

AMERIND STUDIES IN ARCHAEOLOGY

SERIES EDITOR **JOHN WARE**



Volume 1

Trincheras Sites in Time, Space, and Society

Edited by Suzanne K. Fish, Paul R. Fish, and M. Elisa Villalpando

Volume 2

**Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning
in Indigenous Archaeology**

Edited by Stephen W. Silliman

**COLLABORATING AT
THE TROWEL'S EDGE**

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN
INDIGENOUS ARCHAEOLOGY

EDITED BY **STEPHEN W. SILLIMAN**

WITH A FOREWORD BY **LARRY J. ZIMMERMAN**

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PRESS

TUCSON

The University of Arizona Press
© 2008 The Arizona Board of Regents
All rights reserved

www.uapress.arizona.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Collaborating at the trowel's edge : teaching and learning in
indigenous archaeology / edited by Stephen W. Silliman ;
with a foreword by Larry J. Zimmerman.

p. cm. — (Amerind studies in archaeology)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8165-2722-9 (hardcover : alk. paper) —

ISBN 978-0-8165-2800-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Indians of North America—Antiquities. 2. Indians of
North America—Study and teaching. 3. Ethnoarchaeology—
Fieldwork. 4. Ethnoarchaeology—Research. 5. Ethno-
archaeology—Study and teaching. I. Silliman, Stephen W.,
1971–

E77.9.C65 2008

970.01—dc22

2008027032

Publication of this book is made possible in part by
the proceeds of a permanent endowment created with
the assistance of a Challenge Grant from the National
Endowment for the Humanities, a federal agency.

All proceeds from the sale of this book will go to the Native
American Scholarship Fund of the Society for American
Archaeology.



Manufactured in the United States of America on acid-free,
archival-quality paper containing a minimum of 30% post-
consumer waste and processed chlorine free.

13 12 11 10 09 08 6 5 4 3 2 1

Foreword, by Larry J. Zimmerman vii

Acknowledgments xi

Collaborative Indigenous Archaeology: Troweling at the Edges, Eyeing the Center i

Stephen W. Silliman

PART 1

Methods and Practices in Archaeological Field Schools

2 Field Schools without Trowels: Teaching Archaeological Ethics and Heritage Preservation in a Collaborative Context 25

Barbara J. Mills, Mark Altaha, John R. Welch, and T. J. Ferguson

3 The Tribe and the Trowel: An Indigenous Archaeology and the Mohegan Archaeological Field School 50

Jeffrey C. Bendremer and Elaine L. Thomas

4 Working on Pasts for Futures: Eastern Pequot Field School Archaeology in Connecticut 67

Stephen W. Silliman and Katherine H. Sebastian Dring

5 Summer Workshops in Indigenous Archaeology: Voluntary Collaboration between Colgate University and the Oneida Indian Nation of New York 88

Jordan E. Kerber

6 Field School Archaeology, Activism, and Politics in the Cayuga Homeland of Central New York 103

Jack Rossen

PART 2

Indigenous Archaeology and Education

- 7 Pedagogy of Decolonization: Advancing Archaeological Practice through Education** 123
Sonya Atalay
- 8 Building Pathways between Zuni and Mashantucket Pequot Country** 145
Russell G. Handsman and Kevin A. McBride
- 9 A Critical Change in Pedagogy: Indigenous Cultural Resource Management** 165
Andrea A. Hunter
- 10 *’Ihoosh’aah*, Learning by Doing: The Navajo Nation Archeology Department Student Training Program** 188
Davina R. Two Bears

PART 3

Reflections on Collaborative Indigenous Archaeology

- 11 Collaborative Research Programs: Implications for the Practice of North American Archaeology** 211
Kent G. Lightfoot
- 12 Melding Science and Community Values: Indigenous Archaeology Programs and the Negotiation of Cultural Differences** 228
George P. Nicholas
- References Cited 251
- About the Editor 293
- About the Contributors 295
- Index 301

FOREWORD

During the days before the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), the reactions I got from anthropology students to what I’d been writing about repatriation gave me hope that American Indian voices eventually would be heard. Students seemed to understand the rightness of the respectful treatment and repatriation of human remains. Letters, e-mails, and calls told me that most of them “got it.” Although they knew that there was benefit to be derived from studying human skeletal material and grave goods, they also understood that academic freedom and the rights of scientists didn’t supersede the rights—or at least the expectations—that most people have when they die and are buried: that they will stay that way. Students also were very aware of the expectations of descendants of the dead that their ancestors’ remains would be treated with respect and, if disturbed, would be reburied.

In the late 1980s, an especially memorable, very upset student called from a small, well-known eastern college. She and fellow students had planned a dialogue about repatriation between several Indian people and archaeologists they hoped to bring to campus. When she had raised the idea with her professors, they told her in no uncertain terms that the issue was too controversial and that they couldn’t do it, going so far as to threaten sanctions if they tried. I advised her that if the students wanted to do it, they should, and that faculty members couldn’t really do all that much if the students remained united. I emphasized that taking a stand or action always brings risk and that ethically responsible people take that risk and bear the consequences, good or bad. To my great satisfaction, the students did indeed host the session, which went very well, with even their reluctant faculty members complimenting them on a successful meeting. I was more heartened by that student’s courage than I can ever hope to express.

