Archaeologies of Placemaking

Monuments, Memories, and Engagement in Native North America

Edited by
Patricia E. Rubertone

Walnut Creek, California

CHAPTER 1

Engaging Monuments, Memories, and Archaeology

Patricia E. Rubertone

INTRODUCTION

It goes almost without saying that landscape plays an important role in how the past is remembered. The huge literature on place—specific portions of landscapes entwined with personal experiences and historical narratives—tells through theoretical inquiries, and richly textured and culturally and historically anchored accounts, of the power of places to provoke and evoke memories (e.g., Basso 1996; Bender 1998; Casey 1987; Clifford 1997; Jackson 1994; Lippard 1997; Lowenthal 1985; Schama 1995, to name a few). Place, then, is personal and political; indeed, placemaking, the social practices of constructing place and inscribing memories, does not necessarily require particular skills or special sensibilities. Questions about what happened here (or there), how it was formed, who was involved, and why it should matter can often be answered more or less spontaneously, alone or with others, or with varying degrees of interest and enthusiasm (Basso 1996:5; Lippard 1997:7). Although anyone can be a placemaker and places lurk everywhere, on the familiar and proverbial beaten paths as well as off them, the process is never entirely simple. What is remembered about a particular place is triggered, guided, and constrained, largely by visual "landmarks" but also by verbal accounts and other sensory stimuli (e.g., Bender 2001; Ingold 1993; Tilley 1994; Witmore 2006). These images of place are reshaped and reinterpreted, sometimes by placemakers who selectively seek to cultivate certain responses and, therefore, attempt to define for others what should be remembered and how it should be remembered.

Not surprisingly, archaeological sites—ranging from "picturesque" ruins to small, barely perceptible physical traces on the landscape preserved through antiquities legislation—and built monuments of all sorts figure prominently among places that invoke memory by serving as tangible reminders of people and events in the past worth remembering

and how they should be recalled. Both are "monuments" in the sense that they are reminders, places intended to prompt memory and raise historical consciousness (or at least they should) about pasts most visitors have never experienced firsthand and know little about. They "can be seen as an apology for the betrayal of forgetfulness, a half-hearted bow to the significance of histories we are too lazy to learn" (Lippard 1997:85). Archaeological sites and built monuments especially may "relieve viewers of their memory-burden" (Young 1993:5) by doing their memory-work for them and, therefore, divest onlookers of the responsibility to contemplate, let alone imagine, deeper, layered, and alternative histories and meanings entangled with place.

Such charges suggest that the relationship between archaeological sites championed for preservation and monuments in a conventional sense, and the memories thought to be inspired by them may be problematic. By situating some people and events in the past, these places often deny a present and preclude a future by supplanting histories that are being lived. For many Indigenous peoples throughout the world, historic preservation, other site protection efforts, and monument building have selectively and deliberately generated and condoned remembrances which may have little or no correspondence to the memories and experiences they themselves attach to the specific locales targeted by these activities. Indigenous groups therefore may be, and indeed often are, ill-served by historic preservation and public monuments that protect, preserve, and seek to commemorate vestiges of their history (e.g., Carmichael et al. 1994; Deloria 1992; Joyce 2003; Keller and Turek 1998; Smith 2006). Choices made by preservation specialists or heritage managers, and also archaeologists, about what sites to privilege or disregard, about which time periods are valuable or more valuable than others, and about which cultural or ethnic groups are recognized or ignored have defined what is important and representative in Indigenous peoples' pasts. Although there is a powerful global movement afoot to involve Indigenous people in the decision-making process and in the practice of archaeology (Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997; Smith and Wobst 2005; Swidler et al. 1997; Watkins 2000), what is made known to outsiders has all too often excluded, suppressed, and devalued histories of place still shared by insiders.

Similarly, decisions about built monuments—whether they should mourn events of tragedy and violence or celebrate colonists' heroic victories over Indigenous peoples in bloody encounters, whether they should be representational or starkly abstract, or whether they should accurately mark the spot or simply reference another place and time (see Foote 1997; Lippard 1997; Young 1993)—have generally not been made in consultation with living descendant communities. During long and

grueling public debates, stiff design competitions, aggressive fund-raising campaigns, and innumerable compromises, they are seldom, if ever, asked what kinds of monuments they would like to see and where specifically, or whether they want any at all. Consequently, a monument may be, and often is, built on top of memories it only relates to superstructurally and, indeed, subversively (Lippard 1997:107).

Whether elaborately sculptural or deceptively bland, public monuments commemorating Indigenous people typically project images explicitly commensurate with "colonialist views of Aboriginality" as Jane Lydon has observed in Australia (Lydon 2005:114). There, public monuments generally built before 1970 commemorate "treacherous Aboriginal killers, faithful Aboriginal guides of White explorers, or the death of 'the last of their tribe'" and hardly ever comment on the diverse experiences of Indigenous people in postcolonial contexts (Lydon 2005:114). In North America, iconic brave-on-a-horse monuments and lone nonequestrian statues reproduced in many sizes, forms, and mediums echo the logic of assimilation rather than resistance by depicting American Indians as stoic witnesses to an inevitable demise (Kammen 1991; Lippard 1997:108). Subtler and more ubiquitous monuments such as free-standing, inscribed boulders and polished stone tablets, mounted plaques and roadside markers found in locales everywhere, and frequently emplaced with far less agonizing than sculptural and architectural monuments identified as public art, also serve to "quell associative ponderings" by pushing certain interpretations and precluding others (Lippard 1997:110). Through spatial overwriting, built monuments, regardless of their scale or artistry, construct certain memories at the expense of others, ostensibly curtailing the possibility of alternative and new experiences and memories coincident with the place of memorialization.

