

# Voices in American Archaeology

Edited by Wendy Ashmore, Dorothy T. Lippert,  
and Barbara J. Mills



SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

The SAA Press

## 4

*Consultation and Collaboration  
with Descendant Communities*STEPHEN W. SILLIMAN *and* T. J. FERGUSON

Archaeologists who belong to the Society for American Archaeology, as well as other major professional organizations, have an ethical mandate to consult with the descendants of the people who lived in the archaeological sites we investigate. This mandate is articulated in the principle of accountability in the Society's "Principles of Archaeological Ethics" (<http://saa.org/AbouttheSociety/PrinciplesofArchaeologicalEthics/tabid/203/Default.aspx>). The principle commits us "to make every reasonable effort, in good faith, to consult actively with affected group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to the discipline and to all parties involved" (Watkins et al. 1995:33). Several elements are open for interpretation in this principle, including who counts as a descendant, what constitutes reasonable effort, how consultation is defined, who determines which groups are affected, and how benefit is evaluated. Nonetheless, the principle stands as a guide for best practice, despite the complex array of political, economic, social, and cultural milieus that surround archaeologists working in all areas of the world. In addition, many who work in the United States also find themselves with a legal mandate to conduct government-to-government consultation with Indigenous descendant groups to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), and other federal legislation (see Sebastian, this volume; Wilcox, this volume).

The synergy of these ethical and legal mandates sets the stage for a variety of productive consultative and collaborative relationships between archaeologists and descendant communities of all varieties (and encourages individuals from these communities to become archaeologists in their own right). While archaeologists consult with communities because of legal and professional requirements, they collaborate because they want to. The voluntary nature of collaborative work deepens consultation beyond what Watkins (2000) calls "legislated ethics." For Native Americans, the sovereignty explicitly recognized in government-to-government consultation may only be implied in collaboration (Gonzalez et al. 2006:392), but the latter remains important. However, members of these communities can often tell when consultation is bureaucratic and formulaic rather than a practice that archaeologists enjoy, encourage, value, and benefit from doing. Either way, collaboration and consultation require more than "public outreach." While outreach benefits various groups, particularly school children, disenfranchised groups, local residents, and the general public, it tends to create a one-sided delivery from archaeologists to others. This forecloses important "feedback" from those recipients, particularly since the delivered product—knowledge, artifact, and experience—exists already in a relatively final form before delivery to the public. In contrast, collaboration begins earlier and entails more intellectual, practical, and personal interaction between archaeologists and the communities with which they work.

In this chapter, we answer a number of questions about collaboration between archaeologists and descendant communities, including how those communities are defined, what collaboration entails, how collaboration can be conducted in various ways, and how this work leads to multivocal narratives and multicultural practices. We focus largely on North America and Native Americans, but the implications extend far beyond that continent. Looking back on 75 years of the Society for American Archaeology's history, we argue that effective consultation and productive collaboration with descendant groups has improved and will continue to improve archaeology by expanding the repertoire of questions we ask, developing new methods to investigate those questions, opening the interpretation of results to include Indigenous and other perspectives on theory and history, and making the discipline accountable outside of itself. We admit that this position is both reflective and directive.

### What are Descendant and Traditionally Associated Communities?

Conceptualizing descendant communities is complicated. They are more than simply the biological progeny of the people who lived in the sites we study (Borgstede 2002; Meskell and Van Damme 2008; Singleton and Orser 2003). Beyond genetics, these communities are defined by their historical, cultural, and symbolic associations to places that they consider ancestral, and these values and beliefs must be taken into account in addition to the biological heritage of individual people. Descendant communities can be local, residing in proximity to ancestral sites, or they may be distant or diasporic, having migrated hundreds or thousands of kilometers away from the ancient or recent homes of their ancestors. The identification of descendant communities is contingent on the interpretation of social and historical contexts, as well as the self-identification of social groups, and these can be hotly contested issues (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008). Descendant communities in the Americas, for instance, encompass many groups, including Indian tribes, progeny of enslaved African-Americans, offspring of Hispanic colonizers, sons and daughters of pilgrims and pioneers, more recent immigrants of the last century, and the complex intermixtures of some or all of these. Deciding which social groups form communities that are related to the past groups that we study has political and intellectual consequences that warrant careful consideration. In particular, anthropological concepts of descent must be balanced with Indigenous and folk concepts of ancestry in order to establish fair and equitable dialogue with people who are interested in and may be affected by what we do.

Traditionally associated communities, a concept fostered by the National Park Service (1998), differ from descendant groups in that they do not necessarily claim biological descent from the people who lived in the archaeological sites we investigate. Instead, these communities have traditional ties to archaeological sites that occur in the area in which they live, perhaps for many generations, and they often have deep emotional attachments to these places. We should seek out and consult with traditionally associated communities much as we do with descendant groups, although some of the parameters will vary, particularly when questions of “firstness” come into play. Still, we need to consult these communities about research that impacts archaeological sites so their cultural values and beliefs can be taken into account as we design and implement research.

### What is Collaboration?

Collaboration—working jointly on a project—has a long history in archaeology. In fact, we argue that archaeology has always been about collaboration, but politics and disciplinary tradition structure who participates in that collaboration, and only recently has community collaboration become more common. Traditionally, one type of collaboration in archaeology has grown out of the enormous amount of information generated from archaeological fieldwork—that is, data spanning a number of disciplines including soil science, geology, zoology, botany, architecture, material culture studies, chemistry, ecology, and more. The ability to use multiple sources of information to their fullest potential is frequently well beyond the expertise of a single archaeologist, so collaboration often takes the form of specialist-to-specialist interactions (see Zeder et al., this volume) and has produced the interdisciplinary nature of archaeology today.