As with her, many who contacted me had come to their views in spite of what their professors had been telling them. Apparently, indoctrination into archaeological science hadn’t yet overwhelmed their

be made to the community when pursuing the research and educational goals of the tribe, involving tribal members, and abiding by the decisions of elders, councils, and government officials. In this way, the anthropologist acts to assist tribal people in their own efforts to explore their past, learn more about their ancestors, inspire their membership, and represent themselves to the public. Under these conditions, anthropologists have an opportunity to mitigate some of the damage done to Native American communities by our predecessors and fulfill some of the promise of our discipline.

Working on Pasts for Futures

Eastern Pequot Field School Archaeology in Connecticut

Stephen W. Silliman and Katherine H. Sebastian Dring

Even though collaborations between Native American communities and practicing archaeologists are not yet widespread in North America, the quantity and quality of collaborative projects have increased significantly in the last ten years in the United States and Canada (Dowdall and Parrish 2002; Ferguson and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2006; Kerber 2006b; Moss and Wasson 1998; Peck et al. 2003). The passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990 and the ensuing debates about repatriation played a significant role in prompting more collaborative ventures in archaeology (Swidler et al. 1997), as have explicit efforts to create an indigenous archaeology (Watkins 2000). However, we must be careful not to assume that all collaborations result from federal law generally or NAGPRA specifically, especially when many of these latter “collaborations” are instead mandated “consultations.” We need to explore and recognize the possibilities of collaborative efforts built on other foundations, such as cultural and historic preservation or a recognition that multiple histories can be constructed in a political present. We argue that these latter two elements, rather than concerns about human remains or NAGPRA, have created a context for truly collaborative educational projects between tribal and archaeological communities, and we join others in this volume in highlighting that aspect. Educational and collaborative ventures take a variety of forms, as several chapters in this volume demonstrate, but we choose to focus on the standard and, as some might call it, traditional North American archaeological field school typically administered through colleges and universities. The goal is to suggest ways that this venue can be realigned for collaborative and indigenous archaeological purposes. That is, we seek to make the field school quite nontraditional.

To structure our view of collaborative education in an Indigenous

context, we turn to the idea of archaeology as craft as outlined by Shanks and McGuire (1996). The idea draws metaphorically on the Arts and Crafts Movement of the early twentieth century. Shanks and McGuire suggested that considering archaeology as a craft would collapse the false dichotomies between thinking and doing, between sciences and humanities, and between scholar and community by recognizing that archaeologists craft a product—history—through a combination of skills in using archaeological information about the past and a responsiveness to communities (or crudely, “clients”) who have vested interests in the product. Those communities might be Native American nations, other archaeologists, or an interested public group. Shanks and McGuire (1996) claimed that history detached from communities is esoteric and ivory tower, while history produced only for public consumption and mass markets is uncreative capitalism.

The alternative recognizes that archaeological and historical knowledges are made rather than discovered. This position does not imply that just because history is made, the past is therefore made *up*. The remains of the past, whether artifacts, houses, or documents, constrain what we can say in these histories, yet the production of history resides in a political present (e.g., Lowenthal 1996; Meskell 1998; Trouillot 1995). The craft perspective recognizes that we produce knowledge about the past in a present social context and that we need to acknowledge the limitations and possibilities of that context. We also craft more than histories or even the data to support them; we also craft relationships. Importantly, these relationships make possible the production of certain histories, and we must recognize the role of those social and cultural contexts in the present as we attempt to study the past. A collaborative field school is one way to enhance the potential of crafting archaeological histories and to do so in a specifically indigenous archaeology context.

To complement the creation of responsible and useful histories, collaborative archaeological field schools can serve as a mutually beneficial endeavor between Native American tribal communities and academic archaeologists. University-based field schools can benefit Indigenous communities with limited resources through lower-cost historic preservation efforts, practical archaeological training for tribal members, and Native oversight of research. Simultaneously, field schools provide undergraduate and graduate students with the opportunity to work

closely with descendent communities, to examine the empirical and political aspects of field methodology, and to think about more responsible archaeologies. The latter aspect opens a space to critically examine archaeological field pedagogy and methodology.

Background to an Indigenous Archaeology Field School

In this chapter, we bring together strands of collaboration, methodology, and field school education in a case drawn from Native American New England. The context is the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation and their 225-acre plot of reservation land, located in North Stonington, Connecticut. Community members in varying numbers have occupied and used this reservation land since 1683, when they were granted (and relocated to) it by the colonial Connecticut government following the decades of dislocation, hardship, and persecution after the Pequot War of 1636–37 (Bragdon and Simmons 1998; McBride 1990). This conflict marked the beginning of full-scale European colonial aggression against northeastern Native communities. The Massachusetts Bay Colony, along with Narragansett and Mohegan allies, organized a punitive expedition for earlier colonist deaths and launched an attack on the fortified Pequot village at Mystic in 1637, resulting in a brutal massacre of Pequot men, women, and children. Pequot War survivors were either executed, sold into slavery in the Caribbean, or turned over to Narragansett and Mohegan overseers.

