Federal Recognition Politics and Collaborative Archaeologists: The Need for a Cultural Consensus

Alexandra Grace Martin
College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd

Part of the History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons, and the Public Administration Commons

Recommended Citation
https://dx.doi.org/10.21220/s2-a275-qx14

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.
Federal Recognition Politics and Collaborative Archaeologists: The Need for a Cultural Consensus

Alexandra Grace Martin
Merrimack, New Hampshire

Bachelor of Arts, Mount Holyoke College, 2005

A Thesis presented to the Graduate Faculty of the College of William and Mary in Candidacy for the Degree of Master of Arts

Department of Anthropology

The College of William and Mary
May, 2010
This Thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Alexandra Grace Martin

Approved by the Committee, April, 2010

Committee Chair
Dr. Marley R. Brown III
Research Professor, The College of William and Mary

Dr. Kathleen J. Bragdon
Professor, The College of William and Mary

Dr. Martin D. Gallivan
Associate Professor, The College of William and Mary
Research approved by Protection of Human Subjects Committee

Protocol number: PHSC-2009-05-13-6007-mrbr01

Date(s) of approval: July 7, 2009 - July 7, 2010
As archaeologists have developed working relationships with Native American stakeholder communities in recent decades, discussion and literature with respect to collaborative archaeology has proliferated. This paper will explore the origins and issues of federal recognition requirements in an effort to understand how politics and policies relate to collaboration and archaeology. The federal criteria for recognition are founded on a contrived notion of Indianness that excludes non-Western ideas about time and continuity, making the federal acknowledgement process unreasonably difficult. Through an ethnographic approach, which relies on knowledge of and sensitivity to Native cultures, collaborative archaeology can unite and balance diverse visions of the past. The use of an ethnographic framework in an effort to develop reflexivity and cultural engagement may help archaeologists to reach “cultural consensus” (Appadurai 1981) with stakeholder communities. This paper will also highlight case studies throughout southern New England and Virginia, where Native groups at various stages of the recognition process are engaged in collaborative archaeologies. I will discuss the initiative of several Native and non-Native archaeologists who have shown the possibility for collaborative archaeological research to demonstrate convincing evidence that a tribal community has continued and to address public perceptions of tribal histories.
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Introduction

In the early 17th century, English settlers arrived on the Eastern shores of North America, encountering various Native communities. Near the coast of Virginia, early colonists met members of the Powhatan confederacy, a powerful chiefdom. In Massachusetts, Pilgrims came face to face with the Wampanoag confederacy, led by Massasoit. The relationships that developed among the English and Indian inhabitants of the changing colonial landscape have since become central to our modern mythology of early America. John Smith and Pocahontas, Jamestown, the First Thanksgiving: these stories commemorate the friendly side of English-Native American relations.

Although these stories of early contact and cross-cultural interaction are important today, the substantial significance of tribal authority in the contact period is not reflected in current politics. Federal recognition is the way in which the United States government acknowledges a modern sovereign relationship with Native tribes, granting tribal rights and access to federal programs. For many Native groups, federal recognition is an important goal.

However, the federal criteria for recognition are founded on a contrived notion of Indianness that excludes non-Western ideas about time and continuity, making the federal acknowledgement process unreasonably difficult. Through an ethnographic approach, collaborative archaeology can unite and balance diverse visions of the past. Cultural awareness and sensitivity to stakeholder communities is essential to developing working partnerships.
Though this paper takes an anthropological approach to understanding federal recognition politics, most studies are firmly situated in the disciplines of political science or history (e.g. Cramer 2005; M. Miller 2006; Wilkins and Lomawaima 2002). A humanistic address of the issues will contain theoretical and programmatic elements where history and politics stop short. Considering the importance of collaboration among Native Americans and archaeologists to contemporary archaeological projects, I suggest that approaches to research should be contextualized in an awareness of federal recognition politics. Moreover, historical archaeologists have a unique perspective within academia from which to discuss and reaffirm historicity, change and continuity of Native culture since European contact. This theoretical discussion has the potential to benefit the effectiveness of collaborative archaeologies and to address the difficulties of recognition processes.

An archaeological approach actively embracing collaboration, as presented by Martin Wobst (2005), may be a useful starting point. After addressing the various ways in which archaeologists have divorced the material record from traditional pasts, Wobst focuses on the other ways we might understand the past by incorporating the Indigenous perspective (2005:27-29). To further the anti-colonial aspect of collaborative archaeology, Wobst writes that

*Indigenous societies of the twenty-first century have little patience with non-community members enriching themselves in their comfortable ivory-towers by establishing expertise over their past, present, and future. To decolonize archaeology and Indigenous history requires non-Indigenous archaeologists to reinvent themselves so they are thoroughly grounded in the problems of their Indigenous contemporaries, sensitive to Indigenous needs, and willing to further Indigenous projects and agendas (2005:29).*
With the objective of basing archaeological studies in an ethnographically informed foundation, sensitive to Native issues, I will begin with a theoretical background of the importance of time and place in regards to collaboration. I will especially draw upon anthropologists Arjun Appaduri and Johannes Fabian. This theoretical discussion will be presented in an effort to help reconceptualize the standardized uses of time and place as set forth by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, particularly the ways in which tribes are required by the government to demonstrate historical presence in a region since the time of European contact. An attempt to recognize the interconnected meanings of the past with the present is an important aspect of making modern archaeological projects relevant.

I will follow with a discussion of some historical and current problems of federal policies. To understand how federal recognition efforts articulate with archaeology, the origins of the federal acknowledgement process (FAP) and the issues with its requirements must also be understood. Thus, a brief history of the process will be outlined. As case studies, selected Virginia Indians and the Mashantucket Pequot in Connecticut will illustrate some of the inescapable issues of race and economics.

Next, I will consider problems with recognition criteria specifically related to collaboration and other elements of federally required consultations. A conversation with Rae Gould on issues of federal recognition and archaeological projects in southern New England will demonstrate the importance of a purposeful engagement with descendant communities, along with a shift away from bureaucratic notions of time and continuity. Gould is the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Nipmuc, a non-federally
recognized tribe in Massachusetts. The roles of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers are especially important to developing contemporary collaborative archaeological projects, and as representatives of a growing movement of Native archaeologists.

In the final section, I will present a brief history of collaborative efforts related to Native American archaeological sites. The emphasis will be placed on the effects of the post-processual ethos of archaeology, particularly following the 1990 passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Various examples of anthropological and specifically archaeological contributions to federal recognition petitions and discussions will be considered. Conversations with Nipmuc THPO Gould led to an inquiry into the foundations of archaeological partnerships in New England. The importance of the Narragansett Burial Ground site in Rhode Island, and in turn, the importance of archaeology to the Narragansett descendant community will be made clear.

This paper will close with a discussion of current federal recognition politics in Virginia, looking toward the future of collaborative archaeological projects in the Chesapeake. Eight of the eleven tribes currently recognized by the state of Virginia, including members of the Powhatan confederacy, currently seek federal recognition, some through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and others through Congress. The initiative of several Native and non-Native archaeologists in the area and the utility of historical archaeological projects will be highlighted. Overall, without depending on the essentialized notions of Indianness institutionalized by the Federal Acknowledgement Process, it will be clear that archaeologists are in a unique position to offer an alternative view of Native American history and cultural heritage.
I. Time and Continuity

This section will explore the distinctions between the Western, academic discourse on time versus Native American views of the past, in an effort to elucidate theoretical viewpoints especially relevant to archaeologists who work with Native American groups. Various authors have discussed meanings of the past, some from an anthropological perspective, others in a more philosophical framework. Generally speaking, time is meaningful in a very dynamic way, giving human actors a context in which to refer to the past. I will emphasize the theories of Arjun Appadurai (1981) and Johannes Fabian (1983), who focus on the diverse ways we all talk about and understand the shared passage of time. The ultimate objectives of this discussion are to discuss ways in which archaeologists might shift their ways of thinking about time to understand a more continuous cycle of the past, and to suggest ways in which archaeologists might effectively communicate about the various meanings of the past and interpretations based on anthropological materials.

Collaboration within archaeology has developed substantially in the last 20 years. In many ways, NAGPRA may serve as a milestone for this particular era of archaeology (see Bray 2001; Rose 1996). Some have described the influence of NAGPRA as forcing interaction and shared stewardship (Custer 2005; Hantman 2004; McGuire 1992; Paynter 2000), others would argue that NAGPRA acted as a catalyst in conjunction with more anthropological, post-processual archaeologies (e.g. Chilton 2006; Liebmann 2008; Silliman 2005).
NAGPRA calls for federal agencies and museums, including state and local governments and educational institutions, to inventory and return human remains and associated funerary objects upon request of a lineal descendent, Native American tribe, or Native Hawaiian organization. NAGPRA applies only to materials excavated on federal or tribal land or already housed in federally funded institutions such as museums and universities; private land and private collections are not affected (Rose et al. 1996:89). Although NAGPRA was an important accomplishment, its passage caused a great deal of controversy, particularly focused on the issue of repatriation. Many institutions protested what they saw as a loss of collections, even likening the return of human remains and artifacts to the burning of historical documents (Meighan 1994). Protests such as this represent the recalcitrance within the academic community to respect the traditions of Native Americans and their ancestors. Other archaeologists expressed frustration that their genuine interest in history and accustomed methodologies might be hindered by Native traditions. However, as Senator Daniel Inouye (Democrat, Hawaii) pointed out, “For museums and institutions that have dealt honestly and in good faith with Native Americans, this legislation will have little effect” (Trope and Echo-Hawk 2000:140), indicating that archaeologists who were already working with Native Americans were better positioned to heed NAGPRA’s requirements. Others soon recognized the benefits of working collaboratively and with a knowledge and respect of Native cultures.

In any case, NAGPRA’s repatriation requirements have certainly caused archaeologists to look for cultural continuities. In the context of NAGPRA, cultural affiliation refers to the requirement of the legislation for descendant groups to prove that certain items are those of, or used by, their ancestors. In conversation with Elizabeth
Chilton (personal communication), an archaeologist who has collaborated with the federally recognized Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) in Massachusetts, she stated that one of the explicit effects of NAGPRA to her approach to archaeology had to do with a shift from recognizing ways to mark points of change on a timeline toward realizing a more transitional continuum across time in an attempt to address cultural affiliation. In this paper, I mean continuity in the sense that there is a link between Native American descendant communities and their ancestors. Continuity of cultural traditions means that events in the past, along with material culture, continue to be meaningful in the present.

