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As measured from the standpoint of gender identities and sexualities, our species is a rather diverse group. Within contemporary western culture, we are classified as straight and cisgender; but also lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI). Within non-western traditions, LGBTQI folk are also identified as Ashtime, Hijra, Whakahawhine, Wakatane, Lhamana, Ninauposkitzipxe, Muxe, and Quariwarmi (among many others). It is clear that LGBTQI people make up a significant proportion of the human group and that includes archaeologists. Yet, by any measure, it is also clear that archaeology as a discipline has not been overly friendly towards the LGBTQI community. But this is changing as marked, for example, by the very recent establishment of SAA’s Queer Archaeology Interest Group.

I am very proud to introduce this special issue of The SAA Archaeological Record titled “Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology,” and guest edited by Dawn M. Rutecki and Chelsea Blackmore. Rutecki and Blackmore provide an introduction to the special issue weaving together key definitions (e.g., heteronormativity and privilege) with select elements of LGBTQI history as relevant to archaeology. Aimers and Rutecki make the case for an archaeology of sex, gender, and sexuality that seeks to avoid heteronormative assumptions and interpretations. Blackmore, Drane, Baldwin, and Ellis address the often extreme challenges faced by LGBTQI archaeologists in field contexts. Easy, Godin, and Starzman consider gender and sexuality in the classroom, reflecting upon pathways by which students are empowered to explore diversity in gender and sexuality. Dylla, Ketchum, and McDavid strategize “Allyship” for working in archaeology (or anywhere else) with LGBTQI people. Finally, Danis discusses the first Queer Archaeology Interest Group forum held at the 80th Annual Meeting of the SAA in San Francisco. All in all, this is a rich collection of articles that will make highly rewarding and provocative reading. However, as noted by the guest editors, this collection is only the beginning of a much longer discussion.

Readers should also be sure to catch our usual features including SAA President Diane Gifford-Gonzalez’s highly informative column, the Volunteer Profile with Chris Rodning, and our latest installment from the Native American Scholarships Committee featuring Nola Markey, recipient of the 2002 Arthur C. Parker Scholarship. Finally, be sure not to miss the very informative piece offered by the Archaeological Collections Consortium concerning collections-related terminology.
Happy New Year to all! In a continued spirit of holiday giving, I want to remind everyone that our digital journal *Advances in Archaeological Practice* is now a member benefit for all renewing their SAA memberships. Do use this valuable archaeological resource.

Much of our time this fall has been taken up with holding one significant meeting and planning for two others.

The first ever meeting co-organized by the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) and SAA, *Connecting Continents: Archaeological Perspectives on Slavery, Trade, and Colonialism*, took place in Willemstad, Curaçao, November 5-7, 2015. Attended by about 110, *Connecting Continents* aimed to bring together archaeologists and others from the Caribbean, Latin America, North America, Africa, Asia, and Europe to discuss the complex interactions of the peoples, cultures, and places implicated in five centuries of colonialism and slavery. Meeting co-organizers Jeff Altschul (SAA) and Friedrich Lüth (EAA) and the Scientific Program Committee (Whitney Battle-Baptiste, Claudia Kraan, Paul Lane, Cameron Monroe, and Fraser Nieman), selected 65 abstracts for two and a half days of plenary session presentations. Four distinguished keynote addresses opened sessions: Corinne Hofman (Netherlands): *NEXUS 1492. New World Encounters in a Globalizing World*; Hannes Schroeder and Tom Gilbert (Denmark): *EUROTAST: New Perspectives on the History of the Transatlantic Slave Trade and Its Legacies Today*; Kathleen Deagan (United States): *Colonialism, Slavery, and Trade: A (North) American Perspective*; and Roberto Valcárcel Rojas (Cuba): *The Caribbean and Indigenous Slavery in the New World*. A Wenner-Gren Foundation Conference Grant to SAA supported participation by nine professional archaeologists from African, Caribbean, and Latin American nations, plus seven graduate students from North America. EAA funds supported several other graduate students from these same regions based in European universities. Discussions continued over lunch, after hours, and during the excursion guided by Amy Victorina of Curaçao’s National Archaeological–Anthropological Memory Management (NAAM). Online participant evaluations indicate *Connecting Continents* was very successful in opening dialogue and networking among a truly diverse set of global scholars. Thanks to all, including SAA staff, who made *Connecting Continents* such an intellectual success.

Abstract submittals for the SAA 81st Annual Meeting in Orlando are the third largest in SAA history, and we anticipate a well-attended meeting. Although SAA’s headquarters hotel is not a “Disney Property,” it is close enough to Disney attractions to make this venue attractive to families with young children. See my previous President’s column note on childcare options in Orlando.

