

Äikäs, Tiina & Salmi, Anna-Kaisa (2019) Introduction : in search of indigenous voices in the historical archaeology of colonial encounters. In: Tiina Äikäs and Anna-Kaisa Salmi (eds.) *The Sound of Silence : Indigenous Perspectives on the Historical Archaeology of Colonialism*, (pp.1-14), New York: Berghahn books.

Chapter 1.

In Search of Indigenous Voices in the Historical Archaeology of Colonial Encounters

Tiina Äikäs and Anna-Kaisa Salmi

Colonial Encounters and Indigenous Lifeways

Colonial encounters between indigenous peoples and European state powers are overarching themes in the historical archaeology of the modern era, and postcolonial historical archaeology has repeatedly emphasized the complex two-way nature of colonial encounters (e.g. Ferris, Harrison, and Wilcox 2014; Oliver 2013; Hillerdal, Karlström, and Ojala 2017, 9–10). Even though colonialism is mostly about unequal human relations (Gosden 2004), it is clear that they are two-way relations. The colonizers and the colonized both shape each other, and there is an ongoing negotiation of identities, shared spaces, and material culture (e.g. Ferris Harrison, and Wilcox 2014; Oliver 2013; Hillerdal, Karlström, and Ojala 2017, 9–10). Indigenous people are therefore fully engaged with colonial encounters and with the changes in material culture in relation to those encounters (Hart, Oland, and Frink 2012, 4). Moreover, colonial interactions include many kinds of processes, such as assimilation, cultural revivalism, and transnationalism (Oliver and Edwald 2016). Ethnic identities in colonial societies are culturally contingent, fluid, and multiple – according to Oliver and Edwald (2016), they are slow and complex legacies of interaction. Seeing colonialism in this way, as a context rather than as a “defining moment” for indigenous peoples, helps us see colonial encounters as long-term processes on the continuum of indigenous histories (Silliman 2005; Hart, Oland, and Frink 2012, 5).

This book is based on papers held at the Society for Historical Archaeology Conference in Fort Worth, Texas, in 2017. Three additional papers have been included later. The focus of the session was on the role of material culture in the transformation of indigenous

cultures in colonial contact, especially through the lens of comparative indigenism. Comparative indigenism is a theoretical approach that includes both emic and etic interpretations and compares indigenous cultures around the world. Indigenous peoples are culturally distinctive groups whose history is often affected by colonial encounters. Following the writings of Katherine Hayes (2015) and Craig N. Cipolla (2017), we see the concept of indigeneity as inseparable from the historical and political context and as a reaction and resistance to European colonialism. As Hillerdal, Karlström, and Ojala (2017, 1) put it: “Concepts of identity and indigeneity are relational, and can be viewed as positions, as marking difference and power in political reality as well as theoretical debate [...] challenge simplified categorizations of ‘Us’ and ‘Them’, and emphasize the complexity of the relations between indigenous and non-indigenous pasts and presents.” (Hillerdal, Karlström, and Ojala 2017, 1)

The examples in this volume come from different parts of the world. (Figure 1.1) We concur with Hart et al. (2012) that in taking a global perspective, our aim is not to homogenize or reduce the diverse ways in which indigenous people reacted to colonialism. As the different local examples in this book demonstrate, different indigenous groups had different ways to cope with, resist, and oppose colonialism and to include and transform material markers of colonial contact in their daily lives. A comparative perspective on these case studies offers the opportunity to explore the similarities and differences in the processes behind cultural contacts, change, and renewal. With this volume, we hope to find common trajectories in indigenous colonial histories and to explore new ways of understanding cultural contact, hybridization, and power relations between indigenous peoples and colonial powers from the indigenous point of view.

