edited by Jay T. Johnson and Soren C. Larsen

A DEEPER SENSE *of* PLACE

Stories and Journeys of Collaboration in Indigenous Research

Reconciling Cultural Resource Management with Indigenous Geographies

The Importance of Connecting Research with People and Place

RICK BUDHWA AND TYLER McCREARY

Although Indigenous peoples have possessed their own ways of knowing and being for millennia, the emergence of studies by researchers trained in the Western tradition that seek to articulate and respect this Indigenous depth of place remains a relatively recent phenomenon. Although there is a long genealogy of colonial research ventures that sought to extend Western epistemic and territorial claims by transliterating Indigenous knowledge into colonial frames (Braun 1997; Milligan and McCreary 2011; Pratt 1992; Smith 1999), emerging Indigenous-academic research is increasingly pursuing an alternate course. Such studies seek to recognize the significance of Indigenous ways of knowing and being, not simply as research data but as frameworks informing research activity (Battiste 2000; Garroutte 2003; Kuokkanen 2007; Wilson 2008). The Indigenization of research methods has been most apparent in Indigenous studies, but recent contributions within geography highlight the important contribution Indigenous ways of knowing and being can make to geographic research (J. T. Johnson and Murton 2007; Koster, Baccar, and Lemelin 2012; Louis 2007; Panelli 2008; Pearce and Louis 2008). In this essay, we seek to extend these discussions through a case study of Indigenous-academic collaboration in cultural resource management (CRM) in northwestern British Columbia, Canada.

Case studies typically revolve around an exploration of a particular community, but in this chapter we flip the gaze and instead investigate the experiences of a particular researcher, Rick Budhwa. In so doing, we demonstrate how research experiences in Indigenous community settings can highlight the shortcomings of governing research paradigms and contribute to the development of alternative approaches that seek to reconcile cultural resource management practices with an Indigenous depth of place. We begin with a discussion of how the prevalent archaeological

lens for research on cultural resource management continues to focus on material aspects of culture and displace understanding of Indigenous cultural resources from their relationships to their broader environment. We extend this with a discussion of the importance of being on the land to Indigenous ontologies, and how these ways of being are constituted through the traditional institutions of Indigenous governance. We then examine how the compartmentalization of dominant research paradigms obscures Indigenous ways of being and knowing. Finally, we explore how Indigenous-academic research collaborations, using a "landed" methodology that recognizes the importance spending time on Indigenous territories and listening to the voices of Indigenous peoples, contribute to alternative research paradigms that seek to recognize an Indigenous depth of place.

Interlacing personal narrative and academic argument, this chapter advances through the interplay between the main body of the text and a series of short vignettes drawn from Rick Budhwa's field notes and research reflections (set in italics). These vignettes illustrate the cross-cultural epistemic and ontological negotiation central to decolonizing research methods. Although this essay is the joint publication of both authors, we have chosen to privilege the stories of cultural immersion that occur in community-based research. We both descend from non-Indigenous migrants to northern British Columbia, Rick being born of mixed East- and West-Indian heritage in Kitimat, and Tyler descending from immigrants to Smithers of predominantly Irish heritage. We both continue to live in the north although we now occupy distinct positions with relation to our research work, Rick based in the community and Tyler out of the university. Although neither of us belongs wholly to the field or the cabinet, our collaboration has in part flourished due to our complementary roles. Despite the importance of library shelves and Internet searches in our work, we have increasingly found that it is the knowledge gleaned from personal experiences working in community that most radically revised our understanding. In developing our arguments about the necessity of interlacing academic and Indigenous epistemologies, we have attempted to integrate abstract theoretical and experiential bodies of knowledge. Although the essay remains the dominant mode of academic expression, Watson and Huntington (2008) have suggested the complexities of Indigenous epistemic spaces are best represented through narrative. Thus, we strategically switch between theory and narrative to elucidate the meaning of collaboration in community-based research.

Researching in the Shadow of Colonialism, or Eggheads and Indians

Cultural resource management (CRM) may be defined as the multiple processes through which archaeologists and other professionals manage the impacts of the modern world on cultural resources. Watkins and Beaver (2008, 10) define CRM

as the management of "cultural landscapes, archaeological sites, historical records, social institutions, expressive cultures, old buildings, religious beliefs and practices, folk life, artifacts and spiritual places." There are increasing efforts to integrate Indigenous concerns into CRM practices through instituting consultative processes (Budhwa 2005; Klassen, Budhwa, and Reimer 2009; Fuller 2011). Working with Indigenous communities serves to further challenge foundational binaries separating cultural resource management from natural resource management, as within these communities natural resources are often not easily distinguishable from cultural resources (J. T. Johnson and Murton 2007). For the Wet'suwet'en and Gitxsan people in northwest BC, culture and knowledge are not simply about things but refer to an epistemic space constituted through the social and spiritual relations between animals, environments, and humans (L. M. Johnson 2010; Mills 1994). However, in Canada development projects often equate CRM with archaeology (the study of past human behavior through material remains), echoing conditions Reba Fuller (2011) describes in the US context. In practice CRM often overemphasizes the material aspects of culture, particularly with respect to Indigenous peoples, and has yet to develop a robust approach to understanding the importance of the intangible aspects of place. Thus, in British Columbia, governing approaches to CRM continue to fail to register the full depth of Indigenous peoples' sense of place.