This marked a turning point in the intertwined colonial and Native histories of New England. Only in the postwar years did the surviving Pequots become colonially divided into Eastern Pequot and Western (or Mashantucket) Pequot, community boundaries that continue to this day. The historical trajectories diverged radically in the twentieth century, with only the Mashantucket obtaining federal recognition. Eastern Pequot families have now lived on their reservation for more than 320 years and have maintained community and kinship ties that fan outward from that reservation into the surrounding towns and cities in southeastern Connecticut. The reservation land remains mostly undeveloped today, although some tribal members have houses along the reservation's perimeters. This characteristic offers an unparalleled archaeological op-

portunity to study Eastern Pequot community and household changes, continuities, and creativities over the last few centuries.

A critical feature of this particular brand of collaborative archaeology is the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation's navigation of the federal acknowledgment process. In 1978, the Eastern Pequot Tribe filed its letter of intent to petition the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) for acknowledgment as an Indian tribe, which would establish a government-to-government relationship with the United States within the meaning of federal law 25 CFR part 83. The Eastern Pequot received a preliminary positive finding for federal acknowledgment in 2000 from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for having demonstrated to the U.S. government their longstanding community, political, and cultural practices. After two years of pressure from the Connecticut attorney general and three local towns to extend the comment period, plus a series of Freedom of Information Act lawsuits, the assistant secretary for Indian affairs issued final federal acknowledgment in September 2002. As with other Native American groups that have pursued this goal, the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation compiled many thousands of pages of documentation in support of their claim (Bragdon and Simmons 1998; Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation 2001). The DOI acknowledged the tribe as the Historic Eastern Pequot Tribe of Lantern Hill Reservation in North Stonington, Connecticut, and noted that they had an "unbroken history" of state recognition as an Indian tribe, with a reservation established by the colonial government in 1683, making it one of the oldest reservations in the United States. The assistant secretary for Indian affairs has a trust responsibility to federally acknowledged tribes to promote self-determination on behalf of tribes. Federally acknowledged tribes receive benefits, per federal laws, to support better health, education, housing, environmental and historic preservation programs.

However, within three months, the positive Final Determination was appealed to the Interior Board of Indian Appeals by some public officials, local towns, and others on politically charged evidentiary grounds. Although entering an unprecedented and unfairly long appeals process, the Eastern Pequot Tribal Council had interests in beginning a formal cultural and historic preservation effort on their reservation. Per U.S. Department of the Interior government historic preservation guidelines and Eastern Pequot desires to document material aspects of

their history to accompany what was already known through oral and written histories, the tribal council wanted an archaeological survey of their reservation to determine the kinds of archaeological and historical sites present and their preservation needs. This context opened the door for the collaborative project described in this chapter, and archaeological research took place in the summers of 2003 and 2004. After keeping the Eastern Pequot in appeal for more than two years, the Internal Board of Indian Appeals vacated and remanded the Final Determination back to the assistant secretary for Indian affairs in May 2005 based on questions raised in the appeal.

Despite the tenuous political position, a third season of archaeological work took place in the summer of 2005 because of the continued interest by tribal members and archaeologists in documenting Eastern Pequot history and practices in the past as vital links to cultural life in the present. On October 12, 2005, four months after having the final acknowledgment subjected to reconsideration and an ironic two days after Columbus Day and one day before the beginning of the Amerind seminar that laid the groundwork for this book, the assistant secretary issued a reconsidered final negative decision that rescinded the original positive federal determination. In November 2005, the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation sent a notice of appeal of the final reconsidered determination and a request for reconsideration of the decision to decline acknowledgment to the Interior Board of Indian Appeals. In January 2006 they received a response from the deputy assistant secretary stating that the administrative process of the acknowledgment petitions was complete and the reconsidered final determination was effective. That same month, the tribe also received a response from the Interior Board of Indian Appeals dismissing the Historic Eastern Pequot Tribe's request for reconsideration for lack of jurisdiction.

Despite the enormous blows to the financial and governmental resources that the tribal council had mustered over the last few years in preparation for sovereignty, the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation continues its fight for federal acknowledgment and to redress what they consider to be a serious injustice. The archaeological field school plays an important role in internal and external negotiations of that process as it constantly reveals the cultural survival and historical uniqueness of the Indigenous community. Even though we have such information, we do

not use this chapter to discuss archaeological interpretations of Eastern Pequot history. These are better left for other venues. Instead, this chapter shares some of our thoughts to date on the *process* rather than the final *product* of collaborative indigenous archaeology. We want to focus on how we can reframe archaeological questions, conduct responsible research, and implement methods to meet multiple community needs, especially in light of colonial legacies general to the discipline and specific to this Native American community. This turns archaeology into responsive historical inquiry—that is, a kind of craft. We begin by outlining the ways that collaborative archaeological field schools can benefit Indigenous communities, as illustrated by the Eastern Pequot case, and follow with a consideration of the transformation of field school pedagogy that is possible in a collaborative environment.

