

2009

Crafting Collaborative Archaeologies: Two Case Studies from New England

Elizabeth S. Chilton

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Siobhan M. Hart

Binghamton University--SUNY

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/anthro_faculty_pubs



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chilton, Elizabeth S. and Hart, Siobhan M., "Crafting Collaborative Archaeologies: Two Case Studies from New England" (2009).
Collaborative Anthropologies. 347.

https://scholarworks.umass.edu/anthro_faculty_pubs/347

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Department Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Crafting Collaborative Archaeologies: Two Case Studies from New England

Elizabeth S. Chilton & Siobhan M. Hart

Introduction

Recently archaeologists in North America have sought to engage contemporary descendants and non-descendant local communities. In many cases this is a result of the longtime efforts of Indigenous communities (e.g., Atalay 2006; Kerber 2006; Nicholas 2006; Silliman 2008; Watkins 2003). Over the past twenty years many archaeologists have attempted to respond to community demands for transparency, and have considered issues of relevance and consequences of scientific research through collaborative and community-based archaeology projects (for example, see the collections of essays in Kerber [2006] and Silliman [2008]). At the same time, one of the greatest challenges facing archaeologists today is engaging the diverse individual and community stakeholders that make up pluralistic communities. Engaging multiple stakeholders means that there can be no "one size fits all" model of collaboration. This is certainly evident in New England, where the complexities of federal recognition, the diaspora of some Native communities, and the deep and conflicted colonial history present challenges to archaeologists in their attempts at—and in the possibilities for—collaboration.

This paper considers two major projects with which we have been involved over the past twelve years in New England. Each developed as an archaeological field school. We initiated these projects because of the potential for engagement with contemporary Native peoples, and as such they are built on a collaborative foundation "from the ground up" (Chilton 2006). We discuss each with a particular focus on the role of collaboration in directing a field school. The first study examines work with a federally recognized tribe, and the second describes collaboration with Native representatives and other stakeholders in an area lacking resident recognized tribes. We consider the varied levels of inclusion, collaboration, and engagement in each case. We compare the projects to clarify the challenges of working with a wide variety of stakeholders and of training students in collaboration through a field school context.

The Lucy Vincent Beach Site

The Lucy Vincent Beach site is located in the Town of Chilmark, on the western end of the island of Martha's Vineyard, and in the traditional homeland of the Wampanoag Tribe at Gayhead (Aquinnah). The site is on the top of a 40-foot cliff overlooking a town beach, and is eroding at a rate of approximately two meters (or six feet) per year (Chilton and Doucette 2002). The site was discovered in the winter of 1995,

when beachcombers found human remains on the town beach. Archaeologists from the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) were called to the site to excavate the rest of the remains of the individual from an eroding cliff face. Additional human remains were discovered the following year and, again, MHC archaeologists salvaged the burial. Because the MHC salvage excavations at the site were limited only to recovering the two burials, very little was known about the site at the time. Both the Tribe and the MHC were very concerned that there was almost no way to prevent people on the beach from picking up or disturbing artifacts or human remains. There was also the fear that once the location of the site became known that it would attract illegal digging.

The project was initiated by Elizabeth Chilton and Dianna Doucette at the suggestion of the State Archaeologist at the MHC, Brona Simon. Early in 1997, we made inquiries with the Aquinnah Tribe, to see if they would be supportive of an archaeological survey and, possibly, a future field school at the site. Because there was no Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) at that time, we dealt almost exclusively with Aquinnah's Natural Resources personnel. In early 1997 a full proposal was submitted and approved by the Tribal Council, as well as the Board of Selectmen (the site is located on private land permanently leased to the Town of Chilmark), and the

Massachusetts Historical Commission. This was an iterative process where there were numerous meetings and exchanges of phone calls and faxes of draft proposals and explanations of field methods. Questions and concerns from the Tribe focused on access to the site during our excavations, field methods, and disposition of excavated materials or remains (discussed below). Conversations with the Town, in contrast, centered on parking and access to the site. Discussions with the Conservation Commission for the Town of Chilmark focused on field methods, backfilling, replanting and general issues surrounding soil erosion. Both the Town and the Tribe were also concerned about publicity concerning the site.

In the summer of 1997, a team of archaeologists from Harvard University conducted a preliminary survey of the site to assess site size, age, and integrity. From this preliminary testing it was clear that this was a site of considerable size, antiquity, and integrity. We reported our findings to all relevant parties, and suggested that further testing be undertaken. Archaeological field schools through Harvard University were then conducted in the summers of 1998 and 1999.

The overall goal of the field schools was to obtain as much information as we could about the site in order to assist the Tribe and the MHC in their attempts to protect and/or to salvage the site. The specific objectives of the field schools developed

through discussions with the Aquinnah Natural Resources Department, the Town, and the MHC. These were to: (1) determine the site boundaries; (2) locate all or most of the archaeological features--especially those in most imminent danger from soil erosion; and (3) partially excavate features in order to determine their age and function. These objectives were developed to address two specific questions that came from the Aquinnah Tribe: (1) did additional human burials exist, and (2) what can be done to prevent burials from eroding onto the beach in the future?