<Figure 1.1 here>

Changing Meanings of Material Culture in Colonial Contexts

The meanings and uses of material culture change over time. These changes are co-dependent and create new meanings for material culture. The meanings attached to objects and places change during their life cycle through social interaction (Appadurai 1986; Gosden and Marshall 1999, 160–170; Meskell 2004). Already in 1995, Kent G. Lightfoot and Antoinette Martinez noted that colonial-indigenous interaction can play a critical role in cultural transformations – how people modify, create, and syncretize material objects in culture contact situations (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995, 475). The usual approach has been to investigate how

colonialism changes indigenous cultures under the premise that changes in the cultural practices of the colonizers are innovative adaptations, whereas changes in the cultural practices of the colonized are losses of identity (Beaudoin 2017, 47). Moreover, European observers often interpret the new indigenous use of European objects as misuse (Cipolla 2017).

The understanding of how foreign objects were used in their new indigenous contexts has been deepened by archaeological research (e.g. Cipolla 2017; Silliman 2005; Silliman 2009). Cipolla asks how colonial objects became entangled in their new contexts and how this new set of material relations affected indigenous identities (Cipolla 2017, 6–10). He concludes that indigenous groups incorporated foreign objects in their cultural practices in a variety of ways, sometimes replacing “traditional” material culture with foreign objects, sometimes complementing existing practices with new material culture (Cipolla 2017, 21). Along similar lines, Ritva Kylli et al. (Chapter 6) argue that Scandinavian foodstuffs such as butter, flour, bread, and spirits were incorporated into Sámi foodways from early on, the Sámi being actively interested in these products.

According to Creese (2017, 60), “A person’s decisions about how to engage with foreign things, however apparently traditional or novel, were always creative and multifaceted acts of social reproduction.” An example of the changing meanings of material culture are objects that moved from a domestic context to a ritual one. Meghan C.L. Howey (2017, 167) describes the indigenous consumption of European-made kettles in the northeastern region of the USA during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In early colonial encounters, indigenous groups did not use kettles for cooking in the European way, but instead their main function was as grave goods. The kettles were therefore incorporated in symbolically, ceremonially, and socially charged activities and they were likely to be seen as objects ascribed with *manit*, an animating spirit. Inga-Maria Mulk and Tim Bayliss-Smith (Chapter 3) also demonstrate how ritual practices could change in colonial contacts but at the same time remain resilient to attempts of Christianization.

Material culture also played a role in the interactions that took place between colonizers and indigenous workers in colonial spaces. Stephen Silliman (2010) has highlighted the role of indigenous workers laboring in distinctly colonial spaces. He argues that it is extremely complicated to differentiate indigenous material culture from that of the colonizers because artifacts and spaces in such settings are used by multiple groups of people and their meanings and functions are often ambiguous (Silliman 2010, 29–32). Along similar lines, Risto

Nurmi (Chapter 5) discusses the material culture of Sámi laborers in Early Modern mining communities. His paper demonstrates that although there are objects and cultural practices that can be identified as “Sámi”, most of the material culture was in fact shared by people of different ethnicities. Sámi material culture has played an important role in the daily activities and food culture of the mining communities. Moreover, the Sámi were actively and voluntarily involved in these communities.

The focus on the meanings and roles of material culture in colonial encounters is connected to archaeology’s current occupation with “new materialism” where the agencies of things and material culture are re-assessed. It is now widely acknowledged that things and the material world have an active role in shaping human understanding and experience of the world. There is a network of relations between different actants, which can be human or nonhuman. (Latour 2005; Olsen 2010; Hodder 2012.) Material culture also has agency in colonial encounters. Material culture can actively participate in and shape power relations between groups of people in a colonial context, as demonstrated by Madeline Fowler, Amy Roberts and Lester-Irabinna Rigney (Chapter 2). In their case study, the control over the indigenous people by the English was acted out in “bell hegemony” where church bells structured the daily lives of people. William A. White and Brandi E. Bethke (Chapter 7) offer an example of how material culture has agency in today’s world in the way the precontact landscapes contribute to the Blackfeet’s sense of history and continuity.