There is still a disconnect, however, between the way many archaeologists and Westerners view time in a linear way, versus a perspective shared across many Native American tribes, in which time is cyclical and the past lies embedded in memory, tradition, or the land (Agar 1996; Basso 1996; Bray 2009; Deloria 1995; Howe 2002; Neufeld 2008). Alison Wylie has critiqued the way linear Western history has at once been assumed to be respectable, while being unquestioned as a discipline of methodological unity, calling it “an intellectual borderland” (1995:255). This is not to say that Westerners are unable to think critically, but rather that reflexivity is essential to the growth of anthropology as a useful discipline.

An important contribution to the theory on time as a non-linear system was made by the *Annales* school, founded in 1929 by Febvre and Bloch. Fernand Braudel, a leader of the second generation *Annales* school, proposed that time may develop across three distinct scales: the short term, medium term, and long term (the *longue durée*) (Lucas
2005:15). The short term encompasses certain events or the lives of individuals, the medium term includes eras of social structures or organization, and the long term refers to slow processes like environmental change. Archaeologists have incorporated these distinctions of time into research in an effort to examine the cyclical nature of time (Lucas 2005). With the events of the short term laid over the processes of medium or long term time, the past appears on a non-linear scale, allowing for a coexistent relationship between continuity and change.

A less Western perspective on time has to do with the ways we recall meaningful events in various ways. Barbara Bender augments the importance of our relationship to the past in the context of “Time and Landscape.” Like the archaeological record, and like time, the landscape is subjective. Individual engagement with the landscape is politically and socially particular (Bender 2002), and spatial and temporal dimensions are linked (Munn 1992). Place may also be used to augment a feeling of historical legitimacy (see Paynter 2002). The subjectivity of time and place are particularly relevant to the importance various authors have ascribed to the landscape for Native American representations of time (e.g. Basso 1996; Deloria 1995; Howe 2002).

My specific interest in this section is in the way archaeologists work with and conceptualize the Native American past. Craig Howe problematizes the approach he perceives in typical studies of “Indian history” in two ways (2002). First, “Indian” generalizes indigenous peoples as a collective; secondly, history is all too often implicitly understood to be an objective look at chronological time (Howe 2002:161). He proposes a more useful alternative of tribal histories. Howe describes the Native perspective on
the past as a more personalized recount, triggered by the relationships among the narrator, an event, and the landscape (2002:162). According to Howe, histories told from a tribal perspective are less centered around sequence and dates, and rather used by the narrator to realize connections between past and present (2002:162). Indeed, histories presented as memories demonstrate the true depth of meaning.

Native oral histories and oral traditions are differently accepted as worthy contributions to archaeological projects. A conversation about oral traditions developed by the end of the 1990s, largely due to NAGPRA’s inclusion of oral traditions as a possible line of evidence to be considered by museums and federal agencies in regards to cultural affiliation issues. Debate arose due to scholars who sought to substantiate oral traditions, taking an analytical and critical approach to Native American worldviews. Oral traditions as historical records are rejected by some (e.g. Mason 2000) and welcomed by others (e.g. Echo-Hawk 2000; Whiteley 2002). The only point of agreement seems to be on the distinction between oral histories as verbal recollections as related by participants, and oral traditions as memoirs passed down by firsthand observers that nevertheless are “believed by their narrators to be more or less faithful renderings” of events (Mason 2000:240; see also Echo-Hawk 2000).

Ronald Mason suggests that the inclusion of traditional histories into archaeological projects generates major difficulties based on different conceptual understandings of the past, concluding that it may not be worth making an effort to do so. Based on Mason’s idea of archaeology, the field does not depend on traditional indigenous knowledge, thus “archaeology is of little or even no relevance” to Native
Americans (2000:240). Roger Echo-Hawk, on the other hand, views oral traditions as virtual documents, as worthy of attention as written records. He acknowledges a misconception among scholars who deride oral traditions, suggesting that they are limited by a barrier that “prevents information from being effectively conveyed into the present from distant time periods” (Echo-Hawk 2000:273).

Joe Watkins summarizes the debate on the inclusion of oral traditions in archaeological projects, pointing out that while most archaeologists wish to supplement information about the past with documentary histories, including oral traditions, some do not consider oral traditions appropriate to “scientific research” (2003a:280). Peter Whiteley suggests that consideration of oral traditions generates important dialogue with the potential to enhance evidence, interpretations, and explanations of the past (2002). Overall, the disconnect between traditional versus academic understandings of the past must certainly be addressed in order for collaborative dialogues and projects to succeed.

a. Time and the Other

Johannes Fabian's *Time and the Other* is largely a critique of structural-functionalist and evolutionist anthropologists whose ethnographic work results in rendering their subjects a resident of the past – then, rather than the now, as inhabited by the anthropologist. For example, the anthropological use of time in the discipline’s history has served to temporalize and therefore distance the observer from the observed (Fabian 1983:25). This is certainly an issue to be discussed within an archaeological context in terms of other-ing our subjects, but for the theoretical discussion I am
developing concerning meanings of the past, I find Fabian's notion of coevalness most relevant.

To share a common time is to coeval, in Fabian's definition. He critiques the encapsulation of time "as a dimension of intercultural study" (1983:41) that, when talked about as a cultural construction, precludes the anthropological ability to communicate about continuities and changes across time. In fact, a heavy focus on differentiating between reality and theory may prevent anthropologists from realizing how much we rely on the way we produce knowledge (Fabian 1983:165). Being involved in a discourse in a moment of coevalness is a better approach to the meaning of time.

Fabian also offers some useful commentary to apply to the notion of cultural continuity. In his discussion on writing ethnographies, he describes how the actual action of writing defines a cultural activity or characteristic as part of a moment in time. For example, in the ethnographic present, it may be written that members of a certain society "are matrilineal" (Fabian 1983:80-81, emphasis added). Fabian worries that the publication of this temporally linked statement may bind a society to the moment of observation. While this ethnographic present has been defended as a literary device, it remains "unattentive to the fact that all cultures are constantly changing" (Fabian 1983:81). The use and publication of tense in writing about archaeological subjects continues to be problematical. Due to the way Westerners are accustomed to reading and thinking about time as defined by verb tenses, we may tend to place events on a timeline.

Consider the work of John McTaggart, a philosopher of the British Idealist tradition that believed in an "Absolute reality." He suggested that there were two
essential views on time. He described a distinction between an A series and a B series, in which the A series refers to the continuous nature of time, understood in terms of past, present and future, while the B series describes time as a series of points, understood in terms of earlier or later than (Lucas 2005:21). To discuss time in a functional manner, one must use the terms of the B series to explain the duration of the A series.

In McTaggart’s distinction, the tenses of the ethnographic present Fabian critiques tend toward the employment of the B series. However, the duality of these terms creates a contradiction in that the distinct points of time of the B series belie the continuous flow of the A series, and yet the B series may only work if time moves along in the sense that the A series describes. McTaggart addressed this conflict by pitting the logic of reality against the illogic of time, and concluding that time is not real (Lucas 2005). While this in an interesting philosophical question, the utility of McTaggart's ideas for the archaeologist lie in the purpose of the discussion on time. Paradoxically in the West, it is difficult to talk about time as continuous, or refer to a lived experience without dividing the past into points. This is only a problem if we do not accept that time becomes an individualized representation or expression at the point of discussion. Therefore, time may be interpreted in any number of ways.

Not only does Fabian wish to access the variable meanings of time, he also calls for anthropologists to accept various representations as legitimate (1983:123). Dealing with the need for humanism in anthropology at the time of his publication, he highlights the authority of the ethnographic informant. What underlies the human respect between the anthropologist and the informant is a disruption of “their time” versus “our time”
(Fabian 1983:150), making the meanings of time more immediate to the discourse. Overall, Fabian’s emphasis on an awareness of different but valid views on the past is important for anthropologists who wish to collaborate or coeval.

b. The Past as a Scarce Resource

In “The Past as a Scarce Resource,” Appadurai refutes earlier claims by anthropologists including Malinowski, Durkheim, Evans-Pritchard, and Geertz, who claim that time itself is infinitely variable. He argues that it is be impossible to prove the variability of time over diverse conceptions of time. So, rather than applying relativism to the conception of the past itself, Appadurai applies that cultural variability to the meaning of the past. That is, there is only one past, but there are infinite ways of understanding and interpreting that past. As a supporting example, in the great ontological discussion of Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*, he concurs that while there is an extant coherence of history, the objective nature of time is not what makes being authentic. Rather, being is related to interpretation of the specific aspects of the world history which concern the self (Barash 2005:177-178).

Regardless of whether we maintain issues with the idea of time as a finite resource, it is indeed intangible. The variable meanings of the past are slightly more substantial. Appadurai’s suggestion that we examine the various meanings of the past rather than the concept of the past itself is especially useful because of the criteria Appadurai sets forth to understand the normative dimensions of the past that all people seem to talk about: authority, continuity, depth, and interdependence. Appadurai applies various combinations of these dimensions in action as they concern the varying oral
traditions surrounding an Hindu temple in India, but I believe that clarifying these discussion points for reaching consensus on understanding a shared past could be more broadly applied to archaeological discussions.

Although Appadurai’s work in *The Social Life of Things* (1988) has been utilized often by archaeologists talking about material culture, his examination of the past has been used seemingly exclusively in ethnographic applications, with a few archaeological exceptions (see Knapp 1992; Spencer 1995). I find it surprising that in all the literature on the variability and meaning of the past, few have drawn upon Appadurai’s proposed constraints on understanding the norms of talking about the past. Especially for archaeologists working with Native American communities in the realms of legislated issues such as cultural affiliation and federal recognition, an ethnographic framework for how archaeologists and tribal representatives consider the past would be very useful.

According to archaeologists Quetzil Castañeda and Christopher Matthews, ethnography has been a dynamic tool for archaeologists. Previously used for analytical approaches to archaeological materials, ethnography is increasingly “called in to address the problem of how to ethically engage the diverse publics, especially descendant stakeholder communities, with which archaeology has a primary responsibility” (Castañeda and Matthews 2008:3). Thus, the integration of ethnography into archaeological projects in an effort to develop reflexivity and cultural engagement may help archaeologists to reach “cultural consensus” (Appadurai 1981) with stakeholder communities.
Appadurai suggests that although there is endless variation in the norms about the past, all such norms fall into four minimal dimensions, which all people seem to use in order to reach cultural consensus when talking about the past (Appadurai 1981:203). Authority refers to the idea that there is a certain source or origin of the past which lends credibility. Continuity relates to the degree to which the past is linked to that authority. Depth involves the various values of time-depths in the evaluation of the past. Interdependence suggests that there be a degree of relation between one past with others. Appadurai describes these constraints as a minimal recipe which does not limit or predetermine the ways people look at the past, but rather, as frequent and codifiable parts of the discourse (1981:203-205).