By the 20 November closing date, SAA had a very successful solicitation of papers for the third *Conferencia Intercontinental*, to be held in Oaxaca City, Mexico, 3–6 August 2016. Local Arrangements Chair Nelly Robles García and Program Chair Luis Borrero anticipate a lively meeting on the smaller, 125–150 person scale that has characterized earlier *Conferencias*. Ample time for discussion and field trips to some of Oaxaca’s archaeological monuments are planned. Registration for attending this Spanish language-only meeting in a lovely part of Mexico will open in mid-April. Watch our home page for further details.

Finally, I want to update you on SAA’s exploration of publishing partnerships to sustain our journals in the rapidly evolving political economy of scholarly publishing. SAA is now in negotiation with a finalist from this year-long search. When this is complete, we plan to devote part of an issue of *The SAA Archaeological Record* to fully inform members of partnership benefits and present our Publications Committee’s and Treasurer’s assessments. I assure you that SAA retains ownership of its journals, and that only a change from self-publishing to a contractually defined publishing partnership is being negotiated.
A Taste of Orlando

SAA’s 81st Annual Meeting, self-contained in the Walt Disney World® Dolphin, will provide the stage for the third largest number of submissions received to date, along with a host of additional activities, including the Board of Directors hosted Student Welcome Reception on Wednesday night following the President’s Forum on Climate Change and Archaeology.

The meeting app will be reprised for the third year, along with the Orlando meeting hashtag #SAA2016. New in Orlando is the hashtag that will be launched exclusively for student connectivity: #SAAstudents.

You can explore the depth and breadth of the meeting content through the Preliminary Program, posted on SAAweb (www.saa.org). Preliminary Programs also were dropped in the mail in late December. Even if you are already registered for the meeting as a participant, you may want to browse the Preliminary Program to take advantage of other events now open for registration.

Please Vote!

As is customary, the election for 2016 was opened in early January. Please participate in the governance of your Society by casting your vote for a President-elect, a Secretary-elect, two Directors for the Board, and two members of the 2017 Nominating Committee. Please check your email for your ballot link.

Groundbreaking in 2016

With the advent of 2016, there are a number of key benefits that have been added to your SAA membership package:

- All SAA members have access to the online seminars archive, which will now contain all of the free online seminars after live presentation. They can be viewed at your leisure.
- There is an incredible group of fee-based and free online seminars in development, including: creative mitigation; tribal consultation; LIDAR, NAGPRA; advanced digital data management; R statistical computing language; strategies for working with the media; how to write an op-ed; collaborating with metal detectorists; strengthening your academic CV; and climate change.

Check out the Online Seminar Series schedule on SAAweb. Interested in offering an online seminar? Please contact SAA’s executive director, Tobi Brimsek, at tobi_brimsek@saa.org or at +1-202-559-4580.

Planning Ahead!

It is never too soon to plan ahead for the SAA Annual Meeting! The Board has recently selected the dynamic combination of Austin, TX, and San Francisco, CA, for 2020 and 2021, respectively. Our complete lineup to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>April 6–10, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>March 29–April 2, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>April 11–15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>April 10–14, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>April 22–26, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>April 14–18, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Hashtag #SAAStudents

#SAAStudents will help all members—students and practicing archaeologists alike—connect, discuss, and follow along on topics of relevance to archaeologists in training and those just beginning their careers. #SAAStudents joins #SAA2016 as the official hashtags of SAA’s 81st Annual Meeting, April 6–10, in Orlando.
Volunteering makes a difference to ourselves, to others, and to our community. The more of us who volunteer, the better, both for the sake of spreading the workload and also for the sake of drawing on the different talents and areas of expertise and experience that we all have.

SAA is a large and diverse community, and the annual SAA meeting is a large and diverse gathering—sometimes, the meeting can even seem a bit hectic and overwhelming, while also exhilarating and inspiring. Volunteering for SAA committees, programs, events, and task forces offers the chance to connect with many people and groups within SAA, to make the “world” of SAA slightly smaller and more familiar, and, often, to get to know people with whom we might otherwise not interact. Meanwhile, volunteering for SAA gives us the chance to make an imprint on the life of an organization that benefits all of us.

I was honored to have the chance to chair the program committee for the SAA Annual Meeting in 2014 in Austin, and it was an opportunity for growth. Through reading and grouping abstracts, and reviewing plans for symposia and workshops and special interest group events, I learned a tremendous amount about the richness and diversity of activity within our SAA community. I found it very rewarding to interact with program committee members, SAA board members, SAA staff members, and many of you who contributed to the program—including those who helped me correct mistakes I made along the way.