Benefits to Tribal Communities

All collaborative indigenous archaeologies must place Native American needs and wishes in the foreground, from the initial conceptualization of the research, through all phases of field and laboratory work, to final interpretation and dissemination (Bendremer and Thomas, Mills et al., this vol.; see Harrison 2001). This is particularly essential, although historically overlooked, when university and museum archaeologists work on aboriginal lands and with Indigenous people. By granting singular importance to Indigenous needs and wishes, archaeologists can ensure that their projects serve the Native American community whose heritage they propose to study. As we will demonstrate, this commitment does not undermine academic research questions or methodology, but rather enriches them. Here we outline three direct benefits possible from a collaborative tribal–university field school program.

First, tribal governments can begin to meet their historical and cultural preservation needs by using university- or college-based archaeological field schools with only minimal financial outlay. This is by no means imperative, since many Indian communities conduct their own archaeological research (see Bendremer and Thomas, Two Bears, this vol.), but it remains an important option for those Indigenous nations that may not have the financial or technical means to accomplish such a

task despite their interests in doing so. This lower-cost historic preservation strategy is particularly important for tribes without DOI federal acknowledgment who still want to begin a proactive historic preservation program on their reservation or aboriginal lands. Since academic field schools are funded in large part through student tuition and since the instructors are paid by universities to teach such courses, these multi-week field courses do not require that the primary benefiting group—the tribal community—expend major funds to acquire archaeological information. However, care must be exercised to prevent the money from wielding too much power, as it is prone to do, in the collaborative relationship. In practice, much of the archaeological work becomes a “donated” service in such an arrangement. Although student field crews can never be as quick in “data retrieval” as trained cultural resource teams from private companies, they require nowhere near the finances that the latter do when contracted to provide archaeological services. This does not mean that we should misuse student labor; rather, it means that we can derive from an otherwise necessary curricular field course benefits beyond the practical training of students. Besides, laying this archaeological and historic preservation groundwork may later open doors for historic preservation funds should these Native communities receive full federal recognition.

Second, by using an educational setting to engage in archaeological research, opportunities exist for training not only enrolled students but also tribal community members who participate in the field project or who become involved with the research planning and execution. At least two Eastern Pequot tribal members have participated as paid interns each summer field season in our project, and others, including youth and elders, have visited and worked on several occasions (fig. 4.1). Taking time to teach and to learn while engaged in archaeological research rarely happens in “contracted” situations because of budgetary and monetary constraints, but teaching and learning are integral parts of the field school experience. We simply emphasize extending that education beyond the enrolled students. The benefits to tribal communities are notable, particularly when tribal interns enjoy many, if not all, of the educational activities that field school students have had to pay for to receive academic credit. The participation of tribal interns provides di-



4.1. Eastern Pequot elder Norma Parrish and Eastern Pequot youth Brianna Sebastian working with field school student Edith Thomas (Akimel O'Odham/San Carlos Apache) in 2006. (Photo by Stephen Silliman)

rect training in archaeological techniques, terms, and issues. This training does not presume that tribal members will alter their life courses to become professional archaeologists, although it sets the context for community members to take over their own heritage management and research in the future. Similarly, it does not attempt to overwrite Indigenous ways of understanding with the imposition of professional or academic language. Rather, the training introduces Native communities to the jargon and methods of “standard” archaeological research so that they can converse with archaeologists on common ground and, similarly, can critique them. This ensures that academic discourse does not alienate descendent communities because of lack of communication with Native people while archaeologists continue crafting their history, and it helps to close the gap between professionals/academics and the nonspecialists or public communities who interact with them.

Third, running archaeological field schools in a collaborative setting

guarantees that the research design, practice, and results fall under tribal community oversight (Bendremer and Thomas, Mills et al., this vol.). Doing such research in a field school setting requires a discussion about tribal sovereignty, both political and legal. Tribes have certain governmental powers because of their inherent tribal sovereignty that may not be unilaterally taken away by the U.S. federal government, but many now struggle to regain or assert those rights. Specifically, non-Native professionals and students should become familiar with the inherent sovereign rights of tribes, especially as they relate to their land, natural and cultural resources, and relationships with other sovereign nations. These have tangible impacts on archaeological research and interpretations of reservation land because these elements form the crux of political and economic life for contemporary Indian people.

Community oversight at the logistical and interpretive level prevents archaeologists from conducting their research in a political, social, or cultural vacuum and from presuming that the student educational components of the field school are the only important elements. In other words, archaeologists and students are now accountable to the tribal community. For example, the mixture of archaeologists and Eastern Pequot tribal members in our field school sets the context for mutual trust and observation. Students work closely with individuals who have personal or community connections to the reservation landscape, while at the same time, tribal members monitor the activities of archaeologists in the reservation forest. The thought of sending university anthropologists by themselves into the woods to dig on ancestral ground was not the most comfortable feeling initially for many Eastern Pequot tribal members. In the end, tribal members have displayed respect for professional training in archaeology as a useful tool for their community, while archaeologists and students have shown respect for Eastern Pequot values, views of the land, and local knowledges.