Appadurai discusses a Hindu temple from three differing viewpoints, drawing out several norms appearing in each conversation. Textual evidence, in one instance, exemplifies the authoritative aspect of talking about the past. Continuous evidence for a charter is sought through the documented past. Naturally, the state tends to rely heavily on the textual basis for authority (Appadurai 1981:206-207). The worshipping communities of the temple discussing its history call upon a historical constitutional framework involving other charters, which lends their claim a sense of interdependency (Appadurai 1982:208-211). Although the three stakeholder groups whose claims to the charter of the temple certainly constitute three distinct versions of the past, their meanings are all important. The norms suggested by Appadurai aid in making these views on the past equally valuable and manageable, specifically in an anthropological dialogue (1981:215-216). Appadurai's framework also helps to relate divergent views on the past by highlighting the contextually similar elements.
Fabian's ideas seem to align well with Appadurai's rejection of the past as a variable and the need to instead focus on understanding the variable meanings of the past through anthropology. Appadurai has suggested that we expand the norms we apply in the discourse to understand authority, for example, in different but equally relevant ways. Fabian has shown us how it is important to recognize the immediacy of our relationship with our informants, and in the discussion on the continued meanings of the past to Native Americans, tribal consultants are shown to be vital consultants.
II. Federal Acknowledgement: An Historical and Political Dilemma

An inherent difficulty in developing collaborative archaeological projects is that stakeholder communities are variously defined by politics and regulations, and thus have varying degrees of access to archaeological materials. Understanding how modern Native people navigate complex political and social situations linked to the study of their past requires academic archaeologists to take a step outside the realm of archaeological theory. Engagement with current events, politics, history, and anthropology’s four fields is an important step toward modern, responsible archaeology.

Critiques against the guild model and academic gatekeeping in professional archaeology have been launched (Atalay 2006; McGuire 2008; Mihesuah 2004), demanding that archaeologists question their privilege to author the past. Accordingly, archaeologists must not only apply interdisciplinary practices to their studies, but should take an intercultural approach as well. As collaborative archaeologies have developed, the importance of building relations with Native groups is more apparent than ever.

Federal acknowledgement is an issue that cannot escape consideration by many archaeologists who seek to interact with stakeholder communities. The guidelines for receiving recognition and contention surrounding petitions and decisions are impacted by a range of historical factors. This section examines some of the major developments in United States policy throughout the centuries that currently affect the ability of Indigenous communities to be acknowledged by the government, along with the establishment of the federal recognition criteria within the Bureau of Indian affairs. Related to the historical management of Native communities are politicized and
racialized aspects of indigeneity that also affect federal recognition efforts. Brief
examples from Eastern tribes will illustrate limitations and negativity concerned with
recognition. Overall, an understanding of the historical production of Indianness in the
United States will be shown to be important to a modern anthropological approach to
collaboration.

a. The ‘Indian Problem’

United States policy related to Indian affairs and the status of American Indians
has vacillated wildly. From one decade to the next, measures were taken to alternately
assimilate Native Americans into American culture or effectively separate them entirely.
This trial-and-error approach to governmental management of people has created many
problems that echo in current affairs concerning Indian status.

Along with federal trade and intercourse laws, as well as the Constitution, one of
the first acts of major significance came in 1830 with the Indian Removal Act. During
the administration of Andrew Jackson, the national desire for westward expansion
instilled Jackson and his constituents with a justification for separating Native Americans
from American culture to a radical extent. The act gave congressional authorization to
remove Native residents of any lands east of the Mississippi River in an intended
exchange for unclaimed land to the west of the Mississippi (Prucha 1987).

The notion that the government could remove and redirect entire nations seems to
have emboldened the administrations responsible for the next major policy change. In
the 1850s, parcels of land were reserved for Natives to inhabit. Relocation of Indians to
reservations “developed as an alternative to the extinction of the Indians” (Prucha
James K. Polk’s presidency was responsible for shifting Indian affairs from the War Department to the newly formed Department of the Interior in 1849, and his successor, Zachary Taylor, confirmed the goal of assimilating Native Americans. The shift in the political mindset is exemplified in a November 1869 editorial in the *New York Times*, in which the editors implied merit in “altering the status of the Indian from that of an enemy or outlaw to that of an American citizen” (reprinted in Hays 1997:26, emphasis in original). The reservation system functioned to restrict and regulate Indians as the country expanded into an uncertain West (Prucha 1987).

During the development of the reservation system, treaties continued to be made between the government and Natives, concerning lands to the West newly encountered by American settlers. Resulting in part from reformers’ pressure, treaty making was ended within the Indian Appropriations Act of 1871. More strife among Natives and non-Natives developed, leading to a renewed effort to manage Indians within reserved lands. To more effectively disrupt the tribal authority that the end of treaties had begun to negate, the political focus shifted toward further division and assignment of land. In 1887, the Dawes Act established general allotment, which divided reservations into discrete plots and assigned portions to individuals or families. Continuing the effort to assimilate Indigenous people into society depended on being able to isolate and manipulate individuals, in the minds of reformers (Prucha 1987).

This era perpetuated a notion that Native Americans could essentially be divided and conquered. Again in the words of the editors at the *New York Times*, educated and assimilated Indians should appreciate that “civilization means peace, good will and
prosperity, rather than barbarous warfare, bad whisky and bloody scalps” (July 1867, reprinted in Hays 1997:177). Although the Dawes Act attempted to eradicate tribal memberships, creating tribal rolls based on blood quantum, it was not until 1924 that the Indian Citizenship Act was passed, through which most Native Americans finally had a way to receive United States citizenship (Prucha 1987). However, the attempts at assimilation ignored funding for aid needed by impoverished Native communities.

The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was created in an effort to mitigate the poor planning of assimilation endeavors. John Collier, the commissioner of Indian Affairs appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, directed the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), ending allotment policies, reestablishing the government’s trust relationship, and generally granting tribes more autonomy (Cramer 2005). In a sense, the IRA suggested a separate-but-equal status of Native Americans, in a switch from assimilation. Yet, while Collier stated that Natives “must be given status, responsibility and power,” Indian tribal politics were still limited by federal policy, having to develop constitutions and receive charters (Prucha 1987:317).

After attempting to manage the New Deal-like components of the IRA for nearly two decades, Collier and his supporters had left or resigned from office, leading to another reversal in the government’s direction on Indian affairs. Dillon Myer became the new commissioner in 1950, initiating an era of termination through which not only the government’s responsibilities to Natives would be terminated – the tribes themselves would be terminated as well (Prucha 1987). Under Myer, the Bureau of Indian Affairs saw assimilation as a paternalistic endeavor that prolonged Native poverty and
dependence on the government. In this redefined and reinvigorated approach to assimilation, the tribal statuses of thousands of Indians were revoked, creating new non-recognized groups and depriving them of the government-to-government relationship of trust that had been developing (Cramer 2005).

The marginalization and denial of tribal rights stimulated a rising Native political movement. Pan-Indian politics saw the founding of the National Congress of American Indians in the 1940s, which later protested termination policies through legislative action. Relatedly, the Red Power movement rallied Natives to organize as the American Indian Movement in the 1960s, also protesting termination, sometimes through radical action and also through support of a revitalization movement and return to reservation homelands (Cramer 2005). In the spring of 1968, the passage of the Civil Rights Act addressed the rights of Native Americans and the powers of tribal government, attempting to “bring the Indian tribal governments within the constitutional framework of the United States” (Prucha 1987:363).

Shortly after the Civil Rights Act came an era of self-determination. In the 1970s, the federal government aimed to actively involve Native participants in federal programs, particularly in education. Native Americans also took hold of the opportunity to reestablish rights that had lapsed in the absence of appropriate recognition of tribal access to resources. An illustrative Supreme Court case is *United States v. Washington State* (1974). A group of tribes raised the issue of treaty-granted fishing rights in the Pacific Northwest, wishing for their fair share. Judge George Boldt upheld their treaty rights, presenting a standard for Indian fishing that took into consideration the access to fishing
rights as separate from others (Prucha 1987). The decision, while unpopular, characterized a separatist approach to Indian-related policy; self-determination signified the potential for access to tribal recognition.

Unfortunately, the fluctuation in the government’s approach to Native American affairs over time, as briefly outlined here, meant that tribal rights were not so straightforward to reestablish. Undertakings that denied Natives access to their homelands, disregarded tribal relations, and blatantly attempted to terminate their culture and governance resulted in self-deterministic and activist Native groups struggling to reestablish access to tribal rights.

b. Recognition: Process and Problems

In 1978, the Bureau of Indian Affairs established the Branch of Acknowledgement and Research, which has been staffed with anthropologists, historians, and genealogists, evidently qualified as scholars to determine Indianness through the Federal Acknowledgement Process (FAP). Over the course of historical United States policy changes, the underlying issue remained the question of status. As policy makers, reformers, and other figures with influence struggled with the social position of Indians, they eventually settled on offering federal relations and benefits to tribal groups, signifying their sovereign status. Federal recognition efforts were developed to provide a venue through which formal recognition would make tribal groups officially eligible for federal protection and other services (Prucha 1987).
Seven criteria were established for verifying Native groups. The BIA federal recognition process focuses on continuity in the contexts of identifiable authority and authenticity, privileging documentary sources. In abbreviated form, the criteria are:

1) The petitioner has been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis since 1900.
2) A predominant portion of the petitioning group comprises a distinct community and has existed as a community from historical times until the present.
3) The petitioner has maintained political influence or authority over its members as an autonomous entity from historical times until the present.
4) A copy of the group’s present governing document including its membership criteria. In the absence of a written document, the petitioner must provide a statement describing in full its membership criteria and current governing procedures.
5) The petitioner’s membership consists of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.
6) The membership of the petitioning group is composed principally of persons who are not members of any acknowledged North American Indian tribe.
7) Neither the petitioner nor its members are the subjects of congressional legislation that has expressly terminated or forbidden the Federal relationship.