Another type of collaboration stems from the impossibility of doing fieldwork alone. Digging complex stratigraphy, screening hundreds of kilograms of sediments, recovering artifacts, mapping discoveries, completing paperwork, and backfilling requires coordination among many team members. This labor is regularly provided by undergraduate, graduate, and sometimes secondary students who are taught and supervised by professional archaeologists in formal field schools; by skilled and semi-skilled field technicians employed by cultural resource management firms; by volunteers of all ages who seek archaeological experience; and by local populations hired as seasonal workers by national and international archaeological teams. Until recently, these “reservoirs of cheap labor” (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008:467; Shepherd 2003) or workers at the trowel’s edge (Berggren and Hodder 2003) have not been considered as legitimate stakeholders of the pasts being investigated.

Collaboration with descendant communities has become an increasingly popular addition in the last 40 years spurred largely by the inclusion of Native American tribes, First Nations, and other descendant communities in the historic preservation program of the United States and other countries, and by an ethical commitment on the part of archaeologists to implement an inclusive theoretical program relevant to Indigenous peoples and local stakeholders. Collaboration with descendant communities, particularly Indigenous ones, has become a global project wherein archaeologists seek to

work with local people who have a direct interest in and involvement with the archaeology, history, and lands that we study (Meskell and Van Damme 2008; Smith and Jackson 2008).

As Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) point out, collaboration occurs along a continuum of practice from resistance, to communicating research plans, to full-fledged involvement of descendant groups in the design, implementation, and interpretation of results. At one end of the continuum is a mode of resistance in which the goals of archaeology develop in opposition to descendant groups and traditionally associated communities. As a result, information about heritage resources is secreted by all parties, and stakeholders have no voice in interpreting the past. Although resistance seems like the antithesis of collaboration, this mode of interaction happens when two or more groups are pitted against one another. This opposition forms a basis for building communities nevertheless, be they communities of Indigenous people opposing archaeologists or communities of archaeologists opposing Indigenous peoples or a blurring with archaeologists allied with and assisting Indigenous groups, all of which were evident in the recent controversies surrounding the Ancient One, or Kennewick Man (Burke et al. 2008; Chatters 2001). The communities created or empowered by opposition sometimes produce a rapprochement between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples that allows them to cooperate on future projects on an equal basis.

In the participatory mode, archaeologists confer with descendant groups and invite them to be involved in research activities, but they develop the goals of research independently. By virtue of participation, descendant groups gain a voice in the interpretation of research results. This voice is strengthened when a project achieves full collaboration, with research goals and methods developed and implemented jointly by archaeologists and descendant group members. Collaborative research provides a means by which to best meet the needs of all parties interested in archaeological research. To achieve mutual benefit does not necessarily mean that all parties benefit equally or completely, but it does mean that participants have open dialogue, make respectful compromises, and seek a useful process and final product. Beyond collaboration, some tribes elect to exercise Indigenous control over archaeology on their lands as part of self-determination. This Indigenous control often entails hiring archaeologists to assist tribes in meeting their goals, resulting in collaborative research. Some of the archaeologists

Indigenous groups hire are community members, but others are not (e.g., Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Two Bears 2008).

The various modes of interaction along the collaborative continuum are not mutually exclusive in that some projects start out in one mode and then progress to another mode as research unfolds. Other projects have some components that are participatory and others that are collaborative. Individual archaeologists often work sequentially in various modes as new projects develop with new opportunities for engagement with descendant communities. True collaborative research is predicated on all parties developing a fundamental trust with one another, and this trust requires a long-term research commitment on the part of archaeologists working with descendant groups.

### When do Archaeologists Collaborate?

In North America—much like in Australia, South America, Central America, and Africa—archaeology developed in a colonial context where the pre-eminent goal was to maximize scientific knowledge by extracting artifacts from archaeological sites and removing them for study and curation in museums, often far from their original place of origin. Little thought was given to how the disturbance of ancestral places and the displacement of material culture impacted descendant groups, particularly since most archaeological research in North America until the mid-twentieth century focused on studying Native American pasts whose descendants had a muted political voice. Although descendant groups and traditionally associated peoples often provided labor for archaeological excavations, these groups were rarely involved in setting or implementing the scientific research agenda. In most instances, their labor has long been forgotten. Decisions about which sites to study and how those sites were investigated remained the purview of archaeologists who were primarily concerned with advancing scientific goals.

Over time in the United States, the unregulated removal of archaeological materials on federal and tribal land came to be viewed as a threat to the integrity of the archaeological record, and thus an impediment to scientific study. In response, Congress passed a series of laws to protect archaeological sites, beginning with the Antiquities Act of 1906 and continuing through the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended in 1992 (King 2008; Sebastian 2004). The federal historic preservation program defined by these laws initially conceived of places of past human occu-

pation as scientific resources that could be managed much like natural resources to conserve scientific values and maximize research potential. Only after the amendment of the NHPA in 1992 did federally recognized tribes gain the ability to participate fully in the national historic preservation program by developing tribal historic preservation offices (THPO). THPOs strengthen the control of tribes over cultural resources management and archaeological research on their land (Ferguson 2000).

The field of cultural resource management (CRM) developed in the United States after 1966, and an increasing number of archaeologists began to work in the governmental and private sectors to provide the professional services needed to implement the federal historic preservation program (Snead and Sabloff, this volume). In the 1970s several tribes established tribal archaeology programs to capture the economic benefits of CRM and facilitate development of infrastructure on their lands by having archaeologists assist with historic preservation compliance activities. The archaeologists who worked for tribal programs applied research to meet tribal goals and objectives, including developing tribally owned contract archaeology businesses and historic preservation offices; assisting with repatriation of human remains, funerary objects, and sacred artifacts; helping to develop tribal museums; and conducting research for litigation of land and water rights (Anyon et al. 2000; Downer 1997; Forsman 1997; Jones and McBride 2006; Stapp and Burney 2002). CRM work sponsored by tribes entails participatory and collaborative modes of research, and the cultural experience of archaeologists working directly for or with Indigenous peoples had a profound influence that served to balance scientific and Indigenous beliefs and values about how and why archaeology should be conducted. This experience shaped their professional ethics profoundly (Adams 1984). Some of these archaeologists began to espouse a paradigm of covenantal archaeology in which tribes and archaeologists worked under explicit agreements about the goals and methods governing archaeology on tribal lands (Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Powell et al. 1993; Zimmerman 2000).