Tribal Review of Research Design

All field archaeologists are accustomed to working with a variety of stakeholders, whether it involves submitting permit applications, working with landowners, or collaborating with broad teams of researchers. However, what made this project innovative for us was direct involvement with the Tribe. Each year we would have site walkovers and discussions with tribal representatives from the Tribe's Natural Resources Department before our work began. We would then submit a research design to Natural Resources, which would also be reviewed by the Tribal Council. There would occasionally be some questions or adjustments to the research design, but because we kept the lines of communication open, we tried to anticipate the wishes

of the Tribe as much as possible, so that there were usually few changes to the research design itself. Some of those changes included placement of units, mitigating further soil erosion, protocols for the discovery of human remains, the disposition of artifacts and human remains, and the publicity associated with the excavation. For example, the Tribe felt strongly that human remains and funerary objects should remain on the island, rather than being removed to a research facility for analysis. The Tribe also asked that it receive any human remains and associated funerary objects immediately after their documentation for safekeeping and eventual reburial. All parties agreed to this protocol, even though a requirement that all analysis be local created a precedent for MHC-Aquinnah agreements. This type of agreement creates logistical difficulties because lodging and transport to Martha's Vineyard can be expensive, and finding local research facilities presents a challenge.

In the second year of our work, we were asked to appear at a Tribal Council meeting so that Tribal members could ask questions before the Tribal Council made a decision about whether to support the proposal. This was in part because there were some questions as to whether the Tribal Council would continue to support any excavation of at the site. Tribal

members were not in agreement about whether a site that contained human remains should be excavated at all. Some members of the Tribe felt that spiritual beliefs should prevent the Tribe from ever condoning the excavation of burials. We were asked to present why we thought that excavations of these burials was in the Tribe's best interest. To that effect we discussed the severity of the erosion, the lack of security on the town beach, and the former desecration of remains after burials had eroded onto the beach. Some tribal members were also concerned about publicity that had followed our work. The Tribe had indicated to us all along that they did not want publicity surrounding the excavations. However, because we were on a popular beach in a very prominent location, and because in 1998, with the blessing of the Tribe, we had given a public presentation in town (in part to dispel rumors about the excavations), a few articles were published in local papers, and one article appeared in the Boston Globe. Thus, we were asked to make better attempts to keep the level of publicity down and site as secure as possible, which we eagerly agreed to. In sum, we answered all the questions put to us and addressed all concerns, and the Tribal Council approved the proposal. Most importantly, we made it clear that we were not interested in pursuing any aspect of this project without the full support of the Tribal Council. Each year, after the Tribal Council approved

the research design, we sent the proposal to the MHC, the Town, and the Conservation Commission for review before the start of excavations.

Field Work

Over the two field seasons we excavated 20 2-x-2-m test units and a series of smaller units, and identified archaeological features (including post molds) in nearly every test unit excavated in the project area. Our results indicated that the site was utilized by Native people from the Late Paleoindian period (ca. 10,000 years before present) through at least the late seventeenth century A.D. The most intensive use of the site was during the Late Woodland and early Contact periods (Chilton and Doucette 2002).

As per our proposal to all parties, we only excavated those features that were in most imminent danger from erosion, i.e., those that were closest to the cliff edge. However, at the urging of the Conservation Commission (and for the sake of the safety of our students), we had agreed not to excavate within two meters of the cliff edge. Therefore, we clearly were not in a position to locate all of the features that were likely to erode in the near future. Likewise, the Conservation Commission had urged us not to excavate contiguous units--they requested we excavate in a checkerboard fashion, so as to mitigate the effects of erosion. We complied with the commission's request as

much as possible, while also attempting to ensure that important features--especially burials--were not missed.

Each year we had a Tribal member participate in the field school as a student, and there were frequent visits to the site by members of the Tribal Natural Resources Department personnel, daily phone calls, and occasional visits to the site by Tribal elders and spiritual leaders (see Peters 2006, 38). All of these daily interactions and discussions had a profound effect on both the leadership team and the students in terms of the relevance of the past to people's lives in the present. This is something that is hard to quantify, but before this experience with the Aquinnah, the senior author had been either a co-director or student on six other field schools, five of which were based on Native American sites. In these cases, the mood was often light-hearted, playful, and adventured-filled. There were often tricks played, artifacts planted, and occasionally even music playing on site. Standing back, one could say that such projects were colonialist in the sense that Native Americans were clearly positioned as the "other" by archaeologists. However, our daily interactions with, the influence of, and the gravity of the situation for the Aquinnah people today made the tenor of future field schools--for both authors--more serious and more self-effacing. Native Americans were not just subjects of the project: they were students, colleagues, collaborators, and

stakeholders. Likewise, it was not only "the past" that was the goal of archaeology: it was the implication of the past for people living in the present.

