8

Archaeology and Community Service Learning in the "Pioneer Valley"

ELIZABETH S. CHILTON AND SIOBHAN M. HART

Archaeologists at the University of Massachusetts Amherst have conducted field schools focusing on Native American history in the "Pioneer Valley" of western Massachusetts since the 1970s. While much of this teaching and research has attempted to benefit various—though often ill-defined—publics, only since 2004 has the field school and UMass Amherst archaeologists in general adopted an explicit community service learning (CSL) approach. This shift has fostered research priorities that build on community assets and strengthen collaborative partnerships by (1) challenging the historical erasure of Native American peoples in the middle Connecticut River Valley and (2) documenting and protecting archaeological sites and collections. In this chapter we report and reflect on recent CSL efforts; their positive outcomes for teaching, learning, and preservation; and the challenges we have faced in our efforts to integrate CSL pedagogy with archaeology, Native American history, and archaeological fieldwork.

Since its inception, the primary goal of the UMass Amherst Field School in Archaeology—and of the archaeology curriculum in general—has been to provide students with an understanding of the complexity of the past and its relationship to the present, as well as training in archaeological methods and interpretation. Beginning in 2003, the field school has also sought to make students sensitive to the ways that archaeologists can be more responsive to community partners and descendant communities. This effort has emerged from the field school's commitment to the theoretical principles of "critical archaeology" which began in the early 1980s (Gero et al 1983; Keene and Chilton 1995; Leone et al. 1987; Potter 1994). Critical archaeology involves (1) challenging hegemonic historical narratives by working with historically marginalized or "erased" peoples, such as Native Americans and African Americans, and (2) examining how archaeology contrib-

utes to or challenges historical hegemony (Keene and Chilton 1995; Lewis and Labrador 2006; Potter 1994). Critical archaeology was part of the larger post-processual critique in American archaeology. Post-processualism in North American archaeology—with its emphasis on multivocality—challenged archaeologists to consider the wider publics and stakeholders with interests in archaeology and the historical narratives that archaeological data are used to construct. Since the 1980s the post-processual critiques of mainstream practice and those articulated by feminists, combined with an increased sensitivity to professional ethics, an expansion of heritage management, and the development and exploration of postcolonial theory within anthropology and archaeology, have resulted in practical shifts in archaeology as well as changes in how it is taught and situated in higher education. Since the 1990s, indigenous archaeologies worldwide have led to a greater consideration of the role of archaeology in the politics of identity with the goal of "decolonizing archaeology" (see Smith and Wobst 2005; Thorley 2002; Watkins 2000). CSL pedagogy, with its emphasis on scholarly engagement, connection to community activism, and commitment to de-centering the academy, is a pedagogical reform responding in part to these theoretical shifts within the discipline, but also to broader shifts in higher education (see Nassaney, chapter 1). It resonates well with our theoretical perspectives and has helped us put those perspectives into practice.

Our teaching and archaeological practices have evolved in the twenty-first century as we have experimented with different ways of mobilizing and embracing the principles of critical archaeology and its theoretical descendants with respect to the archaeological field school, as well as the rest of the curriculum. We report here on two of these efforts: (1) an upper-level undergraduate course on the archaeology of northeastern North America, which was converted to a CSL course; and (2) the 2006 UMass Amherst Field School in Archaeology.

ANTHROPOLOGY 529

In 2004 Elizabeth Chilton received a CSL Faculty Fellowship for Anthropology 529, the Archaeology of Northeastern North America, thanks to both inspiration and encouragement from Arthur Keene. That same year the Department of Anthropology received a departmental fellowship from the CSL office on campus to allow eight faculty members and a few graduate students to work together on developing CSL courses. The Archaeology of Northeastern North America has been taught twice since then.

Anthropology 529 has been taught at UMass Amherst for many years, first by Dena F. Dincauze and then Elizabeth Chilton. The goal of the course is to examine Native American history in the region through the lens of archaeology—from initial colonization at least eleven thousand years ago to the present. The major learning goals for the course have always been to examine the great antiquity, cultural complexity, and historical continuity of Native American peoples in the region. With regard to the latter, all of the archaeology courses at UMass Amherst stress the idea that history is created by and for people in the present. However, before this became a CSL course this point was difficult to get across. While students often took on semester projects, the links between the learning process and our community partners were not well defined; likewise, the community service that we did outside of the classroom did not have a solid link to learning opportunities for students.