Participation of tribes in the historic preservation program is legally mandated, with consultation required at specific points in the compliance process (Ferguson 2009). Archaeologists are required to confer with federally recognized tribes about the management and investigation of archaeological sites impacted by federal undertakings. In the course of discussing managerial decisions, many tribes, including those that do not employ their own

archaeologists, decide to become directly involved in research, moving the process from participation in the historic preservation program into collaboration in archaeological research (Kerber 2006). Tribal members help develop research designs, determine appropriate methods, participate in fieldwork, and share authorship in report preparation (Dowdall and Parrish 2002; Ferguson et al. 2004; Swidler et al. 2000).

Outside of CRM, some archaeologists occasionally applied their work and collaborated with descendant groups to meet goals defined by Indigenous communities. The most notable of these were the archaeologists employed as expert witnesses during the Indian Claims Commission established in 1946 to quiet title to lands taken from tribes without payment during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Ellis 1974; Ross 1973). The research goals and methods of these archaeologists were informed by their collaborative work, and in some instances archaeologists were granted permission to excavate archaeological sites on tribal land that were theretofore off-limits to scientific study (Ellis and Brody 1964).

The passage of NAGPRA in 1990, with its provisions mandating consultation with tribes and traditional religious leaders during the process of repatriating human remains and sacred objects, led to a tremendous increase in the number of archaeologists directly interacting with descendant groups. One of the unintended consequences of NAGPRA has been an increase in collaborative research as the social and political ties forged in consultation carry forward into new research projects of interest to both archaeologists and descendant groups (Killion 2008). Collaboration arising out of NAGPRA has infused archaeology with new methods, theory, and epistemological viewpoints. A similar process to the CRM context occurs in museum settings, where consultation pursuant to NAGPRA requires that archaeologists and other museum employees engage in sustained dialogue with federally recognized tribes concerning culturally affiliated human remains, funerary objects, objects of cultural patrimony, and sacred objects in museum collections. This dialogue leads to new collaborative engagements in which tribes participate in the documentation of collections, design of new exhibits, and other museum activities (Kreps 2003; Lippert 2008).

Collaborative approaches forged in the area of Americanist CRM and NAGPRA have been embraced by university-based archaeologists, who have conceptualized and articulated the goals of collaborative research as a critical means of making archaeology socially relevant and democratic (Colwell-

Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Dongoske et al. 2000; Hodder 2002; Silliman, ed. 2008; Zimmerman 2008a). The historical trajectory of the development of collaborative archaeology in Canada mirrors much of what transpired in the United States (Lilley 2000; Nicholas and Andrews 1997; Peck et al. 2003). Especially notable in Canada was the early adoption of archaeological training in formal educational programs as a form of Indigenous empowerment (Nicholas 1997). Bound by ethical rather than legal requirements to consult with descendant groups, archaeologists based in the academy follow the same general process as described for CRM. The goals and outcomes of archaeological research are negotiated with descendant groups to create projects that are both culturally relevant and conducted in a manner to enhance Indigenous and local community goals and objectives (Dillehay 2008; Heckenberger 2004, 2008; McDavid 2002). Academic archaeologists have also embraced collaborative approaches in training students at field schools in the social and intellectual skills they need to practice archaeology in the twenty-first century (Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Bruseth et al. 2000; Herle 1994; Mills 2000; Mills et al. 2008; Preucel et al. 2005; Pyburn 2003; Rossen 2008; Silliman and Sebastian Dring 2008; see also Altschul and Patterson, this volume). These skills include innovative research design, low-impact archaeological methods, incorporation of Indigenous oral narratives into archaeological interpretation, and integration of multiple sources of information in archaeological research (Lightfoot 2008).

### Why Collaborate?

Collaborative archaeology employs a variety of research and participatory techniques because a multiplicity of peoples have a stake in how heritage sites and objects are defined, managed, studied, and interpreted (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008:7; Watkins 2003). Common to the various practices of collaborative archaeology is a research model that balances ethics, methods, and archaeological theory with the concerns of descendant groups and traditionally associated communities. Because the legal arena of consultation is complicated and historically focused on Native American concerns, we discuss collaboration more broadly within and outside of consultation. Since we define collaboration as a function of wants, we must ask the following question: What makes archaeologists *want* to collaborate,

given the highly variable and exclusionary ways they have handled various community, public, and scholarly constituents over the last century?

We consider theoretical interests and political commitments separately even though they frequently intertwine in the practices of individual archaeologists. Ethics play an unquestionably critical role in guiding current and future ideas and practices about collaboration and deserve attention in their own right (e.g., Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2004; Zimmerman 2006; Zimmerman et al. 2003), but we concern ourselves here with what makes ethics of community work and cooperation desirable and workable. An impetus for increased collaboration between professional and academic archaeologists and a variety of descendant communities comes from developments in theory and politics inside and outside of archaeology. Elements shared across these perspectives include political awareness, social justice, reflexivity, and multivocality.

Post-processual theory has contributed to community archaeology, as demonstrated by Ian Hodder's work at Çatalhöyük in Turkey. Hodder developed important elements of practice as he navigated a variety of communities, including local residents, politicians, New Age Goddess followers, and artists (Hodder 2002, 2003). This multicomunity, multistakeholder responsiveness has not garnered a significant following in North America, where archaeologists focus their attention primarily on descendant communities. Hodder's collaborative model employing the metaphor of "at the trowel's edge" (Berggren and Hodder 2003) has had more appeal, however, acknowledging the need to incorporate community members and other collaborators at all levels of the archaeological process. A recent book, *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge* (Silliman, ed. 2008), has used this model to frame the ways that North American archaeologists work with Native communities, develop research designs, excavate in the field, narrate histories, and teach students. This particular goal is actually more postcolonial than post-processual per se, and such terminologies and approaches are increasing as this decade draws to a close (see Preucel and Cipolla 2008). Moreover, following more pragmatist philosophical and critical race studies, Carol McDavid (1997, 2002) developed a community-based approach in Brazoria, Texas, that uses web technology and critical dialogue to incorporate descendant groups in her research on an eighteenth-century plantation. Although the collaborative elements developed later in McDavid's (2007) research, the goal has been to recognize and encourage the project as a "historically situ-

ated conversation” involving the local community, both descendant and non-descendant, African-American and White, historically enslaved and enslaving (see also Franklin and Paynter, this volume).

