

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Kennewick Man: Perspectives on the Ancient One. Edited by Heather Burke, Claire Smith, Dorothy Lippert, Joe Watkins, and Larry Zimmerman.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2dr2h1bx>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 34(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Crawford O'Brien, Suzanne J.

Publication Date

2010-03-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

with Munson's observations on the texts. Although Munson's volume offers researchers the information in a concise, clear format, Chapman and Barrie's biography provides a richer, more readable version of Chapman's life. This biography fleshes out many elements of Chapman's life, although, given his large body of work as a painter, more color images of his paintings, particularly the murals he painted for the St. Francis Auditorium at the Museum of New Mexico, would have been helpful. As it is, the book is an enjoyable read for anyone interested in the history of this unique part of the country, and scholars from various fields, from Native American cultures to archaeology and art history, will find much to recommend it.

Suzanne Newman Fricke
University of New Mexico

Kennewick Man: Perspectives on the Ancient One. Edited by Heather Burke, Claire Smith, Dorothy Lippert, Joe Watkins, and Larry Zimmerman. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008. 298 pages. \$65.00 cloth; \$29.95 paper.

This book makes an important contribution to ongoing conversations about the social ethics of archaeology and the path toward collaborative working relationships with indigenous communities. It does so by focusing on the controversy over Kennewick Man, also known as the Ancient One, and compiling a diverse array of perspectives on this complicated issue. The book is comprised of forty-one short chapters; authors range from tribal elders and cultural resource managers to museum curators and junior and senior archaeologists and anthropologists. Originally intended to be two volumes, the editors decided to combine the collection so as to reveal the overlapping concerns and perspectives that exist between Native communities and scholarly interests. As an anthology, it is distinct from other books on the subject that tend to present a single author's interpretation of the controversy, its history, and its implications.

Kennewick Man is a 9,600-year-old body discovered in the eroding banks of the Columbia River in 1996. Following the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the Army Corps of Engineers determined to repatriate the remains to local tribal communities for reburial. A group of scientists sued to halt the reburial and gain control of the remains for study. After years of legal proceedings, the courts found for the scientists. The remains are currently housed in the Burke Museum in Seattle, Washington.

A variety of common themes can be traced throughout the diverse contributions to this volume: media coverage of the controversy, traditional Native perspectives regarding the remains, damage to working relationships as a result of the controversy, what archaeologists and tribes can learn from the conflict, and a critique of NAGPRA as it currently stands.

Media coverage of the case has been problematic. Coverage emphasizes artificially polarized positions, pitting "science" against "religion," and

“Natives” against “archaeologists” when, as this text demonstrates, such binaries are far from clear. Much of the media storm has focused upon initial descriptions of the body as having Caucasoid characteristics. Journalists and members of the public were quick to misinterpret the descriptor as implying that the Ancient One was of European descent. As one piece in this volume notes, the repercussions of this can still be seen on white supremacist Web sites that point to Kennewick Man as evidence that white Americans are the only true Americans.

Numerous chapters highlight Native perspectives on the Ancient One that emphasize their responsibility to care for the earth and the dead. Native authors locate the conflict in terms of the continuing sacred connection they hold with their past, the natural world, and their ancestors. They argue that they have inherent responsibilities and rights to protect and care for the deceased. Authors also critique the scientists seeking control of the remains, seeing them as driven by “pure selfishness,” pursuing “their own personal gain” and “prestige,” and having an agenda intent on undermining the legitimacy of indigenous identity (151, 48, 99, 225). The court’s decision to allow scientists access to the remains is seen as undermining indigenous sovereignty and a tribal community’s right to care for and rebury its dead.

Indigenous and nonindigenous authors express concern that the Kennewick Man controversy has irrevocably damaged working relationships between tribes and archaeologists. For Native authors, the heart of the conflict stems from the failure of scientists to show tribes “common decent respect” (99), and several authors point out that such conflicts could have been avoided from the beginning if tribes had been properly consulted. As one author argued, “respect and empathy are huge components that need to be interjected into this whole process” (101). Archaeologists mirror this concern, fearing that the plaintiff scientists acted inappropriately, showed disrespect, and intentionally sought to undermine NAGPRA. Several authors express fears that in so doing the plaintiffs have damaged working relationships for the future.

Archaeologists here also offer critiques of archaeology, pointing to its foundations within a colonial, racist, and patriarchal past. Authors argue that this case provides an opportunity for archaeologists to reform their tradition despite the risks it may pose to their existing authority. Such reform, authors argue, would provide opportunities to make archaeology more relevant and useful to the communities it purports to study. As one author put it, the controversy provides an opportunity to challenge “undisguised attempts to limit the effects of NAGPRA” and the “fraud, folly and ineptitude” that characterized the initial approach to Kennewick Man (215).