Over the course of the two field schools, human burials were discovered during the last week of each excavation. In each case the Tribe and the MHC were notified at once and decisions were made about the timing of excavation and later reburial of the remains by the Tribe, in conversation with MHC and with our assistance. The visits to the site by Wampanoag tribal members after the discovery of the burial were emotional charged, uncomfortable, and somber, and these interactions set the stage for the rest of the project. For example, when Ramona Peters, a Wampanoag spiritual leader, visited the site after the discovering of the first burial in 1998, she said prayers in Algonquian to protect all of us working on the site and to acknowledge the spirits of the ancestors who were buried there (see Peters 2006, 38). During visits by the chief and his wife, and by other tribal members, the emotional pain and discomfort all felt as a result of the disturbance of these burials was evident despite their thanks to us for our work there. The discomfort that we witnessed in turn made all of us continually question our motives, other methods, and other aspects of our practice of archaeology then and afterwards.

Because in both cases the burials were in imminent danger from erosion, we returned to the site to excavate the burials after the field school was over. Both of these excavations were preceded by detailed proposals and discussions. At the request of the tribe all analysis was done in the field and in a temporary lab nearby, and all human remains and funerary objects were left with the Aquinnah at the tribal headquarters.

Since 2001, the Tribe and the MHC have taken a monitoring approach to the site. MHC has excavated remains only on an emergency basis. We have been consulted only occasionally, and we are still trying to assist the tribe in a long-term solution for the site. Changeover in the tribal governance and THPO, and the movement of professional location for the archaeologists leading the project, has meant that some continuity has been lost in our relationships. However, we continue to keep in touch with Tribal members and are currently seeking funding to assist the Tribe with a mitigation of the site.

Pocumtuck Fort Archaeology and Stewardship Project

The Lucy Vincent Beach project provides an example of a collaborative relationship among archaeologists and a federally recognized tribe in New England. But what about places without federally recognized tribes, tribally held lands, or sole descendant community? This is the landscape we faced in initiating a fieldwork project in New England's middle

Connecticut River Valley. In places like this, the default position of archaeologists has been to engage with only with funding bodies (e.g., granting agencies, heritage institutions), government bureaucracies (e.g., state historic preservation offices, town governments), landowners, and, in some cases, local residents in the form of "public education." We sought to initiate a collaborative project that engaged multiple stakeholders--including but not limited to Native American descendants--through the University of Massachusetts Amherst Field School in Archaeology.

Between 2004-2008 the field school investigated a seventeenth century Native American archaeological site in Deerfield, Massachusetts, known as "Area D." Deerfield is a place with a deep and complex Native American history, with no present-day resident Native community. Nevertheless, it has an ethnically and socially diverse past and present (Keene and Chilton 1995; Paynter 2002). Most often referred to historically as "the Pocumtuck," the Native peoples encountered by early Europeans were identified by the name of *the place* where Europeans first confronted them, in this case along the banks of the river called "Pocumtuck"--an Algonquian place name meaning "swift, shallow, sandy stream"--known today as the Deerfield River (Bruchac 2005).

The public memory of the Native peoples of the middle Connecticut River Valley has been shaped by narratives of cultural disappearance and historical erasure anchored by places on the landscape that invoke their disappearance or "pastness." One of these places, the so-called Pocumtuck Fort, has served as a metaphor for the destruction of Native peoples in the Connecticut River Valley during the seventeenth century. Historical accounts of an attack on the fort by the Mohawk in 1665 purport that this attack "destroyed" the Pocumtuck (Melvoin 1989, 46). Settlers from Dedham, Massachusetts, were granted the Pocumtuck lands only a few months later. Thus, for over 300 years Euroamerican settlement in the area has been justified on the basis that the attack left the area "empty" of Native peoples.

One of the major efforts of the field school since the early 1990s has been to challenge the historical erasure of Native peoples by highlighting the 12,000 year long complex history of Native peoples in the Connecticut River Valley (Keene and Chilton 1995). Recently, this effort turned to address questions about the "Pocumtuck Fort" shaped by collaborations with multiple stakeholder communities.

The "Poly-Communal" Approach to the Pocumtuck Fort

In the early stages of the research for the Pocumtuck Fort project, we realized that it could offer a potent entry point

for redressing the historical erasures it has been used to reinforce and an opportunity to engage multiple stakeholders in heritage work. The involvement of representatives of Native American descendant communities was crucial to the goals of this project because the dominant narrative of the destruction of the Pocumtuck Fort has served as a justification for the historical erasure of Native peoples in the middle Connecticut River Valley. The fact that the Pocumtuck Fort is believed to be a place where Native lives were lost in the seventeenth century made their participation even more important. However, it was clear that a number of non-descendant stakeholder communities, including property owners, local residents, and heritage institutions, also had interests in interpretations of the past and stewardship in the present. As a result, the project involved collaboration with multiple stakeholders, including those we were legally required to engage with (e.g., the landowner and the Massachusetts Historical Commission) and several who participated in voluntary collaboration (e.g., representatives of descendant communities, avocational archaeologists, heritage institutions) (see Hart 2009).