This collection of essays explores the tensions between prevailing regional and national versions of Indigenous pasts created, reified, and disseminated through monuments here broadly defined, and Indigenous peoples' memories and experiences of place. Through detailed case studies from across North America, the contributors ask questions about processes of historic preservation and commemoration, and build connections between these processes, Indigenous peoples' histories, and archaeology. Although the case studies cover vast ground, from California to Virginia and from the Southwest to New England and the Canadian Maritimes, the book is not intended as a comprehensive or comparative survey of popular or less well-known Native North American monuments (see, for example, Cantor 1993). Instead, the chapters, encompassing a select group of studies by archaeologists engaged in ongoing and collaborative research with Native Americans in the United States or with First

Nations in Canada, raise critical questions about the very complicated and uncertain intersections of history and memory, place and displacement, public spectacle and private engagement, and reconciliation and reappropriation that resonate loudly all across the Indigenous world. While broadly relevant to Indigenous groups globally, these issues are not exclusive to Indigenous peoples. They also concern subordinate and minority groups throughout the world whose pasts and, indeed, living traditions have been conspicuously excluded and marginalized on the landscape by monuments of the dominant culture. The North American case studies in this book, therefore, have broad applicability, not only to archaeologists, historic preservationists, and heritage managers working in other locales, but also to individuals and communities everywhere poised to look beyond what is visibly remembered and imagine what is less visible.

Without neglecting the undeniably fascinating and incredibly intricate politics of placemaking and collective memory, the authors venture into and examine the ambiguous and murky middle ground of monuments. However, the essays are not merely about compromise over contested terrain as might loosely be implied by the metaphor of a "middle ground," a phrase used by the historian Richard White (1991) to characterize colonial relations between American Indians and Europeans around the Great Lakes region of North America. Instead, the essays are more correctly about middle grounds as actions "in the realm of cultural meaning-making, performance, and communicative practice" (Deloria 2006:16) and their material expressions. Thus, the authors look at processes that transform places, erase actors, and delight the masses and also at those which involve routine visitation, dissent and resistance, and occasionally countercelebrations. Through the lens of monuments, the book shows many Native peoples' deep attachments to place and the efforts that some have taken in the past or are currently taking to reverse insinuations about their disappearance and other misconceptions and reclaim moral territory for the future.

SENSES OF PLACE, SENSES OF HISTORY

That the past is intimately tied to place goes without saying, though not in ways that its manipulators would like us to think. Clearly attempts to freeze a place in time do not always truncate or entrap memories (Bender 1998). Nor do such efforts to keep the past separate from the present as a place to be visited when we want to escape modernity seem entirely successful (Lippard 1997). Past and present are inextricably intertwined on the contemporary landscape. The past is not distant and may not be that foreign, in spite of interpretations to the contrary. In its material

forms, it shapes how we move through and experience the world on a day-to-day basis, perhaps even without fully knowing or appreciating the meanings of these places, distorted or otherwise.

For North America's Native peoples, the notion that the past is a separate world is especially troublesome. Standard archaeological approaches that construct linear narratives tracing the successive replacement of one archaeological culture by another identify ancestral places in ways that may not conform to community memories. While archaeology may be able to retrieve evidence of deeper pasts than can be preserved through memories of personal histories and community experiences, and arguably may add to and enrich the history of a place by making it more profound, standard archaeological approaches and terminologies may be alienating. As Donald Julien, Tim Bernard, and Leah Morine Rosenmeier suggest in Chapter 2, such categories and labels "alienate people from the landscape and places of their ancestors." The vocabulary of culture history, which conceptualizes the past in terms of discrete archaeological phases or cultures, not only ruptures relationships temporally, but also serves to disconnect Native people from places they consider ancestral. Moreover, assumptions about "disconnection" impinge on the dominant society's perceptions of Native peoples' identities and, therefore, may undermine interpretations of their land rights and shape opinions about other critical issues that affect their lives.

Nevertheless, ancestral relationships to place are complex and multidimensional. Clearly, they cannot be reduced to biology, gauged merely by similarities in technology, artifact styles, or language, or even fixity. The past may not be foreign—that is, separate from the present as some might assume—but an ancestral place need not be a site of continuous experience extending into deep time either. To Mi'kmaw communities in Nova Scotia, Canada, for example, the "Paleo Indian" Debert site, radiocarbon dated to 11,000 years old, is considered ancestral because they perceive a connection that is firmly rooted to place and historical experiences, and not because they are directly descended from the ancient inhabitants who lived there (though they concede they might be). They are in some way descendant from Debert's occupants because Debert is located in their homeland. It is part of, rather than apart from, the landscape in which generations of Mi'kmaq have dwelled and still do today. Although ancestors who resided at the Debert site might not be remembered in local genealogies, the Mi'kmaq have a relationship with them. This emotional and spiritual relationship is playing a crucial role in community-based initiatives to protect and care for sites like Debert, and paving the way for interpretive and educational programs that squarely situate them in a Mi'kmaw, rather than a foreign and anomalous, context.

Similarly, some Native Americans may have important relationships with places on the landscape they do not consider specifically ancestral. The Reeve Ruin and Davis site in southeastern Arizona's San Pedro Valley are cases in point (Chapter 3). Archaeologists have long hypothesized that the Reeve Ruin was settled by Pueblo peoples, who migrated from the Hopi Mesas around AD 1250 and who eventually returned to their home or stayed and became part of local communities. The Hopi do not disagree with the archaeologists' interpretation. They see the Reeve Ruin as part of their collective past, a place "that memorializes the lives of their cherished ancestors." The Reeve Ruin and other San Pedro Valley sites are documents that identify the paths their ancestors took in their migratory routes and evoke emotional responses that far transcend concerns about the sites' archaeological particulars. But as the authors, Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, T. J. Ferguson, and Roger Anyon, note, other Native American groups living in nearby areas also have connections to archaeological sites in the San Pedro Valley. Drawing on conversations conducted during a three-year collaborative ethnohistory and archaeology research project, they report that both the Reeve Ruin and Davis site are intensely meaningful to Western Apache and Tohono O'odham peoples, who say their ancestors did not build these sites, and the Zuni, who speculate that, like the Hopi, their ancestors might have lived at these places.