Ongoing Colonialism and Cultural Appropriation

Colonialism is not just about territorial claims, economic strategies, and racial ideologies; it also involves the appropriation of material culture (Naum and Nordin 2013). In many ways, indigenous people still consider themselves colonized (Lawrence 2004). Colonial history has consequences today, as can be seen, for example, in the conflicts concerning the exploitation of natural resources and land ownership (Ojala and Nordin 2015). In addition, colonial legacy concerning indigenous material culture is also evident in contemporary discourses concerning matters such as the right to indigenous cultural heritage, repatriation (e.g. Nordin and Ojala 2015), and the cultural appropriation of indigenous material culture. In Finland, news headlines repeatedly report the misuse of Sámi material culture. Beauty queens and athletes dress in mock versions of Sámi clothing (*gákti*) and advertisers use symbols from Sámi culture. Members of the Sámi community see this kind of cultural appropriation as highly disrespectful. For the Sámi, *gákti* connects its wearer to family, shared history, and a place of origin and enables

cultural creativity, but the Finns who have worn Sámi dress have used a mock version that presents an insulting, simplified, and stereotypical picture of Sámi culture. In addition, Sámi material culture and history is distorted in advertisements, which may show a woman wearing a traditional man's hat or Sámi shamans (*noaidi*) conducting their rituals in a dark and dirty tent (*lavvu*) (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/video/travel/video-1213752/100-Days-Polar-Magic-unique-expedition-Finland.html>). The Sámi see the abuse of their material culture as a continuation of colonial traditions in Finland. (Mikkonen 2016; Näkkäläjärvi 2016; Seitsonen 2018, 149; cf. Nakatani 2015.)

< Figure 1.2. here >

Mock Sámi dress has also been seen in art. In 2016, the Kiasma Museum of Contemporary Art in Finland exhibited the artwork *Grind* by video artist Jenni Hiltunen. The video is said to be a playful take on the dancehall culture with its provocative costumes, suggestive poses, roles, and blatant sexuality (<https://vimeo.com/44392653>), but its display of female buttocks dressed in male Sámi clothing aroused criticism of both the artist and the museum, which was seen to have symbolically given its blessing to the exploitation of indigenous cultures (Paltto 2016).

In Chapter 8, Katherine Hayes discusses cultural appropriation through the case study of Sam Durant's sculpture *Scaffold* (2012) at the Walker Art Center Hayes in Minneapolis. She argues that art can be seen as cultural appropriation and that historical narratives can lose some of their meanings when told by non-Natives. Here, as in the case of Hiltunen's video, the artist does not fully grasp the nuances of historical traumas. But art can also be used to raise awareness (Edelman 1995). For example, a group of Sámi artists called *Suohpanterror* uses their art to take a stand on ethno-politics, criticizing, among other things, the above-mentioned abuse of Sámi clothing (Hautala-Hirvioja 2015) (Figure 1.2).

Re-interpretations of Sources in Search of Indigenous Voices

A unifying theme across many of the papers in this volume is the attempt to find indigenous voices through a careful re-interpretation of archaeological and historical sources. Historical

archaeology has a long legacy of using material culture as a means of finding alternative interpretations and subaltern voices of the past (Hall 1999; Hart, Oland, and Frink 2012; Cipolla 2017). Historical records have usually been created by elite members of the society and represent various elite opinions, voices, and strategies. On the other hand, subaltern groups, such as slaves, ethnic and sexual minorities, certain social groups, and indigenous peoples often have no voice in historical documents (Spivak 1988). It is clear that any researcher trying to give a voice to subaltern groups of the past, whether through historical records or material culture, must be careful not to impose her own opinion on the group of people she is studying (Spivak 1988; Liebmann 2008). Indeed, Spivak (1988) is even skeptical of the idea that subaltern voices can be found by re-reading historical documents.

Unlike historical documents, however, material culture was used and left behind by all social groups, including indigenous people (Liebmann 2008). Therefore, in principle, there is a material record left behind by indigenous people, although their voices may be absent from historical documents. Still, it has to be remembered that the material culture is interpreted by archaeologists, who can only claim to speak about, but not for, the indigenous people in question (Liebmann 2008). Moreover, it is crucial to understand that the indigenous peoples of the present do have a voice (Källén 2015). Several papers in this volume combine different sources, such as archaeological and historical data, oral histories, and current indigenous voices to find ways to speak about indigenous history and cultural heritage.