At the outset, all of the stakeholders involved--legally required and voluntary--articulated a common goal: ensuring the long-term protection and preservation of the site of the Pocumtuck Fort, if it was located archaeologically.

Archaeological testing would be used as a tool of preservation planning, allowing us to determine the presence, extent, and integrity of cultural features at the site, so that a long-term stewardship plan could be developed. Though the project involved both mandated and voluntary collaborations, here we focus only on the voluntary collaborations.

Descendant Community Representatives. Due to the complex history of dispossession and historical erasure of Indigenous peoples in the middle Connecticut River Valley, a number of non-federally recognized Native American groups, including several bands of Western Abenaki and Nipmuc peoples, trace descent from or connection to the Pocumtuck and other historically known Native groups of the area (e.g., Woronoco, Agawam, Nonotuck, Sokoki; see Bruchac 2007). Rather than partnering with one individual community, tribe, or band, and thus positioning ourselves (the archaeologists) as having the power to negotiate complex identity issues and competing claims for legitimacy, we sought a partnership with the Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs (MCIA), comprised of Native representatives from the Commonwealth, to represent the collective interests of Native American descendant communities. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts created the Commission in 1974 (Massachusetts General Law Chapter 6A, Section 8A) to assist Native American individuals and groups in their relationship with state and

local government agencies and to advise the Commonwealth in matters pertaining to Native Americans (Commonwealth of Massachusetts [COM] 2008). The MCIA is part of the Commonwealth's Department of Housing and Community Development, and consists of seven members who are recommended by tribal councils and groups and appointed by the governor (COM 2008). A group's federal status does not impact their ability to recommend someone to the Commission. This serves to balance power at the state level, since there are only two federally recognized tribes in the Commonwealth today (Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah and Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe). Among many other responsibilities, the MCIA represents Native communities with interests in heritage work and archaeological sites in the Commonwealth. For decades, the Commission has played an important role in archaeological projects and repatriation efforts, particularly in areas of the Commonwealth where there are no resident descendant groups, federally recognized tribes, or tribally held lands, like present-day Deerfield. This partnership seemed appropriate for this particular context where there is a diasporic descendant community comprised of multiple tribes and bands.

Avocational Archaeologists. Avocational archaeologists have long been interested in the location of the Pocumtuck Fort. Here, we use the term "avocational" to refer to individuals with

a strong interest in and often an extensive knowledge of archaeology and Native American history and distinguish them from "collectors" and "looters" because their relationship to the material record is similar to that of professional archaeologists, in that the knowledge and information gained from the context of material culture is valued, rather than just the artifacts themselves. With imminent threats to archaeological sites in the face of rapid development, avocationalists play a crucial role in the documentation, preservation, and stewardship of sites. They self-identify as stakeholders in many archaeological projects that take place in their communities. Avocational archaeologists have worked with us for many years, often suggesting site locations, conducting research, and providing information that has been critical to the success of our work.

A number of avocational archaeologists, past and present, have been interested in locating the Pocumtuck Fort, and several have expressed an interest and concern for the long-term preservation of the site. Despite this, unauthorized digging continues to be a problem in the middle Connecticut River Valley and has affected the area being investigated as the possible location of the Pocumtuck Fort.

Heritage Institutions. Deerfield is home to a number of institutions aimed at the preservation and interpretation of

various. The largest and most well known is Historic Deerfield, Inc., an open-air museum that commemorates Euroamerican settlement in New England through preservation and interpretation of architecture, artifacts, and lifestyles of the town through time (Historic Deerfield 2008). The museum, incorporated in 1952, is situated on a mile-long street and consists of exhibits in restored buildings dating to 1730-1850 (e.g., homes, taverns) and dedicated exhibit spaces (Historic Deerfield 2008). Inter-institutional relationships among archaeologists at UMass Amherst and Historic Deerfield, Inc., have been developing for over a decade. Historic Deerfield's interest in archaeology and the Native American history of Deerfield has increased in recent years, especially as it related to the famed 1704 French and Indian raid on the town, which plays a central role in the colonial history that Historic Deerfield commemorates (Demos 1994, 11-39; Haefeli and Sweeney 2003; Melvoin 1989, 209-275; PVMA 2004). As a result, Historic Deerfield has partially supported the UMass Amherst Field School investigations of both Native and Euroamerican sites.

