

Growing Indigenous Influence on Research, Extended Perspectives, and a New Methodology

A Historical Approach

Bjørg Evjen and David R. M. Beck

How are we to understand the historical context leading up to today's "Indigenous methodology" in the social sciences and humanities? Study of the growing Indigenous influence on research over the last 150 years in Norway and the United States shows how the dynamics in the encounters between researchers and the researched have become increasingly complicated. Originally put in a passive role as the objects of research, old ethnic peoples and Sámis in Norway and Native Americans in the United States today have become active participants and researchers. Researchers and their research must be placed and understood within the contemporary ideological contexts in which they live or have lived, since the situation of the researcher undoubtedly reflects the social and political conditions of the time. Analysis of research demonstrates how the researcher's perspective on Indigenous peoples and cultures consequently has changed over time and how the Indigenous role as researchers has increased. To what extent do these changes include an extended and new perspective, and to what extent is the change the consequence of a new methodology and a reflection of the international Indigenous revitalization movements? How do patterns of change in research agendas and methods compare between Norway and the United States?

In recent decades a new focus on research and research methodology has arisen. Various methodological concepts including Western research,

Indigenous methodology, and decolonizing methodology are now considered to play key roles in the analysis of research. One hundred years ago it would have been unthinkable for a Sámi, and somewhat rare for a Native American, to stand up to be an active participant in research. There was no concept of an Indigenous methodology. What happened to research on topics of relevance for Indigenous peoples?

Many contemporary scholars are fully aware of the changing research milieu that includes a change in power of the academic, cultural, and political sort (e.g., Niemi 1983; Stordal 2008; Trouillot 1995). Research serves as a tool of power and defines the history of the past or present. It includes those doing research and those being researched. This chapter focuses on the historical development of these changes. On the Norwegian end, our focus is on research in Sápmi in general, with examples from research conducted in a smaller part of Sápmi, namely in the Lule Sámi area. No Kvens were living in this area. In the 1900s the Sámi part of the population of Tysfjord was sought out for several large international research projects. The U.S. picture is more complex. Scholars and collectors visited hundreds of communities for large and small research projects resulting in publications, archival holdings, and museum collections. Only a very few of these relationships will be highlighted here with the intention of elucidating broad themes.

Indigenous peoples have become the focus of increasingly nuanced studies. Museums and universities began large-scale ethnographic (not to mention artifact and human remains) collecting projects in the late nineteenth century with varying degrees of cooperation from and exploitation of Native American community members and scholars. To what extent did the same patterns appear in Norway and the United States regarding the focus of research and the encounter between the researcher and the researched? What were the key differences? How can this be explained? The main lines of relevant historical development serve as backdrops and will be sketched briefly step-by-step.

Time of Enlightenment, the First Step

The years preceding the mid-nineteenth century when research on minorities was broadly characterized by exoticism throughout the Western world will be considered first. Non-Norwegians were to be integrated “naturally” into Norwegian society. In Norway, as in the rest of Scandinavia, senior officials, often vicars, mostly coming from the southern part of the country,

wrote in their journals or in books of travel about the people they met, not the least on the strange and exotic Sámi population. Although Norway was christened around 1000 AD, it wasn't until 1700 that missionaries were sent north to christen the people living there. Reports and letters from the missionaries tell about a pre-Christian worldview. Through stories and drawings they mediate an understanding of Sámi as a people living in and close to nature (Nordnorske samlinger 1938–1947). In North America most of the early observations of Indigenous people were recorded by missionaries, travelers/explorers, or government officials, and Indians were represented as objects of proselytization (Thwaites, 1896–1901). As time went on, Native people were viewed as “savage,” either in romanticized terms as the “noble savage” living in harmony with nature, or fearful terms, such as the “savage savage” threatening the safety of the European invading settler societies (Berkhofer 1978; Pearce 1967). Documenting Native peoples became a key component of America's expansion to the west by the early nineteenth century.

The pastor Olav Holm of the parish in Tysfjord (1878–1884) carried a residue of this attitude and a transition representing what was to come. He arrived in local societies where different ethnic groups lived close together, which was new to him. He took a great interest in the Sámi. Holm studied the cultural diversity of the area and wrote books and several articles for newspapers and periodicals (cf. Evjen 1998). In many contexts Pastor Holm is especially mentioned as an example of the condescending attitude of majority society toward the Sámi. In his work *Fra en nordlandsk Prestegaard* (*From a Nordland Parsonage*), he describes meeting with the Sámi of Tysfjord. Not surprisingly, his account is colored by the distance between the state officials and his subjects, and it gives an exotic picture of the Sámi while highlighting positive and negative qualities. Thus, he is struck with wonder when Sámi children demonstrate especially strong powers of reasoning in arriving at answers to his questions and states, “it is remarkable how quick these youngsters can be with answers to questions when—it must be noted—they have had a good teacher. Truths pop into their minds from nowhere, as it were” (Holm 1923, 129). Many times he remarks on how beautiful some Sámi can be, as if this were something unexpected that had to be emphasized for his readers.

Holm's writings reflect the changing attitude in the culture of the time from exoticism to nationalism; his were clearly influenced by the attitudes of social Darwinism. He wrote that “the White man's” culture was superior to that of the Sámi. While central in the work mentioned above, the Sámi are not mentioned in his 1889 *Det norske Folks Historie*

(*The History of the Norwegian People*). The influence of nationalism meant that any historical account had to stress the homogeneity of Norwegian culture. Given this point of view, the Sámi were too different and a minority to boot. However, Pastor Holm collected enough stories, myths, names, and so on for an entire book about them. For unknown reasons it was not published, but the manuscript for *Lapperne* (The Lapps) can be found in the manuscript collection of the library at the University of Oslo. Holm viewed the Sámi as if they were one homogenous group rooted in an Eastern culture. He described them in a 1907 publication in the following manner, a well-known attitude in the contemporary context of his time.

I believe the Lapp is all but immune to what, to us, is higher culture, which is the level of our culture at this time. As far as I can see, he lacks the preconditions to create a social order that requires diligence, respect for rules, and a basic discipline in all aspects of higher form of social existence . . . for which the Asiatic nomad is not well suited, no matter how long he has been permanently settled. (Holm 1907, 16)

In North America and the United States the fascination with American Indians was strong, even if the attitudes toward them were similar to those toward the Sámi in Norway. The Jesuit missionaries in the north and the Spanish invaders in the south wrote copiously about their perceptions of Indian people from the first encounters onward. Missionaries sent news back to their European bases in the form of letters in order to raise funds; they emphasized the backwardness of Indian communities and glorified their successes in bringing them to Christ (Thwaites 1896–1901). Spanish America in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries developed the legal system that would come to characterize a significant foundation of the modern United States' Indian policy, defining American Indians as culturally inferior to Europeans (Anaya 2004). This definition gave Euro-Americans a special obligation, in their view, to bring about massive cultural change to the people in Native American communities.

By the early nineteenth century the United States had begun its expansion across the continent in earnest, which culminated in the dispossession of nearly all tribal land and resources by the end of the century. The "cant of conquest," to borrow a term from Frances Jennings (1976), informed the reservation and assimilation policies that accompanied and followed it. American Indians were viewed as childlike, without religion, and lacking real social and governing institutions. They were also treated as curiosities and alternatively as peoples to be feared (the savage savage) or

emulated (the noble savage). Ironically, even as Indian lands were being taken from them, as Indian people were being killed in warfare and massacres, and as Indian cultures were coming under heavy assault, non-Indian people idolized their own perceptions of Native American culture (D'Alora 1999).