The Community Service

In order for students to have the necessary background to take on community service projects, most of the first half of the semester was spent reading, writing papers, and discussing the results of archaeological research. During the second half of the course, students applied the material they learned to projects with community partners, which included the Hadley Historical Society, Historic Deerfield, Inc. (a museum dedicated to the preservation and interpretation of colonial New England history, architecture, and art that encompasses a mile-long street and associated buildings), Frontier Regional High School (Deerfield), the Conway Grammar School, and the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association (a local history museum in Deerfield). Service at these organizations was intended to support student learning by allowing students to apply their academic knowledge of the subject to real-world problems, such as exhibit or tour planning, archaeological collections management, and K-12 education. Since the class was composed of anthropology majors and graduate students in anthropology/archaeology, and since most archaeologists in this country work outside of the academy, these placements were also good preparation for a career in archaeology (see Nassaney, chapter 1).

Successes

The successes of the class were many and included a more transparent and explicit pedagogy, greater emphasis on written and oral expression, and

hands-on learning. As an example of the latter, one student wrote in his journal for the class: "Theorizing is great, even necessary in the academic community. However, if a connection cannot be made between the theories and a living community complete with needs and feelings, it will never be relevant to the outside world." A student whose group project involved teaching high school students wrote: "I feel that by forcing myself to be able to teach it, I learned 200% more than I did by simply discussing it in classes. I think that's the point of CSL." Another student wrote: "I think this offers an excellent opportunity to practice communication skills for future employment in the work force."

Students were required to keep journals throughout their service-learning projects. Many of them questioned themselves in their journals—their motivations, their goals, and their preparedness. In particular, while we had well-defined community partnerships, many students felt their most important goal was to treat Native American history responsibly. One student wrote: "This brought up a key issue with community service learning: which community are you serving?" So while students realized that they were explicitly serving the historical society, museum, or school they were working with, Native Americans were really the silent partners in all of the projects, since the course was centered on Native American history. In many cases this led students to think more broadly about how their project contributed to the common good: "While our inventory of the limited pre-contact collections at the Hadley Historical Society may not directly challenge dominant histories, it can provide a starting point to begin to address questions of who the Native peoples in this area were and who their present-day descendants are."

One of the most positive outcomes of the course is that we have begun to build strong, long-term community partnerships. All of the CSL evaluations by the community supervisors were very positive, and we have continued to work with most of them.

Points of Resistance

Of course, in trying anything new there are always challenges. CSL courses are more time consuming for students than other courses, especially if the students are working in teams. Although students were made aware of this, and even though they could receive one extra CSL credit, the time commitment was a problem for some students.

Another challenge was that during the first semester this course was

offered a conflict arose between one of the groups of students and some of the members of their community organization. The conflict involved a group working with a history museum on the creation of training materials for their docents (guides who give tours of the museum's historic houses) relevant to Native American history and archaeology. While the underlying goal for the students was to bring out Native American history, the mission of the museum itself is not about interpreting Native American history but rather about Euro-American colonial history. Although the students were encouraged to explore the mission and history of the organization they were working with—and they had an assigned reading explicitly about the mission and history of the museum—they were not as sensitive as they could have been about how they came across to the guides. After these students went on some of the tours with the guides, the instructor received complaints from museum staff that the students were asking very pointed questions about Native American history and African slavery and were making the guides very uncomfortable. The students were not aware that their questions or their approach had made the guides uncomfortable, and they expressed great surprise when the instructor relayed the complaints. Some of the students responded with remorse. One student wrote in his journal, "Looking back on how we handled our project I can understand some of their complaints." He then goes on to describe how he thought they might have done things differently and how their project relates to an as-signed article they read about the "politics of the past." Other students did not take the criticism well. One student wrote, "I am annoyed that our team has been accused of rudeness unfairly." Rather than looking inward, some students projected the blame onto the community organization. However, most students were willing to be self-reflective. "Perhaps we dove in too quickly," one student wrote. "The group that continues this project will have to be patient."

This conflict has not hurt our long-term collaborative relationship with the museum. Overall, it was a positive experience because it led to more dialogue about interpretation, history, and archaeology. The museum staff and the director have continued to collaborate with us on many projects, and we have all been more explicit about our needs, priorities, and goals.