Other roles I have taken on for SAA include membership on the Student Poster Award Committee, the IFR Undergraduate Paper and Poster Award Committee, and annual program task forces. As I recall, I was first drafted by SAA for potential committee participation after I responded to a call for volunteers, and that first committee appointment has led to others. These experiences have contributed positively to my involvement with committees in other societies, including the American Anthropological Association, the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, and the Archaeological Institute of America. Every group is different—cultural diversity matters!—and I appreciate having a sense of perspective from these experiences to apply towards initiatives and activities in other settings, including my campus community at Tulane University in New Orleans and a not-for-profit public outreach organization associated with an ongoing archaeological research project in western North Carolina.

The research project in western North Carolina—for which I am a codirector, with David Moore and Rob Beck, and which involves an army of capable consultants and students—concentrates on encounters and entanglements between Native Americans and sixteenth-century Spanish conquistadors and colonists. Years ago, we began holding public events to share what we were learning through our investigations. Then and now, I have found that contributing to public knowledge and conversation makes an impact on people, sometimes in surprising ways. Those efforts led to the formation of a not-for-profit organization, the Exploring Joa rã Foundation (EJF), devoted to public outreach and education, and that organization has grown to encompass many members, volunteers, and staff members. What EJF has accomplished is remarkable; volunteers and volunteerism have been critical to this success.

Here at Tulane, I am currently graduate studies coordinator in the Anthropology Department, and I am an advisor and mentor to graduate and undergraduate students. Some of the advice and guidance that I share with students reflects experiences I have accumulated through volunteering for SAA and other organizations. I hope students find those perspectives helpful, and I am confident that I am a better mentor because of the volunteer experiences I have had.

Volunteer! Let’s get out there and make a difference, y’all.
Readers of *The SAA Archaeological Record* should be well aware that the 81st Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) will be in Orlando, Florida, in 2016. The Walt Disney World® Dolphin will be a great backdrop from which to enjoy the many papers, symposia, and forums planned for the annual meeting. In addition to taking advantage of deals to Disney and visiting the Jock Lindsey's Hangar (aka the “Indiana Jones” bar) in downtown Orlando, we hope you get a chance to see other parts of Florida during your stay.

While the meeting is mostly self-contained, advanced registration includes the opportunity to visit the Vero Site via bus tour. While Vero is celebrating 100 years of archaeological investigations, the current dig is the third season of a community-funded initiative by the Old Vero Ice Age Sites Committee (OVIASC; http://www.ovias.org/). Drs. James Adovasio and Andrew Hemmings look forward to welcoming tour registrants and giving a tour of the site, and OVIASC will be providing a BBQ lunch as a thank you for making the trek on over to Vero.

If you prefer to explore Florida on your own, be sure to visit the following two Florida-based websites. The first is the Florida Public Archaeology Network (www.fpan.us), which features recommended sites to explore, organized by region and county. Orlando is in Orange County in the East Central Region, and our website (http://www.fpan.us/ecrc/) features upcoming events, links to regional heritage sites—Oakland Nature Preserve, Orange County Regional History Center, Fort Christmas Historical Park, and Winter Park History Museum—and blog posts highlighting current news and events.

If you’d rather take a thematic approach, the Florida Department of State has published an astounding range of heritage trail guides that you can download for free and take along on your trip, including guides focusing on Native American, Spanish Colonial, French, British, Civil War, Seminole Wars, Cuban, and Black Heritage sites and themes (http://dos.myflorida.com/historical/preservation/heritage-trails/). Other guides available online include the 1733 Spanish Galleon Trail, the Florida Panhandle Shipwreck Trail, Florida’s Underwater Preserves, the Jewish Heritage Trail, and the Women’s Heritage Trail.

April is a great time to be in Florida, so, as the temperature drops across the country, finalize your plans and join us in Orlando!
A LOOK AT PAST SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS AND THE NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIPS COMMITTEE

Nola Markey

Nola Markey was the 2002 recipient of the Arthur C. Parker Scholarship and is now a Sessional Instructor at Nicola Valley Institute of Technology, a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Archaeology at Simon Fraser University, and a registered professional archaeologist in British Columbia, Canada.

In 2002, I was honored to receive the Arthur C. Parker Scholarship in support of archaeological education. The scholarship facilitated my graduate studies in archaeology at Simon Fraser University (SFU) in British Columbia (BC). My Ph.D. research investigates how Aboriginal traditional knowledge has been collected and integrated with the many components (i.e., cultural heritage resources) of environmental assessments (EA) conducted in Canada. I further explore how traditional knowledge data are protected and I investigate the degree to which Aboriginal communities’ local knowledge of the land, as well as their values, contribute to the overall EA process. The objective of my research is to challenge the current environmental policymaking process in Canada to grant Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge equal consideration with Western science. If Aboriginal peoples conduct their own environmental assessments, they will achieve greater control over the decisions that impact their communities and lands.