Government-sponsored explorations to the west in the early nineteenth century generally included orders to report on conditions in Indian Country so that governing officials back east could be better informed in the efforts to expand American influence across the continent. This would become a pattern for the next century and a half or more. Lewis and Clark and Zebulon Pike, in their famous expeditions, recorded data regarding the American Indian people they encountered as did Jedidiah Morse in his commissioned report of the conditions of American Indian tribes. Although this information lacked the perspective of the Native Americans themselves it came to guide federal relations with tribes (Coues 1895; Morse 1822; Ronda 1984; Salish-Pend d'Oreille Culture Committee and Elders Cultural Advisory Council 2005).

Occasionally during this era observers recorded ethnographic material about Indians because they were curious. These were largely descriptive and judgmental. At times these could provide valuable details of everything from social relations to tribal customs, as in the case of Edwin James and the Menominee in 1815. James was stationed at the military fort at Gree Bay and recorded a lengthy journal providing ethnographic descriptions of Menominee customs and practices. More often, however, these recorded observations described violent encounters, such as those of Jedidiah Smith with Indians in Oregon, or cultural misunderstanding, such as that between Alexander McLeod and Coos tribal people. The latter expressed frustration in his journal in 1826 at being unable to ascertain the location of trapping grounds from tribal leaders, who after all were simply protecting access to their resources. All of these types of narratives are marred by ethnocentric assumptions of Western cultural superiority (Beck 2002, 2006; Davies 1961; Kasprzycki 1990).

Historian Robert E. Bieder, in his seminal work on early American ethnologists, observes that in the nineteenth century, ethnologists' work purportedly influenced policy makers, though he questions the extent to which this actually occurred. Some, such as Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, actually worked for the government in the field of Indian relations and directly applied their observations to their actions in the field. Ethnologists in these years were still concerned with defining how and where American Indian fit into the development of human societies, whether they were a separate

developed race, and the extent to which environment shaped people and vice versa. Their various works often reflected the scientific theories they propounded more than the peoples they studied (Bieder 1986).

Nationalism, the Second Step

In the second step, from approximately 1850 to 1940, nationalism held sway. Indigenous peoples were viewed as "outsiders" who should be brought into the life of the dominant culture. A nation was meant to consist of one culturally homogenous population. In Norway a lot of effort was put into defining everybody as one and the same in the policy of Norwegianization, including sending children to Norwegian schools. In Sweden the policy of Swedenization was a bit different but was nevertheless founded in the same kind of national policy. While in Norway this policy can be labeled as "assimilation," in Sweden to a certain extent it was "segregation." Reindeer-herding Sámi were organized in *Samebyer*, that is, local areas where reindeer husbandry was allowed and where children went to Sámi speaking schools. In the United States nationalism followed the era of "separation," as even the meager lands set aside for Indian tribes were increasingly coveted by Americans. In this U.S. era, reservations were established in small remnants of tribal homelands, and then Americans laid siege to them to dispossess tribes from their resources and individuals from their cultural affiliation. The federal policy of forced assimilation was enacted in an effort at Americanization.

In the decades prior to World War I, Norwegian researchers held German universities and researchers in the highest regard, including the German's focus on finding national human physical features and races. This was the heyday of social Darwinism with its agenda of the racial superiority of "the white man." The attitude at the time strongly favored the assimilation of "the outsiders" into society. In addition, there was a negative attitude in the dominant society regarding the position of reindeer-herding Sámi and the sea Sámi. The latter were often portrayed as if they stood on the lowest rung of the social status ladder (Eriksen and Niemi 1981; Helland 1908). To what degree this also was considered to be true internally amongst the Sámi has so far not been the subject of research.

German dominance changed with the outbreak of the war in 1914. After that a meeting place for Nordic researchers was formed with the establishment of the Institute for Comparative Cultures with its own publication series. The study of the Arctic peoples became one of the main tasks with

a primary focus on the Sámi. Norway was obliged to do research on them before they "yield for the modern culture's homogenizing influence" (Stang 1925, 62). The Sámi was a small population with "an exotic and strange language and culture." Thus, the results from the future research were expected to be rich and meaningful (Stang 1925, 62).

During these years, cultures of Arctic peoples with particular emphasis on the Sámi culture became a main area of interest for the Norwegian Scientific Society and the Ethnographic Museum, which also produced their own publications. In this context we can especially point out the North Norwegian collections in which the Sámi culture was strongly represented.

Linguist Just Qvigstad held a great interest in the Sámi people and saw it as a task of major importance to collect Sámi materials while there still was time (Hansen 1991). Qvigstad had contacted none other than Holm to become better informed about the conditions in Tysfjord. He took a special interest in the sea Sámi. Among other things, he took on the task of examining the sea Sámi dialect called *Finnagiella* or the old Tysfjord dialect. This dialect was significantly different from the one spoken by the mountain Sámi in the same area (Qvigstad 1925, 18). According to Qvigstad, the dialect was close to extinction to some extent because of the influence from the mountain Sámi and Norwegianism. The Lule Sámi dialect of the mountain Sámi still held its own against Norwegian influence (Qvigstad 1888, 1925).

Qvigstad managed to collect samples of *Finnagiella*, but he was not able to learn the language. According to oral tradition, he paid a sea Sámi to come and visit him in his hometown Tromsø and share his knowledge. Another story relates how Qvigstad, when visiting Tysfjord, even had to follow an informant in a rowboat across the fjord to get information. The sea Sámi disliked Qvigstad comparing and claiming a common origin for mountain and sea Sámi; the relationship between the researcher and the researched was somewhat strained. He succeeded only to some extent and did not manage to define the language grammatically. He only gave an overview list of the words he managed to find. Today we do not know much more about *Finnagiella* aside from that found by Qvigstad.

Of a more ethnocultural documentation was his collection of oral tales, published between 1927 and 1929 (Amundsen 1972, 61f). Qvigstad also wanted to document the extent of the Sámi population in the Lule Sámi area. In 1929 he published *Sjøfinnene i Nordland (Sea Sami in Nordland)*, where he quantifies and documents a sea Sámi settlement on the basis of several source categories. Tysfjord's work shows the highest number of sea

Sámi in Nordland County (Qvigstad 1929). Decades were to pass before researchers picked up this thread.

Qvigstad maintained contact with Nordic and European linguists to stay informed and develop new research projects. There was, among others, K. B. Wiklund with whom he documented cross-border reindeer herding. This Swedish researcher also documented the cross-border activity in his own publication. Two publications dealing with the same subject must be seen in the context of the breakup of the union with Sweden in 1905 when Norway became completely independent. The Swedish researcher Wiklund wanted to reveal all the Swedish Sámi that seasonally were moving from the Swedish side of the border to the Norwegian side, while the Norwegian researcher Qvigstad wanted to focus the Norwegian Sámi using the same areas (Wiklund 1908; Wiklund and Qvigstad 1909). Nationalism still held a strong position.

Language and stories were popular objects of collection and recording in the United States at this time as well. Ethnologists working for the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, regional museum anthropologists and ethnologists, and some university scholars all undertook projects. The ethnologists fanned out across Indian Country. Some specialized in languages and cultures of specific tribal communities; others collected more generally. In order to collect effectively, these scholars collaborated with tribal members in their communities, and the relationships that resulted were complex and varied.

Walter James Hoffman, a Smithsonian ethnologist, voiced the justifications for collecting stories and languages that would be used for generations to come. He studied the religious ceremonies first of the Ojibwe and then the Menominee tribes in the late nineteenth century. When Menominee leaders, including Neopit, became aware of this, they met with Hoffman in Washington, DC, and asked him to conduct a similar study for them “in order that their version of the traditions and dramatized forms of initiation could be studied and preserved ‘for the information of future generations of the Menomini’” (Hoffman 1896, 11). For generations to come, ethnologists and tribal elders reasoned that the old ways were dying out and they needed to be recorded to preserve them (Densmore 1932; Dusenberry 1998; Slotkin 1952, 1957). In fact, in popular culture among reformers, political and bureaucratic officials, and scholars, American Indians were viewed as a “dying race.” This meant that Americans expected Indians to disappear as distinct peoples, communities, and cultures (Beck 2001). Such was also the attitude in Scandinavia toward the Sámi (Evjen and Hansen 2008).