Since the class as a whole continued to meet throughout the second half of the semester, we were able to talk about this particular challenge with the whole class. In the end, this conflict drove home important issues about the contextual nature of the past and about how to work effectively in large

organizations and with people who may have different goals and objectives than your own.

CSL Pedagogy and the UMass Amherst Field School

The UMass Amherst Field School in Archaeology is another important part of the archaeology curriculum that incorporates CSL pedagogy. The chronological and cultural focus of the field school shifts from season to season and has included pre- and post-contact Native American sites as well as eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Euro-American and African American sites. The University of Massachusetts Amherst and Historic Deerfield, Inc. provide funding for this field school each year. Geographically, the field school focuses primarily on the middle Connecticut River Valley in western Massachusetts, and much of the fieldwork has taken place in the town of Deerfield. Deerfield is a place with a deep Native American history and an ethnically and socially diverse colonial history that is much more complex than is acknowledged by the dominant and celebrated Euro-American history (Paynter 2002).

As part of our efforts to mobilize the principles of critical archaeology and our commitment to decolonizing archaeology, we introduced aspects of CSL pedagogy to the field school curriculum in 2006. This stemmed in part from the significant overlap among the faculty and graduate students who teach or have experienced the CSL-focused Anthropology 529 and those who direct the field school. Although we did not design the field school explicitly as a CSL course, the core elements of CSL (preparation, reflection, action, and evaluation) and features of CSL curricula (providing a service to a community building on existing community assets, improving student academic learning, and advancing student commitment to civic participation [see Howard 2003:3]) informed and infused our efforts. Because of the real-world context and cooperative nature of archaeological fieldwork, the field school was well suited to incorporate CSL pedagogy (see Nassaney [2004] for more in-depth discussion of the intersections of CSL and archaeological fieldwork).

The 2006 field school aimed to investigate a place that has been used historically to "erase" Native American peoples in Deerfield. We focused on an archaeological site believed to be the location of a seventeenth-century Native American fort. Records indicate that the Pocumtuck, who lived in and around what is today Deerfield, constructed a fort in the 1640s. Sub-

sequent colonial accounts relate that the Mohawk attacked the Pocumtuck Fort in 1665. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians point to this raid as the primary reason that the area was "empty" of Native American peoples when the British came to establish a settlement the following year.

The 2006 field school, as part of a broader community-based project known as the Pocumtuck Fort Archaeology and Stewardship Project, took place in a region where there are multiple stakeholders with varying interests and claims to the past and varying amounts of political and social power in the present. With the increasing visibility of some Native American groups in New England, particularly federally recognized tribes with tribal land bases, other groups are increasingly marginalized. Deerfield, and the middle Connecticut River Valley in general, is an area where there are no resident federally recognized tribes, tribally held lands, or sole descendant communities. Descendant communities are dispersed, but they maintain connections to these ancestral homelands. Here, non-descendant communities of property owners and local residents also have interests in interpretations of the past and stewardship in the present. Therefore, an approach that engages all of these stakeholders in the planning, excavation, interpretation, and stewardship for this site was, and continues to be, crucial (Hart 2006a).

We are working with a group that includes avocational archaeologists, historians, representatives of descendant communities through the Massachusetts Commission on Indian Affairs (MCIA), landowners, and local institutions like Historic Deerfield, Inc. on a project that seeks to protect and preserve the Pocumtuck Fort for the long-term, while using what we learn from the archaeology and collaboration to combat the erasure of New England Native American peoples, past and present. The common goal that emanated from all of the communities involved was to identify, protect, and steward the Pocumtuck Fort site for the long-term.

The MCIA has been a particularly important stakeholder throughout this project. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts created the commission (Massachusetts General Law Chapter 6A: Section 8A) in 1974 to assist Native American individuals and groups in their relationship with state and local government agencies and to advise the Commonwealth in matters pertaining to Native Americans. Among many other responsibilities, the commission represents Native American communities with interests in archaeological sites in the Commonwealth. For decades the commission has played an important role in archaeological projects and repatriation efforts in the Commonwealth, particularly in areas where there are no resident

descendant groups, like Deerfield. The involvement of the MCIA is crucial to the goals of this project because the fort destruction narrative has served as a justification for the historical erasure of Native American peoples in the middle Connecticut River Valley. Representatives of the MCIA review and comment on project proposals, visit the site before, during, and after fieldwork, and keep in touch frequently. We made it clear from the start that we would not proceed with the project without their support, and they in turn agreed with the need to document the site for the longer-term purpose of preservation and stewardship.

