as provide a network of connections and mutual encouragement, information, possible practises, and inspiration. Smith (1999) cites Wilmer (1993:5): "Indigenous peoples represent the unfinished business of decolonisation" (7).

Despite the emergent and varied nature of Indigenous archaeologies, there are several dimensions to them that can perhaps characterise these practises and concerns, at least as we see them today. Throughout this paper, I will follow the core idea put forth by George Nicholas (e.g., 2003) that an Indigenous archaeology is one that is done with, for, and by Indigenous people, and that it can be an archaeology done not only by Indigenous people: "One need not be a native person to follow an Indigenous archaeology paradigm," and the archaeology "need not be located only on an Indigenous land base" (Atalay 2004). An Indigenous archaeology requires a critical gaze, genuine collaboration, and the inclusion of Indigenous epistemologies and Native conceptions of the past, history, and time; and it requires a questioning of the role of research in the community where one is working or about which one wants to know. To a great extent, Indigenous archaeologies will feature critique and a deconstruction of Western archaeological practise. This will likely be combined with a set of "Indigenous concepts that model the way archaeology should best be practiced, by *all* archaeologists" (Atalay 2004).

Some of the many goals of Indigenous archaeologies would include centrally a decolonising goal, including decolonising methodologies (e.g., Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Smith 1999; Wilson and Yellow Bird 2005; for an archaeological example see Faulstich et al. 2003, or Smith and Ward 2000:xvi). Some of these are discussed later in the paper, but the overall implication is that the entire research process requires transformation. A core method may be one of "researching back," which involves "a 'knowing-ness of the colo-

nizer,' and a recovery of ourselves (as Indigenous peoples), an analysis of colonialism, and a struggle for self-determination" (Smith 1999:7).

Another goal is to claim the "power to set the agenda, ask the questions, determine what is excavated and retain aspects of control over final interpretations and dissemination of knowledge" (Atalay 2004; see also Watkins 2000). A fully Indigenous archaeology is when Indigenous populations *control* "the quantity and quality of archaeology performed within their homelands" (Watkins 2000:177). And thus, Indigenous archaeologies require an explicit engagement with and agreements about intellectual and cultural property rights (see Nicholas and Bannister 2004), which are often local, gnarly, and contested. The notions of "ownership" and of "protection" (of archaeological and cultural resources) will have to change for a truly Indigenous archaeology (Watkins 2000:178), and we must keep in mind that even these basic terms may have different meanings at a deep ontological level.

Indigenous archaeologies advocate an ethical and human-centred practise, in which all lines of evidence have a potential place, including oral traditions and the experiential, as well as the material and the contextual. As Watkins (2000) has said, "such examination, while perhaps disconcerting to the individual archaeologist, strengthens the discipline by allowing the development of alternative means of viewing the past" (166). Indigenous archaeology will bring to the discipline a "viewpoint that refuses to be 'objective' and embraces the emotional, one that pursues not 'truth' but understanding, and one that includes all facets of what it is to be human on the brink of an exciting adventure" (Watkins 2000:181; for an example, see Spector 1993).

One bottom line is that the growth and development of Indigenous archaeologies is not just about the establishment of (more) tribal cultural resource management programmes, excellent as many are. The discipline of practising archaeologists must include increasing numbers of Indigenous people and in senior and leadership roles (Watkins 2000:177), which should help to generate transformations within the discipline (e.g., Ferguson 2000:35–36)—even if, as we have learned from the entry of women into science, this is not necessarily enough. This means that archaeologists must expand their pedagogies, their recruitment for degree programmes and field opportunities, and their training programmes and curricula (e.g., Riggs 2004). A key issue is about *relationships*: relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples. Archaeology as a discipline must develop "with the control and influence of Indigenous populations around the world" (Watkins 2000:xiii), and this is to be instantiated in viable, collaborative working relationships. This means full integration, when desired, of Indigenous archaeologists and archaeological perspectives into the practises of archaeology—from "the field" to the classroom and to the administration of archaeological programmes and practises. As with feminism, Indigenous concerns about archaeological practise are not "merely political" and cannot be dismissed as such. Indigenous archaeology in North America, for

example, should be based more in American Indian *cultural* values and interests than in "just politics" (Watkins 2000).

There is no doubt that many archaeologists will balk at the request/requirement of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous archaeologists to regulate and even control what is said and "done" with their pasts. Yet, what Nicholas and Bannister (2004) articulate is that the "ultimate risk to *both* sides is the *loss of control* of knowledge" (332). Just as control—use, appropriation, commodification—of archaeological knowledge has been central to non-Indigenous archaeologists in their claims to *professional* integrity (and rewards), archaeological and cultural knowledge is, to Indigenous peoples, "both part of cultural *property* and integral to cultural *identity*" (Nicholas and Bannister 2004:332). One need not be a social scientist to understand that the very *cultural* integrity of Indigenous peoples is inextricably dependent upon their control of cultural knowledge.

Fortunately, in 2005 there are numerous examples of the programmes and practises of an archaeology that is an Indigenous-informed archaeology; in fact, they are too numerous to list in a reasonable set of citations. Two recent examples might indicate the range of such possibilities:

1. A new Ph.D. scholarship (at the Australian National University) supports a graduate student to write a thesis on Indigenous collectors and collections, which "considers Indigenous people's contemporary roles in shaping private and public collections, and the influence of historical circumstances and ideas of communal ownership and responsibility. It therefore subverts the dominant emphasis upon Europeans as collectors and appropriators of Indigenous objects. By considering Indigenous people as collectors, curators, and presenters of beloved objects, this project will offer major new perspectives on Australian Indigenous history and museology. By exploring the power of material objects in cultural identity and historical consciousness, this project disrupts the stereotype of Indigenous people as purely 'museum victims' (www.arc.gov.au/apply_grants/linkage_projects.htm).
2. Members of the Santa Ynez Chumash Indian Reservation in California have negotiated an agreement with archaeologist Mike Glassow and bioarchaeologist Phil Walker at the Repository of Anthropological and Ethnological Collections (RAEC) of the University of California, Santa Barbara, that archaeological materials repatriated to the Santa Ynez band will be housed at the RAEC (on the Santa Barbara campus). "The Santa Ynez, however, will *own* these collections, oversee their use, and share in their management and curation. Walker and Glassow are also working with other Chumash descendants to educate the public about Chumash heritage through loans of Repository collections for exhibition at Chumash-run facilities" (www.anth.ucsb.edu/AGSANEWS/agsa.F95/repos.html).

What Do We Mean by Feminist Archaeology (Archaeologies)?

As many authors have pointed out (e.g., Conkey and Gero 1997; Hanen and Kelley 1992; Hays-Gilpin 2000a; Meskell 2000; Wylie 1997), there is a rich literature about the archaeology of gender, but much less literature that is more fully engaged with feminist issues, theory, and approaches. Wylie (2003) generously suggests that, by engaging with the concept of gender, even non- or a-feminist archaeologists have contributed to an archaeology that both makes gender visible and raises important questions about the objectivity of an archaeology that had either ignored gender or was gendered in an androcentric or sexist way. Some feminists ask whether the label "feminist" still has a function. Despite the many meanings of "feminism," most who consider themselves feminists would agree that it is still necessary to include gender—but in more expansive senses of the term—as a "category of analysis in the consideration of any cultural product" (Keller 2000:384), or as some part of the coproduction of many cultural, social practises.

So, indeed, the last twenty years have witnessed the production of a very robust, diverse, and vibrant literature in archaeology from most parts of the world (e.g., Bertelsen et al. 1987; Claassen and Joyce 1997; DuCros and Smith 1993; Gero and Conkey 1991; Kästner and Karlisch 1991; Kent 1998; Moore and Scott 1997; Wadley 1997) that has not only challenged prevailing androcentric accounts of human life and critiqued the gendered (usually masculinist) nature of preferred research questions, of subjects, and of professional reward systems, but also carried out research on aspects of gender towards an engendered archaeology—one that the early advocates of an archaeology that took gender seriously never imagined in their wildest dreams. There are archaeologies of gender and trade (Seligman 2001; Spielmann 2000); gender and mortuary practices (Arnold and Wicker 2001); gender and power (Sweely 1999); gender and material culture (Donald and Hurcombe 2000); engendered considerations of ritual (Hays-Gilpin 2000b), religion (Gilchrist 1994), art (Hays-Gilpin 2003; Joyce 1998), and architecture, space, and place (Lane 1998; Tringham 1994); gender and hide working (Frink and Weedman 2005); gender in regional archaeologies (e.g., the U.S. Southwest [Crown 2000]; China [Linduff and Yan Sun 2004]; pre-Hispanic America [Klein 2001b]); sexuality (Schmidt and Voss 2000); and "the body" and engendered socialisation practises (Joyce 1998a, 2000; Meskell and Joyce 2003). There are even second editions of synthetic texts (e.g., Nelson 2004) and Ph.D. dissertations that "engender" specific archaeologies (e.g., Hudecek-Cuffe 1998), and that use "gender" as a conceptual platform for re-imagining analytical frameworks for specific archaeological materials and technologies (Dobres 1995, 2000), or for reconsidering major cultural "transitions" of the human past (e.g., Peterson 2002; Pyburn 2004). Attempts are being made to

assess the impact of feminism on archaeology (e.g., Conkey 2003). Gender and even some feminist archaeology is included in most major North American introductory archaeology textbooks. It is impossible now to provide a comprehensive bibliography, despite earlier attempts (e.g., Bacus et al. 1993; Conkey and Gero 1997), and a handbook of gender in archaeology is in preparation (Nelson 2006).

As with some other archaeological approaches, feminists have been concerned with extricating archaeology from the trap of a focus on and fetishisation of the "archaeological trace as a thing in itself" (Byrne 2003:181) or from the famous "fallacy of misplaced concreteness." This has in turn led many feminist approaches to confront the problems of "visibility" in at least two senses:

1. The apparent invisibility of women, gender, sexuality, and other contained, silenced, erased people and contexts; and
2. The "optical illusion" (after Burton 2000) of visibility, which allows that while these formerly invisible are now "visible," they are, all too often, made visible in roles, attitudes, and relations that are merely extensions of stereotypical and problematic roles, attitudes, and relations, usually those of the present (e.g., in Lovejoy 1981).

Even more importantly, the "making visible" often precludes analysis of the very systems of muting and suppression, and of their historicity. This results in reproducing their terms, instead of contesting them as ideological systems. Thus, it is not only "making visible" or visibility that should be of concern to archaeologists but also the very contexts and practises of invisibility (Byrne 2003).

Feminist archaeologies have consistently been about both a more reflexive archaeology and one that recognises the ways in which archaeological knowledge is "situated knowledge" (Haraway 1988). Despite the debates over the use (or not) of feminist theory and practise in an archaeology that takes gender seriously (Conkey 2001; Klein 2001a; Sørensen 2000:4–11), much of this archaeology has revealed how archaeological research had been "compromised" by its androcentric and sexist assumptions, the limits of its categories (e.g., Spector 1993:30–35), or just its omissions. Feminist archaeologies are an audible addition to the expanding chorus of voices—of which Indigenous archaeologies must be central—that mandate that we make explicit our responsibilities for our ethical and political, as well as theoretical and methodological, standards of disciplinary practise (Conkey and Wylie 1998).