In addition, tribal members participate directly in generating their community history alongside archaeologists rather than waiting, by choice or by necessity, for archaeologists to “find” Native American history and “report back” as the authority. We find the latter to be a problematic way to craft archaeological and cultural histories. In our case, tribal members help to acquire the information, feel that they are con-

tributing to the preservation of cultural objects and histories for future generations, and now have a direct connection to the archaeological process. In fact, they helped to constitute the process *and* to change it. The collaborative process continues into the documentation and interpretation of the findings, since participants have diverse frames of reference for describing the site, materials, historical facts, or conclusions.

To avoid too partial a view, it is important to describe the project with Native voices as well as non-Native voices in order to clearly represent the history of the people who lived on the land. Sometimes a story is told by an elder who remembers a similar area, dwelling, or artifacts that may assist in drawing conclusions about the historical materials found. Other times it is necessary to acknowledge a Native preference *not* to speak about spiritual and personal matters. Ways to ensure the collaborative balance include having jointly authored works, using words of the people whose histories are being represented, or requiring that academic and student writings on Native archaeological materials undergo critical review by the tribal council before documentation is finalized. All master's theses completed on reservation sites thus far have gone through this process, whether about faunal remains (Cipolla 2005), ceramics (McNeil 2005), or pollen and charcoal (Jacobucci 2006). Striking a balance between tribal preferences for confidentiality and academic needs for publication, we both share in the commitment that all benefit by making Eastern Pequot history more widely but carefully known in tribal, archaeological, historical, and public arenas.

This cooperative spirit is upheld by the independence of the field school research as a university project since it ensures that the interested parties—tribal members and academic professionals—can engage in a dialogue about the meaning(s) of the archaeological results from multiple standpoints. This process acknowledges that people and data cannot be forced into any or all desired scenarios and helps counter any charge that all indigenous archaeological histories are *only* political. We feel that “indigenous archaeology” is in part defined by having this space for multiple views and dialogue. This does not deny the desirability of projects run completely by tribal governments as a function of their sovereignty, self-determination, and autonomy, but instead emphasizes that the university-tribal government relationship *can* be a mutually beneficial one at economic, cultural, and intellectual levels.

Benefits to Academic and Educational Communities

While benefiting tribal communities, collaborative tribal field schools provide undergraduate and graduate students the opportunity to work closely within and alongside descendent communities, to examine the empirical and political aspects of field methodology, and to think about more responsive and ethical archaeologies. These are above and beyond the traditionally assumed benefits of field schools, such as practical training in methods, regional cultural history, and interpretation, as well as the formation of “authentic research communities” (Perry 2004). Yet, we want to argue that the field school has not had its pedagogy examined carefully enough (but see Pyburn 2003; Walker and Saitta 2002), and that such reexamination is required in, and a result of, collaborative indigenous archaeology (Bendremer and Thomas, Mills et al., this vol.).

We want to discuss two main models for the pedagogy of archaeological field schools. Perry (2004) recently offered one such model, that of the “authentic learning” environment, which she outlines in the context of the multiyear San Clemente Island field school in southern California. This model emphasizes the development of a productive “research community,” one that forms in the context of people—trained and undergoing training—who coalesce to answer specific research questions about the archaeological past. The focus is the “culture of archaeological research” and the “methods and tools used to acquire and interpret data.” Although this model may be sufficient for certain field schools and does capture the archaeological research process fairly well, we argue that it is overly narrow with respect to collaborative indigenous field schools (but see expansion of this perspective in Perry 2006). Field schools need to be about more than methods and tools, need to emphasize methods as social as well as research practices, and need to reconsider the “culture of archaeological research” since that “culture” has generated at least as many problems in contemporary Indigenous communities as it has information about past ones. For instance, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999:5) has argued for decolonizing scientific research in general: “research is not an innocent or distant academic exercise but an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions.” These conditions are particularly striking for Indigenous people as the subject of researchers

of all stripes, whether archaeological, anthropological, sociological, or historical.

A second model for archaeology arises from critical pedagogy, as suggested by Hamilakis (2004). Hamilakis does not focus on field schools, but his words are pertinent to field learning environments:

Pedagogy in archaeology, or in any other field, is not simply the passive transfer and delivery of produced knowledge nor the training of students in certain skills and abilities, as the current dominant discourse would have us believe. It is rather a socially crucial and politically contested field of cultural production, the effects and implications of which permeate everything we do in archaeology, from the production of archaeological knowledges and the reproduction of the field of archaeology as a whole, to the economic, social, and political articulations of our activity and its products. (Hamilakis 2004:288)

We find this emphasis on pedagogy as “cultural production” and on the “economic, social, and political articulations of our activity and its products” to be absolutely central to a reformulation of field schools in a collaborative setting. The creation of Eastern Pequot history through archaeology takes place in a political present—it articulates with individual biographies, community concerns, federal acknowledgment, state politics, colonialism, nation-to-university relationships, historic preservation, land management, racial discourses, debates on authenticity, public opinion, and many other aspects. Students need to know that history is produced in this complex mix with particular methods and by certain people rather than simply “discovered” in the sifted dirt of a shaker screen. These dimensions all intersect at the edge of the trowel, which is frequently held by students, and not just in the final write-up of project results or interpretations (see Berggren and Hodder 2003; Silliman, this vol.).