One of the major limitations of the FAP is the high cost and extreme length of decision-making time associated with petitioning the BIA. Evidently, the Bureau approximated that of an estimated 251 unrecognized groups, only about 150 would plan to petition for federal recognition (Prucha 1987). However, while these estimations may have justified the under-staffing of the Branch of Acknowledgement and Research initially, the huge number of petitioning groups has not led to renovation of the process. The Bureau of Indian Affairs reports that the number of Letters of Intent received as of September 2008 is 332. Only 47 petitions have been resolved through the criteria determined by the Bureau, and of these, only 16 have been decided in favor of the petitioning group (see Table).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petitioner Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Petitioner Number</th>
<th>Date Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown Clallam Tribe</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2/10/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunica-Biloxi Indian Tribe</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/25/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Valley Timbi-Sha Shoshone Band</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1/3/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narragansett Indian Tribe</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4/11/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poarch Band of Creeks</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wampanoag Tribal Council of Gay Head</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4/11/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3/28/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohegan Indian Tribe</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5/14/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena Band of Choctaws</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8/29/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Potawatomi Inc.</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/17/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samish Indian Tribe</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/26/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>8/23/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Indian Tribe</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10/6/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz Tribe of Indians</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11/4/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashpee Wampanoag</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2/15/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petitions Resolved: 16 Tribes Acknowledged through 25 CFR 83 (based on Fleming 2008)

The success rate set thus far is extraordinarily dismal. Many tribes have been denied recognition based on a common failure to meet the same criteria (the first, second, and fourth), which relate to the continuity of a discretely defined group of tribal members since 1900 (B. Miller 2008). Paradoxically, many of the policy eras prior to the 1978 establishment of these criteria directly attempted to disband tribal communities and governments, as discussed. That Native petitioners are consistently being asked to prove that the government essentially failed to assimilate or terminate their ancestors certainly brings the efficacy of the federal program into question, perhaps indicating a need for the system to be reformed.

While tribes are not required to seek recognition through the FAP and may choose to take a legal, legislative route through Congressional action, the government has tried to maintain the BIA as the standard for contact between Indians and the federal government (Prucha 1987). For example, in the fall of 2002, Bush administration officials gave
testimony on Capitol Hill opposing the recognition of six Virginia Indian tribes seeking recognition through the Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act, saying that recognition would bypass the standard review process underway by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Metro 2002).

Overall, the current political environment presents a struggle for Native Americans trying to reorganize tribal bodies and receive federal recognition. American political history has negatively affected the access of Indigenous people to federally granted protection and rights, but difficulties that ultimately relate to recognition issues also include other societal factors.

c. Racialization: Limitations on Federal Recognition

Issues of race and indigeneity have been major obstacles to developing petitions for federal recognition. For example, as representatives of the Powhatan Chiefdom, Pamunkey Indians participated in the 1893 Chicago World's Fair. In an effort to seek publicity and raise awareness about their own reservation, the Pamunkey chose to be involved in this display, representing themselves in a conscious response to expectations. The fair marked an occasion for “which to dress in ‘Indian’ style in public” (Rountree 1990:210). To effectively raise awareness about their indigeneity, the Pamunkey representatives chose to wear fringed buckskin outfits that did not resemble their early ‘authentic’ style of clothing, but rather corresponded to what the Victorian public expected. In this act that recalls Gayatri Spivak's strategic essentialism (1996) as well as historian Paige Raibmon's argument that Natives may actively manipulate essentialized
conceptions of their own Indianness (2005), Virginia Indians actively raised the public's awareness about their presence, albeit on tenuous terms.

Unfortunately, for the Native residents of Virginia, 1924 marked the passage of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act, or Registar Walter Plecker's “one-drop rule” (Rountree 1990). Developing from various Jim Crow legislative acts in the early 1900s, which restricted what it meant to be white based on blood quantum, the non-biological dichotomy between white and colored was increasingly cemented across most of the southern United States. By 1924, Virginia Natives were forced to identify as colored (rather than Indian), racialized by Virginia legislators within a generalized non-white constituency. This negatively impacted the genealogical records of many Virginia Natives, of great detriment to the later necessity of establishing continuity related to the Federal Acknowledgement Process defined by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

As former Virginia Senator George Allen stated in 2006 at a hearing before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, “People were threatened with imprisonment for noting ‘Indian’ on a birth certificate” (Emerling 2008). This act has had a lasting effect on recognition issues among Virginia Indians. Many tribal leaders have cited the Racial Integrity Act as the cause of suppressed culture throughout the mid 1900s (Whitson 2000). Recently, in the House of Representatives, Virginia Representative James Moran equated the act to “paper genocide” (Emerling 2009). In regards to the Racial Integrity Act, Representative Moran also stated that

this state-imposed policy has left gaps in the Virginia tribes' historical record. These gaps make it nearly impossible for the tribes to pursue federal recognition through the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs process. Their last resort is
pursuing an act of Congress, which they have been doing for the past seven years (McLaughlin 2007).

There are many ways that race has been a negative issue for Native groups, both within tribes and across the nation (e.g. Cramer 2005; Sturm 2002). The local example cited here, however, is a specific instance in which the possibility of tribal recognition is restricted by a general inability to accept indigeneity, further suggesting that the system needs reform.

d. Recognition and Gaming, or, “There’s a Museum at the Casino?”

Even if tribes successfully receive federal recognition, the historical and societal limitations and manipulations of indigeneity continue to cause problems for tribal sovereignty. For example, the Mashantucket Pequot of eastern Connecticut are widely known for their success as a tribe. Specifically, the Foxwoods Resort and Casino on the Mashantucket Reservation is the largest casino in the country, and makes an annual profit of over one billion dollars. Compared with other reservations in the United States, where Native people are faced with poverty and unemployment, and make an average income of $13,000, the Mashantucket Pequot have developed a community profit-

Figure 1: Foxwoods Casino, as viewed from the observation tower at the Pequot Museum
sharing system in which every adult member receives a monthly payment equaling about $100,000 a year, and more for tribal leaders (Kershaw 2007). In addition, Pequot tribal members are guaranteed employment, free medical care, and tuition at private schools and colleges.

Their true success, however, came when the Mashantucket Pequot gained federal recognition through Congress in 1983. Before the Pequot reorganized as a united group in search of recognition, it seemed that the Pequot people were in danger of losing their reservation lands altogether. In May of 2009, a special exhibit was opened in the Mashantucket Gallery at the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center, entitled “Pequot Lives in the Lost Century.” The exhibit was unlike anything the museum had previously tackled concerning the 20th century history of their people. The gallery strove to inform visitors about the ways Pequot people had kept their Indian identity alive despite their distance from the reservation, and discussed personal experiences leading up to their reorganization and recognition.

At the end of the nineteenth century, at a time when many Americans were led to believe that Native people were becoming extinct, obituaries of Pequot people perpetuated the language of endangerment and extinction, even while they clearly listed surviving family members of the deceased. With the passage of the local “Act Concerning Indians” in 1951, the Pequot came close to losing their tribal land when Connecticut officials suggested that absence from the reservation represented forfeiture of state recognition (Mashantucket Gallery exhibit 2009).
Between the 1900 and 1989, the percentage of tribal members born on reservation land dropped dramatically, during a period that has been described as the Pequot Diaspora (Mashantucket Gallery exhibit 2009). During this diaspora, when Pequot people were continuing to be born in other parts of the country, the reservation land area was reduced to less than 200 acres (Mashantucket Gallery exhibit 2009). Then, during the 1980s, many Pequot returned to the reservation to live and work, and between 1990 and 1999, an increasing number of Pequot births occurred on increased tribal land. Despite protests from local officials, the Pequot maintained that they would always be "connected by blood, history, and tribal land," refuting suggestions that having lived off the reservation somehow made them less authentic Indians (Mashantucket Gallery exhibit 2009).

In any event, the return to the reservation and subsequent Congressional acknowledgement paved the way for the establishment of the Foxwoods Casino, changing the way New England and the rest of the nation perceived the Mashantucket Pequot, and by extension, all Native Americans. In the words of tribal member Rebecca Perry Levy, "At 23, I was me. At 24, I was a casino Indian" (Mashantucket Gallery exhibit 2009). The recent history of Mashantucket Pequot is a useful example for understanding how casinos and gaming have become a focus of the continued debate over Indian identity and recognition, even once the demands of the BIA criteria have been met.

In many cases, debates concerning recognition have been refocused on the issue of gaming (Cramer 2005; see also Benedict 2001). There are several politically
legitimized reasons for the redirection of debate: Firstly, recognized tribes with access to gaming may have resources that can be redistributed to nearby petitioning tribes, in either negative or positive ways. Unrecognized tribes may also utilize financial backing from others toward their petitioning. Finally, recognized tribes who have gained high profile status due to gaming-related successes have generated a negative backlash from the public directed toward petitioning groups (Cramer 2005). It is this negativity that generates the biggest problems, and not coincidentally, is mired in political history.

Constituent and state protestation of gaming brought about the passage of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act in 1988. By creating a jurisdictional framework for gaming, Congress hoped to pacify state officials. The transference of power from the federal government to states to control Native business initiatives also benefited federal officials by decreasing reliance on federal funding (Cramer 2005). This reorganized framework, however, is an inversion of the trust relationship that had been established so many decades earlier. The status and power of Native nations were diminished by this attempt at compromise, limiting sovereignty by state-negotiated constraints (Cramer 2005). The Regulatory Act has given many opponents of federal acknowledgement solid ground from which to protest the reestablishment of recognized tribal governments. For example, Virginia State Representative Frank Wolf refused his support for the bill to recognize Virginia tribes for eight years, citing gaming-related issues (Emerling 2009).

As discussed, the Mashantucket Pequot represent a success story in terms of receiving recognition and developing a lucrative tribal economy. Although contention over Indian gaming has been the focus of much of the attention and discussion about the
Mashantucket Pequot, it is also important to note the relation between economic success and archaeology. A visit to the museum is one aspect of the entertainment at the Foxwoods compound; however, the museum also serves to show how the Mashantucket Pequot engage with research “including anthropology and archaeology – to further validate their claims to a historical continuity” with their Pequot ancestors as well as other Native North Americans (Bodinger de Uriarte 2003:550).