Alongside the general theoretical parameters established by the post-processual agenda are the contributions of feminist and Marxist archaeologists to thinking about and doing collaborative archaeology. Spector’s (1993) pivotal early work reveals how a feminist agenda encourages collaborative research with Native American communities, including knowledge sharing, self-reflexivity, and multivocality. Recently, Conkey’s (2005) assessment of feminist and Indigenous archaeologies reveals additional commonalities. Marxist archaeologists also developed approaches to communities, frequently framed by class rather than ethnicity, which encourage sharing power and asserting a political goal in archaeological practice. The Colorado Coal Field War Project, centered on the early twentieth-century workers’ strike and subsequent massacre in southern Colorado, used this approach (Ludlow Collective 2001; McGuire 2008; Saitta 2005), demonstrating the value of thinking about archaeology as a craft coproduced with and for communities (Shanks and McGuire 1996). In this project, archaeologists considered the mining community as a descendant group based on a shared class position as unionized laborers rather than on biological or cultural heritage (McGuire 2008:10; Franklin and Paynter, this volume).

Politics have also helped to shape collaborative archaeologies. The politics of “public archaeology” have led some archaeologists to account for how archaeology can and should serve a variety of publics (Little and Zimmerman, this volume). Some versions of this political approach promote the relevance of archaeology to public interests, in part to ensure that the various publics continue to support the enterprise of archaeology. In these formulations, archaeology is already seen to be a part of certain communities, usually framed as generalized, if not national, communities (e.g., McManamon 2000, 2003). In a more radical way, archaeologists like McGuire (2008) anchor their community archaeology in Marxist theory to argue for praxis, the use of archaeology to intervene in the world. Similarly, others from critical archaeological traditions use community archaeology projects to develop a more democratic archaeology and a more democratic society (McDavid 2002:312). This comprises part of an effort to situate archaeological practice within a wide spectrum of community interests and civic engagement (Little and Shackel 2007).

The activist politics of particular communities, mainly Indigenous and minority, have ushered in new forms of cooperative archaeological projects. Some communities have requested, if not demanded, more accountability from archaeologists and more openness in the archaeological process that permits their participation as researchers, consultants, stakeholders, and historical or political authorities. This is exemplified in the African Burial Ground controversy that erupted in New York City in the early 1990s. Minimal consultation and mismanagement of the African Burial Ground project metamorphosed through community insistence into collaboration (Franklin and Paynter, this volume; LaRoche and Blakey 1997; Perry 1997). Other collaborations between archaeologists and African-American communities have developed in a more positive context (Cuddy and Leone 2008; Shackel and Gadsby 2008). Matthews (2008), for instance, has revisited the nature of collaboration and community work with African-American communities in New Orleans, Louisiana, by emphasizing critical anthropological understandings of the politics of difference rather than relying on “rigid identity markers” to define communities and collaborations. Similarly, Mullins (2007) has approached the “color line” in Indianapolis to unpack assumptions and to encourage community participation and development in multicultural urban contexts.

The most noticeable impact of activist politics in American archaeology appears in the form of Indigenous archaeology, a term widely used now to refer to archaeologies with, for, and by Native people (Nicholas 1997, 2008; Silliman 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005; *contra* McGhee 2008). Community politics at national and at local levels spurred many archaeologists in the 1980s and 1990s to form productive working relationships with Indigenous communities. The struggles behind the passage of NAGPRA reveal these early antagonisms as communities fought to have their voices heard and their repatriation claims recognized (Sebastian, this volume; Wilcox, this volume). The development of Indigenous archaeology after 2000 has been grounded more in an ethic of cooperation and a recognition of the value and legitimacy of Indigenous claims and knowledge, due in large part to Watkins’ (2000) seminal contribution. The increasing interest in archaeology by Native American and First Nations communities has transformed archaeological practice. Several volumes dedicated entirely to the practical, theoretical, and methodological dimensions of Indigenous archaeology have appeared in the last decade (Dongoske et al. 2000; Ferguson and Colwell-



Chanthaphonh 2006; Kerber 2006; Silliman 2008; Smith and Wobst, eds. 2005), along with other edited volumes (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Shackel and Chambers 2004) and journal issues (Atalay 2006) that have made notable contributions to Native American community archaeology.

### Archaeology as Multivocal and Multicultural Practices

Far from compromising the standards of archaeological practice as a few detractors seem to argue (McGhee 2008), collaborations with a variety of communities, including descendant and traditionally associated groups, have expanded the questions asked, the methods used to answer them, and the interpretation of subsequent results (Zimmerman 2008a). Based on the contexts of history, theory, and practice discussed earlier, we suggest that working closely with descendant communities adds a valuable dimension to our multidisciplinary partnering. It can provide historical information, local environmental and geographical information, sharing of power and resources, participatory historical narration, political and symbolic capital, reflexive insight into the archaeological process, and progress toward social justice and restitution for disenfranchised groups. Therefore, why the collaborative approach has taken so long to develop in Americanist archaeology is puzzling given the long history of archaeology's connection to anthropology in the United States. How can archaeologists proceed without recognizing that they are entering communities and landscapes with different cultural, religious, historical, and practical orientations? The very fact of needing permission to access land demonstrates that the acquisition of archaeological data grounded therein comes with political and social consequences. Archaeologists should not assume that their research does not "do work" in the political and cultural world, and that they are powerless to silence or summon important histories and objects. Doing archaeology as anthropology necessitates paying careful attention to the *living* people who descend from the past and not just to the past.