As a result, archaeological field classes are prime candidates for a critical pedagogical reexamination in the context of collaborative indigenous archaeology. Field courses regularly neglect theory as they opt instead to focus on methods and the “practical” side of archaeology. Students often do not gain access to the theoretical choices that lie behind field strategies, the bigger issues that drive the research, or the implica-

tions of particular methods or findings for larger theoretical discourses. However, the fact that field courses focus heavily on methods offers untapped potential for a new pedagogy. Teaching skills in real-world, hands-on archaeology remains a worthwhile goal for field schools, but we run the risk of letting the teaching of methods replace the teaching of methodology. The former involves instruction in the techniques of “doing” field archaeology—how to trowel, how to use a line level, how to make a plan map, how to collect artifacts, and so on—and most standard archaeological field textbooks offer useful manuals in this respect (Hester et al. 1997).

The latter—teaching methodology—involves examining the decisions behind certain methods and, more important, the implications of using those methods. The most overlooked tend to be the social implications, which are just as important to the academy as they are to the cultural resource management world (Chilton 2006:293). We argue here that archaeological field methods are not just research practices, but also *social* practices with *social* consequences. Yet, archaeological field classes tend to implicitly teach students that methodology means only knowing which methods work best to achieve practical and empirical needs to “gather data.” For instance, archaeologists have spent countless pages debating the pros and cons of regularly spaced small shovel test pits in the forests of New England and have batted around the question of whether a plastic or metal line level should be used on that taut string tied to the corner of a unit. Archaeologists are rightfully concerned about using standardized yet flexible methods for obtaining the best possible information from a field project.

However, for collaborative indigenous archaeology, we must avoid relying on an instrumentalist version of pedagogy where students learn methods as products rather than as processes (Atalay, this vol.). These methods constrain what can later be done with “data” in the laboratory in ways that few of us appreciate, much less teach (Galloway 2006:42–52), but more significantly, they may impact the perceptions and involvement of collaborators and descendent communities. In other words, the methods’ process (the acts themselves) deserves just as much of our attention as the methods’ products (the data). Even status quo, seemingly innocuous field methods regularly employed in archaeological field schools may “do work” outside of “the field” in significant ways.

Despite archaeologists' rigorous attention to how we do our research, considerable room remains for flexibility, particularly with regard to social and cultural needs. This is an aspect of research that we often do *not* impart to our students. Part of that flexibility involves remaining open to surprises, as collaborators may perceive "standard" practices as inappropriate and confusing or may have their own methodological requests (see Chilton 2006).

Archaeologists often cannot know how methodologies, much debated in the academic literature and frequently "black boxed" as standard practice, might affect local communities with different interests if we do not engage with or participate in them. An example from northern California will illustrate. Dowdall and Parrish (2002) argue elegantly for the collaborative nature of archaeological research between the Kashaya Pomo and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. They reveal that even the standard archaeological practice of simply showing up to work—the most mundane and unquestioned aspect of doing archaeology—may be culturally significant. They discuss how the agency archaeologists agreed to abide by Kashaya *k^hela* rules that prohibited menstruating women and husbands of menstruating women from actually excavating, particularly on sacred sites (see also Lightfoot, this vol.).

Collaborative Methodologies and Pedagogies

We can illustrate these various points about pedagogy and methodology with examples from the Eastern Pequot Archaeological Field School. The student-intensive archaeological research has hinged on efforts to emphasize the social, as well as the practical, aspects of field methodology. The methodology is designed to "do work" in the field, the community, the collaborative environment, and the educational setting. The features include modifications to standard archaeological practice that meet community needs without radically altering data collection and welcome interjections of Eastern Pequot cultural traditions into the archaeological work. The modifications have gone a long way toward forming a relationship of trust, mutual respect, and cooperative learning. The latter is critical because just as the Eastern Pequot community had little familiarity with the actual practice of archaeology at the outset of the project, the archaeological team also had minimal knowledge

of Eastern Pequot preferences and perspectives. The realization of this learning process meant that we needed to maintain open dialogue about even the most mundane of archaeological tasks.

The standard procedure for a New England archaeological field project focused on preliminary reconnaissance is to excavate shovel test pits at regular intervals, fill them in with backdirt when done, and move on to the next one in the series. Although care must be exercised in choosing the sampling interval, depth of excavation, and screen mesh size for recovery, archaeologists take the practical side of dig-fill-and-move-on for granted, particularly when they complete a large number. However, the Eastern Pequot perceived the methods differently—they saw each instance as disturbance to their ancestral lands. They wanted to place an offering of loose tobacco at each location that we excavated, an act performed by the tribal historic preservation officer, to honor the disturbed earth (fig. 4.2). This compliance required a new sense of vigilance of otherwise mundane shovel test pits. The students played a key role in regularizing this process, for it had to become routine while retaining its cultural significance.