Archaeology remains a discipline entangled with the legacies of colonial research that informed its development. The governing practices of archaeology split Indigenous peoples from their complex cultural, political, and economic relationships to their surrounding environment, fixing Indigenous culture to a fragmented geography of villages and campsites, pit houses and caches, fishing holes, and trail markers. Further, as Mary Louise Pratt (1992, 132) describes, Western research "produces archeological subjects by splitting contemporary non-European peoples off from their precolonial, and even their colonial, pasts." Thus, traditional archaeological practice works to relegate Indigeneity to the past, positioning it as an anachronism and denying the dynamism of Indigenous cultures. Recognizing the connections between archaeology and colonial processes of deterritorialization, Joe Watkins (2005, 433) has suggested that archaeology, as a discipline, was "at least partially complicit in the removal of American Indians from their lands." Archaeologists are increasingly working to decolonize their discipline through more collaborative research processes (Budhwa 2005; Nicholas 2006) and an appreciation of how Indigenous knowledge can supplement their work (Budhwa 2002; Martindale and Marsden 2003), yet as a discipline, archaeology remains at a distance from Indigenous communities and their understanding of their cultural heritage. This is exemplified by Rick Budhwa's experience shifting from the academy to the community:

What I was taught in graduate school in the 1990s and actually being in First Nations communities and on the land were two very different things. Although I am grateful for my education, and the direction it propelled me, there remained gaps in my learning. Although I emerged from school with an appreciation for the environment, I lacked a serious and profound connection to the land. But it was only after developing relationships with the First Nations peoples of northwestern British Columbia that I was to become aware of this shortcoming.

After graduating in 2001, I was eager to apply my education. I knew about the Wet'suwet'en from books and media, and in May 2002, it was extremely fortuitous that the Office of the Wet'suwet'en (OW) located in Smithers, BC, had an opening for an archaeologist/anthropologist. The original intention of the OW was to guide the Wet'suwet'en through the British Columbia treaty process. However, by the time I had arrived, the OW's mandate became much larger and inclusive of many other sociocultural aspects of Wet'suwet'en governance and land management. Governed by the Wet'suwet'en hereditary chiefs residing throughout their traditional territories, the OW had developed into a central office for the exercise of Wet'suwet'en governance. Interacting with First Nations and public governments and institutions, including the provincial and federal government, development agencies, and research and educational institutions, the OW developed a significant profile. In fact, working together with the neighboring Gitxsan in the Delgamuukw and Gisdaywa case, the Wet'suwet'en achieved recognition by the Supreme Court of Canada of the evidentiary weight to First Nations' oral traditions. Suffice it to say, I was keenly aware of the OW, and leapt at the opportunity.

From the beginning of my work with the OW, I didn't have any apprehension about engaging their world—I never thought once about maintaining any level of distance, I just did it. I was learning about Wet'suwet'en culture immediately, and this learning process was like no other. I was seeing the world through a different lens that was radically enhancing everything. Being raised by a grandparent, I always respected my elders. But it's one thing to be raised by one grandparent and another thing to be raised by many. That's what it felt like, being surrounded by dozens of grandparents. There was an immediate connection that way. I listened. I heard their stories. And showing that respect got me a long way. These elders continually reminded me of the power of the spoken word.

It reminded me of how I saw the landscape differently after learning land formation processes when I took my first geomorphology course during my undergraduate studies in the mid-1990s. Where geomorphology brought to life the dynamic nature of the geophysical landscape, listening to people's stories exposed me to the living cultural landscape. Relating to people's connections to the landscape, I started viewing my surrounding environment differently. I began noticing the completeness, the holistic nature of our resource base—all the values and resources that exist on the landscape and how they're connected. It took a while to establish trust, but once that was there, I was immersed in a different world. I didn't plan any of it. None of it was conscious. It was just happened through spending time with the Wet'suwet'en people on the territories.

Through this experience, I started connecting my research to the land and seeing it as one component of the big picture. From the perspective of a First Nations community, what is valued might have no bearing on what environmental scientists suggest. However, within my work, understanding the First Nations cultural landscape became primary, overriding the values that science, industry, and government prioritize. Needless to say, my views were (and continue to be) somewhat different from those of my colleagues who didn't experience that level of immersion with First Nations' culture. I was valuing science less than they were, and instead found myself increasingly pushing boundaries and incorporating other perspectives. I was really focusing on social science and prioritizing First Nations' community values. This is where my sense of belonging, purpose, and place as a scientist and community member began to define itself.

Being on the Land, or Discovering What You Don't Learn in the Classroom

Indigenous geographies are fundamentally informed by holistic— subjective and material—relationships to territory. As Jay T. Johnson and Brian Murton (2007) note, Indigenous geographies do not reflect the foundational culture/nature dualisms of Enlightenment thought that inform the development of Western geography; instead Indigenous communities integrate their understandings of their culture and natural environment. Indigenous geographies are deeply interconnected with generations of experience on the land. The stories, songs, and symbols of these histories continue to circulate within Indigenous communities. Indigenous landscapes are composed of relationships with physical sites but also a set of cultural essences,

intangible structures of belief, that tend to be difficult to bind to a particular location (Pearce and Louis 2008). The matrix of relationships within this physical and spiritual landscape defines Indigenous ways of being.

For Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en peoples, the relationship to territory is one of reciprocal stewardship between the people and "the land and the life and spiritual energies it contains" (Daly 2005, 271). Being on the land is vital to maintain these reciprocal relationships with the land itself. According to Sterritt et al. (1998, 12), "The process of claiming territory is described as 'walking the land' or 'surveying' it and includes naming mountains, rivers, lakes, and other areas. These names are highly descriptive and reflect a detailed knowledge of the landscape." Being on the land, understanding the rhythms of the land along with the histories and meanings of its occupation, are fundamental for demonstrating a claim to territory through the proper ceremonies. Indigenous relationships to territory are governed by dynamic, interconnected processes in the social, natural, and spiritual world (Henderson 2000, 2006).

These relationships to the land are fundamental to the maintenance of Indigenous collective identity. The Assembly of First Nations (1993, 39) began its submission on the environment to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples by stating, "The environment is fundamentally important to First Nations Peoples. It is the breadth of our spirituality, knowledge, languages and culture." Gitxsan hereditary chief, Delgamuukw (Ken Muldoe) (1992, 7) explained, "The ownership of a territory is a marriage of the Chief and the land. Each Chief has an ancestor who encountered and acknowledged the life of the land. From such encounters came power. The land, the plants, the animals and the people all have spirit—they all must be shown respect. That is the basis of our law."

The land is the basis of Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en culture, and their cultural resources remain directly and inextricably bound to their land and its natural resources. Their law and culture, beliefs and values, and the ability to maintain identity as a people remain strongly connected to territory.

> For nearly three years (from March 2002 to December 2004), I worked for the Wet'suwet'en hereditary chiefs. It was a change from the approach to research I learned in university. We all had desks, offices and schedules—in keeping with scientific Western society—but my manager was the Lands and Resources Department manager and also a hereditary chief. Sometimes those two hats conflicted. Beyond office work, I was sometimes mandated, on random sunny days, to go out onto the territories and just be. No agenda. No words, really. Just being on the land.

The first time this happened, my manager told us we were all going out; we just needed to be on the territories. The "territories" were referred to often. That's how we referred to the land base. I interpreted his request as, "We're going into the field." So, I got ready for the field. I went to the office, got maps, got a GPS, got tools for the field, got my caulk boots, my vest, my compass, everything—I was ready for the field.

When I came down to the twelve-passenger van, all the chiefs and elders that were joining us that day were in their normal, everyday street clothes. Some had cowboy boots, but no one looked like me. I thought to myself, "This is not very conducive to good fieldwork," but I was confident in my field abilities. I arrogantly assumed I was even prepared to "care for" some of these folks in the field, if need be. How could someone sixty years old in cowboy boots be as ready for the elements as a thirty-year-old in caulk boots?

Most of the ride out to the territory was spent laughing at me. The chiefs particularly liked the spikes on the bottom of my boots, and were curious if I was planning on spending time on the glacier. I was even asked if my field vest doubled as a life preserver. The teasing and humor, while at my expense, indicated the ways I was being integrated into the community.

Once we got out there, the chief who governed that particular territory welcomed us with a short speech. He reminded us about the importance of respecting our land. After his words, people started walking around. I wasn't really told to do anything. Some people looked like they knew where they were going; others seemed to be leisurely strolling.

That was the first day I actually felt and learned what it was like to just be out on the land, not with a specific purpose, but going there just to exist and let connections happen. That was really eye-opening and important for how I learned to view the territories. That was the day I understood the difference between getting ready for the field and being on the territories.

Belonging, or the Archaeologist Goes Native

In northwest British Columbia, the local Wet'suwet'en and Gitxsan peoples have occupied their traditional territories for thousands of years and continue to maintain their relationship to their territories through their traditional house system of governance. As Richard Overstall (2005, 31) describes it, their system of

territoriality is fundamentally defined by "the power created by fusing the spirit of a reincarnating human line with the spirit of a specific area of land—a partnership in which both the human and the non-human parties have reciprocal obligations and privileges." Each house is a matrilineal kinship group that shares a common ancestry, with distinct claims and relationships to its own particular house territories and responsibility for a number of reincarnating chiefly names (P. D. Mills 2008; Roth 2008). When a house member dies, his or her name is passed on to another member of the house. The Wet'suwet'en concept of law centers "on acknowledgement of the rights invested in ever-reincarnating lineages" rather than individual rights (A. Mills 1994, 24).

Within the feast, the main business of the host house is conducted in the transfer of titles and reaffirmation of a house's relationship to its territories. It is at the feast that chiefly names are transferred down a house lineage after the death of a hereditary chief. Other houses act as observers, witnessing that business is conducted in accordance with the laws. Gitxsan hereditary chief, Ax Gwin Desxw (Glen Williams quoted in P. D. Mills 2008, 109–10) explained,

> What the chief is doing is that he is demonstrating publicly in that feast to the other chiefs that he has invited, that he knows the laws that he has to follow for that particular feast, and he is demonstrating publicly that he has land, that he has fishing holes, that he has power, that he has wealth and that he owns the land; and these are my other members of my immediate house. He is publicly telling all the people in that feast hall, that this is who I am, I am chief, I am a high chief, and this is my authority.