If we are to emphasize the "public" in public archaeology (Little 2002), we need to share—and this does not mean *give up entirely*, since archaeologists have valuable skills and knowledges—the interpretive authority and physical products of archaeology. This means that coauthorship with community members and peer review by descendant communities may be criti-

cal elements for collaborative projects. Sometimes we find that community members want to cowrite scholarly publications (e.g., Bendremer and Thomas 2008; Silliman and Sebastian Dring 2008). At other times, a community person involved in directing the research may wish to be listed as an author much in the same way that the directors of scientific laboratories will be listed on publications written by postdoctoral researchers working on their research team. With authorship comes responsibility for the contents of a publication, so Indigenous people and other descendant communities approach this opportunity as part of their serious commitment to a project.

An interesting development in collaborative archaeologies is the creation of knowledge in the context of application, as what many might term "applied anthropology." Archaeological problem definition, methods, and findings all improve when the communities involved with archaeologists use the research. We find that archaeology can give back to descendant communities in profound ways, including sharing knowledge produced during the archaeological process. Such knowledge can be used as a resource for cultural preservation, resource management, site protection, alternative histories, repatriation efforts, economic incentives, political capital, education, and more. When crafted in collaborative contexts, knowledge resonates strongly with community needs (Shanks and McGuire 1996).

An important component of equity and reciprocity involves sharing the financial benefits of archaeology. Paying a fair wage for the work of Indigenous consultants, when appropriate, and seeking funds to pay for tribal research, participation, and travel of community members to professional meetings so they can participate in the dissemination of knowledge and interact with the wider archaeological community require dedicated effort on the part of collaborating archaeologists. Peers who review grant proposals need to be aware that these are essential to the collaborative process, and are thus a legitimate part of project budgets, even if expensive. Conducting archaeological research in collaborative contexts also permits the *practice*, not just the results, of archaeology to serve a greater good. The process of working with communities is as important as the products of that work (Silliman 2008:9–11). Many communities use archaeological field and laboratory training to build capacity for its members who may then seek education and careers in archaeology or any number of other fields. Community volunteers or interns on projects with strong educational components, such as field schools, offer low-cost training options for economically



disenfranchised communities (Silliman and Sebastian Dring 2008). Encouraging community members to be conversant in archaeology's jargon gives them the opportunity to join or to contest those languages. The discipline can only benefit, even if that means undergo harsh critique, when more of "the public" knows about what we do.

When archaeology takes place in a community context, we come to realize that we need to mitigate the effects of archaeological work on people past and present. Although archaeologists conceive of their practice as scientific, nonharmful, and ethical, communities may evaluate our work using different values. Beyond the obvious concerns with disturbing human remains, Indigenous communities often have to take steps to ameliorate the cultural, political, and spiritual impacts of fieldwork, such as digging holes in the earth (Dowdall and Parrish 2002; Million 2005; Silliman and Sebastian Dring 2008). Respecting power, even when scientifically trained archaeologists may not recognize its cultural dimensions, is important. Reflecting about collaboration with archaeologists, Leigh Kuwanwisiwma (2008), the director of the Hopi Cultural Preservation Office, notes that this endeavor requires equality, respect, and reciprocity. Trust, the underpinning of all collaborative relationships, can only be established when archaeologists work with Indigenous people over many years. Members of descendant communities need to see how archaeologists react to the myriad challenges that inevitably arise in collaborative work so that they know the archaeologist will honor the commitments entailed in ethical and equitable research.

### Conclusion

We conclude this chapter with optimism and caution. We are optimistic that archaeology will continue to improve with more collaboration and community involvement, becoming better in empirical and scientific applications, as well as cultural and human practices. To accomplish this, we need more theoretical treatment of what collaborations are and what they can produce, and more methodological guidance for how to do community archaeology in the many diverse contexts, some of which involve rather internally heterogeneous communities, that archaeologists face (Marshall 2002; Watkins and Ferguson 2005). We also need more explicit attention to what has been termed "ethnographic archaeologies" or the systematic and critical approach to the ways that archaeological knowledges, results, and

practices take form in the world of politics, emotions, values, heritage, and science (Castañeda and Matthews 2008; Mortenson and Hollowell 2009). In addition, we should not lose sight of the possibility, too, that archaeology does not just work in communities, but also creates them (Zimmerman 2008b). Archaeology should become a practice that does more than take away objects, bodies, history, rights, and power from communities, a characterization of the field that still resonates strongly with Indigenous and minority groups, as Tuscarora singer/songwriter Pura Fé passionately captured in her song "You Still Take." Archaeology should *give back* to communities in responsible and helpful ways. Giving back to communities means many things, and we leave it to readers to continue exploring those possibilities and expanding its horizons.

We must approach this future cautiously as well. By working to integrate the varying perspectives of groups from diverse professional and cultural backgrounds, collaborative archaeology creates opportunities that sometimes lead to unique tensions outside the realm of most academic research or expertise (Adler and Bruning 2008). We need to recognize that collaboration will not always lead to unitary approaches or complete consensus (Brown and Robinson 2006; Kuwanwisiwma 2008; McGuire 2003), and that archaeologists may find themselves at the limits of what interpretations that they, in good faith, can support. Therefore, we need to approach these matters through explicit protocols, open discussions, flexibility, and, most importantly, respect. While our chapter focuses on Indigenous groups, the basic approach we espouse is also effective in working with other communities whose beliefs run counter to standard archaeological interpretation. As Zimmerman (2008c:77) remarks in an essay about interaction with non-Indian "fringe" groups, archaeology has powerful tools that should be used with respect and humility to produce work that communities can use to create their own pasts and meanings for it. The difficult but workable challenge is to do this in a manner that simultaneously respects the scientific basis of our discipline.

As David Hurst Thomas (2008:xii) observes, collaborative archaeology can be transformative, accompanied by significant changes in ethics, methodologies, and actual interpretive results. Thomas counsels, however, that we should not assume that the shift of our profession toward a more inclusive and reciprocal archaeology is either universal or permanent. All archaeologists concerned with the broad range of social and intellectual val-

ues inherent in collaborative archaeology need to share these principles with their colleagues and students in order to carry the paradigm forward in the future development of our discipline.