There are some parallels, perhaps, between the history of doing feminist research in the social sciences and the issues and dimensions of Indigenous research. For example, it is well known that high among the concerns of feminists has been that women's voices are heard, that their insights and experiences are valued and included as an equal source of knowledge and information, that "women's ways of knowing" are valid and validated—even if

there is debate as to the very existence of distinctive "women's ways of knowing." As early researchers pointed out (e.g., MacKinnon 1982; Smith 1974), this very dimension might require new or different ways of working, different language and concepts, and different analytical frameworks, even though these are not likely to be among the accepted conventions for doing research in the social sciences. At first, there was a particular engagement with more "qualitative" research methods, including drawing on women's experiences, and often communicated through storytelling, narratives, and oral traditions. Certainly these modes of discourse—these "ways of telling"—feature prominently in many Indigenous knowledge systems. Yet they are not mainstream to social science research; in fact, many have been explicitly disdained, trivialised, and dismissed (for some reviews of the history of the quest for feminist methods, see, for example, Jayaratne and Stewart 1991 and Reinharz 1992; for a good recent discussion see Naples 2003). Although there is a much longer story to tell here, the result of the quest for perhaps "a" feminist methodology has been to question that there even could be such a thing (e.g., for ethnography, see Abu-Lughod 1990).

But here comes the important point: rather than abandoning an understanding of feminist research because there can be no one way or no set of feminist method(s), the very methodological pluralisms, and, as we have seen in the archaeologies of gender, the profusion of all sorts of previously unanticipated and unimagined questions, analyses, and ways to shed light on a previously "invisible" domain of human cultural life have led instead to a reframing of the question. It is not so much "how to do feminist social science" or "how to do feminist archaeology"—assuming perhaps some sort of manifesto or guidebook—but rather, "How does one do research *as a feminist*?" (see Conkey and Wylie 1998; Longino 1994; Wylie 1995a). This reorienting of the question, and all that follows from it, may be one of those common grounds for feminist and Indigenous archaeologies.

One key issue among those practising an Indigenous archaeology is being explicit as to what it means to do archaeology as an Indigenous person or from an Indigenous perspective. What can be learned from feminist approaches, and how might one approach archaeology as a feminist Indigenous person? What are the decolonising methodologies at hand and to be developed in order to accomplish this? And why are archaeologists now perhaps more ready and able to listen to these approaches that some have been advocating within the profession for some time (e.g., McGuire 1992; Thomas 2000; Zimmerman 1979, 1989a, 1989b, 1989c)?

Thus, while there is still vibrant and important work in archaeology that takes up issues of gender and of gender intersections, there is simultaneously work that brings feminist principles and practises to bear on archaeological materials and evidence, work that *complicates* the concept of gender (e.g., Joyce 2000, 2001), and work that is attempting to reconceptualise the entire research

process (Conkey and Wylie 1998; Gero 1996; Joyce and Preucel 2002; Spielmann 1994). As this latter concern emerges among feminists and others, there is not only a space but also a need for a dialogue with people who are doing Indigenous archaeology—those who, it would seem, are simultaneously concerned that the research process in archaeology be reconceptualised for some of the same reasons: to bring divergent and multiple perspectives to bear on our accounts of the past, to mistrust practises and interpretations that do not take gendered/Indigenous voices and evidence into account, and to mistrust interpretations that simplify or reduce the complexity of the past to monolithic, "totalising," and essentialist narratives.

This concern to both challenge and reconceptualise the research process is almost a necessary and inevitable outcome of taking gender seriously in archaeological work—and all that that has come to imply, including newly framed and nonessentialist understandings of "gender" itself (see an entire "key words" book about gender: Cornell et al. 2004). Feminist archaeologies hold some different starting assumptions, many of which have been concisely discussed by feminist epistemologists Helen Longino (1994) and Alison Wylie (1995a): a recognition that knowledge production is a pluralistic enterprise—one that serves divergent goals, engages dissent seriously, and fosters views from (not just any where, but from) "many wheres" (Longino 1993:113). And specific to archaeology would be the respect for the very materiality of the archaeological record (Wylie's [1992] "evidential constraints").

Thus, there are at least two quite core implications of feminist research for all of archaeology and for an archaeology that includes and promotes Indigenous archaeologies:

1. As with many feminist projects in epistemology and "how we know what we know," the ideal(s) of being "objective" have had to be substantially reformulated, to say the least. The very process and results of exposing the androcentrisms and preferential research practises, subjects, and thus what we have held as our understandings of the human past have called "objectivity" into question (Code 1991:321; Wylie 1992, 1997, 2003; see also Lloyd 1995, 1997). But this is absolutely *not* an "anything goes" archaeology, for feminists have insisted on engagement with evidence and the limits of interpretation. As Wylie (1997) states so succinctly about feminist archaeologists, "they are clear about the social, political nature of the archaeological enterprise, and yet they do not consider the outcomes of inquiry or the criteria of adequacy governing practice to be reducible to the sociopolitics of practice" (85–86).
2. The feminist standpoint in archaeology (Wylie 2000a, 2003) is, however, just one of a number of other critical standpoints in archaeology (Gero et al. 1983; Layton 1989, 1994; Leone et al. 1987; Kohl and Fawcett 1996, among many, and including Indigenous archaeologies) that are chal-

lenging, informing, and expanding—in insightful, significant, and positive ways—the standard ways of doing in archaeology.

What about Feminisms and Indigenous Concerns?

Of course there is a domain in which feminism and Indigenous women are linked. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) explicitly notes that many Indigenous researchers today are "informed academically by critical and often feminist approaches to research" (4; see also 9). She charts some of the ways in which the feminist critique has contributed to the postpositivist and emancipatory possibilities for research and researchers, even if she is not convinced that such emancipations have transpired. The work of black feminists (e.g., Collins 1986 on the "outsider within") has been of particular relevance. Both approaches argue that we can no longer carry on research within or about women and Indigenous communities as if they—and their perspectives, voices, actions, and practises—did not matter. When archaeologists, for example, claim that what they are doing is "in the public interest," it has all too often been as if Native people were not part of "the public." Among Smith's "decolonising projects" is "gendering," which requires an "analysis of colonialism as a central tenet of an Indigenous feminism" (1999:152). As with other intersectional perspectives, indigeneity/ethnicity will necessarily *complicate* divergent feminisms (Suleri 1992).

At a recent conference entitled "Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century" (Bauerle et al. 2004), one of six panels was devoted to "historicising and dehistoricising gender" with the following goals: to explore continuities in women's power and authority in Indigenous societies, to develop a critical perspective on anthropological and archaeological accounts of women and gender by exploring local knowledge of women's lives as passed down by elder women, and to interrogate the relevance of Western concepts of gender and feminism to Indigenous culture and the significance of gender to Indigenous nationalism. For an August 2005 conference ("Indigenous Women and Feminism: Culture, Activism, Politics 2005"), the organisers point out that, despite the interventions of "third-wave feminism" and attentions to intersectionalities, "Indigenous women and feminism issues remain undertheorised within contemporary feminist theory" (Indigenous Women and Feminism 2005). Indigenous feminism has its differences from the feminism of women of colour and postcolonial feminism (within which it is often contained) because "Indigenous feminism remains an important site of gender struggle that also engages the crucial issues of cultural identity, nationalism, and decolonisation" (Indigenous Women and Feminism 2005).

In Mihesuah's (2003) excellent chapter "Feminists, Tribalists, or Activists?" she sums up many of the divergent standpoints from her perspective as a Native

American. Of course, as she points out, many "Native women go about their daily business with little appreciation [or concern] for what scholars decide to label them" (161; see also Williams and Harjo 1998). Mihesuah expresses some specific cautions about an integration of feminism with American Indian women's studies, but, despite these, there is at least a dialogue, and questions are raised that are directly relevant to an intersection between feminist and Indigenous archaeologies (Mihesuah 2000, 2003; see also Smith 1999); this dialogue is made quite clear by the list of conference panel goals stated above. Deeper understanding of gendered Indigenous lives has a great deal of crucial knowledge to offer the dialogues of feminism (Suleri 1992). Several additional points can be made:

1. For both feminist and Indigenous archaeologies, we need to be wary of "scaling down" both postcoloniality and feminist frameworks to North American academic terms (Suleri 1992:765). No one feminist theory could cover the multiple cultural ideologies and interests of Native people.
2. There is often a tendency for one "side" of an intersection to come first, in what Suleri (1992) has called a "hierarchy of loyalties" (763). Nonetheless, as Mihesuah (2003) discusses, there is a range of feelings about how interconnected Indigenous women's concerns are with those of feminists; for many Indigenous women, for example, there is a priority for tribalism, for tribal survival, even if it is acknowledged that the accomplishment of such may be primarily or most efficaciously in the hands of women.
3. "Activism tribalism" is (understandably) much more than "women's issues." For some Native women, feminism is rejected or ignored (Mihesuah 2003), even if it is widely recognised that it is the very intersection of racial and gender oppression—gender oppression of women *and* men—that is of central concern especially in the context of "tribal rights" (143, 160). It should not be surprising that conceptions of what feminism means, and what role(s) it should play in their activisms, are multiple, varied, and mixed. As well, ideas about what "decolonisation" means and how to accomplish it are equally multiple and varied (Mihesuah 2003:160).
4. Indigenous resistances to a feminist and gender archaeology may well be motivated by the recognition and belief that "emphasizing gender rather than other sources of difference and oppression may actually be a tool of social control" (Minow 1988:52n26). An archaeologist with an Indigenous perspective might say to a feminist archaeologist: "Consider for a moment the degree to which your own understanding of gender roles in Indian [Indigenous] cultures might be distorted by the legacy of white patriarchy itself" (Williams 1989–1990:1029). This is a serious and important question.

There are other problems as well. For example, despite the abundance of materials now available about Indigenous women, "the majority of writings are devoid of Native voices, and are thereby only partial histories"; "many interpretations remain incorrect and underdeveloped"; and "most do not connect the past to the present, which is why we should be writing history in the first place" (Mihesuah 2000:1247). This is an important message to archaeologists. Second, if one does inject the multifaceted lives and values of Natives and also does justice to the heterogeneity among women, this should (appropriately) "confuse" any understanding of "women's" experience. Mihesuah's critique is that seeking certain "clarity" about gender is often at the expense of the visibility, agency, and identity of those represented.

But some feminist archaeologists are, in fact, not purely seeking *clarity* about gender and gender roles and relations—clarity in the sense of unambiguous and clear pictures of gender in the past. To many critics, that we cannot attribute a gender to a specific artefact or feature, that we do not have the "smoking gun" of sex identification (male or female in a burial or in art), or cannot somehow "make visible" gender roles in some precise way is a failing of a feminist archaeology. But feminist archaeologists have different aspirations, including making it understood just how very ambiguous *all* archaeological data is, how uncertain our interpretations must be, and how multiple the possibilities are for any renderings of social life (e.g., Gero 1998), whether gender is involved or not.

Within archaeology there are increasing concerns and practises that appear to resonate with both Indigenous and feminist principles and practises, be they explicit pedagogies and teaching (e.g., Conkey and Tringham 1996; Hamilakis 2004; Pyburn 2002; Smith 2003); fieldwork practises (e.g., Gero 1996; Moser 1998; Pyburn 2003); or the "languages of archaeology" (Joyce 2002a). One exceptionally lucid example is a conference about Indigenous cultures in an interconnected world (held in 1997) in Darwin, Australia (Smith and Ward 2000). Here, the very structure of the conference, the actual setting (it was held outdoors, minimising culture-bound spatial containment practises) and the content that centred on the "integration of cultural workshops and demonstrations into the program," enabled a grounding of "the discussions in Indigenous wisdom and cultural expertise, and in the strengths of Indigenous cultures in performance and in teaching roles" (Smith and Ward 2000:xvi).