Ethnologists, linguists, and folklorists all collected stories in tribal languages and in English. Sometimes they would be published in both languages, sometimes in English. Often the published stories were distillations of much more comprehensive sets of field notes. Many times the notes were collected by local tribal members for the ethnologists (Bloomfield 1928; Saokio Heritage 2009; Skinner and Satterlee 1913).

In a few cases American Indians themselves conducted the ethnological work. Most well-known among these individuals was William A. Jones, a Fox tribal member who earned a doctorate in anthropology from Columbia University and studied under Franz Boas. In 1904 Jones became the first American Indian to earn a PhD in anthropology. A skilled linguist, he worked within the museum world until he met an untimely death in the Philippines in 1908 (LaPier and Beck 2012).

The idea in these cases was that tribal languages were dying, and in order to preserve them, either for the future of tribal members or of science, they needed to be recorded. Probably the most prolific recorder of tribal languages in the first half of the twentieth century was John Peabody Harrington, who gathered stories for tribes throughout California and the Pacific Coast (Kraus International Publications Microfilm, 1981).

Physical Measurements of the “Other”

Around the turn of the century, research became intensely focused on “races” and the “Other” to determine, among other things, the differences between ethnic groups of people. One method was the so-called skull measurements, physical measurements that included not just the head, but also other parts of the body of the living and dead. Military physicians all over Norway gathered data in conjunction with drafts for military service, data that also was categorized according to ethnicity.

International research projects were undertaken in order to make physical measurements of ethnic groups (Schreiner 1935, 1939). In Norway this was done with Sámi, Kven, and Norwegians. Tysfjord was one of a number of Norwegian areas included in the study. Extensive materials were also collected in Sweden. The leading researchers in Norway were the physician Kristian E. Schreiner and his wife Alette. Initially they wanted to examine the sea Sámi part of the population because they had been told that they were the original inhabitants. They changed their approach to focus on a particular fjord—the Hellemo Fjord—when they learned that the sea Sámi were scattered across the area. In this fjord lived descendants of sea and

mountain Sámi. Schreiner's measurements in Tysfjord in 1914 and 1921 were taken of 210 Sámi, with as many as 28 measurements per person. It turned out it was not possible to assign exact measurements to any distinctive features of Sámi people; they were as different amongst themselves as the people of London, according to Schreiner (1935). The results of the international research also did not provide any basis for clear patterns. It was problematic, if not impossible, to determine original physical features of the members of an ethnic group.

In the generations to follow, the descriptions from these encounters between Sámi and researchers have become veritable migratory tales. There are still people who remember these events. Different versions have been told in which the Sámi had to be physically restrained while the measurements were taken. Many refused to undress, not surprisingly, making it impossible to take measurements of their bodies. Others present at these measurement sessions supposedly found the whole scene interesting. They probably were not familiar with the theories that could only be tested with their participation. This situation was an extreme case of using the Sámi as passive research objects. The results of the investigations conducted in 1914 and 1921 were published in German and English and printed in the publications of the Scientific Society, *Vitenskapsselskapets skrifter*. This made them all but inaccessible for the local population (Evjen 1998; Schreiner 1932, 1935, 1939).

Since this was part of broadly conceived international research projects, similar testing was conducted in the United States at this time. The new science of physical anthropology was increasingly used to shape or reinforce policy. This was done on living people and the dead, on fresh corpses and older remains. Some of this research was sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution, the national museum of the United States. The research on the living was used to determine the extent to which American Indian individuals were "full blood" versus "mixed blood." By the late nineteenth century Indian competency and tribal membership were considered by federal officials to be based on the degree to which Indians ancestors were Indian or white. The more white blood that Indians had, the more competent they were deemed to be. This led to a blood quantum-based identification system that still exists in many tribal communities in the United States.

As American entrepreneurs in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries schemed ways to disenfranchise Indian communities and individuals from their lands and resources, anthropological testing, with a scientific imprimatur, became a valuable tool for federal officials who sided

more often with resource extractors than with tribes. In Minnesota, for example, when logging interests hoped to gain access to valuable timber resources, they brought in nationally renowned scientists, such as Albert Jenks and Aleš Hrdlička, to determine who was full-blood and who was mixed-blood tribal members. As tribal lands were allotted, the federal government had more authority to sell resources belonging to full-bloods, and the private market played a larger role in relation to mixed-bloods. Testing, such as judging whether individuals resembled facial casts of full-bloods, how curly their hair was, the size of their feet, and how quickly their natural color returned to their skin when it was scratched upon, formed the basis of the judgment. Unfortunately, this "science" was used in massive resource dispossession of some of the richest forestland in the United States (Beaulieu 1984).

Hrdlička's knowledge was based in part on his skull and human remains collection work with the Smithsonian. In fact, before the 1906 Antiquities Act protected human remains and burials for scientific research, Hrdlička published a how-to manual for collecting human remains through the United States Government Printing Office. He emphasized the value of robbing fresh graves in which skin was still in relatively good shape on the corpses and the value of collecting the remains of children. He urged amateurs to send these collections to the national museum for study. He also included color markers similar to modern paint chips so that the collector could judge skin color (Hrdlička 1904). Even one of the key figures in American anthropology, Franz Boas, participated in the collection of these remains for study and display. But he complained in his diary that "it is most unpleasant work to steal bones from graves, but what is the use, someone has to do it. . . . Yesterday I wrote to the Museum in Washington asking whether they would consider buying skulls this winter for \$600; if they will, I shall collect assiduously. Without having such a connection I would not do it" (Boas in Kosslak 1999, 134).

The U.S. Army and museum officials made such collections and used them as part of studies that reinforced social Darwinistic theories. Skulls collected by army officials that later went to the Smithsonian, for example, were classified to rank the intelligence of racial groups. When the skulls did not match preconceived hierarchical assumptions, the data were manipulated in various ways to prove that Caucasians were the most intelligent race, while other racial groups lacked the cranial capacity to meet those same standards. These encounters with collectors and the loss of ancestors were remembered with sorrow and anger in tribal communities throughout the country. In 1990 after tribal member Curly Bear Wagner conducted

research at the Smithsonian, the Blackfeet Tribe of Montana recovered some remains, which had been collected by an army doctor. They then held a ceremony for the repatriation and reburial of these ancestors. Oral histories among the Menominee also have revealed the horrific memories of tribal elders who in the early twentieth century in their childhood saw graves rifled (Beck 2010; Bieder 1986; Could 1981; Hinsley 1981).

In Neiden, Norway, protests arose when outsiders came to open graves and remove the skeletons. Sámi and Kven also put spells on the diggers to stop them but without success. A researcher at the University of Oslo processed and stored the material. After a long process of negotiation, in September 2011, the remains of ninety-five persons were brought back and reburied in Neiden.

Increasing Focus on the Sea Sámi

In the 1920s it was claimed that only the reindeer-herding Sámi had an exotic culture different from the Norwegians. The sea Sámi had been living close to the Norwegians using their language and clothing, and thus were of a lesser interest as research objects (Stang 1925, 74). However, shortly after World War II, there was a renewed focus on the sea Sámi portion of the population. It began in Finnmark with teacher Anders Larsen's book *About the Sea Sámi* written in the Sámi language in 1947 and translated into Norwegian in 1950. Larsen was himself a sea Sámi, but he was not a researcher. His account presented the sea Sámi culture through the activities of everyday life. He published his knowledge and familiarity of the sea Sámi after the strong urging of Qvigstad. Larsen's publications broke new ground—an attempt to reveal the distinctiveness of sea Sámi culture and way of life seen from the vantage point of “the Other.” However, it fell to the ethnologist Knut Kolsrud to make the sea Sámi culture of the Lule Sámi area the focus of scholarly attention.