LisaMarie Malischke (Chapter 4) combines historical and archaeological data from Fort St Pierre, Mississippi. By re-reading historical sources from an ethnohistorical perspective, she gains a better understanding of the reversed power dynamics between the indigenous groups and the French.

In their paper, Ritva Kylli et al. (Chapter 6) take into reconsideration a body of historical sources that has previously been used to construct narratives about the primitiveness of the Sámi food culture and the Sámi in general. By carefully re-reading these sources and using archaeological data to support their ideas, Kylli et al. find that the Sámi food culture was hybridized with Scandinavian and Finnish food cultures from early on. The Sámi also had agency and initiative in incorporating new foodstuffs into their foodways. Most importantly, Kylli et al. show how historical data that has previously been interpreted as evidence of Sámi primitiveness can be re-read, when supported by archaeological data, to reveal how the Sámi

actively shaped their material culture by using their own needs and strategies as a point of departure.

William A. White and Brandi E. Bethke (Chapter 7) reinterpret the history of the Cut Bank Boarding School in Montana in search of Blackfeet voices. The Cut Bank Boarding School was situated in the precontact landscape carrying memories of Blackfeet presence and resilience from earlier centuries. Such boarding schools were established to destruct and enculturate native peoples, and this is the framework in which their histories are often told. However, White and Bethke go on to search for the Blackfeet narrative of the history of the Cut Bank Boarding School, based on archaeological data, oral histories, and archival sources. They are able to show how the Blackfeet people are actively reclaiming and reinterpreting the landscape that they have continually used for centuries.

As a Conclusion: New Insights and Indigenous Voices from Local Approaches

An expanding body of literature on historical archaeologies from different parts of the world has deepened our understanding of the variety of colonial encounters. Colonial encounters in places like Scandinavia, Africa, Australia, Oceania, and southeast Asia are increasingly addressed by archaeologists (e.g. Reid and Lane 2004; Paterson 2011; Naum and Nordin 2013; Flexner 2014; Cruz Berrocal and Tsang 2017). This is an important development because it allows us to emphasize local histories and interpretations over Eurocentric ones and provides alternative stories and interpretations of colonial histories, which have been as varied as the peoples taking part in them. Along the same lines, indigenous archaeologies from different parts of the world have the potential to highlight how indigenous peoples around the world have negotiated their relationships with colonial powers.

The papers in this volume, representing various ethnic groups from different parts of the world, show that while colonial histories share a number of characteristics, such as unequal power relations, changing meanings of material culture, and cultural appropriation, the responses and solutions of the indigenous communities coming into contact with colonial powers were clearly local and individual. They were also dependent on the historical context and the goals, means, and ideologies of the colonizers.

A unifying theme across the papers in this volume was that specific archaeological finds and spaces can seldom be labelled as “indigenous” or “colonizer” material

culture. Interactions between different groups in colonial societies were often close-knit. Material culture and spaces were shared by different groups. Indigenous groups adopted the colonizer's material culture and made it their own, and vice versa. The premise of several papers in this volume was to look at the encounters between (at least) two ethnic groups in a colonial setting. However, the papers clearly show that the use, ownership, and interpretation of material culture in colonial societies are complex issues. Indigenous peoples as well as colonizers created their own solutions and cultural practices, independently or codependently. Sometimes the relations between groups were forced and fraught with tensions, sometimes they were driven by mutual interest and benefit. The agency and creativity of indigenous peoples in transforming and negotiating (material) cultural practices in colonial settings was something that emerged from all papers in this volume. Finally, the papers show that traces and tensions of colonial encounters are still present when the material culture of indigenous peoples is displayed, used, and discussed. Cases of cultural appropriation have raised questions about who is allowed to use, modify, and mimic indigenous material culture and how this may be done. Thus, archaeology has a vital role to play in deepening our understanding of the histories and meanings behind the use of indigenous material culture.