What seems to elude the public contrarians is that establishing a casino does not preclude the Mashantucket Pequot from continuing to be Indian. “Rich Indian Racism” (see Cramer 2005:57), the notion that successful Native Americans cannot be real Indians, has been an influential factor in public support and even basic acceptance of federal recognition efforts. The proceeds of the Foxwoods Casino serve to support the tribal community, and extend to educate the visiting public on the long cultural and political history of their people. Fortunately, a free shuttle runs between the casino and the Museum and Research Center, providing an avenue for education and public recognition of a modern Indian identity.

e. Negotiating Indigeneity in the Context of Federal Recognition

One of the most important overall questions, and the reason for exploring the broad survey of Native history and related politics here, remains: what does it mean to be Indian? As a non-Native person, I am unable to answer such a question, and surely there are many individualized self-definitions across the country. But it might be possible to conceptualize what Indianness means to the general population, with an emphasis on issues related to race and gaming.
Modern Natives continue to maneuver through expectations along the way to recognition. Among rights including access to federal education, health and housing benefits, federal recognition grants Native groups land rights, including jurisdiction over archaeological materials recovered from their homelands (Metro 2002). Preparing for recognition and dealing with the outcome of the process requires a renewed attention to the effects of historical and current concepts of Indianness. Ideally, federal recognition and the related conversations that are broached can also open up seats at a collaborative table: the historical table, political table, or the anthropological table.

Federal recognition has become a central focus of the lens through which Americans view indigeneity. Although there are unfairly conjured expectations of continuity in tribal communities associated with navigating the process, there is also a revitalized aspect of cultural continuity in which the connection of communities to their pasts reaffirms the importance of history.
III. Collaboration and Criteria

Communication as a collaborative effort among archaeologists and Native Americans has developed substantially, particularly in the last two decades. In the recent history of archaeology as a discipline, many collaborative efforts have tended to relate primarily to consultation. NAGPRA requires archaeologists and museum employees to make inventories available to descendant communities, requiring a basic amount of communication or consultation. When archaeologists deal with NAGPRA’s legislation as it applies to unexcavated sites on federal land, a basic amount of consultation is required as well.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, established by the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, also mandates consultation, particularly in its most recent plan (ACHP 2010). Historic properties with cultural or religious significance to Native groups are recognized in coordination among federal and tribal officials, in an effort to respect tribal sovereignty that extends beyond site- or project-specific consultation in the context of NAGPRA. Of course, federal consultation only occurs among groups who are federally recognized, limiting the efficacy of this approach in terms of a broader appreciation of historical significance.

Joe Watkins, an archaeologist and a Choctaw Indian, has written extensively about the duality of his position and Native identity (2000, 2003b). Besides focusing on Indigenous archaeologists and the ethics of archaeology, he discusses the politics of, and access to the past. He refers to the ways national legislation, including the National Historic Preservation Act (which includes Section 106, relevant to many CRM jobs) and
NAGPRA have affirmed the United States as stakeholders for all cultural resources, regardless of ancestors (2005). These types of legislation, while they have certainly advanced civil rights for many tribes, have also privileged archaeologists as protectors of cultural resources, as they so often are recognized in the context of archaeological sites (Watkins 2005). Cultural resource management, when it revolves around the specifications of such legislation, continues a trend of scientific colonialism (see Zimmerman 2001). It is therefore important for archaeologists to step outside the limits of what the law considers cultural, and expand our definition of what it means to manage or protect such resources. The breadth of the past, as it may be possible to study from an anthropological perspective rooted in collaboration, has the potential for infinitely complex and interesting meanings.

For archaeologists working with Native Americans, it is important to be able to engage in relevant communication about the past. Being able to have respectful dialogue about meaning in the past is important not only because we wish to be academic experts on material culture, but because the federal government in fact accepts our authority. Conversation also occurs within the context of corroboration, when archaeologists work with tribal representatives seeking federal recognition. In the extended form of the criteria for federal acknowledgement, a tribe may have been identified as such “by anthropologists, historians, and/or other scholars” (Bureau of Indian Affairs 2008). However, while the legislation accepts the word of anthropologists as expert witnesses, a dialogue about the past may be mutually beneficial. Lewis Binford once said that “archaeologists have no informants” (1987); however, stakeholder communities can contribute important information to archaeological interpretations.
Dialogue about the past is especially important in an effort to step out of the bounds of academia and toward a conversation that offers sight of the meaningful nature of the archaeological record. As Russ Handsman and Trudie Lamb Richmond point out, “the language of scientific analysis and interpretation is so dehumanized that it becomes easy to forget that the archaeological record represents the memories and heritages of living people” (1995:99). Indeed, what we publish may contribute to a Western conception of the past if we do not incorporate the present day. The importance of developing and respecting tribal histories lies in the recognition that “such histories are about living peoples and ongoing communities” (Howe 2002:171). Richard Bradley neatly summarizes an argument made by Shanks and Tilley (1987) in which they critique the way archaeologists contribute to and perpetuate a Western idea of time by creating and using chronologies (1991). Shanks and Tilley also suggest that this chronological abstraction of time is irrelevant to archaeologists and people, differentiating a substantial, or human time, in which the past is marked by experience, and people “understand their world by referring to tradition” (Bradley 1991:209).

A relevant example to the importance of considering various interpretations of the past is the Rashomon effect. In order to show the difficulty in representing past events, Karl Heider calls upon the work of director Akira Kurosawa. In Kurosawa’s 1950 film “Rashomon,” the story unfolds of an ill-fated encounter among a bandit, a woman, and her husband, narrated from their various perspectives, as well as that of an observing woodcutter. Heider likens the variation of these perspectives to the complexities and disagreements that may arise from ethnographic work. Heider discusses these differences to highlight an important aspect of the work of anthropologists: “ethnographies are
made, not found” (1988:73). Anthropologists construct differing views of culture from the perspective of engaged, interested parties that reflect their own biases, mistakes, and diverse experiences (Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). This is an important point for archaeology as well; although excavating material culture may seem like discovery, archaeological interpretation is indeed a construction of the past. Hollowell and Nicholas point out that interpretations may differ based on various research objectives, theoretical approaches, and methodologies (2008). The different perspectives that made the true story of “Rashomon” a mystery are similar to various interpretations of the past, which may be equally meaningful without proving definitive.

As we have seen, for many people, history and memory are inextricably linked (see also Hamilton and Shopes 2008). However, the idea of memory does not quite fit into the seven mandatory criteria for federal acknowledgement according to the BIA. These criteria do have in common a sense of the importance of continuity, and also draw upon norms mentioned by Appadurai, including authority and interdependence, albeit in regards to documentation. That is, the BIA recognizes the historical record as an appropriate authority on the past, and depends upon the continuous upkeep of records to judge that past. However, the federal approach to understanding the past is not mitigated by attempts at reaching Appadurai’s idea of cultural consensus or the use of an ethnographically informed sensitivity. Having to deal with these unilaterally presented criteria does not necessarily align with the traditional sense of the past that I have discussed, and for the archaeologist attempting to engage in working relationships with stakeholder communities, there is a potential to navigate a very difficult situation. Reference to the past according to the Bureau of Indian Affairs involves continuity in a
much more rigid sense, disregarding aspects such as the meaning of the landscape and instead focusing on the completeness of a prescribed timeline.

For the anthropologist or archaeologist, it is important to recognize and carry on the traditions of tribal histories without transposing tradition into a Western chronological view of the past. In the context of postcolonial theory, several scholars have written about the need for an approach to deconstructing notions of cultural difference in order to make our understandings of Native American history useful and relevant (Liebmann 2008; Handsman and Richmond 1995; Silliman 2001, 2005, 2009). Handsman and Richmond suggest that archaeologists are uniquely positioned to be able to map and present the cultural landscapes of Native American ancestral communities in a way that mediates the stories the general public might expect to hear, and the stories descendant communities wish to tell (1995:115). As our work relates the lives of people in the past to living peoples, we may address questions about cultural differences.

**a. The Nipmuc: Federal Recognition Issues and Archaeology**

This section will explore the ways a non-recognized tribe in New England engages with historical and archaeological research. For the Nipmuc tribe of Massachusetts, an active focus at the end of the twentieth century had been on achieving federal recognition from the United States government. The Nipmuc originated from people inhabiting Central New England, the root of their name meaning “fresh water people.” The documented history of the Nipmuc ancestors begins at the time during which Europeans began trading with Native tribes (Bragdon 1996). According to post-contact documents, English settlement in the Nipmuc area was in Lancaster in 1643, and
a second settlement was attempted in 1662 in Mendon (Connole 2001). The tribal offices of Nipmuc Nation are now located in South Grafton, MA, and they maintain the very small Hassanamisco Indian Reservation in Grafton, MA.

Rae Gould is a member of Nipmuc Nation who acts as the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), a title she has held for over ten years (Gould personal communication). She is also a PhD candidate at the University of Connecticut and currently a visiting instructor of anthropology at Connecticut College. At this point, her role as THPO allows her to delegate responsibilities to others, but she is recognized as the authoritative voice for potentially sensitive archaeological sites in Nipmuc territory. Much like State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) who are responsible for general resources falling under Section 106 of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, THPOs were granted formal responsibilities for preservation on tribal land, including reservations and other territories. However, the 1992 Amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act in fact only grants these responsibilities to federally recognized tribes.

The Nipmuc initially worked together with the Chaubunagungamaug band of Nipmuck to produce an original petition for federal recognition in 1980, but broke apart in 1996 (Gould personal communication). For tribes in New England, federal recognition is based mainly on evidence from the post-contact period. Often, the focus is on whether a tribe can “demonstrate convincing evidence that the tribe has maintained community” in the last 100 years (Gould personal communication).

Federal recognition battles have ultimately been extremely disappointing for the Nipmuc. On June 18, 2004, the BIA rejected both tribes in their final determination
The Principal Deputy Assistant Interior Secretary of Indian Affairs in office during the George W. Bush Administration, Aurene Martin, signed the BIA's findings, which declared that out of seven criteria necessary to receive federal recognition, Nipmuc Nation failed to meet four (Adams 2004). Despite Massachusetts state recognition, support from state government, and years of researching for the petition, the tribe has sadly been denied many rights that would be granted upon federal recognition. Gould, who served as a member of the federal recognition research team, described the rejection of the Nipmuc petition as heartbreaking (personal communication). She believes that the decisions made by the government are as much political as they are about the facts of tribal belonging. The rejection of Nipmuc Nation's petition would likely not have been changed based on what was presented, but perhaps to whom they presented their document; that is, Gould's doctoral degree may not have made a difference to the BIA, but officials assembled during a different administration may have responded differently (Gould personal communication).