In the feast, a house renews social bonds with other houses while reasserting definitional power relationships through the display of "the power of life in all the creatures and the land itself" (P. D. Mills 2008, 120). Edward Chamberlin (2000, 127) recounts how a Gitxsan hereditary chief, astonished by claims of forestry officials to Crown jurisdiction over Gitxsan traditional lands, condensed his discomfort into a question: "'If this is your land,' he asked, 'where are your stories?'" The stories, songs, and crests of a house work to establish that house's connection to their territories. Performances in the feast reaffirm a house's connection to the spirit of the land, and through this affirmation its title to those lands.

In this way, the feast is a central institution for the social and political maintenance of the relationships between Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en houses and their territories (Daly 2005). Antonia Mills (1994, 38) describes the feast as "a forum in which Witsuwit'en law is both enacted and upheld." The feast determines how

territory is owned and used, and provides structure to the practice of Wet'suwet'en and Gitxsan governance. This extends to interactions with researchers.

> In May 2006, I was adopted into the Cas'Yex (Grizzly House) of the Gitdumden (Bear Clan) of the Wet'suwet'en. This has been one of the great honors in my life thus far. I had always known what the feast system meant to First Nations peoples, specifically its centrality in their epistemology. However, being involved to this degree exposed me to another level of intimacy with Wet'suwet'en culture.
>
> The feast that was held had two purposes: payback and adoption. In the payback portion, chiefs and clan members collected money and paid back other clans for previously borrowed resources. In the adoption portion, it was announced that Roy Morris, House Chief Woos of Cas'Yex, was adopting me into his house, and that from that point onward, I was to be considered a clan member, just like everyone else.
>
> I will never forget shopping for the "resources" that I was to give away to anyone who witnessed this event. This is one of the aspects that many non-Native people don't understand, that a person's wealth is measured not by how much they accumulate, but rather how much they give away. My chief informed me of what I had to buy (items such as teacups, towels, blankets, drinking glasses, as well as other useful household items). As I shopped for these items, I remember thinking how interesting it was to see how the feast system remained intact, but the resources that were involved had changed over time.
>
> During the feast at the appropriate time, I "gave away" all of the items I brought to those in attendance (the chiefs, then distinguished members of the clans, and finally any other witnesses who were in attendance). I shook each person's hand, expressed my gratitude for their acceptance of me and their attendance as a witness. Each person, in turn, impressed some words of wisdom upon me. It was a profound experience that has added yet another layer of depth to my perspective of our landscape and the resources within it.
>
> Since my adoption, I am regularly teased about being more "Indian" than the Wet'suwet'en, since my mother is of East Indian descent and my father is from the West Indies, and now I am adopted. Many times, in jest, chiefs and clan members refer to me as "the real Indian." While this teasing highlights the increasing level of community acceptance of me, my inclusion into the community has heightened my sense

of responsibility to ensure that the Wet'suwet'en are meaningfully involved in the resource management process.

From Compartmentalization toward an Indigenized Interdisciplinarity

CRM is governed predominantly by a universal approach that often is antithetical to a broader recognition of the depth of Indigenous cultural geographies. The particular temporal and geographic frames conventionally used to define Indigenous cultural heritage resources do not reflect Indigenous systems of knowing and being in the world. Instead they impose Western managerial frames grounded in a set of Eurocentric presumptions about progress in accordance with a presumed "linear movement of progress from an original, wild state to a developed, civilized and domesticated state" (Howitt and Suchet-Pearson 2006, 324).

Legislative definitions of cultural heritage in British Columbia's *Heritage Conservation Act* (1996) that protect those sites or artifacts in existence before 1846 reflect colonial, not Indigenous, timelines. The British and Americans signed the *Oregon Treaty* in 1846, delineating the boundary of a British territorial claim that extended to the west coast of North America. This year marks the assertion of Crown sovereignty over the territory that would become British Columbia. In the next century, the government sought to reconstruct Indigenous space through application of a colonial land policy that denied Aboriginal title and sought to restrict Indigenous peoples to reserves (Tennant 1990; Harris 2002). The Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en peoples in the region, however, never consented to ceding sovereignty to the British in 1846 or the Dominion of Canada in subsequent years. While the government refused to make treaties with Indigenous peoples for the land and simply claimed jurisdiction over their territories, the Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en maintained their relationships to their territories and continued to resist government impositions (Galois 1993; McDonald and Joseph 2000; P. D. Mills 2008). As a result of the continuity of their traditions, the necessity of predating the assertion of Crown sovereignty holds little relevance within Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en frameworks for determining the importance of their cultural resources, and they do not recognize 1846 as a relevant date to delineate their heritage resources.

The constrained and compartmentalized spatiality of dominant CRM practices often renders Indigenous geographies unintelligible, and further entrenches the gap between how Indigenous communities and CRM practitioners understand the meaning of cultural heritage resources. CRM works through a Cartesian cartography in which space can be segmented into a linear coordinate system. Within this paradigm, cultural sites become discrete and exclusive, and interconnections between sites and the larger cultural landscape are silenced (L. M. Johnson 2010; Pearce and Louis 2008). Further, the reduction of cultural resources to material

artifacts and features aggravates the segmentation of cultural spaces in CRM practice in BC. Prevailing CRM practices fail to account for the significance of intangibles such as sense of place in maintaining group traditions and identity, thereby neglecting the bodies of knowledge available through traditional knowledge. In neglecting the depth of Indigenous sense of place, conventional CRM practices often even misapprehend the cultural significance of material artifacts, features, and human remains. This is further aggravated by the often token and sometimes entirely nonexistent involvement of Indigenous communities in the management of their archaeological and other cultural heritage resources.