I am Saulteaux, a member of the O-Chi-Chak-Ko-Sipi First Nation community in Manitoba. I grew up in Toronto, Ontario, and got married and had two wonderful children (Marie Claire and Christopher) and then I began my student career at Trent University. I transferred to the Secwepemc Cultural Education Society in partnership with SFU located on the Tkemlúps Indian reserve in Kamloops, BC. This was a unique campus where the goal was to offer university courses on the reserve in order to enhance the quality of the Secwepemc peoples and their indigenous neighbors, as well as to preserve and promote their history, language, and culture. Once I completed my B.A. in anthropology and archaeology, I continued on to complete an M.A. in anthropology at the SFU Burnaby campus. My thesis, Data “Gathering Dust”: An Analysis of Traditional Use Studies Conducted within Aboriginal Communities in British Columbia, (2001), critically analyzed government-funded traditional use studies (TUS) and the efficacy of the methods used by researchers that focused on quantified, site-specific inventories of land use. A shortcoming of this inventory approach is that it

Figure 1. Nola Markey horsing around following a RISC course held near Ashcroft, BC.
Towards an Inclusive Queer Archaeology

An Overview and Introduction

Dawn M. Rutecki and Chelsea Blackmore

Archaeologists have increasingly recognized the need to diversify our discipline, yet there is still little discussion of the heteronormative assumptions that linger in research, fieldwork, and classrooms—assumptions that affect both archaeological perspectives and the composition of its practitioners. The contributors to this special issue of The SAA Archaeological Record explore what it means to be a queer archaeologist, the limitations that queer archaeologists face, and the possibilities of building more inclusive spaces. In 2014, the Society for American Archaeology approved the formation of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG). QAIG reflects not only a growing interest in queer theory and sexuality studies, but also the need to recognize, support, and mentor Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual, Queer, and Intersex (LGBTQI) archaeologists, students, and communities. This issue is a direct outgrowth of the conversations and discussions of a small collection of QAIG officers and members over the last two years. Contributors to this volume expand on these conversations and discuss the queering of archaeology—from examinations of sex, gender, and sexuality in the past to discussions of the role that these categories play in archaeological work, practice, and education.

The LGBTQI community includes a wide range of gendered and sexual identities that do not fit traditional heteronormative models of masculine and feminine. How people define themselves within this spectrum is based on the ways that people define their sexuality, gender presentation, and biological sex (Butler 1990; Halberstam 2005; Rubin 1984). As anthropologists, we must be cognizant that these are not necessarily one-to-one equivalencies. One’s gender presentation or assigned biological sex does not necessarily reflect one’s sexuality, even if this conflicts with societal norms (see UC San Diego LGBT Resource Center 2015). In a similar manner, the term “queer” reflects both a political sentiment and a more comprehensive way to define the diversity within our community. While once a slur against sexual and gender minorities, it was reclaimed in the 1980s as a means to assert a collective politicized identity—one that resisted the heteronormative models of assimilation being advanced by many LGBT organizations (Bell and Valentine 1995). Activist organizations such as Queer Nation, Act-Up, and Lesbian Avengers formed in a response to ever-escalating violence and the general apathy in response to the AIDS crisis. Over the last 30 years, “queer,” as a word, identity, and philosophy, has expanded into academia, politics, everyday life, and even popular culture. Moreover, it has been used by allies as an intentional rejection of political and social structures that stigmatize non-normative sexualities.

Just as heteronormativity affects the inclusion of people within our practice, it also affects how archaeology is practiced and how we interpret the past. Within the academy, “queer” arose as a theoretical tool that criticized heterosexist definitions of gender and sexuality, particularly when assumed to be stable and irreducible truths (see Butler 1990). Queer theory explores the ways that sexuality and gender are instead fluid, complex, and performative. More recently, it has been used to deconstruct and question the “taken-for-granted” assumptions within scholarly discourse (Blackmore 2011). For archaeology, its application has ranged from discussions on sex, gender, and sexuality to examinations of the normativity of chronological models and field methodologies (Croucher 2005; Dowson 2000). By critically applying the theoretical and methodological frameworks developed in sexuality studies, archaeologists can challenge deeply held assumptions that limit our understandings of social organization and cultural change in past societies. These key concepts remain contested, largely as a result of a gradual inclusion and recognition of the need to hear more voices and perspectives in archaeological interpretations. A queer archaeology seeks not only to understand diverse sexual behavior and sexualities in the past, but also to provide a critique of normative interpretations to illustrate the way in which intersectional and fluid identities are iden-
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tifiable in material remains (Voss 2008). In this issue, for example, Aimers and Rutecki examine sex and sexuality in prehistory using case studies from the New World. This contribution emphasizes that heteronormative interpretations have rendered sexual and gender diversity invisible. In doing so, the authors address the way in which negative perceptions of modern queer identities become essentialized and reified through incomplete versions of the past.