Decolonising Methodologies and Counterresearch

While there may be no agreement as to what "decolonisation" means for Indigenous researchers and research, or on what constitutes "a" feminist methodology, there are some dimensions of research that both archaeologies might

well share. For both, there is a struggle to counterresearch based on deeply problematic premises and methods, and for both, there are efforts to reframe, reconceptualise, and transform the research processes. While there has been significant discussion and debate about what constitutes feminist research, as noted above, there is increasing discussion as to what constitutes Indigenous research (Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Wilson and Yellow Bird 2005). Linda Tuhiwai Smith's book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999) provides an excellent overview of the issues involved in doing research that involves the past, present, or future of colonised peoples. In her introduction alone, she makes clear a number of crucial points, points that are not unfamiliar or foreign to the feminist:

1. The ways in which "research" is a "significant site of struggle" between different ways of knowing and differing interests/concerns—those of the West and those of the Other (see also Bannerji et al. 1992);
2. That Indigenous peoples have other stories to tell, and would like to tell the history of Western research through the eyes of the colonised;
3. That Indigenous perspectives on research need to be not only acknowledged but understood: how they develop and how they are significant;
4. That her project is more than a deconstruction of Western scholarship. It is an attempt to offer ways of doing Indigenous research that contribute primarily to the need for survival of Indigenous communities and individuals. Her sample of some 25 projects (Smith 1999)—from writing to representing, connecting, restoring, and others—offers excellent guidelines for how to think about what one is doing in any research project, from start to finish (see also Craven 1996; Mihesuah 1993).

Here I will attempt to explore just two dimensions to interpretation that have been and still are integral to both feminist and Indigenous archaeologies: the place and role of "experience" in interpretation and the uses of oral traditions and storytelling.

"Experience"

How can we recognise and use "experience" in the interpretive process? How does experience figure in assessing the validity and credibility of knowledge claims? This is an enormous topic and has been much debated in feminist literature for decades. It has often been suggested that one way to make "the silenced" be heard is to bring forth their experiences, to base our understandings of social and cultural phenomena on the telling of experience. (See Smith 1987 for an excellent consideration of how experience "works" in structuring social inquiry.) Scott (1992) has noted how this engagement with what Wolf (1984) called the "peoples without history" has precipitated a crisis for

orthodox history, if only because now not just stories but subjects have multiplied (24). As in feminist and gender archaeologies, "these histories have provided evidence for a world of alternative values and practices whose existence gives the lie to hegemonic constructions of social worlds" (Scott 1992:24). The place of "experience" in these new archaeologies and histories is important yet complicated.

We archaeologists do not often consider how specific experiences have influenced or informed archaeological interpretation (cf. Bradley 2002; Kus 2002; Rubertone 2001:ix; Schrire 1995; Spector 1993; Tringham 1991). There is little doubt that for those archaeologists who adhere to objectivist ideals, it appears to be a slippery slope to bring in (or openly admit) "experience" as a source of evidence and potential meaning. And certainly there has been scepticism about how the contemporary world of experience—what a tribal elder, for example, may say about ancient rock art—can be brought to bear on activities and practises of the past (e.g., Woody 2000). Yet most of us do draw on not only our own experiences but also those of other cultures and settings, such as in much ethnoarchaeological work. In fact, some might claim that without ethnographic and historical experiences there could be little basis for much traditional archaeological interpretation, as the materials of archaeology do not, in fact, ever "speak for themselves."

But how often are the "experiences" of Indigenous peoples considered by archaeologists? What kinds of experiences "count," "matter," and are considered acceptable? Many who are willing to engage with this as a serious question know that it is more complicated (and interesting) than just adding the experiences of different researchers or of different (previously unrecognised) voices and social actors. We recognise that to appeal to some kind of incontestable evidence, such as "my experience," merely adds another foundational premise to a discipline already overburdened with undiscussed, unproblematised foundational notions—as Joan Scott (1992) has suggested for the field of history. She points out that it is not individuals who *have* experience, but rather we are all subjects who are constituted *through* experience. We cannot, she suggests, just appeal to experience to explain something, no matter whose experience it is. Rather, we need to explain and, in fact, *historicise* experience (Scott 1992:25–26; see also Scott 1991; for an excellent example of the historicisation of experience, see Carby 1987).

When we engage, as we should, with "experiences" as a dimension of interpretation, as integral to our own epistemologies, and as having powerful potential, we begin an inquiry into the ways in which subjectivity is produced, and in which politics (broadly speaking) organise and interpret experience. The lesson, from feminist, Indigenous, and other critical archaeologies, is that we should be openly discussing what counts as experience and, furthermore, who gets to make that determination. We can then perhaps be better situated to historicise experience and to reflect critically on the history we write about

rather than to merely premise our archaeological narratives upon it or dismiss it out of hand. When, as cited above, Williams (1989–1990) poses the question, "Consider for a moment the degree to which your own understanding of gender roles in Indian cultures might be distorted by the legacy of white patriarchy itself" (1029), he is asking us to historicise our experience in the service of our archaeology. What does "experience" mean in different settings, among different social actors, and at different times? Within "the West," what "experience" has meant and how it has been used and transformed is in itself highly variable and historical (Jay 2005; see also Butler 1990:22–25 and Williams 1983:126–129).

From the past two decades of "third-wave feminism," from the growth and expansion of Indigenous rights activism, and from some of the understandings of "the subjective nature of experience" (e.g., Moore 2001), it may be possible to *begin* our social analyses in archaeology with a reflexive and relational analysis that includes (or centres on) a theory of agency and representation that is based on experience, *but does not end there.* Rather, and this is what an intersectional approach may offer, we need an explicit understanding of experience and history within the broader sociocultural frames that have structured and do structure our lives (Russo 1991). Or, as Bannerji (1992) puts it so succinctly, "we need to go beyond expressive self-referentiality and connect with others in time and space" (94).

There may be some good lessons to be learned for both archaeologies from the evolution and critique (e.g., Mohanty 1987) of the use of "experience" in feminist history and analysis, even in a history intent on a history of difference. For example, this has led to a more explicit recognition of the historian/archaeologist as an active producer of knowledge, as having a subject position. This puts into motion the mandate to reflect critically on the archaeologies we write in regard to experience, rather than to premise our archaeologies upon "experience," even if the experiences invoked are only implicit but nonetheless foundational. A critical perspective on experience requires that we take concepts and identities as historical events in need of explanation; in fact, it requires that we denaturalise experience and take all categories of analysis as being contextual, contested, and contingent. In most archaeology, we all too often assume our categories (but see Meskell 2001; Snead 2002; Spector 1993). In fact, it is not so much a matter of how "visible" women, gender, difference, or the Indigenous perspective might be, but first, what does it mean for archaeologists to study the past in terms of these categories, for some of us to think of ourselves/themselves now—or in the past—in these terms?

While experience is and can be a powerful and important concept, it perhaps warrants at least scrutiny (not unquestioned and foundational acceptance), if not redefinition. Since experience is always contested, as both feminists and Indigenous researchers have found, it is therefore always politi-

cal. Thus, the role and place of experience in the production of archaeological knowledge is not what might appear to be the straightforward generation and communication of knowledge that is said to be arrived at though experience but, rather, the analysis of the production of that knowledge itself. This is why one of Linda Tuhiwai Smith's goals of Indigenous research is "to tell the history of Western research through the eyes of the colonized" (Smith 1999:2). What we want to explain is the experience that we invoke, observe, and draw upon—"experience" cannot stand as the source of our explanations and accounts.

Oral Traditions and Storytelling

In the development and execution of counterresearch and in any genealogy of (archaeological) knowledge, the role and uses of language, terminology, and writing/speaking are key entry points. Keller (1985), for example, has shown the centrality of language in the masculinist construction that is Western science. Alarcón (1990) reminds us that "the silence and silencing of people begins with the dominating enforcement of linguistic conventions, the resistance to relational dialogues as well as the disenablement of peoples by outlawing their forms of speech" (363). For archaeology, Joyce (2002a) has exposed concisely our "languages." Both feminists and Indigenous peoples know full well the specifics of how speaking, listening, and writing are regulated by powerful systems of domination.

The last fifteen years have indeed witnessed a more reflexive consideration of archaeological narratives (e.g., Conkey with Williams 1991; Pluciennik 1999; Terrell 1990; and especially Joyce 2002b). From her standpoint as a feminist and a social archaeologist, Joyce has succinctly articulated the ways in which "archaeology is an open-ended collaborative storytelling practice"; "to do archaeology is to create narratives about the past in the present," whether in our professional writings and presentations or in popular versions (Joyce 1998b; 2002a). Joyce makes an important link to Indigenous research: storytelling in archaeology really matters because when we tell our accounts, our stories, we are constituting and bringing into existence relations between ourselves as narrative producers and the very peoples about whom and to whom we are talking. From Joyce's perspective, one of the important possibilities for the feminist practise of archaeology is to "recover the multiplicity of voices that are normally suppressed in archaeological discourse" (Joyce 1998c). This involves, however, accountability and responsibility, right down to the level of individual words and their potential power(s), something that has been of concern in Indigenous studies as well (e.g., Craven 1996; Smith 1999; Thomas 2000).

Relational dialogues of another sort have become more prominent in archaeological writing: these are dialogues between archaeologists (e.g., Renfrew

2001); among imagined archaeologists (e.g., Conkey 2000; Tringham 1991:113–115); between an Indigenous historian/archaeologist and another Indigenous scholar (Denetdale 2004, interviewing Deloria); and between different archaeologists and an imagined Indigenous person (Preucel and Hodder 1996). These are sometimes interviews and sometimes narratives to convey differences of position and opinion, standpoints, and divergent interpretations of archaeological phenomena (Lightfoot 2005). They are also often an attempt to "people the past"; to make the concepts, debates, issues, and interpretive stances more accessible, more explicit, more relational, and therefore more open to scrutiny and to a critical reading of what might otherwise have been objectivised, jargon-bound, and abstracted promulgations. Archaeologists are now flat-out writing excellent fictional accounts of the archaeological process (e.g., Praetzellis 2000, 2003) and embedding archaeological materials in narratives and/or fictionalised but plausibly grounded settings (e.g., Layton 2002; Spector 1991, 1993; Wilkie 2003) in the hopes of better contextualising and thus understanding, at least in a different way, the history and nature of archaeological inquiry and interpretation (Joyce 2002b; Spector 1998). These are often very much about "experience" in the past (e.g., Gero 1991).

From these developments, it should be an easier step to engage with oral traditions and oral accounts as a viable line of evidence in the interpretation of archaeological materials and the cultural past. Mihesuah (2003) notes the problematics of including oral histories. She writes about the differences in critiques by Native and non-Native reviewers for articles to be published (or not) in the *American Indian Quarterly*, which she edits. Native reviewers usually recommend rejection when the writer has not included the tribal version of an event, but, she adds, there are still those professors of the "old school of thought—that oral histories are not viable because they are not textualized" (Mihesuah 2003:29). Elsewhere, Mihesuah (1998b) identifies the use of oral histories as source material as one of the three most pressing concerns to Indigenous scholars.