For these groups, the past is neither distant nor separate from the present. In spite of archaeological chronologies that arrest sites in time and seemingly fracture spatial connections, the Hopi, Zuni, Western Apache, and Tohono O'odham have historical and cultural relationships to places in the San Pedro Valley. Rather than seeing the sites only from the fixed and distanced vantage point defined by archaeologists, they apprehend other meanings of place. The stories evoked suggest how place and landscape sustain multiple meanings. The various narratives highlight the importance of integrating Indigenous views in order to gain insights crucial to advancing more equitable understandings of the past and to reshaping relationships between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples. Additionally, the recognition of archaeological sites as ancestral places may also be vital for individuals and communities dealing with the historical trauma of alienation and attempting to reconcile loss and hurt by reconnecting with the past as Julien, Bernard, and Morine Rosenmeier persuasively argue in Chapter 2.

PLACEMAKING AND REINVENTED PASTS

If the multiple meanings of place are often muted, then their multilayered histories may be even less apparent. In part, their "invisibility" may be attributed to the passage of time and, specifically, to processes of decay,

decomposition, and destruction by obscure human and nonhuman agents that transform sites by changing the form of buildings, features, and objects, altering their functions, and blurring their boundaries in ways that seemingly erode material traces of history and cultural memory (DeSilvey 2006). Certainly, archaeologists have developed and employ procedures that allow them to perceive layers, identify artifacts, and otherwise detect order and meaning in material remains which might at first glance seem too ephemeral, jumbled, and ambiguous. They enlist this reasoning in judging what is significant and determining, along with historic preservationists and heritage managers, what should be remembered about a place.

However, the ways of perceiving and deciphering layers may be subjective and, as mentioned, may advance interpretations that emphasize the successive replacement of one archaeological phase or culture by another. Admittedly, even attempts to detect and preserve layers of lived experiences in the human past archaeologically may not always recover subtle transitions that hint at continuities and complexities. These issues aside, places with richly layered histories may also be the subject of more concerted and inventive placemaking. Using a battery of practices, including naming and selective (re)building, "preservationists" may attempt to erase certain layers of the history of a place at the expense of others.

Not surprisingly, such creative and imaginative placemaking that loosely or deliberately reconstructs the past is often geared to popular audiences, and not Indigenous communities who made history at and/or continue to live in the place, nearby, or still have connections to the place. Consequently, creative placemaking and "invented traditions"—routine performances and ritualized celebrations that package history for public consumption to make the past seem more real and more suitable (e.g., Hobsbawn and Ranger 1983; Trouillot 1995)—may not only seek to inculcate national values and advocate regional prominence, but also to actively promote tourism.

Reinvented places abound in North America (and elsewhere throughout the world). The layers of history—that is, the time periods (and cultural groups) favored and considered valuable and worth preserving—vary widely according to region. Whereas the Colonial period is canonized in New England and Virginia at Plymouth and Jamestown, respectively (see Chapters 7 and 9), in the Southwest, places associated with the Spanish Conquistadors, iconic figures in frontier history, and "disappeared" Anasazi Indians share the spotlight (Lippard 1997:90). There, and particularly in urban areas such as Santa Fe, archaeology and historic preservation have been enjoined in creative placemaking to build a distinctive regional identity as well as bolster American nationalism (McManamon 2003).

For example, in Chapter 4, Robert Preucel and Frank Matero discuss these processes of placemaking at Kuaua, an archaeological site ancestral to the Pueblo peoples of the northern Rio Grande that was renamed and "restored" as the Coronado State Monument to commemorate the Spanish *entrada* and help craft a New Mexican identity. As part of the placemaking effort, Kuaua, an ancient Tiwa Indian village, was extensively excavated in order to establish if it was a Coronado encampment as scholars had supposed. Although archaeology did not confirm their hunches, Kuaua Pueblo was interpreted as a type-site of colonial encounter in the region.

As the Coronado State Monument, Kuaua Pueblo was not merely stabilized for public consumption: its footprint was accentuated and walls, already partially standing, were given a weathered appearance to enhance their look of age and emphasize the depth of Spanish roots in the region. Additionally, placemaking involved building a small museum within the outlines of the archaeological site and a plan to raise a statue of Coronado in one of the pueblo's plazas. Although the statue was never executed, its omission was incidental. Even its absence did not prevent or in any way deter a reenactment of a sanitized Coronado entrada from being staged at the monument's dedication ceremony.

Preucel and Matero invoke the concept of *heterotopia*, a term coined by Michel Foucault (1986) to describe spaces that are several places at once—that is, places where there are other real sites which may be simultaneously represented, contested, or inverted—to characterize the Coronado State Monument. In their application of the term, however, the monument is not just another space added to an existing one—at the very least Kuaua's 1,200 rooms, six ceremonial chambers, and six kivas known from archaeological excavations. Instead, they prefer to envision heterotopias, and the Coronado State Monument specifically, as radically different modes of conceptualizing space linked to relations of knowledge and power. From this perspective, Fort Apache, an American frontier icon and the subject of John Welch's essay (Chapter 5), may also be considered a heterotopia.