References

Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The Social Life of Things. Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beaudoin, Matthew A. 2017. "A tale of two settlements. Consumption and the historical archaeology of natives and newcomers in the 19th-century Great Lakes region." In *Foreign Objects: Rethinking Indigenous Consumption in American Archaeology*, edited by Craig N. Cipolla, 44–56. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.

Cipolla, Craig N. 2017. "Introduction. Indigenous people and foreign objects: Rethinking consumption in American archaeology." In *Foreign Objects: Rethinking Indigenous Consumption in American Archaeology*, edited by Craig N. Cipolla, 3–25. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.

Creese, John L. 2017. "Beyond representation. Indigenous economies of affect in the Northeast Woodlands." In *Foreign Objects: Rethinking Indigenous Consumption in American Archaeology*, edited by Craig N. Cipolla, 59–79. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.

- Cruz Berrocal, María and Cheng-hwa Tsang (eds.). 2017. *Historical Archaeology of Early Modern Colonialism in Asia-Pacific*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida
- Edelman, Murray. 1995. *From Art to Politics: How Artistic Creations Shape Political Conceptions*. Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.
- Ferris, Neal, Rodney Harrison, and Michael V. Wilcox (eds.). 2014. *Rethinking Colonial Past through Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flexner, James F. 2014. “Historical archaeology, contact, and colonialism in Oceania”. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 22(1): 43–87.
- Gosden, Chris. 2004. *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact From 5000 BC to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gosden, Chris, and Yvonne Marshall. 1999. “The cultural biography of objects.” *World Archaeology* 31(2): 169–178.
- Hall, Martin. 1999. “Subaltern voices? Finding the spaces between things and words”. In *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, edited by P. Funari, S. Jones and M. Hall, 193–202. New York: Routledge.
- Hart, Siobhan M., Maxine Oland, and Liam Frink. 2012. “Finding transitions. Global pathways to decolonizing Indigenous histories in archaeology.” In *Decolonizing Indigenous Histories: Exploring Prehistoric/Colonial Transitions in Archaeology*, edited by Maxine Oland, Siobhan M. Hart, and Liam Frink, 1–15. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Hautala-Hirvioja, Tuija Helena. 2015. “Reflections of the past: A meeting between Sámi cultural heritage and contemporary Finnish Sámi.” In *Relate North: Art, Heritage & Identity*, edited by Timo Jokela and Glen Coutts, 78–97. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.
- Hayes, Katherine. 2015. “Indigeneity and diaspora. Colonialism and the classification of displacement.” In *Rethinking Colonialism: Comparative Archaeological Approaches*, edited by Craig N. Cipolla, and Katherine Howlett Hayes, 54–75. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Hillerdal, Charlotta, Anna Karlström, and Carl-Gösta Ojala. 2017. “Introduction.” In *Archaeologies of “Us” and “Them”: Debating History, Heritage and Indigeneity*, edited by Hillerdal, Charlotta, Anna Karlström, and Carl-Gösta Ojala, 1–13. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Hodder, Ian. 2012. *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things*. Chichester: Wiley.

Howey, Meghan C.L. 2017. "Sympathetic magic and indigenous consumption of kettles during early colonial encounter in the Northeast." In *Foreign Objects: Rethinking Indigenous Consumption in American Archaeology*, edited by Craig N. Cipolla, 162–83. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.

Källén, Anna. 2015. "Postcolonial theory and Sámi archaeology: A commentary." *Arctic Anthropology* 52(2): 81–86

Karlström, Anna. 2017. "Spaces between "us" and "them"." In *Archaeologies of "Us" and "Them": Debating History, Heritage and Indigeneity*, edited by Hillerdal, Charlotta, Anna Karlström, and Carl-Gösta Ojala, 109–11. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: OUP Oxford.