Developing multidisciplinary and community-based approaches to collaboration requires a major paradigm shift. Undoubtedly, there will be challenges to achieving these changes. Although the courts institutionalize a Eurocentric tradition of jurisprudence, they have recognized the salience of Indigenous knowledge and the need to reconcile Aboriginal rights and title with development (Persky 1998; Slattery 2006). By defending their territories and cultural resources through legal activism and direct action, Indigenous peoples have created new spaces of negotiation (Blomley 1996; Morris and Fondahl 2002). Furthermore, the academy has increasingly recognized the value of Indigenous knowledge and the need to develop holistic frameworks that transcend conventional disciplinary boundaries (Turner, Ignace, and Ignace 2000). Although limitations in cross-cultural understanding and community capacity still hinder the development of intercultural exchange, these constraints can be transcended by incorporating community capacity and cross-cultural education into CRM projects (J. T. Johnson, Louis, and Pramono 2006). Interdisciplinary models of community-based research mark the beginning of a paradigm shift, developing an integrated research program that recognizes the depth of Indigenous cultural attachments to place as well as the complexity and diversity of Indigenous cultures.

> One of the worst things that can happen in a First Nation community is that their ancestors become unearthed.
>
> Working with First Nations since 1993, I've encountered several situations where either industry or the government have inadvertently unearthed human remains. While non-Native perspectives may appreciate that it's unsettling for the community, unless they've lived in that community and understand the Indigenous worldview, they have no idea the profound, long-lasting impacts something like that can have on the community.
>
> In October of 2006, I received a phone call from Hagwilget Village Council, which represents and administers services to the mixed

Gitxsan and Wet'suwet'en membership of their community. They told me that a developer had come to re-anchor some power poles and didn't consult with anyone. As a result, they came and dug a hole on the reserve in an area known to the community as a burial area. Not only that, it was in the immediate area where it is believed a great Wet'suwet'en prophet was buried generations ago. Any ten-year-old child in the community could have told them that this was not an area to dig holes.

Excavators unearthed the remains of an unknown number of individuals. Once that happened, they packed up their equipment and left. The First Nation community was left to deal with those remains.

The First Nation had no budget, no resources, no technical expertise, and no plan for something like this. Given the sensitive nature of the issue, it had to be dealt with immediately. The unearthed remains were put in the church and the hole was covered up. A tarp was put over the hole, and earth that had been removed was put over the tarp. That's where the situation sat for four years.

Since 2006, there's been significant unrest in the community—spiritual issues, an elevated number of suicides, elevated poverty and negative energy—and it's all been attributed to this event. There's no closure to it. The negotiations with the industry interests have been excruciatingly slow. No resources have been provided to the First Nation to manage the situation.

Hagwilget Village Council, however, has been proactive, working to develop tools that will express their concerns in a way that planners and officials with the utility will understand. We have produced a cultural impact assessment of the impact of accidentally unearthing human remains on the entire culture. In August of 2010, an interim burial ceremony was held in the Village of Hagwilget, where the unearthed human remains were temporarily buried in the church cemetery. Many community members and hereditary chiefs were in attendance, as was I. It was a highly emotional event which provided some temporary peace for community members. In 2011, a comprehensive cultural resource management initiative was performed, including an archaeological excavation. The purpose of this project was to recover and reunite the remains of these people, and to bring closure to those individuals who were involved in the initial disturbance, and to the community as a whole. At a later date, an all Clans feast will be held

(which will require great resources) and much time to plan in a culturally appropriate manner.

Reconciling CRM with the Depth of Indigenous Sense of Place

Recognizing the vital subjective importance of place remains a central task to reconciling CRM with Indigenous cultural geographies. Cultural resource management needs to recognize space not simply as a container but also as a constitutive element in human experience and social relations. Place exists in between the material and subjective, and serves an important role in the construction of identity as a subjective and embodied experience. The loss of this distinct sense of place can have significant impact on individuals and communities with such connections. J. E. Windsor and J. A. McVey (2005) describe how large-scale hydroelectric projects have contributed to the loss of place and identity for Indigenous peoples. Using the case of the Cheslatta T'en, whose reserves were flooded by the construction of the Kinney Dam, the authors expose how the government prioritized the private hydroelectric demands of the Aluminum Company of Canada (Alcan) and the possibilities for development and jobs over the traditional sustainable livelihoods of the Cheslatta T'en. The flooding dispossessed the Cheslatta of their traditional lands and annihilated culturally important sites, including churches and cemeteries, resulting in marked increases of socioeconomic, mental health, and addictions problems. People committed suicide in the aftermath of their dispossession, but the hurt transmitted down the generations. "By 1990, alcohol use amongst the Cheslatta had reached epidemic proportions and welfare dependency was 95%" (Windsor and McVey 2005, 157). Describing the impact of alienation from the land from an Indigenous perspective, Clarkson, Morrisette, and Regallet (1992, 5) write, "When we begin to separate ourselves from that which sustains us, we immediately open up the possibility of losing understanding of our responsibility and our kinship to the earth." In failing to respect and protect material and intangible relationships to place, the current CRM process is inherently flawed, both conceptually and in practice.