The collaborative field school may also be an introduction for archaeologists and students to unrecorded Native American history, cultural knowledge, and traditions concerning their Indigenous land. Very often, "at the trowel's edge," archaeologists focus their attention on what may lie beneath the earth and often disregard that which is a natural part of the earth. Eastern Pequots and many other Native Americans believe that Mother Earth consists of living things and natural objects, all of which are sacred. They hold that Mother Earth has sustained their people, history, and culture since the beginning of time. Mother Earth holds the spirit of ancestors and is available to nurture and inspire those who honor her. All people and Mother Earth are a part of the Circle of Life, where all contribute and all receive in the process.

People have the responsibility to be aware of this process. Therefore, archaeologists and students who work on the reservation land must respect and try to understand Eastern Pequot ancient history and cultural ways so as not to disturb this balance. In this manner they may truly develop a more responsive archaeology and gain a broader educational perspective. The collaborative field setting reveals the ways that past and present merge in the exploration of the land, of Earth itself. What lies



4.2. Royal "Two Hawks" Cook, the tribal historic preservation officer in 2004 and 2006, applying a tobacco offering in an excavation unit. (Photo by Stephen Silliman)

in the Indigenous land besides dirt, stones, and artifacts? Some Eastern Pequots have noted that it is "peace" that they find when walking or working the land of their ancestors. As a result, Eastern Pequot tribal leaders were thankful when students made efforts not to unnecessarily harm animals and plants impacted by the excavations and when the archaeological team would cover excavation units overnight to keep animals from injuring themselves by falling into them.

To further orient the students to the social and cultural context of the field school, all participants go through an orientation with several tribal members on the first day before actual fieldwork begins. This orientation involves tribal members sharing thoughts on archaeology, history, and the reservation; personal introductions between all students, archaeological staff, tribal interns, and community members present; and, in recent years, a potluck meal. At the close of this orientation, an

Eastern Pequot designee (Mark Sebastian in 2003; Royal "Two Hawks" Cook in 2004 and 2006; Bobby "Little Bear" Sebastian in 2005) conducted a smudging ritual, which involves lighting wrapped sage and other herbs and wafting the smoke over students and staff members for spiritual cleansing. To complement the initial orientation in 2005, we also arranged a meeting of the field school students with the Eastern Pequot Elders' Council to ensure that students understood how elders felt about history, archaeology, and the land.

As we began to sort and clean the artifacts both during the field season and back at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, during the semester, the status quo of lab work shifted to accommodate a special request from the tribal council. Standard practice in archaeological laboratories involves going through bags of items collected in the field to sort, clean, and catalog artifacts and then to discard any objects—usually unmodified rocks!—collected in haste or uncertainty that proved, under more controlled observations, to be noncultural items. Again, archaeologists tend to consider this a process unworthy of reflection, but we encountered a new twist after discussing this with the tribal council: Any items that we would have normally discarded into the trash needed to be returned to the reservation. These natural objects constituted part of that historical and cultural landscape, and many tribal members held the perspective that they rightfully belonged there. Ultimately, all artifacts and other items collected will return to the tribe, but we now include these noncultural items for basic repatriation. We have also designed the flotation protocol on campus to capture as much sediment as possible from processed soil samples to then return it to the reservation. It is no exaggeration to say this poses significant logistical difficulties.

The tribal council also instituted an oversight procedure with respect to removal of artifacts from the reservation. North American archaeologists take for granted that what they remove from the ground goes to the laboratory for later cleaning, identification, and analysis, but a standard contract that Silliman was to sign with the Eastern Pequot had a clause about not removing any natural or cultural objects from the reservation. Silliman had anticipated that Sebastian Dring would say to just cross out that clause once the process was explained more clearly, but instead she reported back that the tribal council agreed to our temporary removal of cultural materials only if we provided a daily count of artifacts being

removed. We reached a compromise that met the spirit of that request but was attuned to field logistics. Archaeologists collect many artifacts in the field, but often do so in bulk with little time to count and identify every piece collected. Once Silliman explained this protocol and noted that in-the-field tabulation would probably cut productivity in half, we agreed on a daily bag count instead. This daily accounting was regularly monitored by the tribal historic preservation officer and witnessed, if not also participated in, by field school students, allowing them to see the ways that archaeological research practices were also constituted as social and cultural practices. North American archaeologists may abide by codes of ethics, such as those published by the Society for American Archaeology, that would prohibit absconding with artifacts and never accounting for them, but real-world communities want their own assurances of ethical and respectful conduct.