In spite of these disappointments in the realm of politics, Gould's career path as a tribal archaeologist has afforded her opportunities to forge alliances with other professionals in the fields of archaeology and museum curation, helping the Nipmuc to "maintain a place as a tribal entity," which is of increased importance due to the denial of federal acknowledgement (Gould personal communication). Today, she is contacted for consultation about Native archaeological sites throughout much of central and western Massachusetts and into northwestern Rhode Island and northeastern Connecticut (Gould personal communication). Although the role of a THPO as described by the federal government and the amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act would limit
Indigenous authority over significant sites, Gould continues to play an important role in New England archaeology. Limiting THPO work to reservated areas for federally acknowledged tribes alone continues to perpetuate the stipulations of the federal government, which are rooted in politics rather than in cultural significance.

Gould is particularly interested in historical archaeology, by which she means archaeology of Native Americans after European contact. One reason for this preference is that the requirements for recognition petitions focus on the most recent 350 years of history, meaning that pre-contact archaeology does not play a role in answering questions about the generations in question. Historical archaeology offers the possibility for research to demonstrate convincing evidence that a tribal community has been maintained (Gould personal communication).

If progressive Native author Devon Mihesuah “is leading the charge in decolonizing American research on Indigenous communities” in the spirit of Vine Deloria Jr. (Lewis 2003), I would suggest that Rae Gould is similarly navigating an archaeological movement in the tradition of Joe Watkins. Watkins, one of the first Native Americans to receive a PhD in archaeology, has often discussed the need for Indigenous Archaeology (see Watkins 2000, 2005). Gould believes that being both a tribal representative and an archaeological scholar allows her to “walk in both worlds,” acknowledging the importance of being “politically savvy” and progressive, while maintaining traditional values (Gould personal communication). She became an archaeologist herself because she didn’t want a non-Native running things, and feels that training the next generation of tribal members is imperative to the future of Native archaeology. As a Native archaeologist, Gould is in a particular position to forge
alliances with other professional archaeologists, helping the Nipmuc to “maintain a place as a tribal entity” even while lacking federal recognition (Gould personal communication).
IV. Successful Collaborations

This section will especially focus on the types of collaborative work that have gone beyond consultation or corroboration, incorporating a holistic approach to working with descendant communities that informs all aspects of the research. I will touch on a few ways in which collaborative efforts have been mutually beneficial, relate diverse theories of time and continuity to the problems inherent in federal politics, and attempt to round up some suggestions for working with tribal groups in a consistently holistic and respectful manner that addresses federal recognition status, but it not defined by it. Archaeologists who have worked with the Narragansett will provide a relevant case study for the development of collaborative efforts in New England archaeology. This section will close with a case study of Virginia, where various tribes have been involved with archaeology even as they await decisions related to federal recognition.

a. Active and Activist Archaeologies

If the structure of archaeology as a discipline and its place in the world of academia remains unaddressed, we privilege not only ourselves as archaeologists and scholars, but also the knowledge we produce, as if it were better informed or more meaningful because we have had access to material culture of the past. However, this should not make us authorities on the past. I believe that the most important step to innovate the archaeological voice is through collaborative work. As we have seen, some collaboration occurs primarily as limited consultation, required by law. It should instead be seen as a moral imperative, required to be a responsible archaeologist.
One way to do collaborative work among diverse individuals, communities, and representatives, is to take an interdisciplinary approach to the historic record. Historical archaeology, by its nature as a discipline, draws upon materials beyond the archaeological record and material culture, lending diverse sources a sense of authority as defined by Appadurai. An explicit approach to making conversations among disciplines has been described by Wendy Beck and Margaret Somerville concerning their research in Yarrawarra, at an Aboriginal Australian site (2005). Thinking in an interdisciplinary way led the researchers at Yarrawarra to collaborate on a grand scale. For example, the conversation on the project focused on such issues as which areas of the site to work on (Beck et al. 2005:233). This made an explicit change in the archaeological methodology being employed on site, by shifting the focus away from typical research questions toward what the collaborating partners found interesting, making the meaningfulness of the past a first priority.

Archaeologists Julie Hollowell and George Nicholas review the uses and meanings of ethnography in collaborative archaeology (2008). They suggest that challenges may arise concerning the equity of working relationships related to the research process and associated resources, as well as efforts to respect diverse ways of interpreting or knowing the past. Nevertheless, archaeologists today must be actively aware of their part in cultural (re)production (Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). In one example cited by Hollowell and Nicholas, archaeologist Mark Warner and others are invited by the Miami Nation to explore issues raised by research done within the community (see 2008:71-73). In this instance, the research question is driven by the community, and within the framework of their own tribal history. In another example,
archaeologist Katherine Dowdall worked with Kashaya Pomo Otis Parrish in a project that attempted a hybridized approach to cultural resource management that maintained archaeological methodology while incorporating an ethnographic awareness of Kashaya worldview (Hollowell and Nicholas 2008:71; 84-85). These collaborations worked because the participants, including the ethnographically informed archaeologists, were able to come to a “cultural consensus” as described by Appadurai.

In the current age of archaeology as a humanistic, anthropological endeavor, scholars have recognized archaeology as not only being affected by political biases (e.g. Franklin 1997), but as political action itself. Both Randall McGuire (2008) and Barbara Little (2007b) have contributed to the literature on making archaeology relevant through actively politicizing its role in making the past meaningful. Incorporating collaboration with Indigenous groups is a way to actively engage with and make many voices heard.

The archaeological world has taken an active interest, notably in recent years, in themes of multivocality, publishing and taking part in symposia on issues of alternative interpretations of the past (e.g. Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Kerber 2006, Silliman 2008). Alternate approaches to interpretation can be rooted in various theoretical stances of archaeology, but may also derive from non-archaeological meanings of the past. In the development of modern archaeology, the inclusion of various interpretations by way of multivocality offers an important opportunity for inclusive and comprehensive narratives. Appadurai’s element of interdependence is also relevant here, as relations between multiple views of the past are considered. Thus,
collaboration is not only about producing alternative histories, it is about alternative production itself.

Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T.J. Ferguson focus on methods of engagement: how to initiate involvement, and utilize a spectrum of strategies that are most useful for various situations (2008). They suggest that the process is part of a continuum, where although different projects demand diverse goals and needs, all archaeological work may be similarly moving “toward a more accurate, inclusive, and ethically sound practice” (2008:2). The publications mentioned here by no means represent all of the scholarly contributions concerning collaborative work, but the prevalence of active engagement is clearly a common trend.

Ultimately, the importance of a review of this literature is to consider various applications of collaborative tools that have been employed in cases where a particular tribe is not federally recognized. What stake do tribal representatives hold over sites with which they may identify cultural affiliations if they are not federally recognized? Although collaboration perhaps developed as an outgrowth of legally mandated consultation, I believe that archaeologists have moved beyond the minimal requirements of NAGPRA and Section 106 to embrace the benefits of working cooperatively. In some cases, the issue of corroboration pursuant to establishing federal recognition is not applicable for tribes that have previously received or been denied recognition, as discussed in the instance of the Nipmuc. But these political issues still deeply affect the climate of conversations surrounding archaeological work. It is the continuing goal of responsible collaboration to engage with many voices to reach consensus about the past.
In Stephen Silliman's work on the archaeology of Native Americans in the colonial era, he strives to show how the arrival of European colonists in North America did not mark a point of culture contact and subsequent acculturation (2001, 2005). Rather, he points out the continuing agency of Native American communities, for example in the choices they made concerning the adoption of new materials and the continued use of traditional materials (2001). He uses the term colonialism rather than contact or culture contact to make explicit the processes of attempted domination by the colonizer, resistance by the colonized, and negotiation of identity overall (2005:57-59).

Silliman's attention to agency and identity might be expanded upon through the work of Bruno Latour, a French sociologist. Latour is perhaps best known for his contributions to the discussion on actor-network theory, which is focused on the ways actors connect materials with meaning. He also focuses on the ways all people are interacting with others, referring specifically to an especially human complexity in terms of "constant attention to others' actions" (1996:228-229). Because of the universality of human interaction, Latour attempts to problematize the way we assume simultaneity of time and place. Because we humans wear clothing of a certain style, inhabit buildings and cities previously designed and built, and depend on language that has been in use since long before our given conversation, Latour points out that the people we interact with are in fact products of history themselves (1996:231). This aspect of complexity means that the networks of our interactions extend well into the past, with meanings continually unfolding in the present. However, these historicized objects, accounts, and calculations help link us to other actors in the past (Latour 1996:233). Not only do
materials have specific meanings, they allow us to generally find commonality and relationship on a larger human scale. For archaeologists, this has clear implications for the importance of the material record and the embedded meanings of objects. In this sense, the choices made by individuals in the colonial period, as Silliman discusses, hold meaning in a way that connects colonial Native Americans with pre-contact Native Americans, and even to modern descendant communities.

Silliman (2009) has recently sought to problematize the dichotomy between change and continuity that he feels has been established in Native American archaeology. He calls on archaeologists to be “sensitive to the social memories of past actors” in our interpretations and representations of the past (2009:227). He draws upon his work on the Eastern Pequot reservation of Connecticut, which has been continuously inhabited since 1683, in order to show the interrelationship between change and continuity. The highlight of his conclusion extends beyond the ways archaeologists might reconceptualize continuity to the political implications on “the commonsense notions of mainstream US social memory that ‘remembers’ – selectively, politically – what an Indian should and should not look like” (2009:227). It is important to recognize that the incorporation of modern material items do not mean that Native Americans are becoming less Indian (2009). Rather, there is an aspect of cultural continuity, in which the past has meaning, connecting communities to their ancestral pasts.

Silliman’s disapproval of what he refers to as mainstream American memory brings to mind the work of Michel-Rolph Trouillot and his critique of the Western discourse on time. In Silencing the Past, which is largely focused on the events of the
Haitian Revolution and the significance of historical narratives, Trouillot criticizes the way Westerners favor defining a moment in time over the historicity and the meaning of process. The way events are indexed cements them in a timeline: “the isolation of a single moment thus creates a historical ‘fact’ ” (Trouillot 1997:113). In some ways, perhaps this isolation is in an effort to prevent the confusion of the messy complexity of history (Trouillot 1997:107). He uses the example of Columbus’ arrival in the Bahamas and our modern celebration of Columbus Day in October to show how denuding a moment of its context empowers the event and avoids surrounding controversy. The main problem, Trouillot suggests, is that to specify a moment in time trivializes the process, ignoring the continuous flow of time and fitting blinders to certain events (1997:118).