In order to protect the land and its vital connections to Indigenous culture and identity, research needs to recognize the integral connection between Indigenous culture and the land, and refuse the separation of cultural and natural resources. Any development that transforms the environment in the territory also affects Indigenous cultural resources. Furthermore, research must recognize the continuity and vitality of Indigenous heritage resources, and reject the colonial framing of Indigenous peoples as an anachronism within the time-space of the Canadian state through the legislated imposition of specific dates delineating heritage resources. Maintaining connections to the land reflects the centrality of the land to traditional

forms of Indigenous education (Marker 2006). Cultural heritage sites also serve as evidence of Indigenous historical use and occupancy of their territories, backing claims in Canadian courts and verifying distinctive Indigenous oral histories and laws.

It is necessary to recognize the integrity of Indigenous traditional territories as an interconnected whole. Researchers need to emphasize the interconnection of multiple facets of Indigenous geographies as encompassing the spiritual, emotional, historic, practical, legal, educational, cultural, and economic realms. An integral component of all of these connections is the sense of place embedded in all these forms of a connectivity that defines and distinguishes Indigenous relationships to their territories.

Recognizing the importance of both tangible and intangible relationships to place within CRM contributes to registering the ways in which the land is a cultural resource for Indigenous communities. Archaeological sites are but a small subset of the important cultural resources that Indigenous peoples derive from their lands. CRM practitioners must attempt to gauge the impacts of proposed developments on Indigenous sense of place. CRM practitioners have too frequently avoided place as a concept, thus evading the psychological, cultural, and environmental components in favor of more empirical, quantifiable research. But this fails to account for the substantial impacts development may bring to Indigenous ways of being in the world.

> In 2006, I was asked by the provincial government's lands agency to participate in a sustainable resource management planning process. By this time, I had developed a reputation. In addition to anthropological work with industry, government, and academia, people knew that I had worked within a First Nation organization in the past and had been adopted into the Wet'suwet'en Bear Clan.
>
> The government was negotiating the management of the Gitanyow traditional territory. Forestry licensees wanted to develop much of that territory, while conversely, the Gitanyow wanted to conserve and preserve much of that territory for cultural reasons. I was tasked with assessing the situation to find some common ground moving forward. I interviewed both sides to understand their perspectives and produced an assessment stating that the Gitanyow people needed to articulate their cultural interests in the form of a policy so everyone could make informed decisions. That's how the Gitanyow Cultural Heritage Resources Management Policy started.

Developing the policy took almost two years. Working as an independent contractor for the Office of the Gitanyow Hereditary Chiefs on the policy, I had to develop a relationship of trust with the Gitanyow. We didn't rush that relationship. They were very encouraged by my previous work with other First Nations, particularly the Wet'suwet'en. Over time I was trusted more and more. For example, I was given some "Indian Hellebore" or "Melgwasxw" as a gift by a hereditary chief to keep bad energy and spirits away from me and my family. This was indeed a symbol of trust, and with it came an increased sense of responsibility on my part.

With that trust, I was able to work with a team of consultants to get their cultural heritage concerns meaningfully represented in a policy format. All of the members of this policy team had earned the trust of the Gitanyow. We lived in nearby communities and had worked with local First Nations for years. We were part of the community.

The team worked in a collaborative relationship with the Gitanyow hereditary chiefs. They shared their cultural information and concerns with us, and we worked to articulate their concerns in a format legible to industry and government officials. Working to bridge Western and Indigenous perspectives, we produced a document that represents the Gitanyow interests for cultural resource management. While expressing Gitanyow concerns in a format familiar to Western resource managers, the policy also powerfully articulates the necessity of recognizing that natural resources are cultural resources, and cultural experts need to be involved in resource management to account for the importance of tangible and intangible relationships to place.

Since it was unveiled in its complete form in 2009, several First Nations have adopted components of the management policy and fit it to their specific contexts. While the document provides clarity and certainty for industry and government as to what the Gitanyow value, their formal acceptance of this document is still being negotiated. But the process constructed a tangible policy that increases Gitanyow influence over the management of their resources.

The Western resource management process, which compartmentalizes the Indigenous worldview into components such as cultural heritage, fisheries, wildlife, and socioeconomic measures, has forced Indigenous peoples and some consulting archaeologists to address epistemological issues (Budhwa 2005; Howitt 2001).

Foundational concepts to resource management, including the notion of management itself, are embedded within Western frameworks that separate humans from the environment and assume the inevitability of progress and development (Howitt and Suchet-Pearson 2006). However, archaeologists are working increasingly with anthropologists, geographers, and other social scientists to develop new interdisciplinary perspectives that recognize the interconnections between culture and nature and register the continuity of heritage into the present. Indigenous communities' participation in research has been key to the construction of new cross-cultural research practices that attempt to place Western research in dialogue with Indigenous knowledge systems. This productive exchange is evident in the development of new approaches to cultural resource management. Through Indigenous-academic collaborations, research has developed an increasingly holistic approach. This clearly demonstrates an evolution from interpretations of the past based predominantly on material remains to ones that value multiple lines of inquiry and evidence. However, until the resource management system genuinely attempts to understand Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies, management processes and policies will not be appropriate for or acceptable to the Indigenous peoples who are affected. Without this awareness, the overall CRM process will continue to be flawed, and Indigenous peoples will continue to respond to and resist its shortcomings.

