## **UCLA**

# **American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

### **Title**

Historical Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration: Discovering Histories That Have Futures. By D. Rae Gould, Holly Herbster, Heather Law Pezzarossi, and Stephen A. Mrozowski.

### **Permalink**

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/99952672

## **Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 44(4)

### **ISSN**

0161-6463

### **Author**

Warner, Mark S.

### **Publication Date**

2020-09-01

# **Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/</a>

Coming provide the cultural contexts and mores in which Eva Mirabal lived her life that are so often missing and/or inadequately considered in other Studio artist biographies. The book provides a model of scholarly partnership and future biographical work, evident in the choice of language and the careful and sensitive discussions of delicate personal subjects and the avoidance of other more private information.

Bruce Bernstein
Coe Center for the Arts

Historical Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration: Discovering Histories That Have Futures. By D. Rae Gould, Holly Herbster, Heather Law Pezzarossi, and Stephen A. Mrozowski. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2020. 224 pages. \$85.00 cloth; \$89.25 electronic.

I was contacted to review this book three weeks after the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Both at the meeting and in the preceding months, many archaeologists were embroiled in a controversy over a biological anthropologist's position that Indigenous understandings of the world should be considered as secondary to "scientific objectivity." In the wake of that meeting, it was a great relief to read Historical Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration: Discovering Histories That Have Futures, a book that stands in opposition to that perspective. While it is coincidental that the book was published at the time of this controversy and not the authors' intent to write a de facto rebuttal to that perspective, their work does stand as a compelling counter-narrative. Historical Archaeology and Indigenous Collaboration presents archaeologists, historians, and communities with a working model for building sustained collaboration with Indigenous communities.

More importantly, however, this book should compel archaeologists to examine their actions critically in developing collaborative projects. To summarize, the book is the culmination of more than twenty years of archaeological excavations on multiple sites associated with the Nipmuc Nation (located in what is today Massachusetts) covering roughly four hundred years from the 1600s to the present. This history also focuses on Nipmuc women, their leadership, and the centrality of their roles in Nipmuc heritage. The questions that guided the archaeologists exploring Nipmuc history herein are exactly the questions that *all* archaeologists should be asking in any archaeological project: "Have we sufficiently included indigenous knowledge, past and present, in our work? What ethical practices must be considered when working with tribal peoples? How do Native peoples in the twenty-first century think about identity and memory differently than Euroamerican descendants? And how can our work impact politics?" (23).

The book has eight chapters plus a brief and compelling foreword written by Cheryll Toney Holley, the Nipmuc Sonksq. There is much accomplished in this relatively short work (less than two hundred pages) and I note that it is written in a voice that makes the work accessible to interested audiences other than archaeologists.

Reviews 105

Indeed, I think the authors have hit the rhetorical "sweet spot" in their writing, as it is blissfully free of the descriptive minutiae into which archaeological writing so frequently falls. This is particularly important given that the archaeological data is voluminous, synthesizing well over 150,000 artifacts from the various excavations.

The first two chapters are largely introductory. The first chapter begins with three short vignettes of Nipmuc lives from the 1600s to 1800s. The accounts quickly draw the reader in but also illustrate a central theme, which is Nipmuc responses to Euro-American colonialism and maintaining Nipmuc identity. The chapter then outlines the multiple lines of inquiry used (oral, document-based and archaeological) and how each is employed to build a robustly collaborative framework for presenting Nipmuc histories and how the histories are integrated into modern-day Nipmuc lives. As the authors eloquently put it, "Our goal is not . . . to reconstruct the past on its own terms but rather as histories that have futures, some realized, others not, but continuing nevertheless up to the present" (4). Chapter 2 builds on that theme, synthesizing documentary and archaeological evidence to document continued linkage between the Nipmuc and the region and setting the context for more archaeologically focused discussions of Nipmuc history.