One of the common threads throughout these pieces (although not always explicitly discussed) is the idea of privilege. Privilege refers to systematic access to resources, both cultural and institutional, based on a person's race, class, sex, gender and/or ethnicity. What makes privilege a difficult concept to discuss is that those with privilege often don't recognize it. As W.E.B. Du Bois (1935/1995) argued, poor whites were:

compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage.... They were admitted freely with all classes of white people to public functions, public parks, and the best schools. Their vote selected public officials, and while this had small effect upon the economic situation, it had great effect upon their personal treatment and the deference shown them [Du Bois 1935/1995:700–701].

McIntosh (1988:1) describes white privilege “as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was ‘meant’ to remain oblivious.” Moreover, she (1988:9) notes that heterosexuality can also be viewed through the lens of privilege. Those who identify in this way do not have to hide or qualify their relationships, have their families invalidated, or their social value and morality judged. When heterosexuality is thought of as “the natural emotional and sensual inclination [other sexualities] are seen as deviant, pathological, or as emotionally and sexually deprived” (Rich 1993:241, emphasis in the original). This perceived deviance can further isolate individuals from routine social and professional interactions, especially if the individual is a member of other marginalized categories.

Understanding privilege is important for understanding how structural inequities are produced and reproduced. In turn, it requires an understanding of the complexity and intersectionality of people’s identities. We cannot examine privilege without discussing how the various facets of people’s identities shape their experiences and situate them within competing forms of privilege and oppression. As Dylla, Ketchum, and McDavid discuss in their contribution to this issue, ally support is important in breaking apart how privilege operates within archaeology. The authors explore the ways in which allies can support queer colleagues, coworkers, and students in ways that reduce situational and structural microaggressions. Further, they remind us that queering archaeology is not just important to LGBTQI practitioners. Because it can foster more inclusive interpretations, queer theory and sexuality studies are powerful tools for changing the past and the present.

Intersectionality came out of black feminist consciousness and was first defined by Kimberle Crenshaw and later elaborated by others (Collins 2000; Lorde 2007). Smith (2004:8) argues that a “politics of intersectionality” can radically alter how we understand structural oppression. One avenue to accomplish this is by enacting our politics in our professional lives, which for many archaeologists include the roles of supervisor, employer, teacher, and mentor. Teaching or training, whether in the field, a laboratory, or classroom, is the first place many students become acquainted with archaeological method and practice. As role models, what we teach and how we teach affects those we instruct. Each time archaeologists enter classrooms, they must decide how the past is discussed and represented, whose voices are heard, and which interpretations matter. Understanding this dynamic is essential to expanding our archaeological interpretations of the past. In this issue, Easy, Godin, and Starzmann present a dialogue about how gender and sexuality are taught in archaeological classrooms. The authors suggest that teaching, as a political act, both diversifies how we understand the past and can help to change academic communities towards more inclusive spaces. By being aware of our biases, in all archaeological spaces—from the classroom to the rural landscape—we can destabilize assumptions that flatten our understandings of past peoples and the living people who study them.

Heteronormativity skews our interpretations of the past, from our assumptions about kinship, family, and community structures to issues of gender, identity, and intersectionality. Researching the past from the present is a difficult task. Yet, as many in our field have argued, archaeology cannot be wholly extracted or sanitized from our situated modern position. If we are not aware of these possibilities, then we will continue to export modern social and moral views of sex, gender, and sexuality to the past. Moreover, by ignoring these varied and messy histories, we continue to reify dualistic gender categories and marginalize queer peoples in our interpretations, classrooms, and fieldwork. While important work has addressed many of these concerns (see Dowson 2000; Schmidt and Voss 2000; Voss 2008), it remains at the margins of the discipline. By undervaluing the importance
of heteronormative critiques and maintaining the status quo, we fail as social scientists to continue to question our interpretations and expand our knowledge of the past. Contributing to this is an absence of discussions concerning the experiences of LGBTQI individuals within archaeology. In this issue, Blackmore and colleagues discuss how LGBTQI individuals negotiate fieldwork in a variety of social environments. Approaching both field school settings and hired field positions, the authors convey the concerns and challenges individuals face and explore possible directions for negotiating these challenges. Danis similarly focuses on the structural inequities faced by queer archaeologists—concerns that arose during a 2015 SAA forum in which participants discussed their experiences as LGBTQI individuals and as allies. Danis highlights key themes and concerns from that forum and insights from participants and from the society’s wider membership.