Kolsrud's 1947 doctoral dissertation dealt with the Sámi people of the area north of Tysfjord, Ofoten, and *Finnfolket i Ofoten*. This was a seminal work for later research on Sámi and especially sea Sámi culture, settlement, and way of life. Kolsrud demonstrated how the sea Sámi originally made up a clear majority in Ofoten but later over the centuries were pushed aside by Norwegian migration into the area. He was also the first to document and analyze how the special jurisdictional institution known as *Finneodelen* (special allodium rights) functioned in relation to the traditional sea Sámi sites and settlements in Ofoten.

During Kolsrud's doctoral defense, a discussion ensued among the non-Sámi academics about the background for the seasonal movements—between the winter settlements and summer pastures from outer to inner parts of the fjords. This could be documented among some of the sea Sámi population of Nordland. On the basis of this publication, Kolsrud published the study *Sommersete (Summer Pasture)* in 1961. In this work he documented that the population of Tysfjord around 1600 was almost totally Sámi and that the varied economic adaption of the sea Sámi was quite similar to that of Ofoten. The only exception was that the majority regularly moved seasonally to summer pastures because of the need to add feeding resources for raising cattle. Together with Qvigstad's earlier investigations, Kolsrud's works on Ofoten and Tysfjord were to become an important foundation for later research on sea Sámi history in the Lule Sámi area (Evjen and Hansen 2008).

This encounter between the researcher and the sea Sámi occurred on the basis of the researcher's archival studies and interviews. Kolsrud also sought to become informed about conditions by questioning his contemporary sea Sámi relatives.

Post-World War II, the Third Step

A new attitude emerged and gradually left Norwegian nationalism behind. The new trend arose from the welfare state; the egalitarianism subsequently provided a space for pluralism—that is a greater appreciation for diversity in society (Niemi 1983). On an international level the number of researchers increased as did the number of international research networks in the days of globalization.

The Sámi and the Kven were the two ethnic groups in Norway considered to be “the exotic” and “the outsiders,” although they had lived in the country from time immemorial. Increasingly after World War II these groups contributed to the consciousness of cultural pluralism of North Norwegian society. In addition, a growing sense of ethnic consciousness took place on the part of the people being studied—in this context the Lule Sámi on the Norwegian side of the border. This development is clearly reflected in the growth and building of ethnopolitical organizations. Among the Sámi, the first wave of ethnopolitical mobilization came at the beginning of the 1900s. It was dominated by southern Sámi initiators but did not attract a large following and almost disappeared in the period between the world wars. After 1950 the buildup continued with the establishment of

Nordic and national Sámi institutions, but it was not until the politicized 1960s and 1970s that ethnopolitics had a wider impact (cf. Minde 1997, 134). The National Association of Norwegian Sámi, (NSR [Norske Samers Riksforbund]) was formed in 1968 and 1969 when only Sámi were accorded full membership. The “NSR was probably a sign that the Sámi themselves were increasingly in charge” (Drivenes 1994, 265).

Several aspects of social changes after World War II had a bearing on Sámi research. The egalitarian principle was one of the underpinnings on which Norwegian society was built after the war. This forms the basis for the following characterization of Sámi culture in *Nordnorsk kulturhistorie* (North Norwegian Cultural History). “It would seem that Norwegian social democracy found it difficult to support the Sámi cultural awakening. The rhetoric of social democracy about social solidarity and national unity meant that social differences within the nation had to be reduced and—given such an ideological perspective, it was difficult to attach much value to developing minority cultures” (Drivenes 1994, 265).

Another aspect of the social change was the opening of a space in the field for a Sámi scholar to conduct Sámi studies. There was mainly cross-border reindeer herding in the Lule Sámi area with summer residence on the Norwegian side of the border and in winter on the Swedish side. On the Swedish side of the border, the geographer Israel Ruong, subsequently professor in Sámi language, published in the 1940s and later several works on reindeer herding, as well as works on the permanently settled Sámi. Ruong found the area south of Tysfjord, Pite Lappmark, especially interesting because their linguistic, ethnological, and cultural borders crossed between the forest and mountain Sámi areas. He himself was Pite Sámi from the southernmost part of the Lule Sámi area. This time it was an account by the Other; researcher and the objects of research were Sámi. The topics were, however, not different from earlier research.

In the 1960s an American-financed project on employment and out-migration from North Norway, known as the *Isolationsprosjektet* (Isolation Project) was started. Aspiring professor Per Mathiesen, who also took part in the project, gave an analytic discourse on the position of the researcher taking part in this project pertaining to the living conditions of the Other. The research results were intended to be given to the minorities to provide them with information regarding how the majority society made decisions of importance for the minority. The aim was to provide the Sámi with the tools necessary to formulate, present, and implement their political causes, in this case concerning housing conditions (Mathiesen 1970, 64).

Inner Finnmark was one of the places researched. Ringvassøy in Troms was another place, and Tysfjord was a third one. Tysfjord’s neighboring

municipalities of Hamarøy and Sørfold were included to a lesser degree. From their publications it can be read that professor of sociology Vilhelm Aubert and his assistant Lina Homme got to know Sámi society from the inside in their attempt to find answers to their sociological questions. Their research reports reveal that there were close, more personal connections between researcher and research subjects under the impetus of Aubert’s initiative and Homme’s enthusiasm. The economy, poverty, and place of religion, youth, and sexual morality were some of the themes analyzed in their work. The research demonstrated that the Sámi part of the population struggled with problems of poverty, as well as issues related to culture and powerlessness. But Aubert and Homme also showed how Sámi society was imbued with solidarity, tolerance, and openness (Aubert and Homme 1965, 1970; Homme 1969). This was the time of another big international trend on how states wanted to help Indigenous groups in the north to improve living conditions with housing projects.

The postwar years in the United States saw a shift in Indian policy as congress decided to downsize the federal government. One part of this effort led to the “termination” policy intended to put an end to the political-legal relationship between tribes and the United States—one of the most destructive policies foisted on tribes in U.S. history. During the 1950s and 1960s the U.S. Congress passed laws terminating the relationships between more than 100 tribes and the United States, which threw tribal communities into massive upheaval and further impoverished already socioeconomically challenged communities (Beck 2009; Burt 1982; Fixico 1986; Metcalf 2007; Ulrich 2010).

Congressional leaders and federal administrators believed that in order for termination to be complete and lasting, Indian claims against the federal government needed to be settled once and for all. These claims derived from illegally taken resources and lands during the treaty-making era, the allotment era, and other times. Up until the 1940s tribes made these claims through the United States Court of Claims, but there were so many tribal claims that in 1946 the U.S. Congress decided to establish a separate Indian Claims Commission (ICC). This was intended to operate for five years; instead, it conducted work for more than three decades. It only made final adjudication in a handful of the hundreds of cases filed, so in the end it was not successful in its established aims (Rosenthal 1985).

The ICC process involved lengthy hearings into individual cases, and the need for evidence led to the establishment of the field of ethnohistory. Scholars combined anthropological fieldwork and archival documentary research to build evidence of tribal occupation and use of lands in order to prove their cases. The process ensconced the scholars as experts in Indian

history and culture in the legal realm and within academia (McMillen 2007). It would not be until the 1960s and 1970s that American Indians would begin the process of actively inserting themselves into the academic world on a relatively larger scale in order to take some control over the interpretation of their histories and communities to the outside world.