Although there is a tendency to look toward the development of new institutions as the solution to difficult relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, our experiences of cultural immersion and cross-cultural education highlight that changing the dynamic begins by building better relationships and recognizing the cultural institutions that already exist in Indigenous communities. Researchers and officials grounded in Western institutions need to develop better baseline cross-cultural understanding. Moving meetings outside office buildings in major cities such as Vancouver or Victoria is a significant gesture, as cross-cultural understanding often begins with simply spending time in the community and on the land. Being on the land with elders highlights the importance of listening rather than constantly working with a set agenda. Furthermore, being on the land and visiting the territory with Indigenous knowledge holders exposes outsiders to the relationships that inform Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies. Similarly, recognizing the importance of traditional cultural institutions, such as the feasts, by attending and offering financial support can significantly improve relations. Researchers must be grounded and experienced in the geographic region, not just the academic discipline, to fully understand the culture, the people, and their landscape. There is no substitute for experience on the territories. Such experience forms the foundation for meaningful personal relationships between Indigenous

and non-Indigenous peoples. Researchers attempting to work with an Indigenous people or within an Indigenous people's traditionally claimed territory must be responsive to the unique relationship and responsibilities to place of those people.

There is no universal template for a solution, but rather a need to develop diverse approaches that respect the unique cultural traditions and cultural protocols of different Indigenous communities. Within various Indigenous communities and nations, communities may desire different forms of representation, and cultural management processes need to be attentive to the different levels of administrative, traditional, and treaty governance that communities may favor. Although studies often include token Indigenous participation, it is necessary to understand how Indigenous communities are organized to identify the appropriate knowledge holders.

The colonial history of underdevelopment and dispossession has also left many communities without adequate financial, technical, and cultural capacity. Gaps between the educational attainment of First Nations community members and the general Canadian population remain significant (Clement 2009). It is necessary to integrate capacity building into CRM processes, developing skills and institutional competence in the community through research projects. Researchers need to work to empower communities with critical knowledge of Western knowledge systems so they can make informed choices about CRM processes (J. T. Johnson, Louis, and Pramono 2006).

Interdisciplinary and community-based work in CRM presents the opportunity to develop new paradigms that recognize the depth of Indigenous cultural attachments to place and the complexity and diversity of Indigenous cultures. Although such approaches would certainly be considered daunting by the resource management industry, the qualitative and contextual sensitivities of interpretive social science methodologies are paramount to the accuracy and integrity of cultural resource management. Continuing to redefine CRM can broaden the work of consulting archaeologists in collaboration with other social scientists and Indigenous community members to recognize the importance of the relationships at the center of Indigenous cultural identity.

Acknowledgments

We dedicate this chapter to the memory of Roy Morris (Chief Woos), who held a wealth of knowledge on Wet'suwet'en traditions and worked through his life to ensure the transmission of this knowledge to future generations of not only Wet'suwet'en people but also their Canadian neighbors. We also thank all of the other First Nations people and communities with whom we work every day—we consider them all contributors to this essay. Research for this essay was funded in

part by a Canada Graduate Scholarship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Thanks also go to the editors and the anonymous reviewers for their invaluable feedback on earlier drafts of this essay.

References

Assembly of First Nations. 1993. *Reclaiming Our Nationhood: Strengthening Our Heritage.* Prepared for the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Ottawa.

Battiste, M., ed. 2000. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Blomley, N. 1996. "Shut the Province Down: First Nations Blockades in British Columbia, 1984–1995." *BC Studies,* no. 111, 5–35.

Braun, B. 1997. "Buried Epistemologies: The Politics of Nature in (Post)colonial British Columbia." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87 (1): 3–31.

Budhwa, R. 2002. *Correlations between Catastrophic Paleoenvironmental Events and Native Oral Traditions of the Pacific Northwest.* Burnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University.

———. 2005. "An Alternate Model for First Nations Involvement in Resource Management Archaeology." *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 29 (1): 20–45.

Chamberlin, J. E. 2000. "From Hand to Mouth: The Postcolonial Politics of Oral and Written Traditions." In *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision,* edited by M. Battiste, 124–41. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Clarkson, L., V. Morrissette, and G. Regallet. 1992. *Our Responsibility to the Seventh Generation: Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development.* Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Clement, J. 2009. "University Attainment of the Registered Indian Population, 1981–2006." In *Aboriginal Education,* edited by J. P. White, J. Peters, D. Beavon, and N. Spence, 69–106. Toronto: Thompson Education Publishers.

Daly, R. 2005. *Our Box Was Full: An Ethnography for the Delgamuukw Plaintiffs.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Delgam Uukw (K. Muldoe). 1992. "Delgam Uukw Speaks." In *The Spirit in the Land: Statements of the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en Hereditary Chiefs in the Supreme Court of British Columbia, 1987–1990,* edited by Gisday Wa Delgam Uukw, 7–9. Gabriola, BC: Reflections.

Fuller, R. 2011. "Consultation in Cultural Resource Management: An Indigenous Perspective." In *A Companion to Cultural Resource Management,* edited by T. F. King, 373–84. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Galois, R. 1993. "The History of the Upper Skeena Region, 1850 to 1927." *Native Studies Review* 9 (2): 113–83.

Garroutte, E. M. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harris, Cole. 2002. *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Henderson, J. Y. 2000. "Ayukpachi: Empowering Aboriginal Thought." In *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision,* edited by M. Battiste, 248–78. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

———. 2006. *First Nations Jurisprudence and Aboriginal Rights: Defining the Just Society.* Saskatoon: Native Law Centre.