Cultural continuity should not preclude the notion of modernity. The idea of “since time immemorial” often arises in conversations and literature on the processes of deciding cultural affiliation or federal recognition (von Gernet 1994; Wiseman 2001; also see Liebmann 2008). But this does not imply that Native Americans have not changed. Being able to engage in collaborative efforts based on a mutual understanding of the complexities of time should prevent the idea of continuity from seeming static; rather, the past becomes increasingly dynamic in the myriad contexts in which it is drawn upon in a meaningful way in the present. Thus far, this section has offered several examples for applying more holistic, de-colonialized approaches to conversations concerning the past in the context of Native American archaeology. If archaeology is to be useful as a tool for understanding the past, we must consider diverse interpretations and applications of the past.
c. The Narragansett

The archaeological site RI-1000 in North Kingstown, Rhode Island, is a Narragansett Indian burial ground from the mid-17th century (Turnbaugh 1984). Native archaeologist Rae Gould described the site as having a particular influence on the development of engaged archaeology throughout southern New England. When the burial ground was excavated in the early 1980s, a variety of materials were recovered as grave goods, including Native shell beads and wampum, along with European items like glass and brass beads and buttons, tools, hardware, and smoking pipes, and items made or modified by the Narragansett from raw European materials (Turnbaugh 1984). While this site may contribute many interesting interpretations of colonial Native culture (see Rubertone 1989 for a discussion of evidence for the continuity of Narragansett tribal authority), it is equally important for the example it upheld concerning the archaeological heritage of New England.

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act initiated and encouraged cooperative work among state historic preservation offices and other agencies, organizations, and Indian tribes. This act was echoed by the 1974 passage of the Antiquities Act of Rhode Island. Archaeologists within the state recognized that the best approach to preservation and study of historic sites “is by working with the many ‘publics’ that use them and have interests in them,” (Robinson and Taylor 2000: 109). In the 1970s, the Rhode Island Historic Preservation and Heritage Commission began to develop a relationship based on the responsible notification of tribal authorities during significant archaeological excavations (Robinson and Taylor 2000). Importantly, the Narragansett burial ground excavations strengthened the partnership, as archaeologists
and tribal members cooperated to keep the burial ground from being lost to a private development project (Robinson et al. 1985).

The Narragansett were recognized through the BIA in 1983. The formation of the Narragansett Anthropological-Archaeological Committee in 1987 is a significant institutionalization of tribal members and archaeologists as a partnership with a "shared resolve to protect burial places" (Robinson and Taylor 2000: 115). Members of this committee also focus on maintaining a continuous history of the Narragansett. At public meetings, the connection between modern Narragansett and their three thousand year old ancestors is expressed (Robinson 2000).

The value of the working relationship that was initiated during the era of the RI-1000 project continues to be reflected in the way Native history and research is valued. At the Tomaquag Indian Memorial Museum, a cultural museum run by Narragansett tribal members, the emphasis on education is apparent throughout. Located in Exeter, Rhode Island, near the Narragansett Tribal Offices in Charlestown, the museum's mission statement focuses on public education of Narragansett history and

*Figure 2: The Tomaquag Museum*
culture as well as Indigenous issues of today (Tomaquag website). As Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith suggests, “the old colonial adage that knowledge is power is taken seriously in indigenous communities” (1999:16).

Loren Spears, the Executive Director at the Tomaquag Museum, is also the principal and director of the Nuweetooun School next door. The Nuweetooun School is the only Native school in southern New England, and aims to empower the youth of Narragansett Nation in grades K-8 by developing historical knowledge through “culture based education” (Tomaquag website). The involvement of the community's youth is visible throughout the museum. At a computer station, a program is linked to a project developed at the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian. Narragansett students were invited to the NMAI to work with artifacts specifically associated with Narragansett culture, many of which had been collected by archaeologists. The students were able to use imaging software to bring three dimensional images of these cultural pieces to the computer screen, where they can be manipulated in space by the computers' users. Next to each image, there is a short piece of writing by students with their name and age, explaining the meaning of each object to their tribal history; an explanation informed by anthropological knowledge as well as the cultural knowledge that is central to their education.

Narragansett students also have access to archaeological collections stored at the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center. According to Kate April, a historian and genealogist who currently works with the Narragansett, a number of Narragansett students have taken the initiative to access their cultural heritage collections, and archaeology is considered as a career goal to continue working with artifacts. “For
the Narragansetts, archaeological sites are tangible symbols of a long and enduring Indian history” (Robinson and Taylor 2000:116).

The central focus of the main display room at the Tomaquag is a recreation of a historical Narragansett village, surrounded by palisades, which was constructed by a teenage graduate of the Nuweetoooun School. It is explained in the museum that decision to show the village in the post-contact era has been informed by archaeology. For Northeastern tribes, palisades have been found to be associated specifically with defensive Native villages after European contact (Snow 1994). This recreation may represent an interpretation of a historical struggle to protect Narragansett culture, a struggle which continues today.

Although the Narragansett were recognized by the federal government nearly three decades ago, issues relating to tribal sovereignty and the effects of the Rhode Island Indian Claims Settlement Act continue to drive Narragansett activism. The Settlement Act, passed in 1978, meant that Narragansett lands were subject to state jurisdiction (Adams 2005). The Smoke Shop Raid in 2003, when police entered a shop on tribal land, seizing its stock and arresting tribal officials in a violation of sovereign rights, is an infamous example of the ways the tribe feels it has been maligned by the state. In the spring of last year, Narragansetts took to the streets of Rhode Island’s capital, carrying a reading “Racism Does Exist – Ask the Narragansetts” (Abbott 2009). The march was organized in response to a Supreme Court case, which ruled that a tract of tribal land should be subject to state law, limiting the authority of the federal government. Although sovereignty issues remain at large, the work of tribal officials, including THPO John
Brown, to dismantle the Settlement Act once and for all gives hope to the tribe (Toensing 2008a).

Federal recognition politics affect the perceptions of the general public for both recognized and non-recognized tribes in New England. In the aforementioned instance of the Mashantucket Pequot, their financial successes have generated gaming-related debates over the ramifications of federal recognition for other tribes in the Northeast (see Harrington 2009). However, collaborative archaeological projects may offer an alternative to the static conceptions of Indianness held by federal policy and the public. For example, archaeologist Stephen Mrozowski and his colleagues have developed the Magunkaquog Project as an outgrowth of Rhode Island’s Public Archaeology Lab, representing a collaboration between archaeologists at the University of Massachusetts Boston and Nipmuc Nation. The project explores a “Praying Indian” community in Massachusetts, aiming to include a Native perspective on the historical period in reexamining popular perceptions of Native authenticity (Mrozowski et al. 2009).

Overall, the nature of collaborative archaeologies in New England represents a unique development toward recognition in a non-federal context. Archaeology of the colonial period may allow non-recognized tribes like the Nipmuc to explore and represent change and continuity within their community through research, and for recognized tribes like the Mashantucket Pequot or the Narragansett affirm and represent aspects of their past that they find to be particularly important to share. While the federal government relies on static notions of Indigeneity, Native agents like Rae Gould work in relatively new positions to mediate traditional histories with current research. As Appadurai
describes, archaeological interpretations borne out of collaboration among Native Americans, Native archaeologists, and non-Native scholars create a shared past, composed of the elements of the divergent pasts of various groups.

**d. The Future of Collaborative Archaeology in Virginia**

As was previously discussed, the politics of race have troubled Virginia Indians historically. The political situation for Virginia Native communities is unique on a nationwide scale. The significance of colonists' arrival at Jamestown and their interaction with members of the Powhatan confederacy is celebrated as a founding moment of America, indicating the importance of exchange. Notably, Governor Timothy Kaine of Virginia has spoken on behalf of Virginia Indians seeking federal recognition, acknowledging the entwined histories of English colonists and Native tribes. However, interactions related to current access to and management of cultural resources have been limited, due to minimal regulatory procedures (Jameson 2004; cf. Petraglia and Cunningham 2006) that could be established by federal acknowledgement of the eight tribes recognized by the state of Virginia.

Among Virginia’s state recognized tribes, those seeking federal recognition include the Chickahominy, Eastern Chickahominy, Mattaponi, Monacan, Nansemond, Pamunkey, Rappahannock, and Upper Mattaponi. Only the Mattaponi and Pamunkey retain reservation lands today, and are seeking recognition through the Federal Acknowledgement process. The remaining six tribes are awaiting a decision on a congressional act.
The Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act officially began development in the mid 1990s, when Native activist Thomasina Jordan made a personal appeal to Representative James Moran regarding federal recognition for Virginia Indians, which he introduced as legislation to the House of Representatives in 1999 (Dwyer 2007). Upon initial introduction to the House, the reactions of some legislators indicated that the quest for federal recognition would be a difficult struggle. During an early discussion of federal recognition legislation, several legislators “beat their desks like tom-toms and swung their arms in tomahawk chops” while delegates from the Rappahannock Tribe of Virginia watched from the public balcony (Timberg 1999). This unsettling and unenlightened display was perhaps indirectly representative of lawmakers’ feelings on passing the legislation at hand. Later, in the fall of 2002, Bush administration officials give testimony on Capitol Hill opposing the recognition of Nansemond and 5 others, saying that recognition would bypass the standard review process underway by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Metro 2002).

In The Senate, slightly more enthusiastic support for the bill was garnered, perhaps related to the timely coincidence of the 400th Anniversary Commemoration at Jamestown. In 2007, Virginia Natives appeared at commemorative events (Schulte 2007a), met with George W. Bush (Schulte 2007b), and performed for British dignitaries (Hunsberger 2006). Senator Jim Webb and Governor Kaine of Virginia contributed their support for the federal recognition legislation; however, the legislation died on the Senate floor in 2008.
After being reintroduced to the House by Representative Moran in the spring of 2009, Governor Kaine testified before the House Committee on Natural Resources, raising the issue of the inherent injustice related to the early relations between Virginia Indians and English colonists. As Kaine pointed out, Virginia's tribes face additional difficulties because “they signed peace treaties with the English before the United States existed” (Emerling 2009a). Not long after this testimony, the House unanimously passed the bill, and legislation was introduced to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, co-sponsored by Senator Webb and Senator Mark Warner. Since October 2009, the bill has passed out of committee and awaits a decision.