Demand for Active Participation

The next big international project involving Tysfjord Sámi again elicited negative reactions. In the 1980s professor of pedagogy Karl Jan Solstad led the Norwegian branch of an international research project titled *The Developmental Conditions of Growing Up in Sámi Communities*. The project was financed by the van Leer Foundation, an international fund that usually supported projects for at-risk groups in nonindustrialized countries. The board changed the guidelines of the fund to allow for Sámi participation. The project was assigned to Nordlandsforskning (Nordland Research) in Bodø and became the largest project ever in terms of its financial framework.

The goal of the project was to enhance the environment in which Sámi children were brought up and to reduce any possible discrimination. There was also a desire to stimulate the use of Sámi language and culture in the school environment. Evenes, Hattfjelldal, and Tysfjord were the chosen areas to promote this development. It turned out that the conversations with the parents, meant to be one of the starting points for the project, could not take place as a matter of course. The Sámi part of the population was reluctant to come forward.

A similar project was undertaken at the same time in Tornedal on the Swedish side of the Lule Sámi area. In the Norwegian final report, an interesting difference between the two projects was highlighted. On the Swedish side, the project director was Sámi in spite of the fact that the project was not explicitly directed toward the Sámi community. The project was considered a success. On the Norwegian side, the project was led by non-Sámi and was specifically directed toward the Sámi community. As indicated above, the Norwegian project was marred by problems in its implementation.

Representatives of the local Sámi association, established in 1979, had strong objections to the implementation of the van Leer project. They claimed that the project represented the attitudes of the past that the Norwegian majority knew best and made decisions without the Sámi having a

seat at the table (Høgmo 1992, 68). The Sámi population would no longer participate as passive research objects for the representatives of majority society. They insisted on real influence in the project.

The time had come for this change. Thanks to the efforts and active voice of local Sámi, the van Leer project was now to have a Sámi participant from the local community. A tangible and positive result of the project was the production of Sámi teaching aids for use in school (cf. Beaulieu 1984; Eriksen and Skjelnes undated; Grenersen 1995; Høgmo 1992; Isaksen undated and restricted; Jensen 1991; Solstad 1981).

The United States saw a major shift begin to occur in the late 1960s during the heyday of the civil rights movement. Vine Deloria, Jr., famously penned a caustic article on the role of anthropologists in tribal communities for *Playboy* magazine, which was a chapter in his iconic book *Custer Died for Your Sins*. This awoke in Indian Country and in popular American culture a recognition that scholars working with tribal groups generally did so for their own gain, often without considering the value of their work to the tribal communities and individuals they were studying. While there had previously been some recognition of this within anthropological circles, such as Sol Tax's development of the subfield of action anthropology, Deloria's work shifted the general scholarly view significantly (Deloria 1968, 1969; Stanley 1996; Tax 1988).

Popular historians and academic scholars alike took note and began to seek correctives. For example, David Armour's work *Massacre at Mackinaw—1763*, an edited version of Alexander Henry's journal, was retitled *Attack at Michilimackinac, 1763*, reflecting a different view of the circumstances of war (1966, 1971). George and Louise Spindler also changed the title of a study they published on the Menominee tribe in the wake of the Menominee's successful battle to overturn the federal policy of termination that had stripped them of the legal political relationship with the federal government. Originally in 1971 their work was titled *Dreamers without Power*, in reference to Menominee religious tradition. They renamed the book *Dreamers with Power* when it was reissued in 1984.

Even at this time very few American Indian individuals were entering the academy. Deloria and Beatrice Medicine (anthropology), Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (Native American Studies), and David Edmunds and Don Fixico (history) were among the handful of Indian scholars doing research and writing on tribal communities during the 1970s and early 1980s. Young tribal leaders were participating in scholarly led workshops with the result that many became activists (Cobb 2008). The newly established American Indian Graduate Program in Albuquerque was beginning to

fund American Indian students' graduate education, which led to a significant increase of Indian lawyers.

In the 1970s American Indian leaders from a variety of walks of life were working to change federal policy away from the destructive termination era to the modern era of self-determination. Many tribal leaders earning college and advanced degrees were putting their education to work within or on behalf of their communities, either in the local or national context. Some were establishing tribal colleges in their communities, which was a movement that would in many cases lead to instruction and study conducted from within the context of community knowledge and methodologies. Some three dozen tribal colleges in the United States are now members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

Ethnopolitical Revitalization, the Fourth Step

Ethnopolitical revitalization came with the watershed moment in the relationship between the Sámi and the Norwegian state after the opposition to a planned damming of the Alta-Kautokeino River system. What followed was the establishment of the Sámi Parliament in 1989, which was a part of and led to further political and cultural revival and mobilization on ethnic grounds. These events also reflect an international trend where political and cultural revitalization arose in many parts of the Indigenous world.

Sámi Research on Sámi Topics

Increased Sámi consciousness has also led to the establishment of institutions to strengthen Sámi education and research. Several Sámi institutions were established, such as The Nordic Sámi Institute in 1973 and the Nordic Council of Ministers. In 1982, a commission for higher Sámi education was appointed (Norwegian Official Utredninger [NOU] 1985, 24). The Sámi Education Council and the Sámi University College were established in 1976 and 1989, respectively (Stordal 2008). In 1996 the education council set up a branch office at Árran, a Lule Sámi center in Tysfjord, with the Lule Sámi language as a field of study. The center was opened in 1994. Thus, the area has a high profile Sámi institution at the local level. The University in Nordland has an office at Árran. The same university established two chairs in 1998 for the study of Lule Sámi language and culture.

Sámi students in the 1970s and 1980s were mainly drawn to Sámi topics of general interest. For example, many papers were written on Sámi and non-Sámi settlement patterns, organizing in the old *siida* system, ethnopolitics, and Læstadianism, a religious revelation. It is interesting to learn that many of them chose to write about Indigenous people in America rather than from their own areas. In the 1990s, the challenges of bilingual education were revisited. Topics dealing specifically with the Lule Sámi area gradually became more common, as for example, the struggle to retain the Hellefjord settlement, the Lule Sámi dialect, Lule Sámi handicrafts, Lule Sámi *yoik*, and religious issues in the area (cf. Evjen 1999 for a more comprehensive treatment).

Student work reflects changes in contemporary social and political conditions in the same manner as the research mentioned above. Here we find an ethnopolitical consciousness and an appreciation for a pluralistic society.

Dissemination of Research to and by the Other

As we have seen, earlier research has, for the most part, been done, and the results disseminated, by researchers coming from the outside. Ascertaining the results of the research was, however, not without some difficulty for those Lule Sámi who might be interested in such insight. In large measure, this was because many of the publications had restricted access, that is they were not open to general inspection. Furthermore, Alette Schreiner wrote her report from Tysfjord in German, while Kristian E. Schreiner, to all intents and purposes, published his results in German and English. Aubert and Lina Homme published their major sociological reports in English with restricted access to both. Homme's reports from Tysfjord, Hamarøy, and Sørfold were also restricted. The final report from the van Leer project was written in English (Høgmo 1992). Publishing in another language other than Norwegian/Sámi is not uncommon in projects involving international cooperation and must be understood as an act of communicating with an international research community. Final reports are usually restricted for reasons of privacy. However, paternalistic attitudes might also be at work. In other words, there might be a wish to protect the population from insights that—in the view of the researcher—are too complex or painful, or they might be subject to misunderstanding.

It is not only researchers and research institutions from the outside who keep information and material out of the public domain. Many Sámi

students have chosen to allow only limited access to their papers. As in the case of researchers, the reasons may be many and complex. First, it might be a matter of privacy. The Lule Sámi constitutes a small group where individuals can be easily recognized. Second, it could be about a desire to protect the Sámi community. New knowledge is withheld to avoid misunderstandings and inappropriate use, something which is probably the case in regard to papers with religious themes. Third, the reason might be to avoid internal criticism and to shield against anticipated disagreement and internal conflict. The restriction also prevents students and researchers from the outside from gaining access and finding fault with the conclusions. Most student papers are, however, open and available. Irrespective of any cases of individuals being held back, Sámi participation in research is now a fact of life.