By not considering these experiences, archaeologists miss out on available perspectives that can provide valuable insight into the past and the opportunity to develop positive, inclusive training and work environments. This special issue works to promote conversations and awareness of the theoretical and practical applications of an inclusive queer archaeology, advancing a revitalized critique that will strengthen the field. While this issue is a step in diversifying archaeological method and theory, it is only a step. We must strive to enact inclusivity, across all boundaries, every time we design research, consider an interpretation, train future archaeologists, and interact with colleagues to build a better archaeological community (see Agbe-Davis 2010). The discussions within reflect our authors’ particular viewpoints and, as such, may not reflect the full spectrum of our membership, its experiences, and concerns. Instead, this issue should be understood as one part of a much longer and more sustained conversation—one that we must continue both in print and in person.
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Studies of gender in archaeology are now common, but archaeological interpretations of sex, gender, and sexuality are still frequently based on a number of implicit assumptions. The discussion below highlights some of these assumptions, including, but not limited to, those that have been discussed by past scholars. Our tendency to impose unexamined Euro-American ideas about sex and sexuality on the past has the potential to represent ancient people in normative ways that may not be reflective of their experiences. Uncritical, heteronormative interpretations of the past can also be used to buttress taken-for-granted understandings of sex, gender, and sexuality in the present. The New World examples discussed below show that approaches that draw from a range of cross-cultural archaeological and historical studies can be used in the production of less ethnocentric and more critically engaged interpretations.

**Historical Background on Our Ideas of Sexuality/Identity**

Many interpretations of the archaeological record are built through an uncritical, normative framework derived from approximately 150 years of Euro-American ideas about sex, gender, and sexuality. Thus, some of the ideas that archaeologists bring to their interpretations represent sex essentialism: “the idea that sex is a natural force that exists prior to social life and shapes institutions. Sexual essentialism is embedded in the folk wisdoms of Western societies, which consider sex to be eternally unchanging, asocial, and transcultural” (Voss and Schmidt 2000:3; see Rubin 1984). Too many of us treat sex and sexuality as constants, rather than as historically and culturally contextual ideas and behaviors. This also extends into understandings of gender that remain tied to our own expectations of a heterosexual, monogamous family structure. This naturalized and specifically gendered family structure clouds our readings of the past, even when we are presented with contradictory evidence.

Euro-Americans, and increasingly the rest of the world, explicitly link sexuality to a psychosocial identity expressed in the categories “heterosexual” and “homosexual,” which designate categories of people, not just acts. This modern ipso facto link between sex acts and identities creates the perception of a transhistorical stability to identity construction. But, as many scholars have pointed out (especially Foucault), this idea is not common until the emergence in the 1870s of what is called sexology (Gilchrist 1999:56). Sexology postulated “that sexuality was an essential, enduring determinant of a person’s character or identity” (Voss 2006:367). Driven by biomedical, Western models, it also included some references to ethnographies in an attempt to establish historical credibility. The result was classifications and typologies of behaviors and people (e.g., “inverts,” which became “homosexuals,” etc.) that have come to be considered universal by many people.

The model of the monogamous nuclear family and its legacy was perhaps most firmly entrenched in the United States during World War II. The idea that one is born with a particular sexual orientation that is unlikely to change is a relatively recent idea that, in the case of “deviant” sexualities, continues to remain contested and medicalized. This notion forms part of the bedrock upon which we build our ideas about people of the past, although it is quite unusual compared to ideas about sexuality at other times and in other places. While most archaeologists would not look for perfectly aligned categories (e.g., “gay” men in the distant past), we do tend to assume that individuals were heterosexual in the past and often go to great lengths to explain away evidence that contradicts this belief (see Dowson 2009). Scholarship over the last 20 years in particular has shown that binaries, such as male/female, man/woman, and gay/straight, simply do not make sense in other cultural contexts. We need to accept that, given the real variation in sexed bodies (see Fausto-Sterling 1993 on the five sexes), we can’t assume that other cultures recognized only two sexes and correlated them isomor-
phically with two genders. In terms of theory, Judith Butler continues to challenge even the standard “sex = biology and gender = ideology” concept that many of us teach our students in Anthropology 100. For example, Monaghan (2001) has shown that, among the contemporary Mixtec, gender distinctions are not nearly as closely aligned with sex, specifically genitalia, as they are for us.

Seeing the Past through a New Lens

There are less ethnocentric, more critically engaged approaches to sex, gender, and sexuality that draw from a range of cross-cultural archaeological and historical studies. These approaches explore how people drew from and produced the lived experiences of the worlds they inhabited. This forces us to consider how the fluidity of identities in these contexts may not always be translatable to universal archaeological signatures. In depictions of the earliest human history, assumptions about gender and sexuality are the most ingrained and perhaps the least supported. Roosevelt (2002) addresses a number of ideas about the earliest humans that remain pervasive in archaeology and in popular discourse, including the ideas of man as the hunter and toolmaker, woman as the gatherer (and strict monogamist), and the supposed naturalness of male violence and the nuclear family. Ultimately, Roosevelt attributes things like patriarchy, male violence, and monogamous marriage to agriculture, sedentism, and crowding—in other words, cultural context, not nature or biology. Roosevelt is not alone in her critiques of these models; nor has the need to refute them ended.