Those who are working out collaborations between archaeologists and Native Americans have suggested that this "working together" has led to a greater "appreciation" of oral accounts and traditions (e.g., Anyon et al. 2000; Ferguson et al. 2000; Wylie 2000b:vii), or, more precisely, to a greater appreciation of "the *historicity* of oral traditions" (Echo-Hawk 1993:6, emphasis added). Such traditions and stories have social lives (e.g., Cruikshank 1998; Rios and Sands 2000). There are at least two immediate gains from a consideration of oral accounts. They are not only now recuperating a previously neglected resource, but also simultaneously providing us with different, even "divergent traditions for understanding the past" (Wylie 2000b:vii). This latter point is certainly of central relevance to feminist archaeologists, who have shown not only that the traditions we have drawn on for understanding the past have been partial, and most often androcentric at that, but also that it is the very

multiplicity of sources that can epistemologically buttress what are otherwise often rather tenuous interpretations (e.g., Wylie 1992). In a particularly compelling commentary, Lightfoot (2000) shows how Native oral traditions contribute to a much stronger analysis and interpretation. He points to how "silences" in the different sources we use may be of particular use, and one salient example he discusses is the relative significance of interethnic marriage for gender relations in the California colonised groups under consideration.

Bringing forth oral traditions has the potential to work as "counter-research" because the historical records developed and privileged in the colonial context since have been almost always records created by the colonisers, almost always linked directly to practises of legal subjugation. These have favoured concepts and terms such as extermination, disappearance, cultural stasis and "primitiveness," unclear or absent land ownership, and abandonment. They obscure or ignore completely such cultural facts as communal "ownerships" and other-than-Western ways of linking people to property, land, and to each other. When archaeological practise brings in a privileging of identifiable—usually bounded—settlements or "sites," or only a focus on spatial containments, or when the archaeological approach is one of grand theories of abstract cultural evolution, progress, ecology, and cultural "disappearance" (e.g., McGuire 1992; Trigger 1980, 1984), this blinds us to what has, in fact, survived in some forms or another that might provide an alternative and equally valid and plausible historiography, drawing from a historical consciousness that is very much available and powerful (e.g., Handsman and Richmond 1995; Rubertone 2001). Some archaeologists (e.g., Nassaney 2000, 2004; Woody 2000) have drawn on oral traditions of present-day Indigenous peoples in their archaeological inquiry, producing richer and more open-ended accounts (see also Anyon et al. 2000 and Ferguson et al. 2000).

But it is not merely a matter of recuperating underused (or previously dismissed) sources of evidence and information, or even of adding another source of information to our interpretive tool kits. Rather, it is the very structure of the practises of research that must be challenged and transformed; hence the very research process must be reconceptualised, and similar dilemmas that feminist and Indigenous approaches have faced, at least since the 1980s, must be confronted. Central here is the need to engage with what are now considered to be "standpoints" (Harding 2004; for archaeology, see Wylie 2000a or 2003)—those that we are challenging and those that we ourselves occupy. Among feminist debates in the philosophy of science, the core concerns have been how "to articulate an account of knowledge production that recognises its own contingency and standpoint specificity" (Wylie 1995b:270).

And so, as with the concern for and uses of "experience," the very appeal to and proposed uses of oral traditions and oral histories raise important issues of epistemology and practise; who could have thought otherwise? On the one hand, "analyses [in studies of Native Americans] must include Indians' versions of

events" (Mihesuah 2003:29; for an example see Hoikkala 1995). But it is often the case that Indigenous people want and need to control the access and use of these accounts. Many are understandably concerned that, like cultural artefacts and archaeological materials and sites, oral traditions and accounts will be exploited and "mined" for the gain of the non-Indigenous researchers (Anyon et al. 2000:65; Deloria 1969). On the other hand, there is more to be learned than just the particular story being told or passed on. There is now, thanks to feminist, postpositivist, and postcolonial science studies, an increasing recognition that there is not just one way to do science; there is a "world of sciences" (Harding 2003). "Different cultures bring different discursive resources to their queries about their environments—metaphors, models, and narratives make sense within distinctive religious, national and other kinds of projects of their cultures" (Harding 2003:58–59). It is these resources that must be both recognised and, when possible, drawn upon to frame our understandings of the human past.

What Would an Intersectional Approach Look Like?

This is a rich arena for exploration and there are many more examples than those I can consider here. I will just note some of the more general possibilities as well as point to two domains where we might find fruitful intersectionalities—in the study of gender roles and in archaeological reconsiderations of "space." In advocating an intersectional approach, Collins (1999) has three recommendations. First, she suggests that we stress the particular, in order to reverse the process of abstraction that has for so long prevailed and resulted in a widespread loss of historical agency. Thus, we should direct our attention to the "lived experiences"—the small-scale processes and daily practises that, in fact, for archaeologists, ultimately constitute the archaeological record that we study. Feminists and gender archaeologists have been among the most active contributors to household (a microscale) archaeology, in theory, method, and empirical analyses. And archaeologists *can* approach "intimate relations" (e.g., Meskell 1998 and other articles in this special volume).

Because feminists in archaeology definitely have a space for a more humanised history and account—putting a face on the "faceless blobs" (after Tringham 1991)—with possibilities for evoking emotions and motivations, there is a possible connection with the histories of and accounts by Indigenous researchers. Mihesuah notes that the histories of Native women should include these very dimensions (Mihesuah 2003:4; see also Watkins 2000:181). Indigenous people, and Indigenous women among them, seek to not only express but also end their oppression, as do feminists, and this can come from "reliable knowledge," which allows people to be "actors in history."

Secondly, Collins (1999) advocates that we ground the analysis itself in the particular, although not so particularistically that one loses sight of the wider

processes of history and culture, or of the ways in which oppressive and dominant power structures were established and are perpetuated, and how these have structured and continue to structure the production of knowledge. Our research is *simultaneously* about the past and about how the version(s) of the past have come to be and are sustained or not, and what transformative and even emancipatory possibilities they have. One central issue that must be confronted in developing outsider (archaeological) perspectives is how there are many "unstated reference points that hide from view a preferred position and shield it from challenge by other possible alternatives" (Minow 1988:48). Feminists can provide something of a counter to this for Indigenous archaeologies, and indeed, Indigenous archaeologies can scrutinise feminist positions. As we have learned from decades of critical thinking, any group that generalises only from its own standpoint or location is likely to provide a partial perspective (e.g., Haraway 1988); in that sense, we need intersections.

Lastly, Collins (1999) suggests that we look at the connections between what may usually be taken as separate domains or dimensions. This is not only an intersectionality that looks at how different dimensions of social identity may intersect and take their forms from the intersections, but also one that considers connections not previously considered. Mihesuah proposes that "we need less work about 'common knowledge' issues and more that offers complete stories—archival data combined with theoretical consideration, discussion of gender roles, and Native perspectives" (Mihesuah 2003:29; for an excellent example, see Rubertone 2001).

Several recent Ph.D. dissertations in archaeology may serve as examples. In Clements's (2004) study of a Ponkapoag praying town in Massachusetts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, she applies feminist theory to analysing ethnohistoric documents as well as the few archaeological remains from a Cultural Resource Management excavation of a Ponkapoag cemetery, where the people who are mentioned in the documents are buried. She addresses reburial and repatriation (NAGPRA) issues and shows how her research is relevant to modern Native American issues of tribal recognition. She includes the feminist approach of a narrative to bring out the archaeologist's thinking and emotional engagement with the material, humanising the process of discussing multiple possible interpretations of the data.

Atalay (2003) analyses some fairly standard archaeological materials from the important Neolithic site of Çatalhüyök, Turkey—clay balls and artefacts from cooking processes. But she intersperses her archaeological work on these prehistoric materials with a variety of "lesson plans" or curriculum units designed for young people in her Native band (Anishinabe) in Michigan. Atalay's intent is to use some of her people's ways of understanding the world to convey aspects of the human past in terms, concepts, and metaphors that allow them to relate archaeological findings elsewhere to their own worlds, pasts, and cultural understandings.

Working with community partners in the research process has emerged as one of the most efficacious ways to get "in" to the local stories and the previously unanticipated connectivities, and to understand how, on the ground, we are increasingly accountable to the specific case at hand, including a deep consideration for how we present research, how we represent the past, and how we represent ourselves in the research process (e.g., Loring 2001, among many). As feminist archaeologists continually ask what we have to offer, not just to wider feminisms (e.g., Brumfiel 1998; Conkey 1993) but also to our own social and cultural worlds; the project-specific coalitions between previously unconnected but equally interested parties require identification of and collaboration on the common grounds. Perhaps the emergence and articulation of the intersections between Indigenous and feminist archaeologies will push the "working together" of the past decade towards an even more transformative coalitional consciousness.

Gender Roles

Since gender roles have been one key focal point of feminist and gender archaeologists (e.g., Crown 2000), this may be one research area that might particularly benefit from an intersectionality, or from coauthoring. The legacy of white patriarchy is likely to function quite differently in different cultural contexts. We should, for example, direct our attention to the possibility that gender roles in some Indigenous cultures "might be understood differently and in ways unfamiliar to white patriarchal values" (Williams 1989–1990:1037; see also Jacobs 1999; see for a more specific example Chato and Conte 1988 concerning the destructive aspects of white patriarchy on Navajo conceptions of gender roles). These "white patriarchal values" are not easily or automatically overcome, even by feminist convictions and principles (e.g., Lâm 1994).

Many Indigenous women and men—for example, among Indians in North America—are caught in the legacy of a set of gender roles and gendered values that have been historically generated by the white patriarchal societies, often stereotyping males as lazy and women as hardworking (e.g., Williams 1989–1990; Young 1980), or overlooking and ignoring Indigenous systems of gendered power and influence, especially those of women. And yet it is interesting to note how, despite four or five "centuries of the legacy of white patriarchy, many gendered cultural patterns of apparent matriarchal power and influence in Indian tribes appear to enjoy some continuity" (Williams 1989–1990:1034; see also Deloria in Denetdale 2004:140–142). In an important comparative approach, Rothschild (2003) shows how gender roles in two different situations of colonial encounters with Native Americans were at work in what are very varied experiences of colonialism. Mihesuah (2003) remarks that most who write today about Native women are not aware of or do not understand the very powerful legacies that women have within tribal tra-

ditions, and yet Native women are very much concerned with looking to their past for motivation. This is something to which feminist archaeologies can contribute.

Indigenous views can offer to feminists some very differently articulated visions of the relations between gender and power in the life-ways of a people. In his compelling article on "outsider jurisprudence," Williams uses the Iroquois example to suggest that a better understanding of gender roles *in an Iroquois cultural context* has the real possibility of engendering valuable insights and strategies immediately relevant and useful to "the outsider jurisprudential project of dismantling white patriarchy in our own society" (Williams 1989–1990:1043). This dismantling project is, of course, one that feminists would share.

The Archaeology of Space

At a somewhat different analytical level, an archaeology informed by both feminist and Indigenous perspectives could reconceptualise and reframe how we approach, understand, and interpret "space." On the one hand, there is an extremely rich literature from the feminist perspective in geography (e.g., Currie and Rothenberg 2001; Massey 1994; McDowell and Sharp 1997; Moore 1986). On the other hand, there has been innovative work in archaeology that has questioned the taken-for-granteds of imposing Western and colonisers' notions of space onto archaeological materials and settings (e.g., Byrne 2003; Rose and Clarke 1997), while recognising, at the same time, the ways in which spatial practises—such as those of spatial containment in the colonising processes (e.g., Byrne 2003; Casella 2000; Voss 2000)—impose foreign, disruptive, and alien spatiality on the subjects of study and in how we then represent them. To a certain extent, one must question the (usually undiscussed) application of "our" spatial concepts onto prehistoric sites and settings as well as in "activity area" research. Archaeology itself is a practise of spatial containment, where more or less bounded sites are the preferred object of inquiry, even for very mobile humans of the past, and where research practises—such as site excavation—are more highly valued than survey, with its presumed "messy" artefact "scatters" (e.g., Moser 1996).