## References Cited

- Adams, E. Charles  
1984 Archaeology and the Native American: A Case at Hopi. In *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, edited by Ernestine L. Green, pp. 236–242. Free Press, New York.
- Adler, Michael, and Susan Bruning  
2008 Navigating the Fluidity of Social Identity: Collaborative Research into Cultural Affiliation in the American Southwest. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 35–54. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Anyon, Roger, T. J. Ferguson, and John R. Welch  
2000 Heritage Management by American Indian Tribes in the Southwestern United States. In *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society: Perspectives on Managing and Presenting the Past*, edited by Francis P. McManamon and Alf Hatton, pp. 120–141. Routledge, London.
- Atalay, Sonya (guest editor)  
2006 Decolonizing Archaeology. Special issue, *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (3&4).
- Bendremer, Jeffrey C., and Elaine L. Thomas  
2008 The Tribe and the Trowel: An Indigenous Archaeology and the Mohegan Archaeological Field School. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 50–66. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Berggren, Åsa, and Ian Hodder  
2003 Social Practice, Method, and Some Problems of Field Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 68:421–434.
- Borgstede, Greg  
2002 Defining the Descendant Community in a Non-Western Context: The Maya of Highland Guatemala. *Teaching Anthropology: Society for Anthropology in Community Colleges Notes* 9(1):27–29, 38.
- Brown, III, John, and Paul A. Robinson  
2006 “The 368 Years’ War”: The Conditions of Discourse in Narragansett Country. In *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*, edited by Jordan E. Kerber, pp. 59–75. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Bruseh, James E., James E. Corbin, Cecile E. Carter, and Bonnie McKee  
2000 Involving the Caddo Tribe during Archaeological Field Schools in Texas: A Cross-Cultural Sharing. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by Kurt E. Dongoske, Mark Aldenderfer, and Karen Doehner, pp. 129–138. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Burke, Heather, Claire Smith, Dorothy Lippert, Joe Watkins, and Larry Zimmerman (editors)  
2008 *Kennewick Man, Perspectives on the Ancient One*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Castañeda, Quetzil E., and Christopher Matthews (editors)  
2008 *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflections on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practices*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Chatters, James C.  
2001 *Ancient Encounters: Kennewick Man and the First Americans*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Chirikure, Shadreck, and Gilbert Pwiti  
2008 Community Involvement in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management: An Assessment from Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere. *Current Anthropology* 49(3):467–485.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T. J. Ferguson  
2004 Virtue Ethics and the Practice of History: Native Americans and Archaeologists along the San Pedro Valley of Arizona. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 4(1):5–27.  
2008 Introduction: The Collaborative Continuum. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 1–32. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Conkey, Margaret  
2005 Dwelling at the Margins, Action at the Intersection? Feminist and Indigenous. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 1(1):9–59.
- Cuddy, Thomas W., and Mark P. Leone  
2008 New Africa: Understanding the Americanization of African Descent Groups through Archaeology. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 203–223. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Dillehay, Tom  
2008 *Monuments, Empires, and Resistance: The Araucanian Polity and Ritual Narratives*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Dongoske, Kurt E., Mark Aldenderfer, and Karen Doehner (editors)  
2000 *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Dowdall, Katherine M., and Otis O. Parrish  
2002 A Meaningful Disturbance of the Earth. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(1):99–133.
- Downer, Alan S.  
1997 Archaeologists—Native American Relations. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*, edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, pp. 23–34. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Ellis, Florence Hawley  
1974 Anthropology of the Laguna Land Claims. In *American Indian Ethnohistory, Indians of the Southwest: Pueblo Indians III*, edited by David Agee Horr, pp. 9–120. Garland, New York.

- Ellis, Florence Hawley, and J. J. Brody  
1964 Ceramic Stratigraphy and Tribal History at Taos Pueblo. *American Antiquity* 29:316–327.
- Ferguson, T. J.  
2000 NHPA: Changing the Role of Native Americans in the Archaeological Study of the Past. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by Kurt E. Dongoske, Mark Aldenderfer, and Karen Doehner, pp. 25–36. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.  
2010 Improving the Quality of Archaeology in the United States through Consultation and Collaboration with Native Americans and Descendant Communities. In *Archaeology and Cultural Resource Management: Visions for the Future*, edited by Lynne Sebastian and William D. Lipe. SAR Press, Santa Fe, in press.
- Ferguson, T. J., and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh  
2006 *History is in the Land: Multivocal Tribal Traditions in Arizona's San Pedro Valley*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Ferguson, T. J., Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, and Roger Anyon  
2004 One Valley, Many Histories: Tohono O'odham, Hopi, Zuni and Western Apache History in the San Pedro Valley. *Archaeology Southwest* 18(1):1–15.
- Forsman, Leonard A.  
1997 Straddling the Current: A View from the Bridge Over Clear Salt Water. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*, edited by Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, pp. 105–111. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Gonzalez, Sara L., Darren Modzelewski, Lee M. Panich, and Tsim D. Schneider  
2006 Archaeology for the Seventh Generation. *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3/4):388–415.
- Heckenberger, Michael  
2004 Archaeology as Indigenous Advocacy in Amazonia. *Practicing Anthropology* 26(3):35–39.  
2008 Entering the Agora: Archaeology, Conservation, and Indigenous Peoples in the Amazon. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 243–272. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Herle, Anita  
1994 Museums and Shamans: A Cross-Cultural Collaboration. *Anthropology Today* 10(1):2–5.
- Hodder, Ian  
2002 Ethics and Archaeology: The Attempt at Çatalhöyük. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 65(3):174–181.  
2003 Archaeological Reflexivity and the “Local” Voice. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1):55–69.
- Jones, Brian D., and Kevin A. McBride  
2006 Indigenous Archaeology in Southern New England: Case Studies from the Mashantucket Pequot Reservation. In *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples*