However, challenges to heteronormativity as the starting point of interpretation have been slower to appear in archaeological interpretations more generally. While we cannot recount all of this scholarship here, we want to highlight some alternative approaches to understanding representations of sex, gender, and sexuality in the past that can broaden our interpretative perspectives. Geller (2009) suggests applying the idea of queer bodyscapes to heteronormative readings of bodies. Building upon previous scholarship, she argues that it is important to examine our underlying, ahistorical assumptions, which discount how communities understand social difference. Instead, Geller proposes reading “the body as a space unto itself” as it moves “within or through space” (2009:505). This allows archaeologists to see how we often assume sex and gender to be primary attributes of people. Marshall and Alberti (2014) suggest further ways to deconstruct binary assumptions about material culture and meanings. Material culture in the past, as today, was linked to complex, intangible relationships. By applying Geller’s critiques and Marshall and Alberti’s alternatives to representations of past peoples, we gain the opportunity to engage wider interpretive possibilities of individuals and communities. At the same time, we must accept that the way people marked difference may not be represented as we expect; nor were their experiences necessarily expressed in material culture. Instead, we need to carefully consider how representations are connected to other aspects of social and material production. Moreover, we must not assume that the labels modern people assign to themselves or their conceptions of what is “normal” or “deviant” are representative of past communities.

One good example of normativity is the search for “archaeological signatures” of past men and women in graves (see Hollimon 2006 for a critique). The surprisingly common and flawed premise is that there are two dichotomized biological sexes, which correspond to two genders that all cultures recognize and mark with artifacts. So, for example, you simply have to look for weapons to identify men and weaving implements for women. This has the effect of reifying our contemporary ideas about sex and gender and maintaining other unexamined biases. However, archaeological and ethnographic examples support the possibility of alternative readings of graves and burial contexts. For example, as Linton notes of the Skidi Pawnee Morning Star Sacrifice ritual, “[i]f a man deliberately broke one of these taboos and died, he was thought to have taken the girl’s place as a sacrifice” (1922:8). As some shell gorgets, or carved and engraved pendants, are interpreted as connected to the Morning Star ceremony, it is possible that when associated with graves of male-bodied individuals and a subset of other objects, these gorgets may suggest transgression, whether it is related to gendered roles or ritual taboos (Figure 1). At the same time, we must permit the possibility that these individuals were not marked differently in these contexts, or that there were other reasons behind the noted differences.

Among post-contact southern Plains communities, third- and fourth-gendered peoples demonstrate fluidity of dress, tasks, and social obligations, depending on the situation. For example, male-bodied individuals dressed as female-bodied individuals often performed many of the corresponding tasks, but participated in other activities, such as war parties, dressed as male participants. Fletcher and La Flesche (1911) note of the Omaha that visions and dreams of the moon during certain initiation rituals could result in a man being “doomed to forfeit his manhood and become like a woman. He must speak as a woman, pursue her avocations, adopt her dress … It is said that there have been those who … tried to conceal their ill luck for a time, but that few have succeeded” (1911:132). Black Dog recounted similar stories of the
Osage, suggesting that the Omaha are not an isolated case. Assumed binaries are further displaced by the extensive literature on shamans, who often transgressed not only the boundaries of the spirit realms, but also gender binaries (see Hollimmon 2006). Among several nations, two-spirited shamans were believed to be spiritually stronger than either women or men. Discussions of two-spirited individuals in historical and living communities by Williams and other scholars highlight the varied ways that these individuals participated in their communities and continue to do so. Importantly, these researchers attempt to redirect discussions of two-spirited individuals away from heteronormative models in the recent past and enliven understandings of modern communities. Not only were gendered binaries bent and broken in the past, but the experiences of these individuals cannot be assumed to be the same across communities in the past, just as they are not in the present.

When considering protohistoric contexts and historic and ethnographic accounts, we must take caution to ensure that we are not reproducing past assumptions and biases in our interpretations. For example, Arvey (1988) has shown that many of the artistic conventions of Aztec women in the colonial-era Florentine Codex are hybrid, with a strong infusion of Spanish ideas. In fact, precontact Mexico people may have been less sexist and less sex negative than we assume and instead more concerned with concepts like chaos and excess. Similarly, presumed indigenous homophobia leads even well-intentioned scholars to make unsupported claims about the “homophobia” of ancient Mesoamericans. For example, López (1988:305) argued that the preconquest Nahua had an “extremely negative image” of homosexuality and that the “death penalty was imposed on both female and male homosexuals, active or passive.” Interpretations have tended to become more moderate over time, but they still rely on post-colonial documents. These interpretations are very useful to people who claim that the homophobia we see in the contemporary world is cross-cultural and transhistorical.

Archaeological assumptions matter, and we have to be careful of how they are supported.