While many Virginia Indians await a congressional decision, the Pamunkey and Mattaponi have chosen to seek recognition through the BIA. This section will focus especially on the Pamunkey. The Pamunkey maintain the oldest Indian reservation in the United States, and have treaties with the English dating to 1646 and 1677. The remains of Powhatan are said to be buried on the Pamunkey reservation, and there is also a cultural museum open to the public.

Archaeology may offer Virginia Natives a way to address public perceptions of their own history. Jeffrey Hantman is an archaeologist who has experienced the difficulties of recognition politics in his work with the Monacan Indian Nation of central and western Virginia. Recognizing issues with indigeneity the East Coast, where Native Virginians encounter the misconception that ‘real’ Indians only survived in the West, Hantman calls for a collaborative approach to documenting identity and history (2004:20). He describes meeting with the Tribe “shortly after official and public
affirmation of their identity had occurred,” that is, after the Monacan were recognized by the state of Virginia in 1989 (Hantman 2005:31). Based on a belief that “cultures have a right to author their own histories,” Hantman and his colleagues endeavored to work cooperatively with the Monacan (Hantman et al. 2000:56). Calling attention to the Monacan community’s active approach to being in public view and raise awareness about their own history, Hantman has worked with the Monacan on archaeological projects, as well as the development of tourist attractions at Virginia’s Natural Bridge, and an archaeological museum exhibit, which was embraced by the community as a way to provide a counter-narrative to colonial histories (2004, 2005). Importantly, the Monacan historical narrative was able to incorporate archaeology and ethnohistory in a production that developed the narrative of their own deep history (Hantman 2005).

Several Pamunkey tribal members also engage with historical narratives through archaeology. Jeff Brown is a member of the Pamunkey tribe and a tribal councilman who identifies as “a Native field technician” (Time Team America biography). He began his involvement with archaeology during the King William Reservoir Project, which prompted concerns about the treatment of his ancestral lands. The Reservoir Project is an extensive cultural resource management effort in Virginia’s coastal area, and has been largely opposed. Virginia Indians specifically protest the Reservoir on the grounds that the placement of a reservoir would violate terms set in the 1677 treaty, endanger fishing systems, and disturb many potentially sensitive archaeological sites. Approaching excavations and development moved many to action.
After being “bit hard by the archaeology bug,” Jeff Brown participated in excavations at Werowocomoco (Time Team America biography) and served as the Virginia Indian Advisory Board representative for the Pamunkey concerning the project (Atkins personal communication). He says the work at Werowocomoco hooked him on archaeology, and he has since participated in many archaeological projects. Excavations at Werowocomoco drew attention from many due to its importance as a historical site. At the time of English contact, it was the political center of the Powhatan chiefdom. Located on the coastal plains of the York River, it is a village dating from the 13th century through contact. Artifacts related to residential life including non-local ceramics and trade copper have been recovered (Gallivan 2010), making the archaeology of Werowocomoco an important source of information about what life was like at the time of contact between Natives and English.

Werowocomoco is also a noteworthy site for the Werowocomoco Research Group’s emphasis on community engagement. Native collaboration was included at every stage of the research design, from informing the Virginia Council on Indians of the probable identification of the site, to excavation and community outreach (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007). Werowocomoco Research Group members Martin Gallivan and Danielle Moretti-Langholtz place a particular importance on the use of archaeological research to “challenge the restrictive narratives under which Native history is often subsumed” (2007:55). Describing the post-contact history of the Virginia Tidewater region, which involves the more recent racial issues already discussed here, Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz identify a detrimental historical narrative, which implies that Natives no longer inhabit Virginia. The master narratives of colonial Virginia
include Jamestown as the birthplace of America and democracy, and as a place of “cultural encounter,” narratives which “risk marginalizing the voices and histories of the people and cultures that were not free to participate in this democracy in 1619, or for centuries after that” (Hantman 2008: 223). Using Appadurai’s dimensions of the past, a framework for reasserting Native historical narratives emerges through the collaborative work at Werowocomoco.

Firstly, authority on the past is no longer based in historical tropes that consider Indians to be extinct. Native representatives are asked for opinions on the research design and Pamunkey representatives on site discuss the ongoing excavation with visitors and the press (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007), showing that their voices are considered credible sources. Secondly, the dimension of continuity which links the past with authority is evident in researchers’ goals to offer “Virginia Indians an opportunity to reconnect with the past” (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007:49). Finally, depth and interdependence are apparent in the project’s efforts to privilege the Native history of the early colonial period over the familiar stories of English settlement. Native advisory board members have been active proponents of shifting away from colonial narratives favoring Jamestown (Gallivan et al. 2009). Yet, relating the past of Werowocomoco to concurrent colonial events evidently offered a useful point of departure for public interest. Although press coverage often focused on John Smith’s interactions with Pocahontas (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007), the public interest may have been piqued by the visible interdependence between a familiar romanticized story and the history being revived of Natives at Werowocomoco. Importantly, access that may have
been assisted by our shared framework for viewing the past allowed present day Natives to tell their stories and remind the public of their continuation in Virginia.

Other researchers involved with the Werowocomoco project include Ashley Atkins, a Pamunkey tribal member who is currently a doctoral student in the Anthropology Department at The College of William and Mary. For Atkins, archaeology was a part of her childhood. When spending time on the Pamunkey Reservation, artifacts could be spotted everywhere. She ultimately realized that an emphasis on and interest in material culture could become her career (Atkins personal communication). She developed an interest in historical archaeology when she participated in her first professional archaeological project at the Werowocomoco archaeological field school in the summer of 2005. This project especially caught her attention because of the importance that had been placed on Native consultation and collaboration. Not only were Virginia Indians directly involved in the project, but many local tribal members would visit, bringing a unique perspective to the activity on site. Importantly, the presence of Atkins and Brown at the site helped to make the connection between the descendant community and their ancestors clear, drawing more people to the site with an increased level of comfort (Atkins personal communication).

The lack of documentation concerning Native people from the late 17th century into the historic period also drove Atkins’ interest in working as a historical archaeologist. She is developing her own research project with plans to excavate on the Pamunkey reservation, using archaeology as the tool to discover more about the historic time period. She plans to emphasize collaboration on every level, involving tribal
members in the excavation and the interpretation processes (Atkins personal communication). The site she has in mind has been previously tested, turning up artifacts including European trade goods and Native items, and Atkins is interested in discussing the “evidence of survival and persistence” of her tribe within the politicized historic period of Virginia (personal communication). This is particularly relevant to the politics of federal recognition, as the requirements as established by the BIA require demonstration of continuity. Atkins sees the archaeological record as ideal evidence that Indianess is not being lost throughout her tribe’s history – Pamunkey people may change over time, but the material evidence shows that they are literally surviving as a people (personal communication).

Collaborative archaeology and especially Native archaeology is a way to retell history, to make substantive connections, and offer a perspective on Native history set apart from the requirements of bureaucracy. Atkins is another representative of an important growing community of Native archaeologists, like Gould and Watkins. With the theoretical framework of Appadurai in mind, it becomes clear that Native archaeologists are essential candidates for making connections between archaeological excavation and stakeholder communities, as well as making connections between the past and present.
Conclusion

This paper has made evident some of difficulties in reconciling divergent views on the past, particularly in the context of the political and historical problems of federal recognition, an unavoidable aspect of stakeholder communities’ access to heritage. Unfortunately, the federal recognition criteria rely on a politicized definition of Indianness which ignores Native concepts of the past. Collaborative archaeological projects that encompass cultural sensitivity are an important tool for bringing together various views of the past.

First it is necessary for contemporary archaeological projects to begin with an understanding of this political background and knowledge of issues related to the criteria for federal recognition presented by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As was discussed in this paper, many collaborative archaeological projects have developed as expansions on legally mandated consultation in the context of NAGPRA or the ACHP and Section 106. However, collaboration of this nature is only required when archaeologists encounter federally recognized groups. If collaborative archaeologies were limited only to issues validated by the federal government, the possibilities for a responsible and multivocal approach to understanding the past would be severely limited.

Although the federal government includes some common dimensions of time as identified by Appadurai in the BIA criteria, including authority, continuity, and interdependence, there is a regrettable lack of an attempt to reach a cultural consensus. In the words of Fabian, the federal government does not coeval with traditional Native concepts of time. This does not mean, however, that archaeologists cannot actively
approach a framework that successfully incorporates an ethnographic understanding of Native histories.

Through all of this, Appadurai’s dimensions of the past emerge as valuable tools for approaching productive collaboration. Importantly, Appadurai’s framework helps to establish a way for groups to talk about themselves, rather than simply among themselves. This is incredibly relevant for Native Americans who wish to counter mainstream conceptions of their history and what it means to be Indian, as in the examples of the Pamunkey’s involvement with the Werowocomoco research group (Gallivan and Moretti-Langholtz 2007), or the Miami Nation’s invitation to archaeologists to explore questions raised by the community (Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). It is also crucial for archaeologists who wish to express an ethnographic awareness of the stakeholder communities they work with.

The historical archaeology of Native Americans offers a unique means toward effective collaboration and an important alternative to politically defined notions of indigeneity. Ethnographically informed archaeologists are well positioned within academia to approach a new framework for meaningful collaboration with Native groups that relies on reaching cultural consensus. Although some archaeologists have struggled with including different types of histories in their survey or interpretation of the past, as described in the recent debate over oral traditions, it is possible to come to an agreement on the past, especially via Appadurai’s linked dimensions of authority and continuity. Finding continuity or linkages among authorities, or various sources on the past, is fundamental to making archaeological projects relevant today.
As Appadurai points out, the “past that is shared;” that is, the past that all interested parties come to agree upon “stands in a delicate relationship to the ‘pasts’ that are held dear by distinct groups” (1981:216). The understanding is not that archaeology describes a past that could otherwise be lost, but rather is an important supplement to a richer expression of the past, and may be used as a tool to represent a dynamic history to various audiences. In the work of Rae Gould, Jeff Brown, and Ashley Atkins, they use archaeology to express “a place as a tribal entity” (Gould personal communication), and demonstrate the continuity of their tribal communities, countering the concept of continuity narrowly defined by the BIA. For the Nipmuc, as a non-recognized tribe, and the Pamunkey and other Virginia tribes who await decisions on recognition, collaborative archaeologies offer an important framework within which tribal histories are recognized as valid, critical to our overall understanding of the past.
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