Fort Apache, an epically mythologized military outpost in Anglo-American expansion, is a constellation of places and histories largely overshadowed by its name. As Preucel and Matero suggest in Chapter 4, naming is a tactic in placemaking and a feature of heterotopias that serves to situate a place "within a knowable universe and [to] assert a form of possession." For example, naming was used by early European explorers and later American colonists as part of their nation-building process (Thomas 2000). While hardly a neutral practice, naming also served to "lionize heroes and emphasize the most dramatic events in the exploration, settlement, and development of a new territory" (Thomas 2000:xxv). "Fort Apache," a

name so synonymous with hostile interactions and military pacification, then creates a false impression of the place. As Welch writes, much of the military post's history was "a chronicle of arcane bureaucracy, hard work, and institutionalized attention to perceived duties to enforce capricious national policies" that was punctuated only by brief episodes of brutality. But what is even less known about Fort Apache—especially among individuals fascinated with its role in the conquest of the American West (and American Indians) and content not to think beyond its place-name—is its history as an Indian boarding school. The failure to call Fort Apache by this other name, then, underscores an unwillingness to acknowledge sustained contacts between the Apache and European Americans, as well as continuing displacements, alienation, and loss, that were part of an ongoing process of colonialism (e.g., Lightfoot 1995; Rubertone 2000; Silliman 2005).

Visitors expecting to see a palisaded fort may be sorely disappointed. What they see instead is a still-unfolding episode of placemaking that recognizes Fort Apache as a complex and multilayered place. For the Apache Tribe spearheading the rehabilitation, this has meant facing painful memories, some of them very recent. Currently called neither Fort Apache nor the Theodore Roosevelt School, but the White Mountain Apache Tribe Cultural Center, the locale is a place of "footprints" in cultural survival, including both architectural vestiges of the fort and the school, as well as natural landscape features important in Apache culture. It is a place where personal and community healing and anticipated economic development based on tourism are not considered incompatible. Rather, increased access for visitors is seen as a means of facilitating intercultural communication and understanding.

Welch's detailed account unpacks Fort Apache as a multilayered place variously used and remembered during its long and continuing "life history." The discussion strongly suggests that placemaking need not be limited to activities specifically undertaken to emplot ennobling events, triumphs, and sacrifices in national existence. Likewise, it would be shortsighted to think of placemaking as confined to a single, defining "monumental" moment rather than a more fluid and emergent process as recent initiatives at Fort Apache imply. Consequently, as heterotopias, monuments pose interpretive challenges to archaeologists not only in North America but elsewhere throughout the globe that far exceed their study merely as multilayered or multicomponent sites. The archaeology of heterotopias would seem, therefore, to be an especially productive global project that could help eliminate the boundaries between history and prehistory, expand notions of collaborative research, and question other persistent concepts that shape interpretations of Indigenous people regardless of their respective communities.

COLONIAL MONUMENTS, INDIGENOUS MEMORY KEEPING

That placemaking and memory keeping exist under the surface or as unpresupposing markers on the landscape, then, would seem undeniable. However, recognizing, let alone recovering, these other memory-places and the values attached to them has been and continues to be hampered by dominant physical and verbal reconstructions of place and the memories they invoke. Recently, archaeologists have begun to pay closer attention to the traces of purposeful placemaking and memory keeping lurking under the surface or lying on top of it, though perhaps not as prominently or widely recognized as landmarks from the perspective of the colonial or dominant society. Despite the often masking presence of Europeans, researchers have noted "special attention" places, ranging from marked locales to natural features, that serve as mechanisms for creating and recreating linkages between past and present and setting precedents for the future in Indigenous cultures (e.g., Carmichael et al. 1994; Morphy 1995; Simmons 1986). Such memory-keeping places may include stone cairns, deposits of offerings, or engraved or painted rock art, as well as caves, mountains, springs, swamps, rivers, rock outcrops, and a host of other landscape features that are revered and revisited. Alternatively, some have also observed that special places of memory might be intangible or not marked in any particular way. The suggestion that memory-work might not require a physically or materially marked place does not undermine the premise of the importance of a "sense of place" to cultural and social identities, experiences, and values. Rather, it implies that the place or "site," though integral to the message, is not the full story or what alone or inherently imbues meanings (Smith 2006:44).

Detecting how Indigenous identities are maintained in the postcolonial landscape, and particularly how spatial practices of memory keeping bound to specific locations are sustained or perhaps refashioned, are not simple matters. By their very nature, European colonial landscapes represented a change in land use and break with an existing Indigenous history of the land. Furthermore, colonial landscapes were spatially controlled by colonizers through numerous and finely drawn boundaries and rules constraining movement (Byrne 2003). As previously noted, some placemaking in North America took colonial assertions of possession to the next level by denying a previous and continuing Native American presence. Death Valley National Monument would seem to be such a place. Its morbid name, as Paul White discusses in Chapter 6, suggests an inhospitable landscape unfit for human habitation, but also one of foreboding and paranoia for the Timbisha Shoshone who considered what others called "hell on earth" home.

With the establishment of the national monument, a vast testament to the American wilderness, Timbisha Shoshone in and near Death Valley, like many other Native Americans who learned they were "living in US national parks," were faced with forced removal and relocation. Although the Timbisha Shoshone successfully resisted relocation, they were embroiled in conflicts with monument personnel and especially with miners who came to be considered part of Death Valley's living history. Unlike remaining prospectors who were thought to add a good dose of color to the landscape, Timbisha Shoshone presence in the valley went unnoticed by most casual visitors until fairly recently. New signage corrects misconceptions about their persistence, but does not reveal much about their struggles to hold onto their land and their way of life.

However, White points out that testimony to Timbisha Shoshone perseverance, and their complicated history of resistant accommodation, is visible in Death Valley in the form of other monuments, specifically survey or claim markers. These unpretentious monuments, mostly simple stone cairns often located in peripheral locations, are associated with key historical processes that promoted individual over communal ownership, exclusive rights to resources, and in other ways reified European American valuations of land. Using two cases studies, White unravels Timbisha Shoshone and European American claims and counterclaims over possession underwritten by these monuments. His analysis provides insights into how Timbisha Shoshone, who sometimes sought rights to land that was theirs through formal application, lived their lives within and against colonialism. The chapter highlights how tensions and conflicts in colonial situations occasionally led Native peoples to engage in new forms of memory keeping, ones that are manifested in landscapes in subtle but no less powerful ways than the more emblematic expressions of nationhood such as America's national parks.