Rather than marginalizing indigenous voices from their own histories, virtually all of the academic voices in the book embrace the inclusion of indigenous knowledges within their work, and many chapters call for the creation of collaborative projects. Existing models for collaborative work are discussed here, despite the fact that they are generally overlooked within the media. As chapters call for more respectful relationships built on cooperation and engagement, they also provide suggestions for how compromise could

be (or could have been) achieved. One author argues that the Ancient One's remains should be studied under the supervision of advisers selected by the Native communities concerned, so as to ensure proper standards of care and that analysis of the remains pursues questions relevant to the tribes. Another argues that shifting from a paradigm of "ownership" to one of "stewardship" in regard to ancient human remains would provide "an opportunity for accommodating multiple claims of affiliation by opening the door to the possibility of joint or collaborative stewardship" (189). If archaeologists can achieve a shift toward building respectful relationships between all concerned parties, another author argues, it will become evident that the best caretakers of human remains will be teams comprised of archaeologists and Native Americans. Native voices within the text make their own case for increased engagement with the archaeological field, pointing out the need for tribes to take an active role in providing cultural sensitivity training for the next generation of archaeologists. By doing so, tribes will be able to ensure that they have a hand in writing their own histories and managing their own cultural resources.

The book also offers an important critique of NAGPRA, demonstrating its inability to protect or ensure the repatriation of indigenous human remains adequately. Authors point out that NAGPRA applies only to public lands and problematically defines human remains as "property." As one author argues, the point of such legislation should be "not to respect the rights of their descendants, but to respect *the ancestors themselves*" (138, emphasis in original). NAGPRA also stumbles over the definition of what it means to be "indigenous," illustrating the complicated nature of indigenous identity, particularly given the relatively recent construction of "tribes" as we know them today and the artificial (and modern) construction of race. Essays point out how this case has put the responsibility upon indigenous people to prove their identities, while discounting their own methods for demonstrating their history. One possible solution to this conundrum suggests that scholars move away from notions of "affiliation" toward "patrimony," which would allow for an understanding of identity that is more fluid and in-process, enabling archaeology to affirm multiple cultural perspectives and thus be more politically engaged and responsible.

Overall, the book is an extremely valuable contribution, both because of the diversity of opinions presented here and the efforts made to overcome the artificial polarization of positions as they have been presented in the media. It demonstrates that tribes and archaeologists share common concerns and can build respectful working relationships. Within the undergraduate classroom, the book provides helpful resources and pedagogical challenges. A detailed timeline of events and legal proceedings is quite helpful, as is the inclusion of such a wide array of diverse authors. Although the organization of the selections is fine for a general reader, it might have been done more thoughtfully for the educational context. The editors do not explicitly frame the contributions or arrange them according to overlapping themes. Although the book includes a short introduction, it is primarily up to the reader to find common themes among the chapters and bring them into conversation

with each other. If educators are willing to do this, the book provides a wealth of learning opportunities. Educators can challenge students to read these chapters as primary texts, encouraging them to interpret various positions, examine them, and compare them with each other. Although a more helpful organization and framing of the selections might have made the text more easily translatable into the classroom, it remains a valuable tool. *Kennewick Man: Perspectives on the Ancient One* is recommended for readers interested in indigenous legal rights, repatriation, anthropological and archaeological ethics, and indigenous care for the dead.

Suzanne J. Crawford O'Brien
Pacific Lutheran University

The Monacan Indian Nation of Virginia: The Drums of Life. By Rosemary Clark Whitlock. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008. 248 pages. \$46.50 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

Perhaps the most contentious debate in the social sciences and humanities today, particularly where indigenous peoples are concerned, is the question of representation and authority. Does the researcher's critical training privilege her or his interpretation of culture and community over the understandings of those who live the experiences in question? In *The Monacan Indian Nation of Virginia: The Drums of Life*, Rosemary Clark Whitlock seemingly confronts this question head on, paradoxically, by sidestepping it. Whitlock, a member of the Monacan Nation who did not grow up in the tribe's core community, but who has made every effort to embrace and be embraced by her people, offers a meticulously honest account of the Monacan Indian tribe of Virginia through a series of oral histories juxtaposed with critical historical documents that explicate the tribe's unique and turbulent colonial experience.

One of the binding themes of this work is the Monacan people's collective experience with eugenic policies in the state of Virginia during the first half of the twentieth century. From 1914 to 1946, state registrar Walter A. Plecker coordinated a virtual witch hunt designed to erase Indians from the documentary record. Convinced that all Indians in Virginia were heavily intermixed with other races, Plecker authored and saw the successful passage of the 1924 Virginia Race Integrity Act, which essentially declared that the state would thereafter acknowledge only two races existing in Virginia—white and “colored.” Accordingly, he devised a pseudoscientific system for determining the race of individuals based on surnames listed as anything other than “white” in years past. For Indians, this meant persecution for simply self-identifying as such, and it uniformly prevented all tribes in Virginia from gaining access to public schools until the early 1960s. Interestingly Plecker seems to have devoted a disproportionate amount of attention to chastising Monacans in Amherst County and surrounding areas, thereby impacting their historic identity in profound ways. Virtually every oral history presented herein illuminates Plecker's stamp on the Monacan psyche.