Inadequate communication of results to those participating in the investigations has given rise to myths of various kinds. One such myth is that researchers made so many strange discoveries and came to such unbelievable conclusions that publication would be imprudent. Or, the researcher had crossed the line and publication would show that the people had been exploited. This is part of a wider discussion of research ethics, which is not pursued any further here.

As changes occurred in the political arena in Indian Country and within the walls of the academy, the landscape in the United States also began to shift. Increasingly, tribal knowledge became valued in the outside world as it had always been to a greater or lesser extent within Indian Country. On the governmental level, regulations for development more frequently required tribal input about cultural resource studies of lands where building or construction was going to occur. Today such work cannot be done without tribal input utilizing community-based knowledge. For example, the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) requires consultation with tribal authorities whose remains and cemeteries are uncovered in construction projects. And after the 1992 amendments, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires consultation with Tribal Historic Preservation Offices for cultural impact studies related to development (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation).

As tribal colleges and ethnic studies programs in mainstream colleges and universities developed, tribally based knowledge became increasingly important in scholarly studies. Whereas in the past it had been preserved because of fears that cultures were going extinct, it was now valued for what could be learned about modern Indigenous America and what lessons it could provide in terms of the relationship of tribal groups to

modern society. The preeminent Native American studies scholar Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (2007) has defined the unique status of Indian Country and the field of Native American studies as reliant on two foundations: Indigeneity and sovereignty. Both of these themes have increasingly become platforms of study in and of Indian Country by Indian and non-Indian scholars. Despite all of this, Indigenous perspectives are often still marginalized within the academy, as there is a tendency for academics to be more comfortable with people like themselves. This means that tribal members who grew up immersed in tribal communities are less likely to be considered as colleagues than those who grew up in more cosmopolitan settings that mainstream Americans can identify with (Medicine 2001).

Increased Focus on Cultural Pluralism, a Fifth Step Possible

Qvigstad and Kolsrud's groundbreaking research on the sea Sámi part of the population was not quickly followed by increased research on this theme in the Lule Sámi area. However, in 1982 an issue of *Ottar* from the Tromsø Museum was published with the title *Kystsámiisk bosetting* (Coastal Sámi Settlement). An issue of *Ottar* from the previous year dealt with the Alta controversy and had raised questions about the rights of the sea Sámi (Bjørklund 1981, 31). As is well-known, the Alta controversy primarily involved the rights of reindeer-herding Sámi. In the 1982 introduction, the point is made that the name "coastal Sámi" is used instead of sea Sámi, in order to include all Sámi permanently settled by the sea. No mention is made of the argument also possibly being a wish to avoid using the term sea Sámi. Going back 100 years, the social hierarchy among groups of Sámi had, as earlier mentioned, placed the sea Sámi at the bottom. Among the authors there was also Lule Sámi who received the concept positively. At that time it was better to be coastal Sámi than sea Sámi. Today a strong revitalization has lifted the sea Sámi status.

Over the next quarter-century the research landscape in Norway continued to shift. The Norwegian Research Council (NFR) is a central institution that has strongly influenced contemporary research. Through its grants, NFR determines more directly what it sees as the most promising inquiries for future research. In the first Sámi research program, which began in the fall of 2007, there is increased investment in Sámi research topics in general, but in addition, there is also a strong influence on focusing on the Sámi as a heterogeneous group and on developing a Sámi scientific

language. In other words, the national government has become strongly involved in this endeavor.

Recent research represents the pluralistic view. In Evjen and Hansen's 2008 anthology, *Nordlands kulturelle mangfold, etniske relasjoner i historisk perspektiv* (*The Cultural Diversity of Nordland, Ethnic Conditions in Historical Perspective*), the authors focus especially on the sea Sámi in history by identifying them in the sources, their part of the population, and their participation in various livelihoods. In this anthology, the emergence of reindeer herding in the area also is pushed farther back in time than it previously had been. Sámi and non-Sámi were represented, and the text has summaries in the Lule Sámi language. Some ten years prior this would have been a sensation.

The Other in a New Position

In the same project the demand was made that the Sámi institution Árran should play an active part in administrating the project. An attitude emerged among the Sámi and gave the impression that the researchers were representatives of the Other. Obviously, one could no longer take for granted that the Other was representing the minority. This can be seen in a broader context, providing the most recent step of developing the encounter between the researcher and the researched Sámi.

Over the last decade Indigenous researchers have come up with what is called a "decolonizing methodology." It maintains that Indigenous research should be designed by those understanding the culture to ensure that Indigenous peoples' knowledge is the foundation (Smith 1999, 15). Research should be conducted by "those who understand the culture." It further reads that research should be disseminated back to people in a language they can understand "in order to support them in their desire to be subjects rather than objects of research" (Porsanger 2004, 117; Smith 1999, 15). In between the lines it is recognized that "those who understand" come from the minority group. The Other would then be a part of the majority group.

Other features in this methodology are more challenging. The term *research* is understood as the way in which science has been and still is implicated in the excesses of imperialism. It is argued that a deep understanding of Indigenous cultures can only be achieved by a member of that culture. Consequently, an outsider's understanding is biased. Such a line of argument has been connected to international ethnopolitical revitalization since the 1970s and the power of defining the research focus. This is

a part of an international discourse involving "those who understand the culture." An important issue follows and raises the question of who has the power or the monopoly to create such a definition. Much of the debate over the criteria for participation is a variation of the "question of ethnic monopoly" (Thuen 1995).

A bias of dominant-culture researchers is not the only problem when discussing decolonizing history. Those coming from outside Indigenous culture approach Indigenous peoples' cultures and histories from within the experience of the colonial state. This results in different research questions, methods, and interpretations that too often presume Indigenous deficiency, even when researchers mean well. They produce an Indigenous studies rather than decolonizing methodology or history. In line with this, the present chapter portrays how research on Indigenous peoples has changed with historically changing societal attitudes and suggests possibilities for new understandings when Indigenous scholars define research questions.

Programs of preferential treatment should not be seen to replace one type of monopoly (by Western academic structures) with another (Indigenous), but as an important step in establishing a context of genuinely equal opportunity (Saugestad 1998, 9). In research, academic competence rather than ethnic identity must be given priority. The arguments pro and contra the "decolonizing methodology" are taken up in national and international academic fora. The international trend is moving on and taking its point of departure from the fact that the educational level is increasing, especially among the Sámi. In fact, the Sámi in Norway are among the highest educated Indigenous people (Stordal 2008, 255). In a recent international anthology, one-third of the presentations are on the politics of knowledge, and they discuss how higher education and research can build a vision for the future when conducted by the Other in either understanding of the word (Minde 2008). The Other had shifted from one group to the other, from the minority to the majority.

Indigenous researchers are also increasingly becoming trained within conventional research areas and contribute to the advancement of knowledge within those long-standing fields. In some cases they are working within conventional academic theory in those fields, and in some cases they are reshaping that theory. This is adding to the multiplicity of voices across the academy and creating an enriched research environment that cuts across the board. This is increasingly significant as cross- and multi-disciplinary work is becoming the norm.

Taking the topic in this article as a point of departure, the new methodologies can be seen as the final step in a line of change from the nineteenth

century and up until today and as such is part of an interesting process. On the other hand, these methodologies can also be viewed as being the first step in creating knowledge about Indigenous communities from a multiplicity of perspectives. It can be concluded that any form of domination is detrimental to the ideals of intellectual freedom, and more importantly, to understanding our world. The Other, as an insider or an outsider, may present different knowledge, a difference that together provides a broader picture of an Indigenous culture than by either one of them alone.