While White focuses on visible places of memory keeping connected to shared and conflicted histories that offer an alternative perspective on the "monumented" spaces dedicated to mainstream ideas about the past, Russell Handsman (Chapter 7) raises questions about the deeper histories of memory keeping which may exist beneath colonialist monuments. Monuments, as he reiterates, imply "an underlying stratigraphy and thus an archaeology, and perhaps, alternative, interconnected histories." He takes as his subject landscapes of memory in Wampanoag Indian Country of southeastern Massachusetts that lay beneath, and indeed beside, a profusion of monuments—including the iconic Plymouth Rock—raised to help shape the American public's understanding of the Pilgrim experience. Underneath this monumental landscape to North America's settler society are ancestral homelands attested to by archaeology and unwittingly by early settlers themselves in their written accounts. These homelands

are filled with what Handsman, following Ingold (1993), describes as *taskscapes*, places where people lived, hunted and fished, collected raw materials and plants, and did other mundane tasks generation after generation. In addition, these homelands also contain places of intentional memory keeping where the Wampanoag renewed and reasserted connections among generations in ceremonies no less, and perhaps even more, meaningful than the spectacles of mass celebration conducted at Plymouth Rock.

Handsman suggests that these special places of memory were not forgotten, even after the initial insults and incomprehensible disruptions of European colonization. Well into the eighteenth century, Wampanoag communities persisted throughout Plymouth Colony and remained connected to places of memory, often by placing small stones or brush on top of them to record their remembrances much in the same way as generations before them. His discussion strongly implies that special places of memory not only exist under the surface in New England Indian Country, but also endure on other colonial and "monumented" landscapes.

MONUMENTS, PUBLIC CELEBRATIONS, AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The suggestion that not all "monuments" are the same and, especially, that there are differences between monuments as material representations of idealized history and memorials as expressions of local, more complicated histories, and between public celebrations and community or personal memories of place, in Native North America and elsewhere raises critical questions about Indigenous peoples' interest in and possible engagement with colonialist places of memory. Handsman, for example, asks what an alternative tour of Wampanoag Country might look like a little more than a decade from now. Would it avoid altogether places suggested as stops in guidebooks printed for public commemorations? Would a countertour include these sites on the itinerary but offer interpretations of what lies beneath them? Would such a tour cover very different ground? In addition to telling about places hidden from view, as Handsman urges, could alternative tours through Wampanoag Country in the future also pause at Plymouth's monuments to point out how they fused two landscapes and how they too sometimes became important landmarks to Native peoples?

Thus, while monuments and the memories they invoked were typically intrusive and damaging, and often enough interfered with Native peoples' spatial practices, they could sometimes have summoned staunch

determination to hold onto routines of place or perhaps even to redirect them. Likewise, the inherent aggression perceived in an imposed monument might serve to provoke intense counterfactual memories, incite activism, and spur artistic and literal revisions. For example, as early as 1836, decades before European Americans earnestly began to raise monuments and preserve Native American antiquities, William Apess, a Pequot Indian, delivered a speech from the stage of the Odeon Theater in Boston, Massachusetts, that seriously questioned the value to Native people of celebrations commemorating Plymouth Rock and the landing of the Pilgrims. Using words which Native American activists could have comfortably interpreted as a call to arms more than a century later, he said, "Let the day be dark" and "Let every man of color wrap himself in mourning, for the 22nd of December [the day the Pilgrims landed and stepped onto Plymouth Rock] and the 4th of July are days of mourning and not joy" (O'Connell 1992:286).

More recently, Native American artists have commented on, and indeed expressed their discontent over, the symbolism of public sculptures and the content of official signage with their own, often temporary, installations. Edgar Heap of Birds, for example, has appropriated "bureaucratic" signage styles to produce confrontational texts aimed at forcing passerby to "acknowledge genocidal tragedies and histories of stolen lands" (Lippard 1997:111). Similarly, other artists, often working in cooperation with tribes, have offered visual and verbal commentaries on other events affecting Native peoples' lives in the postcolonial past (Lippard 1997:111, 113). In some instances, these criticisms or countermemorials have been instrumental in the cancellation of planned celebrations and in serving as springboards to reconciliation.

However, Native peoples' engagement with monuments might be longer and more variable than supposed by recent countermemorials and other public pronouncements thought to mark moments when they began to remember instead of being remembered (Lippard 1997:101). As important as these public displays are, they only represent a fraction of the possible ways in which Native Americans and other Indigenous peoples actively engaged with monuments. While appropriation often implies not only active, but very public, interventions, it may also involve more private, communal, and less visible, but no less significant, engagement. Therefore, rather than characterizing Native peoples' responses only as reactionary or assuming that they had absolutely no interest in monuments that misrepresented their experiences, we might entertain more nuanced understandings.

In Chapter 8, I consider some of the ways that Narragansett Indians in Rhode Island engaged with simple boulder monuments commemorating their "disappearance" in the aftermath of their detribalization. Although

it might be expected that the Narragansett would have shunned places where European American monuments relegated them to the past, in fact they engaged with them in a variety of ways. Some places such as the site of Memorial Rock, a fortified settlement in an ancestral homeland where they had long lived and worked, continued to be meaningful to them and visited, despite the intrusive presence of the monument. Indeed, it even became a stop on a countertour.