The core of the book is chapters 3 through 7, with each chapter summarizing data from particular excavations of Nipmuc sites. Chapters 3 and 4 present the archaeological and documentary findings of Magunkaquog, a seventeenth/early-eighteenth century "praying town." Chapter 5 summarizes Hassanamesit Woods, lands that housed several Nipmuc families in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, focusing in particular on households headed by five generations of Nipmuc women (Sarah Robins, Sarah Muckamaug, Sarah Burnee, Sarah "Boston" Phillips and Sarah Mary Walker), with the bulk of the narrative focusing on Sarah Burnee and Sarah Boston (circa 1740s–1830s). Chapters 6 and 7 explore the Cisco Homestead, which began to be occupied in the 1850s. More importantly, the building and surrounding lands today serve as the Hassanamisco Reservation and the homestead is in the process of being restored by the tribe for service as the Hassanamisco Indian Museum. These two chapters in particular highlight how the Nipmuc are deeply aware of the linkages between Nipmuc histories and Nipmuc futures, "that they were holding on to the physical representation not only of their past but also of the Nipmuc people's future" (167). The book ends with a brief chapter summarizing key issues that have crosscut the more than twenty years of archaeological and historical work (collaboration, women's leadership, centrality of place), and the continuing challenge of asserting Nipmuc identity.

Through one lens, this work is a story of loss, specifically the deleterious impact of four centuries of Euro-American colonialism. Indeed, the systematic whittling away of Nipmuc lands is a depressing undercurrent through much of the book. However, that is not really the book's message. Rather, it is an account of perseverance illustrating the complexities of identity and how the Nipmuc maintained Indigenous spaces despite persistent Euro-American encroachment. If there is a key message to be taken from this work, I suggest that readers look to the subtitle, "Discovering Histories That Have Futures." People continue to separate past from present all too frequently; the authors

of the book demonstrate that for the Nipmuc, the past, present, and future are intimately intertwined. This volume is important to anyone interested in Nipmuc history, but should be read by all archaeologists, not just historical archaeologists because it lays out how archaeologist can, and should, build long-term collaborative relationships with Indigenous communities. In providing an excellent, long-term example of collaboration to understand cultural landscapes and homeland, it is a model for decolonizing archaeology. Archaeology needs this book.

Mark S. Warner University of Idaho

A Journey to Freedom: Richard Oakes, Alcatraz, and the Red Power Movement. By Kent Blansett. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018. 408 pages. \$40 cloth; \$30.00 paper; \$68.00 electronic.

During the last decade and more, scholars have worked hard to rescue Red Power from the vast canopy of the American Indian Movement (AIM). It's a daunting task. AIM was led by loud, brash, charismatic, confrontational men who garnered mounds of media attention, often at the expense of other leaders and organizations. Whether elbowing other groups out of the way—as when the Trail of Broken Treaties evolved into a takeover of the BIA Building in Washington, DC—or transforming a local political dispute among Pine Ridge Reservation Lakotas into an international cause celèbre and a protracted, armed standoff with the feds at a site less symbolic than Wounded Knee—it was AIM that dominated headlines and drew the spotlight like few other protest groups and it soon came to dominate the Red Power historical narrative. This was only reinforced by a host of films (e.g. *Thunder Heart* and *Incident at Oglala*) and a slew of bestsellers by supporters (e.g., Peter Matthiessen, *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*) as well as prominent AIM members such as the recently departed Leonard Crow Dog, Russell Means, and Dennis Banks.

Of course, Red Power substantially predates AIM's early 1970s heyday and was far more wide-ranging and complex than a handful of famous events or a single organization could ever hope to represent. During the turn of the twenty-first century, scholars such as Paul Chaat Smith, Robert Warrior, Troy Johnson, Joan Nagle, and Duane Champagne moved beyond the AIM-centered stories, in part by focusing on the 1969–1971 occupation of Alcatraz. More recently, the likes of Sherry Smith, Paul McKenzie-Jones, Daniel Cobb, and Bradley Shreve have examined a broader time frame and more inclusive roster of activists, ideologies, organizations, tribal nations, places, protests, and achievements. Through his biography of Mohawk activist Richard Oakes, Kent Blansett augments earlier scholarship on the Alcatraz occupation and joins a recent batch of works that extend our understanding of Red Power beyond AIM and a handful of iconic protests.

Blansett rights pervasive errors, and establishes new and/or improved paradigms for understanding the past. His most interesting theoretical intervention is a redefinition

Reviews 107