Like most field schools, our project requires students to keep daily journals. The journals served one purpose of maintaining quality checks on data recovery (as a complement to field forms) and of encouraging students to keep detailed notes on their activities during the day (cf. Perry 2004:241), but they began to serve another purpose in that students were encouraged to write down not just findings and interpretation but also critical reflections on collaboration and tribal involvement. These latter reflections proved to be some of the most illuminating of all entries, as students recounted interactions with tribal members, wondered about politics, thought about cultural representation and identities, and reflected personally on how transformative the collaborative aspects of the field school had been for them. These journals are, therefore, like those used in classroom settings for pedagogical reasons. "Perhaps the most important contribution of the journals is that they encourage students to see education as a life-transforming experience, a journey of self discovery, rather than simply a race to acquire usable, saleable skills and competences" (Hamilakis 2004:300).

Many of these elements tap directly into a central but often neglected feature of collaborative archaeological research: *relationships*. Everyone knows that archaeological fieldwork is an inherently social endeavor, but the collaborative and indigenous environment offers unique challenges and possibilities. Understanding relationships means recognizing that archaeology is a "cultural science"—or more pointedly for North

America, is still a kind of anthropology—in the social and political present and that it takes place between people with varying interests in the process, content, and outcome. Consequently, the collaborative process must be monitored to ensure that all participants work toward a willingness to consider, respect, acknowledge, and include diverse perspectives, philosophies, and interpretations during the project. Each participant comes to "own the project" in his or her individual ways, which is a better metaphor than simply trying to "own the past." When the voices of archaeologists, students, Native leaders, and tribal participants are heard and valued by all involved, the educational, professional, and personal benefits expand in unique directions. We are reminded of a student who responded to a question from Eastern Pequot tribal members about what she gained from the project. She did not say historical knowledge or archaeological skills; she answered "self-development." If personal or community transformations occur during a collaborative archaeological project, then the project has an impact well beyond—or before—its final output of "interpretation." This is fundamentally important, since many participants in the archaeological process, whether students or tribal members, do not or cannot follow through to that end point (see also Berggren and Hodder 2003). They draw out their own experiences during the collaboration. We can understand these social, political, and even personal dimensions only by paying critical attention to the *process* of collaborating.

Conclusion

We have outlined what the "craft" of archaeology might look like in New England in the context of a collaborative tribal archaeological field school on the historic reservation of the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation. Our central concern has been to document and reflect on the process itself as it has developed in our specific setting. Since archaeology has been a product-driven academic discipline, it has rarely taken stock of how these products take form and how the process itself may have had effects or implications in other arenas. The complex and highly variable nature of collaborative and indigenous archaeological projects necessitates that we pay more attention to these issues. In this context, we made two broad arguments.

First, in such collaboration, academic archaeologists can conduct research that is rigorous, empirically sound, theoretically engaging, and methodologically tight to meet scholarly community standards. At the same time, archaeologists can make the final product—history—responsive to the communities in which the archaeology takes place and to whom the cultural heritage is clearly linked. These are not mutually exclusive, and in fact, these archaeological and cultural histories can be coproduced by archaeologists, students, and tribal members. Doing so requires open dialogue with communities about methods and data. Archaeologists have a tendency to think of methods as only academic or professional considerations, but even the most innocuous methods can have import as social and cultural practices.

Second, we argued that collaborative tribal field schools offer more than the opportunity for “authentic learning” in a research community or the necessary personal test to see if one wants to pursue archaeology as a career. Instead, they offer transformative pedagogical spaces in which students can participate and examine the social practices involved in the production of knowledge and histories and the political contexts of history-making in the present. These can have significant impacts on the ways that students live beyond the field school experience. These collaborative field schools are also venues for tribal communities, particularly those who have not received federal acknowledgment, to receive reduced-cost historic preservation programs for land management and preservation and hands-on field training to tribal members. To meet these pedagogical and community needs, the practice of traditional archaeological field schools must be reexamined carefully and then re-crafted actively in local settings, both to work on the past and for the future.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the many people who have made this field school possible as of 2006. First and foremost, we would like to thank one another for the trust, respect, and open dialogue that we have developed over the last few years of collaborating. We also thank the Eastern Pequot Tribal Council for their support of the archaeological and historic preservation work; the tribal members who participated in the multiyear field project as historic preservation officers (Royal “Two Hawks” Cook, Robert “Little Bear” Sebastian) and as interns (Darlene “Tubby” Fonville, Linda McCall, Gerrilynn “Nuffy” Cagle); the various graduate student

teaching assistants (Craig Cipolla, Starla Lane, Julie McNeil, Jon Patton, Melissa Smith, Tom Witt); the many undergraduate and graduate students who have now participated in the four field schools; the lodging assistance provided by Marilyn Burnett at Connecticut College; and the logistical and administrative support of the University of Massachusetts, Boston, particularly the Department of Anthropology and the Department of Corporate, Continuing, and Distance Education. Finally, we extend our deepest appreciation to John Ware and the Amerind Foundation for their support of the seminar that led to this book project and to all of the participants in Dragoon in October 2005 for their collegiality, encouragement, and critical insights. In particular, we thank Jeff Bendremer and Jack Rossen for their “internal” review of this chapter. At the time of this writing, funding for the project has come from the National Science Foundation (BCS no. 0623532), the Eastern Pequot Tribal Nation Council, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and the University of Massachusetts, Boston.