Byrne (2003) makes two powerful points to illustrate these issues. First, he shows how the heritage archaeology of the postcontact period in Australia, and the places it inventories, privileges loci of spatial containment: mission stations, massacre sites, institutional "homes" for Aboriginal children. These are places, he suggests, where Indigenous peoples rarely went unless they had to, and are places that certainly do not represent the spaces of everyday Aboriginal experience. In fact, an entire spectrum of Aboriginal postcontact experience within the larger colonial landscape is *not* visible, and these are the landscapes that are both the most interesting and the most crucial in the

everyday practises and the "nervous" spaces of race relations (see also Gill et al. 2004).

Thus, the second relevant point finds us, once again, confronting the epistemological and interpretive challenges of "visibility." Just as feminist archaeologists and those engaging with gender continue to be challenged about the very "visibility" of sex and gender, so, too, are Indigenous archaeological inquiries into contact/postcontact times. These were times of racial segregation that appear to have rendered a specific "invisibility." In North America, many so-called contact archaeology studies have privileged the more obvious colonial imprint, and, as pointed out above, the very historiography has rendered much invisible, and intentionally so (e.g., Handsman and Richmond 1995).

In Wylie's introduction to the important volume *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists* (Dongoske et al. 2000), she identifies three "persistent themes" for those collaborative projects that seem to work. Certainly her first theme has been central to the feminist project as well—both in archaeology and more widely—namely, "a willingness to consider other ways of knowing" (Wylie 2000b:viii). Many feminist and other postpositivist philosophies of science have discussed and debated this, and Wylie has pointed out that, in fact, this attitude is actually integral to the scientific process that archaeologists have themselves championed for many decades. Minimally, we gain a more critical appreciation of the strengths and limitations of our own systems of knowledge by engaging with the "empirical knowledge systems" of other cultures (Harding 2003:63). We must engage with the reality that there are a variety of epistemic bases for researching and understanding the past, something that has come only slowly (if at all) to many archaeologists.

From the perspective of the Indigenous scholar and the Native woman, feminist scholars "must abandon being an expert on what counts as important knowledge about Native women. If feminist scholars can engage in reciprocal, practical dialogue with their informants, then Native voices, too, will become part of feminist discourse" (Mihesuah 2003:8). The same general observation applies to archaeologists, and, in fact, Wylie's second persistent theme that she sees in the successful collaborative projects is a commitment to the "cultivation" not only of this reciprocity but also of "accountability in both an intellectual and political sense" (Wylie 2000b:ix; see also Watkins et al. 1995).

What Are Some of the Problems and Tensions?

While both Indigenous and feminist archaeologists would share critiques of Western science, what to do about this will vary and even differ. Both will face different challenges and present different responses to negotiating some sort of connection (or not) between feminist and Indigenous commitments, on

the one hand, and the broadly scientific ones that continue to prevail in contemporary archaeology. There will be some suspicions about how one perspective may be trying to (even unconsciously) co-opt the other; after all, what justifications do I have in making some of the statements that I have laid out here, especially in regard to Indigenous scholarship, research, and peoples?

It would be unusual if what feminists and what Indigenous scholars took as their "bottom lines" were the same, once we move beyond our mutual concerns for survival and human rights. For Indigenous peoples, self-determination and revised definitions and practises of "protection" and "ownership" of cultural resources, heritage, histories, and integrity are likely to be "bottom line." They are not likely to prioritise how knowledge of their specific pasts and cultural histories can contribute to an overarching understanding of humanity: of the "human career" or "what it means to be human." For feminists, an analysis of gender, but as a very different and constantly evolving concept, is perhaps a "bottom line" (Longino 1994)—at least until we better understand how social inequalities have emerged and societies today can be transformed. "Feminism is not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women will have equal rights with men; it is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination" (Collins 1990:37–38).

Indigenous peoples are unlikely to respect the "territorial" notions that some scholars have about "their" subject area when it involves Indigenous knowledge, place, history, and people. In fact, intellectual property has emerged as one of the most critical fulcrums of debate (e.g., Brown 1998, 2003, especially pp. 299–301; Nicholas and Bannister 2004; Riley 2004; and references therein). The most sensitive issues of concern, for example, to American Indians have been cited as the use of oral histories as source material, remuneration to tribes for information received, and the question of who benefits from research on Indians (Mihesuah 1998b:x). Nicholas and Bannister (2004) point out that, despite the perception that most outcomes of archaeology have limited practical application, these outcomes increasingly have potential applications and they very much "matter" to those who are descendant groups—groups who may themselves be caught up in twenty-first-century political, legal, and cultural contestations (330). Thus, there will be, or should be, tensions and contestations over such things as "ownership of, copyright in, or trademarks related to the artefacts, designs, or marks uncovered during archaeological research," as well as "fiduciary duties related to the secrecy of sacred sites, which could also include copyright in maps" (330).

The very nature of an "archaeology of difference" (but see Torrence and Clarke 2000) is likely to be contested, especially if the approaches are based on a somewhat neoliberal pluralistic stance and/or emphasise static identities at the cost of really probing the structural dynamics of the social relations of appropriation. All too often the impression is that there is or can be a positive coexistence among different subject positions, and that some approaches to

"difference" and "diversity" tend to allow for multiple subjectivities, yet enclose them into static identities (Anzaldúa 1990:xxi–xxii). "Lacking an analysis of forms of consciousness and social relations, theories of 'difference' lack the potential for a revolutionary politics" (Bannerji 1992:86). This is a potential trap that feminists perhaps once already fell into, as was much critiqued by third-wave feminists—a trap that should be anticipated by the intersectionalities of feminist and Indigenous archaeologies.

Archaeology as Transformative Practises/Inspirations from Activist Sources

> Difference must not be merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways to actively "be" in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are not charters. (Lorde 1981:99)

A little more than a decade ago, Janet Spector's book *What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village* (1993) was published; in it she made an explicit stand, not only for advancing what a feminist analysis and interpretation of an archaeological site and its peoples could look like, but also for a genuine and integral inclusion of Indian voices and perspectives. In 1991, Spector had noted that "the same general problem that afflicted archaeology with respect to women also applied to the situation of Indian people" (Spector 1991:394). Also more than a decade ago, McGuire (1992) called for a dialogue with Indigenous peoples (especially in reference to Indians in North America) that would fundamentally alter the practise of archaeology. Feminist archaeologists have also hoped for and worked towards transformation. What would such a transformation look like, and why is there such potential to effect it by means of some intersectionality between Indigenous and feminist archaeologies? Transformation, it has been noted, "entails taking on, and engaging and allying with, all parts of society rather than falling back on ourselves" (Lâm 1994:879).

Just as some feminists call for an archaeology that goes in additional directions besides "finding the women," Indigenous archaeologists would surely call for an archaeology that goes well beyond "working together" (archaeologists and Native peoples) and "adding Indigenous voices," even if both of these are crucial starting points. Views on notions such as "ownership" and "protection" (of cultural resources) must change for there to be a truly Indigenous archaeology (Watkins 2000:178). Indigenous archaeologists envision "archaeology as a discipline that is developed with the control and influence of Indigenous populations around the world" (Watkins 2000:xiii). Feminists in archaeology

are calling for a thorough reconceptualisation of the research process, as well as more emphasis on assuming ethical and political responsibilities for knowledge production and on a constant spirit of revision and reflexivity. Both, it would seem, would advocate strongly for not only the recognition of different publics and the creation, even, of "counterpublics," but also knowledge production and dissemination to *many* publics, even if it requires—as it will—a variety of media and messages.

Both feminist and Indigenous archaeologists would agree that research is not innocent, neutral, dispassionate, or "objective" but is something that is embedded in a set of social and political conditions and selective contexts. In all research, something(s) is (are) at stake. Indigenous archaeologists are concerned to understand and show the complex ways in which the pursuit of archaeological knowledge is, and certainly has been, "deeply embedded in multiple layers of imperial and colonial practices" (Smith 1999:2). They want to tell an alternative, but no less "real," story. One alternative story to tell is a story about research itself, which, as feminists would agree, is not just the more or less systematic scientific collection of data by practising and professional archaeologists. It is also the other "collectings" and "tellings" about lives and histories, about women and men, about culture and power. The very social and contextual factors that can be identified to influence scientific research are, in fact, not just sources of influence, but in themselves resources that can be drawn upon both to critique and to open up new and previously unimagined kinds of research.

From the critiques of science and from the concept of intersectionality, we resist and refuse dichotomous thinking, especially the tendency to "pull apart various pieces of social reality" (Collins 1999:278). The point is not just to add feminist/gender concerns to Indigenous archaeologies, or to add Indigenous concerns and perspectives to feminist archaeologies. Rather, we feminists, for example, must recognise that our very conceptual framework is embedded in the social hierarchies and intellectual histories of which "gender" is but one thread. As archaeologists attempting to infer something about the social inequalities of the human past; about how "difference" might have worked; and about the ways in which social identities and ideologies were in production—creating subjects as well as histories—we have much to learn from Indigenous perspectives and peoples who have also "lived" and have themselves been constituted by such processes and practises. Both Indigenous and feminist archaeologies are "lived research" (Fonow and Cook 1991).

Together, we may better understand how to historicise experience, work with historicised oral traditions, reconceptualise the research process, complicate our categories and framing concepts, such as "gender," and scrutinise the varied and yet often intersecting specific locations from which we try to envision the past, with its visibilities and its invisibilities. The feminist archaeologist can now recognise not only that an exclusively gendered analysis of

archaeology and of the cultural past has limitations, but also *how* it can be limited.

One "lesson" for feminist archaeologists from Indigenous concerns, and one lesson for Indigenous archaeologists from feminist concerns, would be that we can each benefit from "treating our own perspectives as just one of many possible points of view affected by white patriarchal systems of racism, colonialism, sexism and homophobia" (Williams 1989–1990:1044). Feminists and Indigenous rights activists could agree that we need an active, creative, conscious, fully subjective ground for direct political agency (see Bannerji 1992:86, 89). Might we anticipate that the intersectionalities could provide a crucible within which a doubly revolutionary social project could emerge?

Together we have more precise ways to expand archaeology so as to push it past the current limits of its own partialities. Both perspectives will productively disrupt settled assumptions, and, as Alison Wylie has often suggested, we will learn entirely new things about our cultural pasts, while simultaneously taking account of—and being accountable for—the epistemic and political commitments that inform our respective and intersected research practises.

Is this, perhaps, part of a reweaving of the very fabric of archaeology, with a different warp and weft, with different relations among the threads? In a moment of optimism, Rowlands (1998) suggests that there are many signs in archaeology that the "powerless" have been taking back their archaeological and historical pasts, often, as he notes, "reshaping them in local terms that do not describe them as a variant of food production, urbanism or the origins of the state" (332). He attributes this to the emergent colonial archaeology and archaeologies of colonialism, but he neglects to include feminist archaeologies that have worked at this for decades (Conkey and Spector 1984; Pyburn 2004). But whatever the motivations and sources, these archaeologies, now further propelled by the mobilisation of Indigenous archaeologies and, I would add, by the intersections among them, are enabled to effect the clearing of the terrain that is required "in order to create new pasts to allow new futures" (Rowlands 1998:332).