Field School Students and Staff. The teaching and mentoring dimensions of this project are intimately related to preservation, collaboration, and stewardship because much of the work (fieldwork, laboratory analysis) has taken place in a teaching and student-training context. As such, field school

staff and students are important stakeholders in the heritage work of this project (Chilton 2009). They carry out the work that produces the “things” and “props” (artifacts, features, and other archaeological data) (after Smith 2006) that anchor the heritage discourse and play a role in how archaeology and the Native American past is presented. UMass Amherst faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and field school students are intimately involved in the process of producing the knowledge that is incorporated into heritage discourses with stakeholders.

Negotiated Archaeological Methods

Stakeholder interests and concerns, aimed at determining whether there was evidence of the Pocumtuck Fort, shaped the project research questions and testing that took place between 2006–2008. At the outset, stakeholders agreed that archaeological testing would be used as a tool of preservation and stewardship planning. The negotiation of methods became central focus of relationship building. It served as a way of de-centering archaeologists and subverting the scientific power of “experts” deployed through dictating research questions and methods. Here, we focus on the dimensions of field methods negotiated with stakeholders related to permissions, testing locations, non-invasive testing strategies, excavation techniques, feature excavation, on-site peer review, and lab

procedure. These practices, explicit in their connection to the preservation and stewardship goals of project stakeholders, are the practical expression of the poly-communal approach of this project.

Permissions and Power-Sharing. One of the initial complexities we faced in this project was related to “asking permission” to do fieldwork. In most cases, unless sites are known to include human remains, North American archaeologists are required to get permission from two entities: the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) through a permitting process, and the landowner. Even though the project was discussed with all participating stakeholders prior to fieldwork and they had expressed their support of the research design and field methods, when it came time to “ask permission” to do the work, it was important to ask formal permission of multiple groups, in particular acknowledging the responsibility to request permission from the representatives of Pocumtuck descendants, as well as the contemporary landowner and the SHPO. In this case, a formal request to undertake field-testing was made to MCIA before an excavation permit was requested from the SHPO. Though the landowner had granted permission, we explained to them and other stakeholders that our excavation was contingent on the permission of the Native American

representatives. After reviewing the request and consulting with their constituents, MCIA formally gave their permission to pursue the fieldwork, and only then was a permit request submitted to the SHPO. This was an important part of efforts to demonstrate the contemporary relationship between dispersed Native communities and ancestral homelands to all of the stakeholders. Though permission seeking is a seemingly routine part of archaeological work, recognizing the rights of descendant communities to allow or refuse the project redistributed power, and shifted the traditional power structure which privileges government organizations and private property owners (Hart 2009).

Testing Locations. Testing locations were another negotiated aspect of the field methods. Most discussions of testing locations took place during site walkovers, which comprised an important dimension of project field methods prior to, during, and after field-testing. During walkovers, discussions took place about where subsurface testing should and should not occur. For example, avocational archaeologists expressed their ideas of where a palisade wall might be located and MCIA representatives shared advice on where to test to locate the remains of structures and everyday activities. In these cases, the field-testing strategy incorporated the areas

that interested stakeholders. During another site walkover with stakeholders, we noted several areas of disturbance, which appeared to be the result of recent digging activities (not associated with the project). This was of great concern to many stakeholders who asked that we try to determine what kinds of cultural features may have been disturbed. Firsthand observation of the disturbances made clear the threats to the site in a way that simply talking about it did not and the field-testing strategy was designed to address the questions that emerged from these on-site experiences.

Stakeholders brought unique individual and community perspectives and knowledge to walkovers and experienced the project area differently: as an archaeological site, as part of a homeland and cultural landscape, and as part of a historical landscape. In addition to discussing testing strategies, we were shown and made sensitive to things we might not have noticed otherwise: a place where deer had nested for the night, a particular viewscape of the valley below, and a sense of danger and struggle for those who lived in this place. Many stakeholders shared their "sense of the place" during site walkovers and this informed their decisions and the advice and feedback on testing strategies they provided (Hart 2009).

Testing Methods. A variety of testing methods were negotiated with stakeholders as the research design was drafted and then discussed and agreed on collectively during a stakeholder workshop in 2008 (Hart 2009). One example of negotiated testing methods is our strategy of excavation only to the base of the plowzone (in most cases) and limited feature excavation. This practice reflected several stakeholders' requests (especially the landowner and MCIA representatives) that the testing be minimally invasive and aimed at documenting as much of the site as possible. Though more intensive feature excavation could provide significant information about seventeenth-century Pocumtuck life, the consensus was that this was not a top priority in the early stages of this project (though this may change in the future). As a result, most features were exposed, photographed and mapped for preservation and future research purposes.