- and *Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*, edited by Jordan E. Kerber, pp. 265–280. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Kerber, Jordan E. (editor)  
2006 *Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Killion, Thomas (editor)  
2008 *Opening Archaeology: Repatriation's Impact on Contemporary Research and Practice*. SAR Press, Santa Fe.
- King, Thomas F.  
2008 *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice*. 3rd ed. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Maryland.
- Kreps, Christina F.  
2003 *Liberating Culture: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation, and Heritage Preservation*. Taylor & Francis, London.
- Kuwanwisiwma, Leigh J.  
2008 Collaboration Means Equality, Respect, and Reciprocity, A Conversation about Archaeology and the Hopi Tribe. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 151–169. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- LaRoche, Cheryl, and Michael L. Blakey  
1997 Seizing Intellectual Power: The Dialogue at the New York African Burial Ground. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3):84–106.
- Lightfoot, Kent G.  
2008 Collaborative Research Programs; Implications for the Practice of North American Archaeology. In *Collaboration at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 211–227. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Lilley, Ian (editor)  
2000 *Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World*. Oceania Monographs 50. University of Sydney, Sydney.
- Lippert, Dorothy  
2008 Not the End, Not the Middle, But the Beginning; Repatriation as a Transformative Mechanism for Archaeologists and Indigenous Peoples. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 119–130. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Little, Barbara J.  
2002 *Public Benefits of Archaeology*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Little, Barbara J., and Paul Shackel (editors)  
2007 *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Maryland.
- Ludlow Collective  
2001 Archaeology of the Colorado Coal Field War, 1913–1914. In *Archaeologies of the Recent Past*, edited by Victor Buchli and Gavin Lucas, pp. 94–107. Routledge, London.

- Marshall, Yvonne  
2002 What is Community Archaeology? *World Archaeology* 34:211–219.
- Matthews, Christopher  
2008 The Location of Archaeology. In *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflections on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practices*, edited by Quetzil E. Castañeda and Christopher Matthews, pp. 157–182. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- McDavid, Carol  
1997 Descendants, Decisions, and Power: The Public Interpretation of the Archaeology of the Levi Jordan Plantation. *Historical Archaeology* 31(3):114–132.  
2002 Archaeologies that Hurt; Descendants that Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 34:303–314.  
2007 Beyond Strategy and Good Intentions: Archaeology, Race, and White Privilege. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul Shackel, pp. 67–88. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Maryland.
- McGhee, Robert  
2008 Aboriginalism and the Problem of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73:579–597.
- McGuire, Randall H.  
2003 Why Can't We Be Friends? In *Indigenous People and Archaeology: Honouring the Past, Discussing the Present, Building for the Future*, edited by Trevor Peck, Evelyn Siegfried, and Gerald A. Oetelaar, pp. 92–101. Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Calgary.  
2008 *Archaeology as Political Action*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- McManamon, Francis P.  
2000 Archaeological Messages and Messengers. *Public Archaeology* 1(1):5–20.  
2003 Archaeology, Nationalism, and Ancient America. In *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*, edited by Susan Kane, pp. 115–137. Archaeological Institute of America, Boston.
- Meskell, Lynn, and Lynette Sibongile Masuku Van Damme  
2008 Heritage Ethics and Descendant Communities. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 131–150. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Million, Tara  
2005 Developing an Aboriginal Archaeology: Receiving Gifts from White Buffalo Calf Woman. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, edited by Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, pp. 5–14. Routledge, London and New York.
- Mills, Barbara J.  
2000 The Archaeological Field School in the 1990s: Collaboration in Research and Training. In *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, edited by Kurt E. Dongoske, Mark Aldenderfer and Karen Doehner, pp. 121–128. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Mills, Barbara J., Mark Altaha, John R. Welch, and T. J. Ferguson  
2008 Field Schools without Trowels: Teaching Archaeological Ethics and Heritage Preservation in a Collaborative Context. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 25–49. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Morrison, Lena, and Julie Hollowell  
2009 *Ethnographies and Archaeologies: Heritage and the Archaeological Past*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.
- Mullins, Paul R.  
2007 Politics, Inequality, and Engaged Archaeology: Community Archaeology along the Color Line. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul Shackel, pp. 89–108. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Maryland.
- National Park Service  
1998 NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Nicholas, George P.  
1997 Education and Empowerment: Archaeology with, for, and by the Shuswap Nation. In *At a Crossroads, Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*, edited by George P. Nicholas and Thomas D. Andrews, pp. 85–104. Archaeology Press, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada.  
2008 Native Peoples and Archaeology. In *Encyclopedia of Archaeology, Volume 3*, edited by Deborah M. Pearsall, pp. 1660–1669. Elsevier, Inc., New York.
- Nicholas, George P., and Thomas D. Andrews  
1997 *At a Crossroads, Archaeology and First Peoples in Canada*. Archaeology Press, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada.
- Peck, Trevor, Evelyn Siegfried, and Gerald A. Oetelaar (editors)  
2003 *Indigenous Peoples and Archaeology: Honouring the Past, Discussing the Present, Building for the Future*. The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada.
- Perry, Warren  
1997 Archaeology as Community Service: The African Burial Ground Project in New York City. *North American Dialogue* 2(1).
- Powell, Shirley, Chrisina E. Garza, and Aubrey Hendricks  
1993 Ethics and Ownership of the Past: The Reburial and Repatriation Controversy. In *Archaeological Method and Theory 5*, edited by Michael Schiffer, pp. 1–42. University of Arizona Press.
- Preucel, Robert W., and Craig N. Cipolla  
2008 Indigenous and Postcolonial Archaeologies. In *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, edited by Matthew Liebmann and Uzma Z. Rizvi, pp. 129–140. AltaMira, Lanham, Maryland.
- Preucel, Robert W., Lucy F. Williams, and William Wierzbowski  
2005 The Social Lives of North American Objects. In *Objects of Everlasting Esteem: Native American Voices on Identity, Art, and Culture*, edited by Lucy F. Williams, William Wierzbowski, and Robert Preucel, pp. 1–26. University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia.