There can be no conclusion to this paper, in that there is much work to be done, there are many voices to be heard, and there is genuine engagement to take place. The idea here was to put forth some musings, some observations, and mostly some aspirations. Perhaps the stormy climate of the 1980s between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples (at least in North America) has moved now to a situation, as Roger Echo-Hawk describes it, of a "kinder, gentler, rain" (Echo-Hawk 2000:7). Reports from Australia suggest a notable increase in "working together" especially in regard to documentation of land claims and Native title. There is real work for archaeology to do in the troubled contemporary world of culture and politics, but we can no longer be the insulated team of scientists; there are many publics to which we must be responsible (Zimmerman et al. 2003). One alternative story to tell is a story about research

itself (e.g., Rubertone 2001:ix, 188–190). A most suitable metaphor for describing the archaeological process is that of a child's string game (often called cat's cradle) in which one needs several participants to play—with each one taking turns, plucking and pulling up on the string held on one's fingers, pulling this string and that, into new designs and patterns. To paraphrase Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), the message here to communities of practitioners is that we have "issues that matter" and "methodologies that will work" for us (161).

Acknowledgments

This paper was written during my tenure as a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, and I am deeply grateful for the time and multiple sources of support that made it possible. I am also thankful to Joan Gero for the original invitation to present a plenary session at the Fifth World Archaeological Congress in Washington, DC, in June 2003. This is where I first took on some inquiry with this topic, and I benefited enormously from the long and engaged forum of many participants at that event. Claire Smith and Nick Shepherd are to be thanked not just for inviting me to do this paper but for their encouragement and patience; the journal's reviewers added many refinements in content and presentation. This became a much longer and longer-term writing project than originally envisioned: I had to take my own advice and "do the reading." My intellectual and collaborative debt to Alison Wylie should be manifest in the abundant citations to her important work, and to our collective project with many others probing the ways in which we can do archaeology as feminists. Lastly, I have been inspired to keep at this topic by numerous colleagues, graduate students, and post-docs at Berkeley, both Native and non-Native, who are the ones really implementing new versions of archaeology.

References Cited

Abu-Lughod, L.
1990. Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography? *Women and Performance* 5:7–27.

Aga Khan, S., and H. bin Talal
1987. *Indigenous Peoples: A Global Quest for Justice; A Report for the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Affairs.* Zed Books, London.

Alarcón, N.
1990. The Theoretical Subject(s) of *This Bridge Called My Back* and Anglo-American Feminism. In *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color*, edited by G. Anzaldúa, pp. 356–369. Aunt Lute Books, San Francisco, California.

Anyon, R., T.J. Ferguson, L. Jackson, and L. Lane
2000. Native American Oral Traditions and Archaeology. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by K.E. Dongoske, M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner, pp. 61–66. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Anzaldúa, G.
1983. Preface. In *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by C. Moraga and G. Anzaldúa. Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press, New York.
1990. Haciendo Caras, Una Entrada. In *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, edited by G. Anzaldúa, pp. xv–xxvii. Aunt Lute Books, San Francisco, California.

Arnold, B., and N.L. Wicker (editors)
2001. *Gender and the Archaeology of Death*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Atalay, S.
2003. Domesticating Clay: Engaging with "They"; The Social Life of Clay Balls from Çatalhüyök, Turkey, and Public Archaeology for Indigenous Communities. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley.
2004. Sites of Power: Multiple Voices for Many Ears in Indigenous Archaeological Practice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Montreal, Canada. To appear in *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, and Imperialist Archaeologies*, edited by C. Fawcett, J. Matsunaga, and J. Habu.

Bacus, E., A.W. Barker, J.D. Bonevich, S.L. Dunavan, and J.B. Fitzhugh (editors)
1993. *A Gendered Past: A Critical Bibliography of Gender in Archaeology*. Technical Reports. University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, Ann Arbor.

Bannerji, H.
1992. But Who Speaks for Us? Experience and Agency in Conventional Feminist Paradigms. In *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles*, edited by Himani Bannerji, L. Carty, K. Dehli, S. Heald, and K. McKenna, pp. 67–108. South End Press, Boston, Massachusetts.

Bannerji, H., L. Carty, K. Dehli, S. Heald, and K. McKenna (editors)
1992. *Unsettling Relations: The University as a Site of Feminist Struggles*. South End Press, Boston, Massachusetts.

Bauerle, P., C. Carroll, R. DeLugan, and B.R. Middleton
2004. CRG Hosts Three-Day Indigeneity Conference (Beyond Race and Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century). *Faultlines: News and Notes from the Center for Race and Gender* 3(1):8–11, 13. Center for Race and Gender, University of California, Berkeley.

Bertelsen, R., A. Lillehammer, and J-R. Naess
1987. *Were They All Men? An Examination of Sex Roles in Prehistoric Society.* Arkeologisk museumi Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway.

Birckhead, J., T. de Lacy, and L. Smith (editors)
1992. *Aboriginal Involvement in Parks and Protected Areas.* Report Series, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra, Australia.

Bradley, R.
2002. Fieldwork and Its Discontents: Confessions from the Clavia Cairns. Between Materiality and Interpretation: Archaeological Confessions, Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, Colorado.

Bray, T. (editor)
2001. *The Future of the Past: Archaeologists, Native Americans, and Repatriation.* Garland Press, New York.

Brown, M.F.
1998. Can Culture Be Copyrighted? *Current Anthropology* 39:193–222.
2003. *Who Owns Native Culture?* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Brumfiel, E.
1992. Breaking and Entering the Ecosystem: Gender, Class, and Faction Steal the Show. *American Anthropologist* 94(3):551–567.
1998. A Role for Archaeology in Feminist and Gender Studies. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Burton, A.
2000. Optical Illusions. *Women's Review of Books* 17(5):21–22.

Butler, J.
1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Routledge, New York.

Byrne, D.R.
2003. Nervous Landscapes: Race and Space in Australia. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(2):169–193.

Carby, H.
1987. *Reconstructing Womanhood: The Emergence of the Afro-American Woman Novelist.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Casella, E.C.
2000. Bulldaggers and Gentle Ladies: Archaeological Approaches to Female Homosexuality in Convict-Era Australia. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited by R.A. Schmidt and B.L. Voss, pp. 143–159. Routledge, London.

Chato, G., and C. Conte
1988. The Legal Rights of American Indian Women. In *Western Women: Their Land, Their Lives*, edited by L. Schlissel, V. Ruiz, and J. Monk, pp. 229–246. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Claassen, C., and R. Joyce (editors)
1997. *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica.* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Clements, J.
2004. A Winding Sheet for Deborah George: Searching for the Women of Ponkapoag. Ph.D. dissertation, Program in Women's Studies, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Code, L.
1991. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

Collins, P.H.
1986. Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems* 33(6):14–32.
1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* Chapman and Hall, Routledge, New York.
1999. Moving beyond Gender: Intersectionality and Scientific Knowledge. In *Revisioning Gender*, edited by M.M. Ferree, J. Lorber, and B.B. Hess, pp. 261–284. Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.

Conkey, M.W.
1993. Making the Connections: Feminist Theory and Archaeologies of Gender. In *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique*, edited by H. DuCros and L. Smith, pp. 3–15. Department of Prehistory Monographs No. 23, Australian National University, Canberra.
2000. Meanwhile, Back at the Village: Debating the Archaeologies of Sexuality. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited by R.A. Schmidt and B.L. Voss, pp. 287–294. Routledge, London.
2001. Epilogue: Thinking about Gender with Theory and Method. In *Gender in Pre-Hispanic America*, edited by C. Klein, pp. 341–362. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC.
2003. Has Feminism Changed Archaeology? *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28(1):867–880.

Conkey, M.W., and A. Wylie (conveners)
1998. Doing Archaeology as a Feminist. School for American Research Advanced Seminar, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Conkey, M.W., and J. Gero
1997. Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 26:411–437.

Conkey, M.W., and J. Spector
1984. Archaeology and the Study of Gender. In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 7, edited by M.B. Schiffer, pp. 1–38. Academic Press, New York.

Conkey, M.W., and R. Tringham
1996. Cultivating Thinking/Challenging Authority: Some Experiments in Feminist Pedagogy in Archaeology. In *Archaeology and Gender*, edited by R.B. Wright, pp. 224–250. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Conkey, M.W., with S. Williams
1991. Original Narratives: The Political Economy of Gender in Archaeology. In *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Age*, edited by M. di Leonardo, pp. 102–139. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Cornell, D., G. Fraisse, S. Niranjana, Raja Ben Slama, L. Waldman, and Li Xiao-Jian
2004. *Keywords: Gender*. Other Press, New York.

Craven, R.
1996. *Using the Right Words: Appropriate Terminology for Indigenous Australian Studies*. School for Teacher Education, University of New South Wales, in association with the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, Sydney.

Crenshaw, K.W.
1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43:1241–1299.

Crown, P.L. (editor)
2000. *Women and Men in the Prehispanic Southwest*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Cruikshank, J.
1998. *The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Currie, G., and C. Rothenberg (editors)
2001. *Feminist (Re)Visions of the Subject: Landscapes, Ethnoscapes, and Theoryscapes*. Lexington Books, Lanham, Maryland.

Davidson, I., C. Lovell-Jones, and R. Bancroft (editors)
1995. *Archaeologists and Aborigines Working Together*. University of New England Press, Armidale, New South Wales, United Kingdom.

de Lauretis, T.
1987. *Technologies of Gender*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Delle, J., S.A. Mrozowski, and R. Paynter (editors)
2000. *Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Deloria, V., Jr.
1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Macmillan, London.

Denetdale, J.N.
2004. Planting Seeds of Ideas and Raising Doubts about What We Believe: An Interview with Vine Deloria, Jr. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4(2):131–146.

Dobres, M-A.
1995. Gender and Prehistoric Technology: On the Social Agency of Technical Strategies. *World Archaeology* 27(1):25–49.
2000. *Technology and Social Agency.* Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Donald, M., and L. Hurcombe (editors)
2000. *Gender and Material Culture in Archaeological Perspective.* St. Martin's, New York.

Dongoske, K.E., M. Aldenderfer, and K.Doehner (editors)
2000. *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists.* Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

DuCros, H., and L. Smith (editors)
1993. *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique.* Occasional Papers in Prehistory, Department of Prehistory Monographs No. 23. Australian National University, Canberra.

Echo-Hawk, R.
1993. Exploring Ancient Worlds. *SAA Bulletin* 11(4):5–6.
2000. Exploring Ancient Worlds. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by K.E. Dongoske, M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner, pp. 3–7. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Faulstich, P., P.S.C. Taçon, and S. Ouzman
2003. Rock-Art and Relationships: An Introduction. *Before Farming* 1:227–237.

Ferguson, T.J.
1996. Native Americans and the Practice of Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25:63–79.
2000. NHPA: Changing the Role of Native Americans in the Archaeological Study of the Past. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by K.E. Dongoske, M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner, pp. 25–36. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Ferguson, T.J., K.E. Dongoske, M. Yeatts, and L.J. Kuwanwisiwma
2000. Hopi Oral History and Archaeology. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by K.E. Dongoske, M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner, pp. 45–60. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Fonow, M.M., and J.A. Cook (editors)
1991. *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research.* Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Franklin, M.
2001. A Black Feminist-Inspired Archaeology? *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1):108–125.