In addition to the negotiation of excavation strategies, many stakeholders expressed interested in non-invasive testing as a strategy to reduce the overall physical impact to the site and undisturbed cultural features (Hart 2009). Though expensive and labor intensive (especially in the debris clearing required in advance of the survey at this site), non-invasive techniques were tools in the standard archaeological toolkit that were

attractive to stakeholders as a way of focusing subsurface testing and minimizing overall ground disturbance. We incorporated geophysical testing into our initial research proposal to stakeholders in 2006, primarily because we thought it could be effective in locating palisade features. It was met with enthusiasm from several stakeholders, though not necessarily for the same reasons. These techniques appealed to the landowner because it reduced the overall physical impact to their property, and to representatives of Native American descendant communities because it reduced the overall ground disturbance. From an archaeological perspective, the geophysical survey was important because the results from ground penetrating radar, electrical resistance, magnetic susceptibility, and magnetometer allowed us to focus our limited resources.

On-Site Peer Review. Stakeholders were invited to visit the site to oversee the process, provide on-site peer review and participate in interpretation "at the trowel's edge." Site visits and walkovers during field-testing were a means for stakeholders to check in on the fieldwork and to make sure that the archaeological testing in practice was consistent with the research design and agreed upon goals and testing strategies. Since archaeology can be unpredictable, these visits and walkovers during fieldwork also allowed us to keep stakeholders

informed, explain our methods and questions in the field context, and get stakeholder input on decisions to be made about additional testing, feature excavation, and interpretations (Hart 2009). For example, when stakeholders like avocational archaeologists and representatives of Native American descendant communities participated in on-site peer review during feature excavation, we discussed both the excavation process (ranging from how and why archaeologists discern different layers and record observations on field forms, to how and why we take flotation samples) and the relationship among several features across the site (were these pits related to domestic structures, and if so, what might that tell us about Pocumtuck life in the seventeenth century?). Stakeholders experienced and observed the cultural materials and the recovery techniques for themselves--unmediated by project archaeologists. The dialogue that unfolded led to both increased sensitivity on our part to aspects of field practices we normally took for granted, as well as to collaborative decisions regarding additional testing and initial interpretations. Firsthand observation of practice and cultural materials by stakeholders inspired dialogues that may not have emerged outside of the field context and carried through once the brief field season ended.

There are several benefits to on-site peer reviews and stakeholder participation in fieldwork. For one, fieldwork is usually treated as the realm of archaeologists where archaeologists interact with the past firsthand. On-site peer review and stakeholder site visits turn the gaze from the archaeological record to the process of archaeology and heritage work. It allows stakeholders to participate in the production of archaeological knowledge from the very beginning, making it a more reflective, engaged process. In addition, the interpretive and decision-making process that occurs during excavation and is invisibly encoded in the site documentation is transformed into a dialogic process with stakeholders. Finally, on-site peer review allows stakeholders see and participate in the craft of archaeology and witness what makes it a sometimes painstakingly slow process (Hart 2009).

Laboratory Methods. Negotiated practices extended beyond field methods to the laboratory, especially in the handling of cultural and non-cultural material. Prior to testing in 2006, we opened up a dialogue with stakeholders about laboratory methods by describing what happens to the materials that are taken from the site to the laboratory. We explained how artifacts were cataloged, conserved, and stored, and asked for feedback on aspects of this process. We also explained that, as is common

in any excavation, some material believed to be "cultural" in the field is determined to be "non-cultural" upon further examination in the lab (e.g., rocks, modern plant materials), and that common practice was to discard these materials (mostly small rocks) in wastepaper baskets or outside of the lab facility. In response to this, representatives of Native American descendant communities requested that any materials determined to be natural, and not cultural, be saved and returned to the site. Since then, this procedure has been followed in all subsequent laboratory processing. We curate a bag of "returns" in the lab and bring this bag back to the site regularly to redeposit the material on the ground surface. We have also extended this practice to the soil remaining after flotation, though this has proved to be more challenging logistically. An unexpected outcome is that these negotiated lab practices have served to make stakeholders and their interests "present" for field school students away from the field as they engage in the work and action shaped by collaboration.

<SPACE>

Though these may seem to some like minor changes, they are the repeated, everyday practices of archaeology. The collaboration is encoded in the everyday lived experience of

archaeology. These practices, shaped by stakeholder engagement, have changed archaeology "at the trowel's edge," but also the social relationships that underpin the project and the process of knowledge production.

Conclusions: The Many Shades of Collaboration

Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) outline a "continuum of collaborative practices" aimed at encompassing the range of variation in collaborative archaeology. They state: "collaboration exists on a continuum, from merely communicating research to descendant communities to a genuine synergy where the contributions of community members and scholars create a positive result that could not be achieved without joining efforts" (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008, 1). Dorothy Lippert (2008) elaborated on this continuum of collaboration in her discussant's comments for the AAA session that this issue commemorates. As Lippert put it, the term "collaboration" is used by archaeologists to mean everything from simply talking to Native peoples in the process of either designing or implementing a project, all the way to a full collaboration on every aspect of the project, or projects initiated by tribes themselves.