- Pyburn, K. Anne  
2003 What Are We Really Teaching in Archaeological Field Schools? In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, pp. 213–224. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Ross, Norman A.  
1973 *Index to the Expert Testimony before the Indian Claims Commission*. Clearwater Publishing Company, New York.
- Rossen, Jack  
2008 Field School Archaeology, Activism, and Politics in the Cayuga Homeland of Central New York. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 103–120. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Saitta, Dean J.  
2005 Labor and Class in the American West. In *North American Archaeology*, edited by Timothy R. Pauketat and Diana DiPaolo Loren, pp. 359–385. Blackwell, Malden.
- Sebastian, Lynne  
2004 Archaeology and the Law. In *Legal Perspectives on Cultural Resources*, edited by Jennifer R. Richmond and Marion P. Forsyth, pp. 3–16. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, California.
- Shackel, Paul A., and Erve Chambers (editors)  
2004 *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. Routledge, New York.
- Shackel, Paul A., and David A. Gadsby  
2008 "I Wish for Paradise": Memory and Class in Hampden, Baltimore. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 225–242. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Shanks, Michael, and Randall H. McGuire  
1996 The Craft of Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 61:75–88.
- Shepherd, Nick  
2003 "When the Hand that Holds the Trowel is Black...": Disciplinary Practices of Self-Representation and the Issue of "Native" Labour in Archaeology. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(3):334–352.
- Silliman, Stephen W.  
2008 Collaborative Indigenous Archaeology: Troweling at the Edges, Eyeing the Center. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 1–21. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Silliman, Stephen W. (editor)  
2008 *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Silliman, Stephen W., and Katherine H. Sebastian Dring  
2008 Working on Pasts for Futures: Eastern Pequot Field School Archaeology in Connecticut. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 67–87. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Singleton, Theresa A., and Charles H. Orser  
2003 Descendant Communities: Linking People in the Present to the Past. In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli, and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer, pp. 143–152. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Smith, Claire, and Gary Jackson  
2008 The Ethics of Collaboration; Whose Culture? Whose Intellectual Property? Who Benefits? In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 171–199. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst  
2005 Decolonizing Archaeological Theory and Practice. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, edited by Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, pp. 5–16. Routledge, London.
- Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst (editors)  
2005 *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Spector, Janet D.  
1993 *What This Aul Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village*. Minnesota Historical Society Press, Minneapolis.
- Stapp, Darby C., and Michael S. Burney  
2002 *Tribal Cultural Resource Management, The Full Circle of Stewardship*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Swidler, Nina, David C. Eck, T. J. Ferguson, Leigh J. Kuwanwiswima, Roger Anyon, Loren Panteah, Klara Kelley, and Harris Francis  
2000 Multiple Views of the Past: Integrating Archaeology and Ethnography in the Jeddito Valley. *CRM* 9:49–53.
- Thomas, David Hurst  
2008 Foreword. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. vii–xii. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Two Bears, Davina R.  
2008 'Ihoosh'aah, Learning by Doing: The Navajo Nation Archeology Department Student Training Program. In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, edited by Stephen W. Silliman, pp. 188–207. Amerind Studies in Archaeology 2. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Watkins, Joe  
2000 *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.  
2003 Archaeological Ethics and American Indians. In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli, and Julie Hollowell-Zimmerman, pp. 129–142. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Watkins, Joe, and T. J. Ferguson

2005 Working with and Working for Indigenous Communities. In *Handbook of Archaeological Methods, Volume 2*, edited by Herbert D. G. Maschner and Christopher Chippindale, pp. 1372–1406. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Watkins, Joe, Lynne Goldstein, Karen Vitelli, and Leigh Jenkins

1995 Accountability: Responsibilities of Archaeologists to Other Interest Groups. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by Mark J. Lynott and Alison Wylie, pp. 33–37. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

Zimmerman, Larry J.

2000 A New and Different Archaeology? With a Postscript on the Impact of the Kennewick Dispute. In *Repatriation Reader, Who Owns American Indian Remains?*, edited by Devon A. Mihesuah, pp. 294–306. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

2006 Sharing Control of the Past. In *Archaeological Ethics*, 2nd ed., edited by Karen D. Vitelli and Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, pp. 170–175. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, California.

2008a Multivocality, Descendant Communities, and Some Epistemological Shifts Forced by Repatriation. In *Opening Archaeology: Repatriation's Impact on Contemporary Research and Practice*, edited by Thomas Killion, pp. 91–108. SAR Press, Santa Fe.

2008b Real People or Reconstructed People? Ethnocritical Archaeology, Ethnography, and Community Building. In *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflections on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practices*, edited by Quetzil E. Castañeda and Christopher Matthews, pp. 183–204. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

2008c Unusual or “Extreme” Beliefs about the Past: Community Identity, and Dealing with the Fringe. In *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*, edited by Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, pp. 55–86. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Zimmerman, Larry J., Karen D. Vitelli, and Julie Hollowell-Zimmer (editors)

2003 *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, California.

# 5

## *Crossing Boundaries and Academic Fair Trade*

JOSÉ LUIS LANATA and ROBERT D. DRENNAN

The political configuration of the modern world molds human activities in practically every sphere of endeavor, certainly including the practice of archaeology. The dynamics of modern national boundaries impede archaeological research and communication in numerous ways, and create multiple inequities in the opportunities available to archaeologists situated in different places. In the spirit of attempting to overcome or at least ameliorate these impediments and inequities, the editors of this volume proposed a chapter on “erasing boundaries.” We have adjusted this title a bit for two reasons. First, the boundaries are so intimately involved in the practice of archaeology—and not always in entirely negative ways—that they require particular attention. And second, as archaeologists, we obviously cannot really erase all the boundaries anyway. We can, however, reduce the damage boundaries do to the archaeological endeavor by making them easier to cross.

### Boundaries and Archaeology

Boundaries—in all their forms—and the difficulty of crossing them, impede the practice of archaeology most fundamentally by restricting communication. It is a commonplace that the free and open communication of information and ideas fosters progress in science, and boundaries represent impediments to this flow of information and ideas. Both “science” and “progress” are, of course, concepts regarded with deep suspicion by some archaeologists—the discipline does include the most remarkable diversity of