Frink, L., and K. Weedman (editors)
2005. *Gender and Hide Production.* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Gero, J.

1991. Who Experienced What in Prehistory? A Narrative Explanation from Queyash, Peru. In *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeologies: Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past*, edited by R. Preucel, pp. 126–139. Southern Illinois University Center for Archaeological Excavation, Carbondale.

1996. Archaeological Practice and Gendered Encounters with Field Data. In *Gender and Archaeology*, edited by R.B. Wright. pp. 251–280. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

1998. Problematizing Certitude/Honoring Ambiguity. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Gero, J., and M. Conkey (editors)

1991. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Gero, J. M., D. Lacy, and M. Blakey (editors)

1983. *The Socio-Politics of Archaeology*. Department of Anthropology Research Report No. 23. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Gilchrist, R.

1994. *Gender and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Religious Women*. Routledge, London.

Gill, N., A. Paterson, and M. Japanangka Kennedy

2004. Murphy, Do You Want to Delete This? In *Hidden Histories and Hidden Landscapes in the Murchison and Davenport Ranges, Northern Territory, Australia*. Northern Australia Research Unit, Darwin, Northern Territory.

Gosden, C.

2001. Postcolonial Archaeology: Issues of Culture, Identity and Knowledge. In *Archaeological Theory Today*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 241–261. Polity Press and Blackwell, Oxford and Malden, Massachusetts.

Hamilakis, Y.

2004. Archaeology and the Politics of Pedagogy. *World Archaeology* 36(2):287–309.

Handsman, R., and. T.L. Richmond

1995. Confronting Colonialism: The Mahican and Schaghticoke Peoples and Us. In *Making Alternate Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, edited by P.R. Schmidt and T.C. Patterson, pp. 87–117. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Hanen, M., and J. Kelley

1992. Gender and Archaeological Knowledge. In *Metaarchaeology*, edited L. Embree, pp. 195–225. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Haraway, D.

1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse in the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14(3):575–600.

Harding, S.
2003. A World of Sciences. In *Science and Other Cultures. Issues in Philosophies of Science and Technology*, edited by R. Figueroa and S. Harding, pp. 49–69. Routledge, New York.

Harding, S. (editor)
2004. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. Routledge, New York.

Hartman, H.
1981. The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union. In *Women and Revolution: The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, edited L. Sargent, pp. 1–42. South End Press, Boston.

Hays-Gilpin, K.
2000a. Feminist Scholarship in Archaeology. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571:89–106.
2000b. Gender Ideology and Ritual Activities. In *Women and Men in the Prehispanic Southwest*, edited by P.L. Crown, pp. 91–136. School for American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
2003. *Ambiguous Images: Gender and Rock Art*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Hoikkala, P.
1995. Mothers and Community Builders: Salt River Pima and Maricopa Women in Community Action. In *Negotiators of Change: Historical Perspectives on Native American Women*, edited by N. Shoemaker, pp. 213–234. Routledge, London.

Hudecek-Cuffe, C.R.
1998. *Engendering Northern Plains PaleoIndian Archaeology*. BAR International Series No. 699. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Hull, G.T., P.B. Scott, and B. Smith (editors)
1982. *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave*. Feminist Press, Westbury, New York.

Indigenous Women and Feminism: Culture, Activism, Politics
2005. Conference to be held August 2005, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Jacobs, M.D.
1999. *Engendered Encounters: Feminism and Pueblo Cultures*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Jay, M.
2005. *Songs of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Jayaratne, T.E., and A.J. Stewart
1991. Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences. In *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Experience*, edited by M.M. Fonow and J.A. Cook, pp. 85–106. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Joyce, R.

1998a. Performing the Body in Prehispanic Central America. *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 33(Spring):147–165.

1998b. Why Archaeology Should Be Seen as Storytelling. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1998c. Accountability and Responsibility in Storytelling. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

2000. Girling the Girl and Boying the Boy: The Production of Adulthood in Ancient Mesoamerica. *World Archaeology* 31(3):473–483.

2001. *Gender and Power in Prehispanic Mesoamerica*. University of Texas Press, Austin.

2002a. *The Languages of Archaeology*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

2002b. The Return of the First Voice. In *The Languages of Archaeology*, pp. 133–144. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Joyce, R., and R. Preucel

2002. Writing the Field of Archaeology. In *The Languages of Archaeology*, by R. Joyce, pp. 18–38. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Kästner, S., and S. M. Karlisch

1991. *Reader zum Symposium: Feminismus und Archäologie?! Symposium Feminismus und Archäologie?!* Institut für Vor-und Frühgeschicte, Tübingen, Germany.

Keller, E.F.

1985. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

2000. Women, Gender, and Science: Some Parallels between Primatology and Developmental Biology. In *Primate Encounters: Models of Science, Gender, and Society*, edited by S.C. Strum and. L.M. Fedigan, pp. 382–397. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Kent, S. (editor)

1998. *Gender in African Prehistory*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Klein, C.

2001a. Conclusions: Envisioning Pre-Columbian Gender Studies. In *Gender in Pre-Hispanic America*, edited by C. Klein, pp. 363–386. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC.

Klein, C. (editor)

2001b. *Gender in Pre-Hispanic America*. Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, DC.

Kohl, P., and C. Fawcett (editors)

1996. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Kus, S.

2002. An Archaeologist's Imagination: Sympathetic Magic or Studied Audacity? Between Materiality and Interpretation: Archaeological Confessions, Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, Colorado.

Lâm, M.C.
1994. Feeling Foreign in Feminism. *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19(4):865–893.

Lane, P.
1998. Engendered Spaces and Bodily Practices in the Iron Age of Southern Africa. In *Gender in African Prehistory*, edited by S. Kent, pp. 179–203. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Layton, R. (editor)
1989a. *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*. Unwin Hyman, London and Boston.
1989b. *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. One World Archaeology. Unwin Hyman, London and Boston.

Layton, T.N.
2002. *Gifts from the Celestial Kingdom: A Shipwrecked Cargo for Gold Rush California*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Leone, M.P., P.B. Potter, and P.A. Shackel
1987. Toward a Critical Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28(3):283–302.

Lightfoot, K.G.
2000. Comments on "Puvunga and Point Conception: A Comparative Study of Southern Indian Traditionalism," by Matthew A. Boxt and L. Mark Raab. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 22(1):74–77.
2005. *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants. The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Lilley, I. (editor)
2000. *Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World*. Oceania Monographs No. 50. University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

Linduff, K., and Yan Sun (editors)
2004. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Lloyd, E.
1995. Objectivity and the Double Standard for Feminist Epistemologies. *Synthese* 104:351–381.
1997. Science and Anti-science: Objectivity and Its Real Enemies. In *Feminism, Science and the Philosophy of Science*, edited by L.H. Nelson and J. Nelson, pp. 79–94. Kluwer, Boston.

Longino, H.
1993. Feminist Standpoint Theory and the Problems of Knowledge. *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19(1):201–212.
1994. In Search of Feminist Epistemology. *The Monist* 77(4):472–485.

Lorde, A.
1981. The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House. In *This Bridge Called My Back*, edited by C. Moraga and G. Anzaldúa. Persephone Press, Watertown, Massachusetts.
1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Crossing Press, Freedom, California.

Loring, S.
2001. Repatriation and Community Anthropology: The Smithsonian Institution's Arctic Studies Center. In *The Future of the Past: Archaeologists, Native Americans, and Repatriation*, edited by T. Bray, pp.185–200. Garland Press, New York.

Lovejoy, O.
1981. The Origins of Man. *Science* 211:341–350.

Lugones, M., and E. Spelman
1983. Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for the "Woman's Voice." *Women's Studies International Forum* 6(6):573–581.

MacKinnon, C.
1982. Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory. In *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology*, edited by M.Z. Rosaldo, N.O. Keohane, and B.C. Gelpi, pp.1–30. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Massey, D.
1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. University of Minneapolis Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

McDowell, L., and J.P. Sharp (editors)
1997. *Space, Gender, Knowledge: Feminist Readings*. J. Wiley, London.

McGuire, R.
1992. Archaeology and the First Americans. *American Anthropologist* 94:816–836.

Meskell, L.M.
1998. Intimate Archaeologies: The Case of Kha and Merit. *World Archaeology* 29:363–379.
2000. Feminism in Archaeology. *Encyclopedia of Feminist Theories*, edited by L. Code, pp. 26–27. Routledge, London.
2001. Archaeologies of Identity. *Archaeological Theory Today*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 187–213. Polity Press and Blackwell, Oxford and Malden, Massachusetts.
2002. The Intersections of Identity and Politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279–301.

Meskell, L.M., and R.A. Joyce
2003. *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Egyptian Experience*. Routledge, London.

Mihesuah, D.A.
1993. Suggested Guidelines for Institutions with Scholars Who Conduct Research on American Indians. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 17(3):131–139.
1998b. Preface. In *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, edited by D.A. Mihesuah, pp. ix–xi. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

2000. A Few Cautions at the Millenium on the Merging of Feminist Studies with American Indian Women's Studies. *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25(4):1247–1251.
2003. *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, Activism.* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Mihesuah, D.A. (editor)
1998a. *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians.* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

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

Minow, M.
1988. Feminist Reason: Getting It and Losing It. *Journal of Legal Education* 38:47–60.

Mohanty, C.T.
1987. Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience. *Copyright* (Fall).
1991. Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by C.T. Mohanty, A. Russo, and L. Torres, pp. 51–80. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Mohanty, C.T., A. Russo, and L. Torres (editors)
1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism.* Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Moore, H.
1986. *Space, Text, and Gender: An Anthropological Study of the Marakwet of Kenya.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
2001. Afterword: A "Masterclass" in Subjectivity. In *Feminist (Re)Visions of the Subject: Landscapes, Ethnoscapes, and Theoryscapes*, edited by G. Currie and C. Rothenberg, pp. 261–266. Lexington Books, Lanham, Maryland.

Moore, J., and E. Scott (editors)
1997. *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology.* Leicester University Press, London.

Moraga, C., and G. Anzaldúa (editors)
1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color.* Persephone Press, Watertown, Massachusetts.

Moser, S.
1996. Science, Stratigraphy, and the Deep Sequence: Excavations vs. Regional Survey and the Question of Gendered Practice in Archaeology. *Antiquity* 70:813–823.
1998. On Disciplinary Culture: Archaeology as Fieldwork and Its Gendered Associations. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mullins, P.R.
1999. *Race and Affluence: An Archaeology of African America and Consumer Culture.* Plenum, New York.

Naples, N.A.
2003. *Feminism and Method.* Routledge, London.

Nassaney, M.S.
2000. Archaeology and Oral Tradition in Tandem: Interpreting Native American Ritual, Ideology and Gender Relations in Contact-Period Southeastern New England. In *Interpretations of Native North American Life*, edited by M.S. Nassaney and E.S. Johnson, pp. 412–431. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.
2004. Native American Gender Politics and Material Culture in Seventeenth-Century Southeastern New England. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4(3):334–367.

Nelson, S.M.
2004. *Gender in Archaeology. Analyzing Power and Prestige*, 2nd ed. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Nelson, S.M. (editor)
2006. *Handbook of Gender in Archaeology.* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Nicholas, G.
2001. The Past and Future of Indigenous Archaeology: Global Challenges, North American Perspectives, Australian Prospects. *Australian Archaeology* 52(June):29–40.
2003. Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology. Paper presented at the Fifth World Archaeology Conference, Washington, DC.