Conclusion

The role of Indigenous peoples in relation to research has changed significantly over time in the United States and Norway. During the five stages presented here, most encounters that took place in the two areas were remarkably similar, showing that what happened was more than a result of national politics and mentality. Research in the larger and ethnically more complex United States and the smaller and less diverse Norway were to a large extent reflective of international trends.

A bird's-eye view of the development of the encounter between researcher and the Other over time shows that from the first step when missionaries and state officials saw the minority groups as noble savages, through to step two with a focus on race and homogenization in the period of nationalism, the Indigenous minority groups were passive objects of research. After World War II, in step three, society opened up for pluralism, and Indigenous researchers increasingly demanded to actively participate. After an ethnopolitical and cultural revitalization, the encounter between researchers and the researched in step four had the character of Indigenous people fulfilling both positions. In step five more Indigenous researchers design research by themselves, and scholarship now has increasingly included work from those who see their own culture from the inside.

Political connections also reflected the international trends. Instruments used on national political levels are surprisingly similar. The role of missionaries in Christianizing the minorities and educating them in reading Christian texts, the effort to immerse the children in the values of the majority culture through the use of boarding schools, and the gathering of human remains and items of cultural patrimony by research museums all occurred at similar times in both countries. So did the shift in the research roles of Indigenous peoples.

We also find major differences. For example, while the United States vacillated between segregating American Indians on reservations and forcing or encouraging them to leave reservation communities to assimilate into American society (although on an unequal basis), in Norway the policy of assimilation focused entirely on forcing everybody to be Norwegians living in the Norwegian society. Demonstrative of this, land-use issues, on-reservation and off-reservation, dominated much of the relationship between Indian tribes and the United States. This was not a main case in Norway mostly because colonization happened in another way and in another time.

In both places, however, researchers served as representatives of colonial powers during the first three steps described above. In the United States they often turned the focus of their research efforts to policy justification and policy manipulation that served in large degrees to diminish the strength of Indigenous communities. The national governments often used the results of the research to enforce power over those communities and, by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, results were increasingly used to define those communities as vanishing or diminishing. In Norway this was found in the Lule Sámi community but only to a smaller extent in the society elsewhere. Ironically, it was at this time that Native people became involved in the research. The initial involvement was primarily as informants, but many served more in the role of collaborators. Even when the Indigenous role was more proactive, it was subordinated or hidden by the researcher. This was the case throughout the first half of the twentieth century. It was not until after World War II that Indigenous community members were able to begin to use this research for the benefit of their societies and communities.

The next step though was for the Other to begin to conduct the research themselves and beyond that to drive the focus of the research. This began in the latter half of the twentieth century, particularly after the 1960s and 1970s when worldwide movements to expand the rights of minority peoples coalesced with Indigenous efforts at increased self-governance. It has been a long, slowly developing process of change that more recently has brought about a call for not only an Indigenous direction of research, but for research in Indigenous communities to be defined by Indigenous values and methods. Research questions should be raised from within Indigenous communities themselves. Indigenous theory should drive such research so that it is meaningful and beneficial to Indigenous communities. The development of such theory is in its early stages and is contested within Indigenous communities and the academy. It is

incumbent upon those of us working with Indigenous communities and in the fields focusing on Indigenous community research to understand the changes and participate in the academic dialogue (re)defining those changes.

References

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. n.d. <http://www.achp.gov/>.
- Amundsen, L. 1972. *Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, 1922–1972*. Universitetsforlaget: Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø.
- Anaya, S. James. 2004. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Armour, D. A., ed. 1966. *Massacre at Mackinac: Alexander Henry's Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1764*. Mackinac Island, MI: Mackinac State Park Commission.
- . 1971. *Attack at Michilimackinac: Alexander Henry's Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1764*. Mackinac Island, MI: Mackinac Island State Park Commission.
- Aubert, V., and L. Homme. 1965. *Hellemofjorden*. Report, Institute for Social Research, Department of Sociology, Oslo.
- . 1970. *Orjo Vuodna*. Institute for Social Research, Department of Sociology, Oslo.
- Beaulieu, D. L. 1984. "Curly Hair and Big Feet: Physical Anthropology and the Implementation of Land Allotment on the White Earth Chippewa Reservation." *American Indian Quarterly* 8(4):281–314.
- Beck, D. R. M. 2001. "The Myth of the Vanishing Race," *Edward S. Curtis's The North American Indian*. Northwestern University Library and Library of Congress. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/award98/ienhtml/essay2.html>.
- . 2002. *Siege and Survival: History of the Menominee Indians, 1634–1856*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2009. *Seeking Recognition: The Termination and Restoration of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Stuslaw Indians, 1855–1984*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2010. "Collecting Among the Menomini: Cultural Assault in Twentieth Century Wisconsin." *American Indian Quarterly* 34(2):157–93.
- Berkhofer, R. F. 1978. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bieder, R. E. 1986. *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Bjørklund, I. 1981. "Hva med sjøsamene?" *Ottar* 129:31–34. University of Tromsø.
- Bloomfield, L. 1928. *Menomini Texts*. New York: G. L. Strechert & Co.
- Burt, L. W. 1982. *Tribalism in Crisis, Federal Indian Policy, 1953–1961*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Cobb, D. M. 2008. *Native Activism in Cold War America: The Struggle for Sovereignty*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Cook-Lynn, E. 2007. *New Indians, Old Wars*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Coues, E., ed. 1895. *The Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike*. New York: Francis P. Harper.
- Davies, K. G., ed. 1961. *Peter Skene Ogden's Snake Country Journal, 1826–1827*. Publications of Hudson Bay's Record Society 23. London: The Hudson's Bay Record Society.
- Deloria, P. 1999. *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deloria, V., Jr. 1968. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- . 1969. "Custer Died for Your Sins." *Playboy* 16(8):131–32, 172–75.
- Densmore, F. 1932. *Menominee Music*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Drivenes, E. A. 1994. *Nordnorsk kulturhistorie (North Norwegian Cultural History)*, 1:265. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Dusenberry, V. (1962) 1998. *The Montana Cree: A Study in Religious Persistence*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Eriksen, K. E., and Niemi, E., eds. 1981. *Den finske fare: sikkerhetsproblemer og minoritetspolitikk i nord, 1860–1940*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Evjen, B. 1998. *Et sammensatt fellesskap, Tysfjord kommune, 1869–1950*. Tysfjord Municipality.
- . 1999. "Fra eksotiske forskningsobjekt til aktive forskere." In *Bårjås, Árran, luleSámisk museum*. Tysfjord, 12–23.
- Evjen, B., and L. I. Hansen, eds. 2008. *Nordlands kulturelle mangfold, etniske relasjoner i historisk perspektiv. (The Cultural Diversity of Nordland, Ethnic Conditions in Historical Perspective)*. Oslo: Pax.
- Fixico, D. L. 1986. *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945–1960*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gould, S. J. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Greneresen, G. 1995. "Kulturell gjenreisning i et markeSámisk kjerneområde." PhD diss., University of Tromsø.
- Hansen, L. I. 1991. "Kulturforsker Just Qvigstad." Doctoral lecture given at the University of Tromsø.
- Helland, A. 1908. *Norges land og folk. Topografisk-statistisk beskrevet XVIII Nordland amt. Annen del*. Kristiania.
- Hinsley, C. 1981. *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1910*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press.
- Hoffman, W. J. 1896. *The Menomini Indians*. Report attached to the Fourteenth Annual Report of the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1892–93. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Holm, O. 1889. *Det norske folks historie*. Christiania: Cammermeyer.
- . 1907. "Lidt om Tysfjord—Lapper," unpublished manuscript.
- . 1923. *Fra en nordlandsk prestegaard*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Homme, L. 1969. *Nordisk nykolonialisme: Sámiske problem i dag*. Oslo: Samlaget.
- Høgmo, A. 1992. *Developing Minority Education in the North: A Comparative Study of Two Bicultural Educational Programmes in Respectively Northern Norway and Northern Sweden Initiated and Financed by the Van Leer Foundation in Netherland, NF—rapport 31, Nordland Research Institute, Bodø*.