What did we do differently with the 2006 field school? How did the incorporation of CSL pedagogy change the field school? Our approach differed markedly from previous field schools in one way: we were explicit that this project was grounded in a community-based archaeology approach. In other ways, particularly framing public interpretation as community service and emphasizing reflection in journal entries, we infused established field school practices with CSL pedagogy. We discuss each of these aspects in turn.

Community Partners

We began the 2006 field school by discussing how and why we are working with stakeholder communities on this project. Although we had limited time and lots to cover in the classroom at the beginning of the course, it was important that students understood that the research we were participating in was a collaborative effort of members of multiple communities: UMass Amherst archaeologists, local historians, avocational archaeologists, and Historic Deerfield, Inc. (which helps fund the field school), in partnership with the landowners and representatives of the MCIA. We discussed our ongoing relationships with many of these groups and described the efforts we were making to build relationships with Native American communities represented by the MCIA. Through readings, lectures, discussions, and site and lab visits from stakeholders, students learned that the fieldwork they were participating in forms a component of a project that focuses on the intersections of archaeology and stakeholder communities in locating this seventeenth-century Native American fort site. We wanted students to begin the fieldwork with an understanding that (1) this project was being developed as a community-based approach to archaeological research; (2) efforts were taking place to develop a community of stakeholders to work toward a preservation and community stewardship plan for this site; and (3) the partners were integral in this process.

Journal Reflection

Journaling has long been a part of the field school curriculum and is integral to the self-reflective aspects of CSL. Prior to 2006, students were asked to use their journals as a place to discuss the "big picture," that is, to connect what they were learning in the field, in readings, and from their experience to broader interpretations of the past and the past's relationship to the present. In 2006 we asked students to use an explicitly service-learning approach to their journal reflections. We provided students with a handout produced by the UMass Amherst Office of Community Service Learning with questions aimed at helping students draw connections between their fieldwork, their reactions, and what these experiences teach them. The field school staff collected these journals once a week and gave each student written feedback, with further questions to tackle for the next week's entries. We had weekly discussions where students could develop some of the ideas in their journals further. They were encouraged to reflect on the nature of their service and learning and to incorporate material from weekly readings and discussions of ethical issues.

Evaluation

Integrating CSL pedagogy and methodology into the field school is an ongoing process. We have learned a great deal from the challenges we faced in this initial field season and from our own self-evaluation and self-reflection on the intersections of CSL and archaeological fieldwork.

In the future it will be important for us to be even more explicit about the CSL component of the field school. The *Wingspread Report on Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning* (Porter and Poulsen 1989) states that an effective program provides structured opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience, articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved, and gives community partners an opportunity to express and reflect on their own priorities. In hindsight, we need to improve on and address all three of these aspects more explicitly. We must begin to think of ways to focus more on the preparation, reflection, and evaluation aspects of the community service. Because of time constraints, this can be difficult to do in the traditional model of a summer field school, so we may need to broaden the scope of preparation and evaluation work we as staff do prior to and after field school to include students (e.g., a preparatory class or mini-course) (see Baugher, chapter 2).

The stakeholders have had varying degrees of interest in and involvement with the project so far. Prior to excavation we discussed the possibilities and goals for intensive survey with all of the stakeholders, including both invasive and non-invasive methods. Many stakeholders, including MCIA representatives and several avocational archaeologists, visited the site and conducted pedestrian surveys with us prior to, during, and after fieldwork. This was important not only for the collaborative relationships among project archaeologists, Native American communities, and avocational archaeologists but also for the field school students (also stakeholders) to understand how their work connected to a broader collaborative project.

Public Interpretation as Community Service

Public interpretation formed an important component of the field school. Although this has been a part of the curriculum since the 1990s, in 2006 the students were engaged in public interpretation with the understanding that they were not just "informing" the public but that they were building relationships with the public and contributing to the goals defined by the community partners by engaging the public in a discourse about site preservation, protection, and stewardship.