Nicholas, G.P., and K.P. Bannister
2004. Copyrighting the Past? Emerging Intellectual Property Rights Issues in Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 45(3):327–350.

Nicholas, G.P., and T.D. Andrews
1997. *At a Crossroads: Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada.* Archaeology Press and Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Nicholson, L.J.
1990. Introduction. In *Feminism/Postmodernism*, edited by L.J. Nicholson, pp.1–16. Routledge, New York.

O'Donovan, M., L.Wurst, and R. McGuire
2001. Marxism and Feminism in Archaeology: A Brief History of Contradiction and Consensus. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.

Oyewumi, O.
1999. Multiculturalism or Multibodism: On the Impossible Intersections of Race and Gender in White Feminist and Black Nationalist Discourses. *Western Journal of Black Studies* 23(3):182–189.

Peck, T., E. Siegfried, and G. Oetlaar (editors)
2003. *Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology*. University of Calgary Archaeological Association, Calgary, Canada.

Peterson, J.
2002. *Sexual Revolutions: Gender and Labor at the Dawn of Agriculture*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Pluciennik, M.
1999. Archaeological Narratives and Other Ways of Telling. *Current Anthropology* 40:653–678.

Praetzellis, A.
2000. *Death by Theory: A Tale of Mystery and Archaeological Theory*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
2003. *Dug to Death: A Tale of Archaeological Method and Mayhem*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Preucel, R., and I. Hodder
1996. Part IX Dialogue: Theoretical Archaeological Discourse. In *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory*, edited by R. Preucel and I. Hodder, pp. 667–678. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Pyburn, A.
2002. Teaching Archaeology as a Global Resource. Symposium organised for the European Archaeological Association, annual conference, Thessaloniki, Greece.
2003. What Are We Really Teaching in Archaeological Field Schools? In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by L. Zimmerman, K. Vitelli, and J. Hollowell-Zimmer, pp. 213–224. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Pyburn, K.A. (editor)
2004. *Ungendering Civilization*. Routledge, London.

Reinharz, S.
1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Renfrew, C.
2001. From Social to Cognitive Archaeology: An Interview with Colin Renfrew. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1):13–33.

Riggs, E.M.
2004. Field-Based Education and Indigenous Knowledge: Essential Components of Geoscience Education for Native American Communities. Electronic document, published online (4 August 2004) in Wiley InterScience, www.interscience.wiley.com, accessed 20 October 2004.

Riley, M. (editor)
2004. *Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Rios, T., and K.M. Sands
2000. *Telling a Good One: The Process of a Native American Collaborative Biography*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Roberts, A.
2002. Indigenous South Australian Perspectives of Archaeology Project Report. Department of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia.

Rose, D.B., and A. Clarke (editors)
1997. *Tracking Knowledge in North Australian Landscapes: Studies in Indigenous and Settler Ecological Knowledge Systems.* North Australia Research Unit, Darwin, Northern Territory.

Rothschild, N.
2003. *Colonial Encounters in a Native American Landscape: The Spanish and Dutch in North America.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Rowlands, M.
1998. The Archaeology of Colonialism. In *Social Transformations in Archaeology: Global and Local Perspectives*, edited by K. Kristiansen and M. Rowlands, pp. 327–333. Routledge, London.

Rubertone, P.E.
2001. *Grave Undertakings: An Archaeology of Roger Williams and the Naragansett Indians.* Smithsonian Institute Press, Washinton, DC.

Russo, A.
1991. We Cannot Live without Our Lives. In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by C.T. Mohanty, A. Russo, and L. Torres, pp. 297–313. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Schmidt, P.R., and T.C. Patterson (editors)
1995. *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings.* School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Schmidt, R.A., and B.L. Voss (editors)
2000. *Archaeologies of Sexuality.* Routledge, London.

Schrire, C.
1995. *Digging through Darkness: Chronicles of an Archaeologist.* University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.

Scott, J.W.
1991. The Evidence of Experience. *Critical Inquiry* 17:773–797.
1992. Experience. In *Feminists Theorize the Political*, edited by J. Butler and J.W. Scott, pp. 22–40. Routledge, New York.

Seligman, L. (editor)
2001. *Women Traders in Cross-Cultural Perspective: Mediating Identities, Marketing Wares.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Smith, C.
2003. Teaching Archaeology for Fun. Symposium organised for the Fifth World Archaeological Congress, Washington, DC.

Smith, C., and G.K. Ward
2000. Preface. In *Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World*, pp. xiv–xvii. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, Canada.

Smith, C., and H.M. Wobst (editors)
2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice.* Routledge, London.

Smith, D.E.
1974. Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. *Sociological Inquiry* 44:7–13.
1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.
1990. *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.

Smith, L.T.
1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* Zed Books, London.

Snead, J.
2002. Time and the Tano: Archaeology, History and Interpretation in New Mexico's Galisteo. Between Materiality and Interpretation: Archaeological Confessions, Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Denver, Colorado.

Sørensen, M.L. Stig
2000. *The Archaeology of Gender.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Spector, J.
1991. What This Awl Means: Toward a Feminist Archaeology. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by J. Gero and M. Conkey, pp. 388–406. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.
1993. *What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology in a Wahpeton Dakota Village.* Minnesota Historical Society Press, Minneapolis.
1998. Writing Archaeology as a Feminist Political Activity. Paper presented at "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist," advanced seminar, organized by M. Conkey and A. Wylie. School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Spelman, E.V.
1988. *The Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought.* Beacon, Boston, Massachusetts.

Spielmann, K.
1994. A Feminist Approach to Archaeological Field Schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.
2000. Gender and Exchange. In *Women and Men in the Prehispanic Southwest*, edited by P.L. Crown, pp. 345–378. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Sterling, K.
2003. A Black Feminist at Home and Abroad. Paper presented at the Fifth World Archaeological Congress, Washington, DC.
2004. Black Feminisms in Archaeology. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Suleri, S.
1992. Woman Skin Deep: Feminism and the Postcolonial Condition. *Critical Inquiry* 18(Summer):756–769.

Sweely, T. (editor)
1999. *Manifesting Power: Gender and the Interpretation of Power in Archaeology.* Routledge, London.

Swidler, N., K. Dongoske, R. Anyon, and A.S. Downer (editors)
1997. *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground.* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Terrell, J.
1990. Storytelling and Prehistory. *Archaeological Method and Theory* 2:1–29.

Thomas, D.H.
2000. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity.* Basic Books, New York.

Torrence, R., and A. Clarke
2000. *The Archaeology of Difference: Negotiating Cross-Cultural Engagements in Oceania.* Routledge, London.

Trigger, B.
1980. Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity* 45(4):662–676.
1984. Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *MAN* (n.s.) 19:355–370.

Tringham, R.
1991. Households with Faces: The Challenge of Gender in Prehistoric Architectural Remains. In *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, edited by J. Gero and M. Conkey, pp. 93–131. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.
1994. Engendered Places in Prehistory. *Gender, Place and Culture* 1(2):169–203.

Voss, B.L.
2000. Colonial Sex: Archaeology, Structured Space and Sexuality in Alta California's Spanish Colonial Missions. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*, edited by R.A. Schmidt and B.L. Voss, pp. 35–61. Routledge, London.

Wadley, L. (editor)
1997. *Our Gendered Past: Archaeological Studies of Gender in Southern Africa.* University of Witwatersrand Press, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Wall, D.
1999. Examining Gender, Class and Ethnicity in Nineteenth-Century New York City. *Historical Archaeology* 33(1):102–117.

Watkins, J.
2000. *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice.* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Watkins, J., L. Goldstein, K. Vitelli, and L. Jenkins
1995. Accountability: Responsibilities of Archaeologists to Other Interest Groups. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990's*, edited by M. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 33–37. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Wilkie, L.A.
1996. Medicinal Teas and Patent Medicines: African-American Women's Consumer Choices and Ethnomedical Traditions at a Louisiana Plantation. *Southeastern Archaeology* 15:119–131.
2003. *The Archaeology of Mothering: An African-American Midwife's Tale.* Routledge, London.

Williams, Raymond
1983. *Keywords.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Williams, Robert
1989–1990. Gendered Checks and Balances: Understanding the Legacy of White Patriarchy in an American Indian Cultural Context. *Georgia Law Review 1989–1990*:1019–1044.

Williams, S.M., and J. Harjo
1998. American Indian Feminism. In *The Reader's Companion to U.S. Women's History*, edited by W. Mankiller, G. Mink, M. Navarro, B. Smith, and G. Steinheim, pp. 198–199. Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts.

Wilmer, F.
1993. *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, California.

Wilson, A.C., and M. Yellow Bird (editors)
2005. *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook.* School for American Research Press, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Wolf, E.
1984. *Europe and the People without History.* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Woody, A.
2000. The Power of the Past in the Present: Historic Uses of Rock Art in Nevada. Paper presented at the 64th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Wylie, A.
1992. The Interplay of Evidential Constraints and Political Interests: Recent Archaeological Research on Gender. *American Antiquity* 57(1):15–35.
1995a. Doing Philosophy as a Feminist: Longino on the Search for a Feminist Epistemology. *Philosophical Topics* 23(2):345–358.
1995b. Alternative Histories: Epistemic Disunity and Political Integrity. In *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western*

Settings, edited by P.R. Schmidt and T.C. Patterson, pp. 255–272. School of American Research Advanced Seminar Series, School of American Research, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

1997. The Engendering of Archaeology: Refiguring Feminist Science Studies. *Osiris* 12:80–99.

2000a. Standpoint Matters—In Archaeology, for Example. In *Primate Encounters: Models of Science, Gender, and Society*, edited by S.C. Strum and L.M. Fedigan, pp. 243–260. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

2000b. Foreword. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by K.E. Dongoske, M. Aldenderfer, and K. Doehner, pp. v–x. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

2003. Why Standpoint Matters. In *Philosophical Explorations of Science, Technology and Diversity*, edited by R. Figueroa and S. Harding, pp 26–48. Routledge, New York.

Wylie, A., and M. Conkey (editors)

n.d. Summary and Overview, An Introduction to the April 1998 Advanced Seminar, at the School of American Research: "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist." Manuscript being prepared for publication.

Young, M.E.

1980. Women, Civilization and the Indian Question. In *Clio Was a Woman: Studies in the History of American Women*, edited by M.E. Deutrich and V.C. Purdy, pp. 98–110. Howard University Press, Washington, DC.

Zimmerman, L.

1979. Indians, Archaeologists, and Bones: Spiritual and Ethical Considerations for the Crow Creek Dig. In *Relationships of the People to the Land*, pp. 32–43. Institute of Indian Studies, Vermillion, South Dakota.

1989a. Made Radical by My Own: An Archaeologist Learns to Understand Reburial. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 6–67. Unwin Hyman, London.

1989b. Human Bones as Symbols of Power: Native American Views of "Grave-Robbing" Archaeologists. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 211–216. Unwin Hyman, London.

1989c. The Present Past: An Examination of Archaeological and Native American Thinking about Law and Time. In *Thinking across Cultures*, edited by D.M. Topping, pp. 33–42. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Zimmerman, L., K. Vitelli, and J. Hollowell-Zimmer (editors)

2003. *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. AltaMira Press, in cooperation with the Society for American Archaeology, Walnut Creek, California.