Arguably, the Narragansett may have appropriated some colonialist monuments as new sites of memory keeping and community building as they charted courses of survival and crafted identity following detribalization, sometimes, though not exclusively, in locations away from their former reservation. Although many Narragansett and other New England Indians regularly gathered at monuments and other prominent local landmarks to socialize and to share news and concerns, not all became sites of interest and engagement, as my research on the Canonicus Monument in Providence suggests. The reasons for appropriation—why some commemorative boulders were considered choice-worthy of Native peoples' interest and not others—were complex and certainly not identical. Thus, while placemaking associated with monuments imposes narrativized and symbolic meanings of history informed by nationalistic and regional interests, these meanings of place may be contested by meanings already in place, and indeed negotiated in processes of making new memories.

The intersected and complicated histories of people, monuments, and place are not, as I suggest, recoverable in archives alone, but instead demand a "hybrid practice" (Meskell 2005) that combines, at the very least, documentary, ethnographic, and archaeological approaches. In particular, archaeology, with its emphasis on deep histories, small-scale processes, and daily practices, as well as the formal aspects of "monumentality," holds enormous promise for illuminating the afterlives of monuments and their richly textured histories (e.g., Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Van Dyke and Alcock 2003). Consequently, archaeology may be crucial to helping challenge the very public assertions of monuments about groups they were meant to silence by revealing that acts of engagement do not only involve staged, public events or exhibitions. Like Indigenous peoples throughout North America and the world, the Narragansett made their lives against, but also at and around, colonialist monuments.

Jeffrey Hantman's essay on Jamestown's 400th anniversary (Chapter 9) provides a fitting conclusion to the volume. He comments on deeper histories of place, colonialist placemaking, other memory sites, and pathways toward reclaiming moral ground for the future through acts of appropriation. Not insignificantly, his subject, Jamestown, is a place

shrouded in layers of American nationalistic myths and overwrought stories that were very much in the news in 2007. If commemorations "sanitize the messy history of colonialism as lived by the actors" but also "contribute to the continuous myth-making process that gives history its more definite shapes" (Trouillot 1995:116), then the public events and programs recently enacted at Jamestown have accomplished their goal. Additionally, if numbers—that is, the number of participants and where they are from, and also the timing and cyclical nature of celebrations—count for anything in raising a site from banality or regional interest, then Jamestown is internationally renowned. Attracting large crowds, besides massive press, it has been visited by various luminaries on its anniversary celebrations and more than once by the Queen of England, Elizabeth II.

Balancing the intoxication with stark reality, Hantman, like other scholars, attempts to temper popular impressions of Jamestown. Archaeological and environmental evidence have been unsettling in exposing the Jamestown experience as "the creation story from hell" (Kupperman 2007:1). Furthermore, recent historical research strongly suggests that Jamestown is not just the epitome of the shortcomings and eventual successes of English colonization abroad, but had been shaped by the harsh realities of engagement in Africa, Asia, and other locations on the world stage. Jamestown, then, was a place of tragedy and loss, both for early colonists, but certainly for Virginia Indians, and also the African Americans who arrived there in 1619.

Using Kenneth Foote's (1997) ideas on how American society treats places of violence and tragedy, Hantman reexamines Jamestown and, particularly, how its associated sites have been sanctified, obliterated, and most recently, designated on the landscape. In the language of place-making, sanctification is the process of turning a site associated with a historic event or person into a place or monument conveying lasting and sacred meaning; on the other hand, obliteration effaces a site by covering it up or removing it altogether (Foote 1997:8, 24). For example, the Jamestown fort has been sanctified. In contrast, numerous Powhatan villages and their histories have been obliterated or largely overshadowed, despite their prominence at the time of the Jamestown colony and recent efforts to incorporate them somehow into the texture of the commemorated landscape. However, the Virginia Historical Highway Markers program has offered Virginia Indians the opportunity to appropriate "monuments of official designation" and create new ones. Through these efforts, offensive language has been replaced, new themes about Indian history introduced, specific individuals named, and references made to the larger Indian world that extended beyond Jamestown. If designation is a step toward sanctification (Foote 1997:20), then the 10 new,

permanent markers represent a small, but significant, shift toward telling the long-term story of Jamestown and its environs as a Native American place, and only later as a place of shared histories.

CONCLUSIONS: ENDINGS AND FUTURES

The tensions between monuments and their landscapes and Native North Americans' memories and experiences of place explored in this book comprise much more than scholarly exercises. Monuments as sites preserved, created, imagined, and performed have shaped historical consciousness about Native American pasts and have impressed certain kinds of identities on Native peoples. However, placemaking, as the chapters compellingly show, is not limited to narrow and, indeed, dominant political conceptions of the past. There are other ways of contemplating what is visibly or verbally remembered by monuments and, additionally, other experiences of place, both deeply profound and recent and emerging. These arguments are not intended to imply that monuments, as broadly defined in this book, are merely inconvenient misunderstandings. Nor do the opinions expressed simply advance dualistic interpretations that pit one understanding against another, or offer new angles on older histories.

The suggestion that the case studies edge into the murky and ambiguous middle ground of monuments emphasizes the creative role of misinterpretations and misunderstandings in generating new meanings and practices in cross-cultural and cross-political contexts. It also underscores the importance of connecting geographical and historical space with ideas about process, thus allowing place to inform process and vice versa (see Deloria 2006:20). And not least, the suggestion stresses the need to bind together multiple angles and arenas of analysis. Therefore, the term "middle ground" and its meanings also provide a useful concept for thinking about monuments in relation to ideas of shared versus segregated or mutually exclusive colonial histories invoked by Murray (2004), Lilley (2006), and others and for linking together what is visibly remembered or officially recorded with the very different ways in which Native peoples' experiences are woven into the cultural landscape.