A field lab in a historic house in Historic Deerfield was open to the public several days a week. In this space, students and visitors were encouraged to share their experiences and understandings of Connecticut River Valley Native American history with one another. Students designed the displays. They were challenged to define a set of ideas that they wanted to convey, determine what the public knows and wants to know about the Native American history of New England, and translate archaeological information into concepts and terms that are understandable to a variety of visitors from different backgrounds and ages. Students were also responsible for welcoming visitors and describing what our project was about. This was particularly challenging, since many of the visitors were not necessarily in Deerfield to learn about Native American history, but rather the colonial Euro-American history of the area. Some of the visitors to the lab were local residents or avocational archaeologists, and several brought collections or photographs and asked our assistance in documenting archaeological sites in Deerfield. In some cases we provided them with information or assistance, and we have maintained relationships with several of these individuals. Many students reflected on their experiences in the lab and with the public in their journals.

It is also clear that we must work on reflexivity. Despite prompts and weekly feedback from instructors, as a whole the students were not deeply reflective in their journals. In contrast to the self-evaluation contained in the Anthropology 529 journals, many field school students used their journals as a daily log of activities. Most journal entries reflect a shallow understanding of the CSL component of the broader project. While many mention visitors to the lab and community partners, they rarely discuss or reflect on their own role in the project. Nassaney (2004) argues that by merging CSL and archaeology, students are empowered to see themselves as catalysts for change in the community. Based on their journal entries, it seems that most of our students did not see themselves as either empowered or empowering. However, there were a few instances where students communicated their role in community-based archaeology. For example, one student wrote: "As archaeology is becoming a more inclusive field where all interested stakeholders are or should be involved in research and excavation and curation processes, knowing about multiple ways to survey should help me/us interact more effectively with other stakeholders to reach agreements and make reasonable tradeoffs on where and when to dig."

As a group, the most reflective passages from student journals were about experiences with public interpretation. Their responses range from frustration at the lack of interest in our project— "We had many visitors come in [the lab] but they were more interested in only the house"—to an understanding of the dialectical process of public engagement: "I also liked to hear what people visiting the lab had to say about what we're doing and to hear what they already know. It's cool to hear what visitors can teach me."

It is also clear that we must bridge the gap between our community partners and our students to more deeply engage in CSL through the field school. One student reflected: "I was really glad that Elizabeth and Siobhan have been actively involved w/native people from academia, bureaucracy, and others throughout the research, planning, and excavation at [the site]. Do [the stakeholders] have concerns about where and how material items are stored and curated? Is there any danger that what we have found and what is reported publicly will impact the public or private native understandings of what went on at [this site] and how it fits into the whole Deerfield story?"

The questions this student poses are vital to a more equitable and ethical archaeology and serve to empower both student and community. The lack of a sense of empowerment conveyed by other students is likely due to the fact that this project did not partner with a single community but

rather engaged several diverse stakeholders with varying levels of interest and commitment to the project, and students had little direct contact with community members. At the time we were still in the process of building relationships with community partners, and our partners were (and are) still figuring out whether or how archaeology is relevant to their priorities. We hope that the trust relationships we have begun to develop will allow us to connect our students directly with our community partners in the future.

While there are improvements to be made in incorporating CSL pedagogy in the UMass Amherst Field School in Archaeology, we are beginning to see signs of important positive outcomes. First, students experienced how formal learning connects with real-world situations, in particular the implications of archaeology on the lives of contemporary people. Second, students began to see archaeologists in many different roles, in this case particularly as organizers, stakeholders, and advocate/activists (see Hart 2006b). Third, students began to see Native American communities as meaningful partners in archaeological research, rather than subjects of research, along with local communities, landowners, and institutions. Fourth, as demonstrated in some journal entries, students realized that history is not just a resource to be conserved but is also the nexus of ongoing and often competing discourses among different communities (after Keene and Colligan 2004:ii). Finally, students had the potential to experience archaeology as a transformative process, realizing that the artifacts we recover have significance to many members of different communities (see also Nassaney 2004). All of these are important outcomes for any archaeology course, but particularly for a field school because they are often pivotal experiences for students—either they fall in love with archaeology or find that it "isn't for them"—and serve to train future professionals.