In the case of Lucy Vincent Beach, we were addressing research questions articulated by Tribal members and had the

full support of the Tribal Council to conduct the work, but we would not go as far as to say that this work was a synergistic collaboration. This project was neither simply about "communicating" to descendent peoples, nor did it include the significant input of Tribal members on a daily basis. It was more in the vein of an ethical clientage or consultant model (see Blakey 2008), where we prioritized the input and approval of the Tribe over that of other stakeholders.

We learned a lot from our collaborations with the Aquinnah, and those experiences informed our approach to the Pocumtuck Fort Archaeology and Stewardship Project. One of the major differences between the projects is that in the case of the Pocumtuck Fort project we brought many of the stakeholders together to the same table. This did not happen often, but because of Siobhan Hart's dissertation project (2009), we were explicit with all parties about wanting to build a stakeholder approach to the project. We believe this made all parties more cognizant of their (and our) role as stakeholders and to the interests and potential overlaps with others. Another difference is that for the Fort project we did not have tribal students participating in the field school, nor did we have regular daily contact with Tribal representatives on-site throughout the fieldwork portion of the project. This had a more

profound impact on students than on the research itself, discussed below.

Thus, the two projects outlined here lie somewhere along the continuum of straightforward communication on the one hand and full, synergistic collaborative efforts on the other. Both projects were initiated and designed by non-Native archaeologists, though in both cases, Native representatives were consulted before a decision was made to initiate the project. In both cases tribal representatives and other stakeholders were invited to contribute research questions and comment on and approve any work plan before the start of the project. The degree to which tribal representatives and other stakeholders participated in the research design varied, though in both cases archaeologists shaped and facilitated it. Open communication was maintained throughout the duration of the project and is ongoing, and power was shared to varying degrees in each project. Despite falling short of full, synergistic collaboration, the positive results achieved by each project would not have been possible without the efforts of the engaged stakeholders.

As for the teaching context for field school students, in the case of the Lucy Vincent Beach project, it was much easier to integrate students into the collaboration themselves because tribal members were on site and working along side us every day.

Each year we offered a full tuition waiver to a tribal student, and visits from tribal representatives were frequent, as were our own visits to the tribal headquarters. In the case of the Pocumtuck Fort project, the tribal representatives and other stakeholders were known to students, but their physical distance from the field site meant that they were not a daily part of the excavation and lab work. While we kept in close contact via email and phone with the MCIA representatives, they were unable to come to the site in person during the field school, such that the immediacy of that collaboration was not as strongly felt by students.

Nevertheless, in both cases, field school students came away with the sense that collaboration with descendant communities, landowners, and various other stakeholders is just a part of how one practices archaeology in the 21st century. We did not shelter our students from the "messiness" of archaeological work, nor the political implications of the work. We also emphasized to students the fact that archaeologists themselves are stakeholders in these projects: that we are not the objective experts disseminating the results of our work to an interested public, but have our own agendas, priorities, worries, and foibles.

Some of the lessons we learned from these particular projects are: (1) that collaboration is not a monolithic

undertaking--the local context, actors, and histories matter; (2) in many cases, collaborative relationships should not be conceived of as just archaeologists and descendant communities--there are quite often many stakeholders in any archaeological project and all of these need to be acknowledged and consulted where appropriate; (3) that collaboration involves a complex negotiation of power relationships, despite anyone's best intentions; and (4) collaboration creates new kinds of social, political, and economic relationships, often in cross-cultural contexts.

To conclude, one of the ways that we have attempted to integrate our dedication to four-field anthropology into teaching archaeology has been to choose projects such as these for archaeological field schools. Field schools are still the keystone for the continuation of archaeology as a profession and for training students for cultural resource management, which is now the most prevalent type of archaeology practiced in this country. But if the goal were simply to have students learn the basics of archaeological fieldwork, they could excavate test units on college campuses or in simulated digs designed by the field school directors. We strongly believe that field schools should be tied into the engaged scholarship of the professional archaeologists who direct them, and that students should learn about and be an active stakeholder in the social, political, and

cultural contexts of archaeology (Chilton 2009). As these projects demonstrate, when one moves beyond the academic and research priorities of field schools, there are other, and often more important, constituents to consider such as the landowners, local communities, and descendant communities. By including and discussing these other constituencies as part of the core mission of field schools and incorporating collaboration into daily practice, we teach our students to be sensitive to issues of power and the political implications of all archaeological research. Field schools are formative experiences for training future generations of anthropological archaeologists, and our primary responsibility is to instill in our students a commitment to respect the implications of the past for people living in the present.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Celeste Ray, Eric Lassiter, and an anonymous reviewer for their extremely helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. We also wish to thank the staff and students of the UMass Field Schools from 2006 and 2008. The on-going collaboration with the Pocumtuck Fort Archaeology and Stewardship Project stakeholders has been an important and formative teaching, learning, and reflective process for us, and we express our gratitude to those involved for sharing their

time, insights, advice, and perspectives.