In addition to offsetting "monumentalism" by helping people to imagine what is less visible, the concept of a middle ground applied to the study of monuments, including historic preservation and heritage sites, may also offer another strategy for decolonizing archaeological and other disciplinary practices. Monuments can be focal points for conversations that may help push collaborations in new directions—across the boundaries of prehistoric and historical archaeology, oral and written histories, and conventional (or "guild") scholarship and popular culture.

New collaborations might also fruitfully take place on a wider geographical scale that involve Indigenous communities in North America, Australia, South America, and indeed in any country with colonial histories where the dominant society's historical narratives have taken on a material and insistent form through monuments. Ideas about middle grounds and shared histories applied to monuments, then, can broaden understandings of what archaeological studies of monuments can achieve and further contribute to expanding what is meant by archaeologies of contact and colonialism and what they might accomplish (Lightfoot 1995; Rubertone 2000; Torrence and Clarke 2000).

Admittedly, archaeologists' involvement in supplying evidence that aids in monument building and interpretation or in revealing other forms of memorialization practiced by Indigenous peoples might be perceived as problematic. Although archaeology may contribute to identifying sites of memory keeping sometimes obscured by colonial settlement or forgotten by Indigenous groups alienated from ancestral land, it might also encourage unwanted tourism or otherwise call attention to private acts and ways of fulfilling ritual obligations by making them the focus of outsiders' scrutiny. Stopping short of indictment or exoneration, this book invites and encourages further dialogue by acknowledging that these concerns make palpable the reality that Indigenous peoples declared extinct or whose histories have been erased or marginalized by monument building, historic preservation, and other commemorative processes continue to struggle with the implications of memorialization.

Although beginnings are never simple or outcomes certain, perhaps the place to start thinking about future possibilities is with the monuments discussed in this book. At Jamestown, the 400th anniversary celebration has come to an end. The stream of politicians and international dignitaries has dwindled; the number of visitors this year or next might not reach the 3.3 million mark that organizers say it did in 2007. For Virginia's Native peoples, the end of the anniversary year was no different than the passing of other historical moments that brought colonial exploration, commerce, and imperialism to center stage. They will continue to tell their stories and pursue federal recognition. Through the Historical Highway Markers program, will they designate other places on the landscape for commemoration? Will some marked sites, long considered sacred to them, be sanctified by 2057?

Compared to Jamestown, the Canonicus Monument and Memorial Rock are monuments of less renown. Among the Narragansett, interest in Memorial Rock is more assured than their interest in the Canonicus Monument. Nonetheless, they make an annual pilgrimage and personal visits to the Great Swamp Monument, which they remember as a place where their ancestors were massacred by colonists in the early days of

King Philip's War (1675–1676). This monument has seen its share of uninvited dirt bikers and relic hunters, but it also exhibits graffiti and scars providing visual statements of the Narragansett's engagement, even to the extent of containing idioms which would reside comfortably in the language of Indigenous resistance. The vandalism by the bikers and relic hunters, and the graffiti and other physical evidence of resistance, may be historically linked and contradictory processes. Is there order to be detected in disorderly conduct? Could it offer further insights into the complicated and continuing intersections of, and unheard dialogues about, cultural loss and survival in Narragansett Country and perhaps even at other monuments where such behavior is usually condemned and would preferably be eradicated?

At Plymouth, the Pilgrim's Progress parade continues to be held each Thanksgiving Day, the fourth Thursday of November, as it has been since the Tercentenary in 1920. Since 1970, this "pilgrimage" has been accompanied by a counterevent marking the United States holiday as a National Day of Mourning. For Native American activists, and some Wampanoag, it is a day of remembrance and spiritual connection, as well as public protest aimed at stirring awareness and demonstrating unity with Indigenous peoples internationally. There have been some altercations, but on the whole, the two events have coexisted more or less peacefully. No one, for example, was arrested when mourners buried Plymouth Rock under a pile of sand (Lepore 1998). The town of Plymouth has even placed a Day of Mourning commemorative plaque on a rock near a statue of Massasoit, a seventeenth-century Wampanoag leader, on behalf of the United American Indians of New England. Could future monuments be raised to the Mashpee Wampanoag, who only recently received news of federal recognition after years of having their tribal identity and ties to place questioned in a court of law and in the arena of public opinion? How would such monuments represent their rootedness, as well as their movements? How might archaeology and community memories be used to ask questions about the complexities and ambivalences of the Mashpee's lives, which for centuries have been navigated between a local past and global future?

Private development along the Rio Grande has raised concerns about the Coronado State Monument. In 2006, the monument was renovated (and rededicated) in conjunction with the 75th anniversary of the New Mexico state monument system. The renovations included a new roof and windows, new stucco for the entire building, a fresh coat of paint, replacement of rotting timbers, and new electrical, heating, and air conditioning systems, but also new exterior lighting to accommodate evening events. The refurbished monument might not fit the vision of what Pueblo people would have wanted. If so, then very little has

changed since earlier episodes of placemaking at Kuaua. However, the efforts of Southwestern archaeologists in championing Indigenous views and integrating them into verbal and material constructions of place may forecast yet another phase in placemaking at Kuaua. How would such different visions reshape the monument?

Would Pueblo groups and others follow the lead of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, which has opened its own cultural center at Fort Apache and which holds events aimed at reconciling ruptured and unfinished relations? Certainly, the Mi'kmaq have begun to think about how the Mi'kmawey Debert Cultural Centre, which will not be completed until 2012, could facilitate journeys of healing and learning. Defying conventional museum practices and notions of monuments, they are exploring how visitors might experience a landscape and not just view or enter a building. Will diverse paths to understanding place converge? How different will Debert and its landscape look because of this traveling and the continuing dwelling of the Mi'kmaw peoples themselves?