Howitt, Richard. 2001. *Rethinking Resource Management: Justice, Sustainability, and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Routledge.

Howitt, Richard, and Sandra Suchet-Pearson. 2006. "Rethinking the Building Block: Ontological Pluralism and the Idea of 'Management.'" *Geografiska Annaler—Series B: Human Geography* 88 (3): 323–35.

Johnson, J. T., R. P. Louis, and A. H. Pramono. 2006. "Facing the Future: Encouraging Critical Cartographic Literacies in Indigenous Communities." *ACME* 4 (1): 80–98.

Johnson, J. T., and B. Murton. 2007. "Re/placing Native Science: Indigenous Voices in Contemporary Constructions of Nature." *Geographical Research* 45 (2): 121–29.

Johnson, L. M. 2010. *Trail of Story, Traveller's Path: Reflections on Ethnoecology and Landscape.* Edmonton, AB: Athabasca University Press.

Klassen, M. A., R. Budhwa, and R. Reimer. 2009. "First Nations, Forestry, and the Transformation of Archaeological Practice in British Columbia, Canada." *Heritage Management* 2 (2): 199–238.

Koster, R., K. Baccar, R. H. Lemelin. 2012. "Moving from Research on, to Research with and for Indigenous Communities: A Critical Reflection on Community-Based Participatory Research." *Canadian Geographer* 56 (2): 195–210.

Kuokkanen, R. 2007. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes and the Logic of the Gift.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Louis, R. P. 2007. "Can You Hear Us Now? Voices from the Margin: Using Indigenous Methodologies in Geographic Research." *Geographical Research* 45 (2): 130–39.

Marker, M. 2006. "After the Makah Whale Hunt: Indigenous Knowledge and Limits to Multicultural Discourse." *Urban Education* 41 (5): 482–505.

Martindale, A. R. C., and S. Marsden. 2003. "Defining the Middle Period (3500 BP to 1500 BP) in Tsimshian History through a Comparison of Archaeological and Oral Records." *BC Studies,* no. 138/9, 13–50.

McDonald, J. A., and J. Joseph. 2000. "Key Events in the Gitksan Encounter with the Colonial World." In *Potlatch at Gitsegukla: William Beynon's 1945 Field Notebooks,* edited by M. Anderson and M. Halpin, 193–214. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Milligan, R., and T. McCreary. 2011. "Inscription, Innocence, and Invisibility: Early Contributions to the Discursive Formation of North in Samuel Hearne's *A Journey to the Northern Ocean.*" In *Rethinking the Great White North: Race, Nature and the Historical Geographies of Whiteness in Canada,* edited by A. Baldwin, L. Cameron, and A. Kobayashi, 147–68. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Mills, A. 1994. *Eagle Down Is Our Law: Witsuwit'en Law, Feasts, and Land Claims.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Mills, P. D. 2008. *For Future Generations: Reconciling Gitxsan and Canadian Law.* Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.

Morris, P., and G. Fondahl. 2002. "Negotiating the Production of Space in Tl'azt'en Territory, Northern British Columbia." *Canadian Geographer* 46 (2): 108–25.

Nicholas, G. P. 2006. "Decolonizing the Archaeological Landscape." *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (3/4): 350–80.

Overstall, R. 2005. "Encountering the Spirit in the Land: 'Property' in a Kinship-Based Legal Order." In *Despotic Dominion*, edited by J. McLaren, A. R. Buck, and N. E. Wright, 22-49. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Panelli, R. 2008. "Social Geographies: Encounters with Indigenous and More-than-White/Anglo Geographies." *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (6): 801–11.

Pearce, M., and R. P. Louis. 2008. "Mapping Indigenous Depth of Place." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 32 (3): 107–26.

Persky, S., ed. 1998. *Delgamuukw: The Supreme Court of Canada Decision on Aboriginal Title*. Vancouver: David Suzuki Foundation and Greystone Books.

Pratt, M. L. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Studies in Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.

Roth, C. F. 2008. *Becoming Tsimshian: The Social Life of Names*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Slattery, B. 2006. "The Metamorphosis of Aboriginal Title." *Canadian Bar Review* 85 (2): 255–86.

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

Sterritt, N. J., S. Marsden, R. Galois, P. R. Grant, and R. Overstall. 1998. *Tribal Boundaries in the Nass Watershed*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Tennant, P. 1990. *Aboriginal Peoples and Politics: The Indian Land Question in British Columbia, 1849–1989*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Turner, N., M. B. Ignace, and R. Ignace. 2000. "Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Wisdom of Aboriginal Peoples in British Columbia." *Ecological Applications* 10 (5): 1275–87.

Watkins, J. 2005. "Through Wary Eyes: Indigenous Perspectives on Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:429–49.

Watkins, J., and J. Beaver. 2008. "What Do We Mean by 'Heritage'? Whose Heritage Do We Manage, and What Rights Have We to Do So?" *Heritage Management* 1 (1): 9–36.

Watson, A., and O. H. Huntington. 2008. "They're Here—I Feel Them: The Epistemic Spaces of Indigenous and Western Knowledges." *Social and Cultural Geography* 9 (3): 257–81.

Wilson, S. 2008. *Research Is Ceremony*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Windsor, J. E., and J. A. McVey. 2005. "Annihilation of Both Place and Sense of Place." *Geographical Journal* 171 (2): 146–65.