References

- Atalay, Sonya. 2006. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." American Indian Quarterly 30(3 & 4):280-310.
- Blakey, Michael L. 2008. "An Ethical Epistemology of Publicly Engaged Biocultural Research." In Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies, ed. Junko Habu, Clare Fawcett and John M. Matsunaga, 17-28. New York: Springer.
- Bruchac, Margaret M. 2005. "Earthshapers and Placemakers: Algonkian Indian Stories and the Landscape." In Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice, ed. Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, 56-80. London: Routledge.
- . 2007. Historical Erasure and Cultural Recovery: Indigenous People in the Connecticut River Valley. Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Chilton, Elizabeth S. 2006. "From the Ground Up: The Effects of Consultation on Archaeological Methods." In Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States, ed. Jordan E. Kerber, 281-94. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

----- . 2009. "Teaching Heritage Values through Field Schools: Case Studies from New England." In Heritage Values: The Past in Contemporary Society, ed. Phyllis Messenger, George Smith and Hillary Soderland. Left Coast Press, in press.

Chilton, Elizabeth S., and Dianna L. Doucette. 2002. "The Archaeology of Coastal New England: The View from Martha's Vineyard." Northeast Anthropology 64:55-66.

Chilton, Elizabeth S., and Siobhan M. Hart. 2009. "Archaeology and Community Service Learning in the 'Pioneer Valley'." In Archaeological Practice and Community Service Learning, ed. Michael Nassaney and Mary A. Levine, 168-182. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Chilton, Elizabeth S., Tonya B. Largy, and Kathryn Curran. 2000. "Evidence for Prehistoric Maize Horticulture at the Pine Hill Site, Deerfield, Massachusetts." Northeast Anthropology 59:23-46.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T. J. Ferguson. 2008. "The Collaborative Continuum." In Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities, ed. Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, 1-32. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts (COM). 2008. Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development: Indian Affairs. Housing and Economic Development. http://www.mass.gov/?pageID=ehedmodulechunk&L=4&L0=Home&L1=Economic+Analysis&L2=Executive+Office+of+Housing+and+Economic+Development&L3=Department+of+Housing+and+Community+Development&sid=Ehed&b=terminalcontent&f=dhcd_ia_ia&csid=Ehed (accessed October 1, 2008).

Demos, John. 1994. The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America. New York: Vintage Books.

Gero, Joan M., David M. Lacy, and Michael L. Blakey, eds. 1983. The Socio-Politics of Archaeology. University of Massachusetts Amherst Department of Anthropology Research Report No. 23. Amherst: Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts.

Haefeli, Evan, and Kevin Sweeny. 2003. Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Hart, Siobhan M. 2004. "Mixed Assemblages and Indigenous Agents: Decolonizing Pine Hill." Northeast Anthropology 68:57-71.

----- . 2009. High Stakes: A Poly-Communal Archaeology of the Pocumtuck Fort, Deerfield, Massachusetts. Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Historic Deerfield, Inc. 2008. Historic Deerfield: About Us. Historic Deerfield, Inc. <http://www.historic-deerfield.org/about-us> (accessed October 1, 2008).

Keene, Arthur S., and Elizabeth S. Chilton. 1995. Toward an Archaeology of the Pocumtuck Homeland: Critical Archaeology and the UMass Archaeological Field School. Paper presented at the Sixtieth Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Minneapolis.

Kerber, Jordan, ed. 2006. Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter, and Paul A. Shackel. 1987. "Toward a Critical Archaeology." Current Anthropology 28:283-302.

Lewis, Quentin, and Angela Labrador. 2006. Toward a Critical Field School in Archaeology. Paper presented at the Sixth International Rethinking Marxism Conference, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Lippert, Dorothy. 2008. Discussant's Comments for Invited Session: "Collaboration and Archaeology." Paper presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco.

Melvoin, Richard. 1989. New England Outpost: War and Society in Colonial Deerfield. New York: W.W. Norton.

Nicholas, George P. 2006. "Decolonizing the Archaeological Landscape: The Practice and Politics of Archaeology in British Columbia." American Indian Quarterly 30(3 & 4):350-80.

Paynter, Robert. 2002. "Time in the Valley: Narratives about Rural New England." Current Anthropology 43(supplement):S85-101.

Peters, Ramona. 2006. "Consulting with the Bone Keepers: NAGPRA Consultations and Archaeological Monitoring in the Wampanoag Territory." In Cross-Cultural Collaboration: Native Peoples and Archaeology in the Northeastern United States, ed. Jordan E. Kerber, 32-43. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association/Memorial Hall Museum (PVMA). 2004. Raid on Deerfield: The Many Stories of 1704. Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association.

<http://www.1704.deerfield.history.museum> (accessed October 1, 2008).

Silliman, Stephen W., ed. 2008. Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

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

Watkins, Joe E. 2003. "Beyond the Margin: American Indians, First Nations, and Archaeology in North America." American Antiquity 68(2):273-85.