Will signage announcing the Timbisha Shoshone presence in Death Valley detract from the important stories that cairns, seemingly in the middle of nowhere, can evoke? Late in 2007, the Timbisha Shoshone dedicated a community center with prayers, songs, and drumming. As part of the ceremony, they dug a hole in the ground to plant a willow tree and place offerings of sweet sage and water. Will the willow become a new special place of memory where they can recall their enduring ties to the land that were ignored for so long and where, under its shade, they can contemplate a future? Will the Timbisha Shoshone and other Native American peoples whose relationships to monuments are discussed in this book initiate conversations with their neighbors about memories of shared landscapes, much like the Hopi, Zuni, Tohono O'odham, and Western Apache have done together with archaeologists? For these Southwestern groups, places that seemingly had little relevance to specific communities because of their reported archaeological significance have unleashed new imaginings. Bridging the middle ground of monuments therefore holds enormous promise for addressing issues that matter to Indigenous peoples and across the colonized world, and points in a direction that just might unmake borders, erase divisions between past and present, and cross new conceptual territory in the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

Ashmore, Wendy, and A. Bernard Knapp, eds. 1999. Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives. Oxford: Blackwell.

Basso, Keith H. 1996. Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Bender, Barbara. 1998. Stonehenge: Making Space. Oxford: Berg.
———. 2001. Landscapes on the Move. Journal of Social Archaeology 1(1):75–89.
Biolsi, Thomas, and Larry J. Zimmerman, eds. 1997. Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Byrne, Denis R. 2003. Nervous Landscapes: Race and Space in Australia. Journal of Social Archaeology 3(2):169–193.
Cantor, George. 1993. North American Landmarks: A Traveler's Guide. Foreword by Suzan Shown Harjo. Detroit, MI: Gale Research, Inc.
Carmichael, David L., Jane Hubert, Brian Reeves, and Audhild Schanche, eds. 1994. Sacred Sites, Sacred Places. One World Archaeology Series, 23. London: Routledge.
Casey, Edward S. 1987. Remembering: A Phenomenological Study. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Clifford, James. 1997. Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Deloria, Philip J. 2006. What is the Middle Ground Anyway? The William and Mary Quarterly 63(1):15–22.
Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1992. Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future. American Antiquity 57:595–598.
DeSilvey, Caitlin. 2006. Observed Decay: Telling Stories with Mutable Things. Journal of Material Culture 11(3):318–338.
Foote, Kenneth E. 1997. Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Foucault, Michel. 1986. Of Other Spaces. Diacritics 16:22–27.
Hobsbawn, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. 1983. The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ingold, Tim. 1993. The Temporality of Landscape. World Archaeology 25(2):152–174.
Jackson, John B. 1994. A Sense of Place, a Sense of Time. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Joyce, Rosemary A. 2003. Archaeology and Nation Building: A View from Central America. *In* The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context. Susan Kane, ed. Pp. 79–100. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
Kammen, Michael. 1991. Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture. New York: Vintage Books.
Keller, Robert H., and Michael F. Turek. 1998. American Indians and the National Parks. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. 2007. The Jamestown Project. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Lepore, Jill. 1998. Revenge of the Wampanoags. New York Times 148(51352):A25.
Lightfoot, Kent G. 1995. Culture Contact Studies: Redefining the Relationship between Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology. American Antiquity 60(2):199–217.
Lilley, Ian. 2006. Archaeology, Diaspora and Decolonization. Journal of Social Archaeology 6(1):28–47.
Lippard, Lucy R. 1997. The Lure of the Local: Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society. New York: The New Press.
Lowenthal, David. 1985. The Past is a Foreign Country. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lydon, Jane. 2005. Driving By: Visiting Australian Colonial Monuments. Journal of Social Archaeology 5(1):108–134.
McManamon, Francis P. 2003. Archaeology, Nationalism, and Native America. *In* The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context. Susan Kane, ed. Pp. 115–137. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
Meskell, Lynn. 2005. Archaeological Ethnography: Conversations around Kruger National Park. Archaeologies 1(1):81–100.

Morphy, Howard. 1995. Landscape and the Reproduction of the Ancestral Past. *In* The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space. Eric Hirsch and Michael O'Hanlon, eds. Pp. 184–209. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, Tim. 2004. In the Footsteps of George Dutton: Developing Contact Archaeology of Temperate Aboriginal Australia. *In* The Archaeology of Contact in Settler Societies. Tim Murray, ed. Pp. 200–225. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Connell, Barry, ed. 1992. On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, a Pequot. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Rubertone, Patricia E. 2000. The Historical Archaeology of Native Americans. Annual Review of Anthropology 29:425–446.

Schama, Simon. 1995. Landscape and Memory. New York: A.A. Knopf.

Silliman, Stephen W. 2005. Culture Contact or Colonialism? Challenges in the Archaeology of Native North America. American Antiquity 70(1):55–74.

Simmons, William S. 1986. Spirit of the New England Tribes: Indian History and Folklore, 1620–1984. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst, eds. 2005. Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice. One World Archaeology Series, 47. London: Routledge.

Smith, Laurajane. 2006. Uses of Heritage. London: Routledge.

Swidler, Nina, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. 1997. Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Thomas, David Hurst. 2000. Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity. New York: Basic Books.

Tilley, Christopher. 1994. The Phenomenology of Landscape. London: Berg.

Torrence, Robin, and Anne Clarke, eds. 2000. The Archaeology of Difference: Negotiating Cross-Cultural Engagements in Oceania. One World Archaeology Series, 38. London: Routledge.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History. Boston: Beacon Press.

Van Dyke, Ruth M., and Susan E. Alcock, eds. 2003. Archaeologies of Memory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Watkins, Joe. 2000. Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

White, Richard. 1991. The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Witmore, Christopher L. 2006. Vision, Media, Noise, and the Percolation of Time: Symmetrical Approaches to the Mediation of the Material World. Journal of Material Culture 11(3):267–292.

Young, James E. 1993. The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning. New Haven: Yale University Press.