CONCLUSION

In all of the archaeology courses at UMass Amherst we stress that history is created by and for people in the present. Incorporating CSL pedagogy in the archaeology curriculum has begun to foster partnerships that address community-defined research problems and build on community assets, making the dialectical relationship and tensions between pasts and presents real to students. Notably, CSL efforts have begun to provide positive outcomes in challenging the historical erasure of Native American peoples in the middle Connecticut River Valley and documenting and protect-

ing archaeological sites and collections, goals shared among many of our community partners. We see the integration of CSL into the archaeology curriculum and the development of partnerships with diverse communities as important methods for combating historical erasures, challenging dominant ideologies, and decolonizing archaeology. These approaches are central to fundamentally changing the practice and pedagogy of archaeology in North America, particularly New England—a region with a long pre-contact and post-contact history and a diverse array of stakeholders.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES CITED

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

Hart, Siobhan M.
2006a High Stakes: An Archaeological History and Community Archaeology of the Pocumtuck Fort. Doctoral Prospectus, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
2006b A Stack of Hats: Exploring the Roles and Responsibilities of Archaeologists in Cross-Cultural Community-Based Archaeology in New England. Paper presented at the Institute of American Indian Studies Archaeology Round Table, "Identity and Community in Native Southern New England: Archaeology's Role and Responsibility in Contemporary Politics." Washington, Connecticut.

Howard, Jeffrey
2003 Service-Learning Research: Foundational Issues. In *Studying Service-Learning: Innovations in Education Research Methodology,* edited by S. Billig and A. Waterman, pp. 1–12. Erlbaum, Mahwah, New Jersey.

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

Keene, Arthur S., and Sumi Colligan
2004 Service-Learning and Anthropology. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10(3):5–15.

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

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

Nassaney, Michael S.
2004 Implementing Community Service Learning through Archaeological Practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 10(3):89–99.

Paynter, Robert
2002 Time in the Valley: Narratives about Rural New England. *Current Anthropology* 43:S85–S101.

Porter, Ellen Honnet, and Susan J. Poulsen
1989 *Wingspread Report on Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning.* Reprinted by the National Service-Learning Cooperative Clearinghouse with permission from the Johnson Foundation, Inc.

182   *Elizabeth S. Chilton and Siobhan M. Hart*

Potter, Parker B.

1994 *Public Archaeology in Annapolis: A Critical Approach to History in Maryland's Ancient City*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst (editors)

2005 *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London.

Thorley, Peter

2002 Current Realities, Idealised Pasts: Archaeology, Values and Indigenous Heritage Management in Central Australia. *Oceania* 73:110–125.

Watkins, Joe

2000 *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, California.

9

Learning in the Service of a Living Labor Community

Local Politics and the Changing Pedagogy of the Colorado Coalfield War Project

PAUL RECKNER, PHILIP DUKE, AND THE LUDLOW COLLECTIVE

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY DAN BROOCKMANN,

TRACY SHAFFER MILLER, AND ALICIA VALENTINO

Dialogue between archaeology and community service learning (CSL) is the logical outcome of trends that began in the 1970s and accelerated in the 1980s as the discipline of archaeology became increasingly aware of its own political significance (Gero et al. 1983). During this period, the debate regarding archaeology's social purpose(s), instigated by practitioners with feminist and Marxist commitments, expanded into a major theme of post-processual (broadly defined) archaeologies (e.g., Chilton and Hart, chapter 8; Conkey and Spector 1984; Leone et al. 1987; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Shanks and Tilley 1987).

This move is to be applauded, but for some archaeologists (including the authors) a sense of frustration lingered, particularly in two key areas. The first lay in the growing sense that the rhetoric of the new developments was not matched by a practical application of their insights to the solution of real-world problems. Leading practitioners in post-processual archaeology seemed content not to alter the essentially hierarchical nature of the discipline. The second frustration lay in the fact that archaeology still seemed thoroughly wrapped in its traditional self-congratulatory blanket. The tone of smugness had, we think, been set by developments of the 1960s and the emergence of a distinct field of cultural resource management (CRM) in the United States. Here, it was felt, for the first time, archaeologists could make the past relevant to the public.

While both of us have benefited professionally from the emergence of the CRM industry, two dissatisfactions remain for us. First, only a particu-

Archaeology and Community Service Learning

EDITED BY

MICHAEL S. NASSANEY AND MARY ANN LEVINE

Contents