Lawrence, Bonita. 2004. *"Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Liebmann, Matthew. 2008. "Introduction. The intersections of archaeology and postcolonial studies." In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, edited by Liebmann, Matthew and Rizvi, Uzma Z., 1–20. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Lightfoot, Kent G., and Antoinette Martinez. 1995. "Frontiers and boundaries in archaeological perspective." *Annual Review in Anthropology* 24: 471–492.

Meskell, Lynn. 2004. *Object Worlds in Ancient Egypt. Material Biographies Past and Present*. Oxford – New York: Berg.

Mikkonen, Nadja. 2016. "Kyse on oikeudesta maahan, kieleen ja kulttuuriin." *YLE uutiset* 19.9.2016. Available at <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-9135075>

Nakatani, Ayami. 2015. "Dressing Miss World with Balinese brocades: The "fashionalization" and "heritagization" of handwoven textiles in Indonesia." *Textile* 13(1): 30–49.

Näkkäläjärvi, Pirita. 2016. "Näkökulma: Närkästyneet saamelaiset otsikoissa." *YLE uutiset* 16.5.2016. Available at https://yle.fi/uutiset/osasto/sapmi/nakokulma_narkastyneet_saamelaiset_otsikoissa/8877876

- Naum, Magdalena, and Jonas M. Nordin. 2013. "Introduction. Situating Scandinavian colonialism." In *Scandinavian Colonialism and the Rise of Modernity: Small Time Agents in a Global Arena*, edited by Magdalena Naum, and Jonas M. Nordin, 3–16. New York: Springer.
- Nordin, Jonas, and Carl-Gösta Ojala. 2015. "Collecting Sápmi: Early modern collecting of Sámi material culture." *Nordisk Museologi* 2015/2: 114–122.
- Ojala, Carl-Gösta, and Jonas M. Nordin. 2015. "Mining Sápmi: Colonial histories, Sámi archaeology, and the exploitation of natural resources in Northern Sweden." *Arctic Anthropology* 52(2): 6–21.
- Oliver, Jeff. 2013. "Reflections on resistance: Agency, identity and being indigenous in colonial British Columbia." In *Historical Archaeologies of Cognition: Explorations into Faith, Hope and Charity*, edited by James Symonds, Anna Badcock, and Jeff Oliver, 98–116. Sheffield: Equinox Publishing.
- Oliver, Jeff, and Ágústa Edwald. 2016. "Between islands of ethnicity and shared landscapes. Rethinking settler society, cultural landscapes and the study of the Canadian West." *Cultural Geographies* 23(2): 199–219.
- Olsen, Bjørnar. 2010. *In Defense of Things: Archaeology and the Ontology of Objects*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Paltto, Anni-Saara. 2016. "Kiasmaa arvostellaan feikkisaamenpukuvideon ostamisesta." *YLE uutiset* 10.5.2016. Available at <https://yle.fi/uutiset/3-8869765>
- Paterson, Alistair G. 2011. "Considering colonialism and capitalism in Australian historical archaeology: Two case studies of culture contact from the pastoral domain". In *The Archaeology of Capitalism in Colonial Contexts*, edited by Sarah K. Croucher and Lidsay Weiss, 243–267. New York: Springer.
- Reid, Andrew and Paul J. Lane (eds.). 2004. *African Historical Archaeologies*. New York: Springer.
- Seitsonen, Oula. 2018. *Digging Hitler's Arctic War. Archaeologies and Heritage of the Second World War German Military Presence in Finnish Lapland*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Silliman, Stephen W. 2005. "Culture contact or colonialism? Challenges in the archaeology of Native North America." *American Antiquity* 70(1): 55–74.

Silliman, Stephen W. 2009. "Change and continuity, practice and memory: Native American persistence in colonial New England." *American Antiquity* 74(2): 211–230.

Silliman, Stephen. 2010. "Indigenous traces in colonial spaces. Archaeologies of ambiguity, origin, and practice." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 10(1): 28–58.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the subaltern speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, 271–313. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.