- Hrdlička, A. 1904. "Directions for Collecting Information and Specimens for Physical Anthropology." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Jennings, F. 1976. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Jensen, Eivand Bråstad. 1991. *Fra fornorskningsspolitikk mot kulturelt mangfold*. Stonglandseidet: Nordkalottforlaget.
- Kasprzycki, S. S. 1990. "'A Lover of All Knowledge,' Edwin James and Menominee Ethnography." *European Review of Native American Studies* 4(1):1-9.
- Kolsrud, K. 1947. "Finnefolket i Ofoten. En studie i Ofotens demografi og sjøfinnenes etnografi i eldre tid," *Nordnorske samlinger* VIII, Oslo.
- . 1961. Sommersete, in Nesheim, A: Bind 5, *Sámske samlinger*, Oslo.
- Kosslak, R. M. 1999. "The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act: The Death Knell for Scientific Study?" *American Indian Law Review* 24(1):129-51.
- Kraus International Publications Microfilm. 1981. *The Papers of John Peabody Harrington in the Smithsonian Institution, 1907-1955*. Millwood, NY: Kraus International Publications Microfilm.
- LaPier, R. R., and D. R. M. Beck. 2012. "Crossroads for a Culture." *Chicago History Spring*, 22-43.
- Larsen, A. 1947/1950. Om sjøsamene, *Tromsø museums årsskrifter*, Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Mathiesen, P. 1970. Boligreising og nasjonal tilpasning hos den Sámske minoritetsgruppe, INAS report no. 70-1. Oslo: Institute of Applied Social Research.
- McMillen, C. W. 2007. *Making Indian Law: The Hualapai Land Case and the Birth of Ethnohistory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Medicine, B. 2001. *Learning to Be an Anthropologist and Remaining Native*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Metcalf, R. W. 2007. *Termination's Legacy: The Discarded Indians of Utah*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Minde, H. 1997. "Historien om Stuoranjárga," unpublished manuscript.
- , ed. 2008. *Indigenous Peoples: Self-Determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity*. Delft: Eburon.
- Morse, J. 1822. *A Report to the Secretary of War of the United States on Indian Affairs*. New Haven, CT: S. Converse.
- Niemi, E. 1983. "History of Minorities: The Sámi and the Kvens." In *Making a Historical Culture: Historiography in Norway*, edited by W. H. Hubbard, J. E. Myhre, T. Nordby, and S. Sogner, 325-43. Oslo-Copenhagen-Stockholm-Boston: Scandinavian University Press.
- NOU (Norwegian Official Utredninger) 1985:24, *Samisk kultur og utdanning. Videregående opplæring for samer*, Samekulturutvalget, Kulturdepartementet.
- Nordnorske samlinger. 1938-1947. Vols 1-8, Etnografiske museum, Oslo.
- Ottar. 1982. KystSámsk bosetting (Coastal Sámi Settlement) Populærvitenskaplig tidsskrift fra Tromsø Museum 4, Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Pearce, R. H. 1967. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Porsanger, J. 2004. "An Essay About Indigenous Methods." Norlit15/2004 Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Qvigstad, J. 1888. "Lappische Sprachproben." *Journal de la Societe Finno-Ougrienne*, Finland.

- . 1925. *Die Lappischen Dialecte in Norwegen*. Oslo: Etnografiske Museums Skrifter.
- . 1929. *Sjøfinnene i Nordland, Tromsø museums skrifter*. Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Ronda, J. P. 1984. *Lewis and Clark Among the Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rosenthal, H. D. 1985. "Indian Claims and the American Conscience: A Brief History of the Indian Claims Commission." In *Irredeemable America: The Indians' Estate and Land Claims*, edited by Imre Sutton, 35-70. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Ruong, I. 1937. "Fjällapparna i Jukkasjärvi socken." *Geographica*. Skrifter från Universitetets geografiske Institution, Uppsala.
- Salish-Pend d'Oreille Culture Committee and Elders Cultural Advisory Council. 2005. *The Salish People and the Lewis and Clark Expedition*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Saokio Heritage. 2009. <http://www.saokioheritage.com>.
- Saugestad, S. 1998. "Research On, With and By Indigenous Peoples, Reflections on the Insider and Outsider Perspectives in Anthropology, with Examples from the University of Tromsø and the University of Botswana." Paper presented to CHAGS 8, Osaka October.
- Schreiner, A. 1932. *Antropologiske Lokalundersøkelser i Norge, Hellemo*. Oslo: Det norske vitenskapsakademi.
- Schreiner, K. E. 1935. *Zur Oestologie der Lappen*. Oslo: Institutt for Sammenliggende Kulturforskning.
- . 1939. *Crania Norvegica*. Oslo: Institutt for Sammenliggende Kulturforskning.
- Skinner A., and J. V. Satterlee. 1913. *Folklore of the Menominee Indians*. Vol. 13, Part 3 of *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*. New York: Published by Order of the Trustees.
- Slotkin, J. S. 1952. "Menomini Peyotism: A Study of Individual Variation in a Primary Group with a Homogenous Culture." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 42(4):535-700.
- . 1957. *The Menomini Pow Wow: A Study in Cultural Decay*. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology No. 4.
- Smith, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. London: Zed Books.
- Solstad, K. 1981. "Locally Relevant Curricula in Rural Norway: The Lofoten Islands Example/Karl Jan Solstad." In *Rural Education in Urbanized Nations: Issues and Innovations*, edited by Jonathan P. Sher. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Spindler, G. and L. Spindler. 1971. *Dreamers without Power: The Menomini Indians*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- . 1984. *Dreamers with Power: The Menominee*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Stang, F., ed. 1925. *Fire innledningsforelesninger, holdt 4-8. September 1924*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.
- Stanley, S. 1996. "Community, Action, and Continuity: A Narrative Vita of Sol Tax." *Current Anthropology* 37:1 Supplement, S131-S137.
- Stordal, V. 2008. "Nation Building Through Knowledge Building: The Discourse of Sámi Higher Education and Research in Norway." In *Indigenous Peoples: Self-Determination, Knowledge, Indigeneity*, edited by H. Minde, S. Jentoft, and G. Midré. Delft: Eburon.

- Tax, S. 1988. "Pride and Puzzlement: A Retro-introspective Record of 60 Years in Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:1-21.
- Thuen, T. 1995. *Quest for Equity: Norway and the Sámi Challenge*. Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research.
- Thwaites, R. G., ed. 1896-1901. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company.
- Trouillot, M.-R. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ulrich, R. 2010. *American Indian Nations from Termination to Restoration, 1953-2006*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wiklund, K. 1908. *De Svenska nomadlapparnas flyttningar till Norge i äldre och nyare tid*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Wiklund, K., and J. Qvigstad. 1909. Reinbeitekommissionen af 1907. Dokumenter angaaende flytlapperne m.m. II. Samlede efter reinbeitekommissionens opdrag af rektor J. Qvigstad and professor K.B. Wiklund, Kristiania.

Critical Issues in Indigenous Studies

Jeffrey P. Shepherd and Myla Vicenti Carpio
Series Editors

ADVISORY BOARD

Hokulani Aikau
Jennifer Nez Denetdale
Eva Marie Garroutte
John Maynard
Alejandra Navarro-Smith
Gladys Tzul Tzul
Keith Camacho
Margaret Elizabeth Kovach
Vicente Diaz

Mapping Indigenous Presence

North Scandinavian and North American Perspectives

Edited by

KATHRYN W. SHANLEY

AND BJØRG EVJEN

Foreword by

S. JAMES ANAYA



THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA PRESS

TUCSON