We must recognize that our understandings of “deviance” are not universal and that how we interpret and translate the past, whether as text, image, or artifact, imports our own world-views into past contexts. Translations are imperfect and how we translate the past necessarily affects how we interpret it. In an article provocatively entitled “Queer Nahua: Sahagún’s Faggots and Sodomites, Lesbians and Hermaphrodites,” Sigal (2007) has written about various non-heteronormative people among the Aztecs, especially people called in Nahua xochichua, which literally translates to “flower bearer” (Figure 2). This is an intriguing name, given the association of flowers with poetry and song, as well as sexual desire and excess, in Nahua art and ideology. Looking at Anderson and Dibble’s translation of the Florentine Codex, they translated “xochichua” simply as “pervert,” whereas in 1993, Kimball (1993:12) translated it as “one who is homosexual.” While less judgmental perhaps, it is still an essentialist category that may not have made much sense to the Aztecs. Sahagún suggests that xochichuas seduced, enchanted, or bewitched others and that they cross-dressed. Sigal (2007:23) concludes: "Nahua society prized masculinity, while the xochihuah was seen as effeminate. However, the evidence shows that many high-level nobles kept xochichuas as dependents. They used them to perform household chores, to clean the temples, and to accompany warriors to war. When at war, the xochichuas provided the warriors with a variety of services, including sex. At other times, the xochichuas, some of whom were housed in the temples, were available for sexual favors and other chores to priests and other members of the high nobility [Sigal 2007:23].

As these examples show, labels are not the best shorthand to describe individuals; nor can they encompass the complexity of the lived experiences of past or living people.
Similarly to the instances described above, early missionary accounts in the Southeast and Midwest of the United States, such as those by Casañas and Espinosa, provide piecemeal information about possible precolumbian life experiences. These sources must be carefully critiqued to ensure that interpretative conflicts and misinterpretations do not misrepresent the image or object and, subsequently, the ways that individual and relational bodies of materials are read. For example, within the broad corpus of Southeast archaeological materials, recognizing regional diversity can better ground interpretation. Simultaneously, researchers must be aware of underlying assumptions made when we apply the cultural beliefs and practices of different communities to a series of archaeological materials. Balance is required to understand the relationships of these communities and the materials and messages they produced within comparative frameworks of material types across a broad region. A one-size-fits-all interpretation proves inadequate for interpreting representations, especially those involving gender and sexuality, because of cultural practices that formed identity boundaries between communities.

Participation in the consumption and use of texts or images does not indicate power to decide text or image production; nor does it mean that representations from one region were read the same elsewhere. Ethnographic data indicate that gendered bodies and sexualities would not have been read or represented identically across communities. In these cases, variation and translation become paramount in understanding the social roles of different bodies and actions, not to mention their meanings. However, in an effort to provide a cohesive picture of the past, discrepancies and deviations are too often discarded, and actions are conflated with identities. For example, Sigal discusses the *cuiñoni*, literally “a person taken from behind,” which the Spanish translated to “puto” (faggot). These persons were denigrated in Aztec life, but Sigal argues that the Aztec reference was not to an identity but to an act. Both Sigal and Kimball (1993:15) consider the widely repeated idea that the Aztecs considered *cuiñoni* evil and burned them to have been a Spanish idea. Spanish good and evil did not translate to the Aztec, who were more concerned with chaos/order and moderation/excess. The Florentine Codex is a hybrid text, and this image exemplifies that fact.

By ignoring variants, dismissing them as “non-significant,” or relying on translations rooted in the present, we render invisible the possibility of alternative or multiple explanations and markers of difference. At the same time, by not questioning the heteronormative biases of early missionaries, we participate in writing “abnormal” bodies out of the past. By uncritically assuming that similarity automatically equals sameness, we are missing the subtleties that mark how individuals conceptualize and negotiate their worlds. The intricacies of representations and materials are intentional. Patterns discerning authorship are emphasized in materials; however, less often are these representations of individuals linked back to the individual bodies with whom they are associated or “bundled” (see discussion in Watts 2013). An emphasis on bundling in Southeast contexts has in some ways allowed interpretations of iconography and associated cultural materials to remain separated from the individual, even as individuals are understood as increasingly entangled within larger social practices and events. This presents two related problems. First, how can exceptions to patterns, especially in representations, be better contextualized? Second, how do we better understand the lived experiences of past individuals outside of the binary? Shifting our
focus to understand how similarity and variation may work together to create complex, fluid social negotiations provides an important opportunity to re-evaluate our assumptions of past peoples.

Conclusion

Archaeology has become more reflexive in many of its assumptions about past peoples, interpretations of the archaeological record, and theoretical and methodological toolkits. Yet we must constantly strive to better understand how our own biases continue to hinder our understanding of the past. We must no longer overlook bodyscapes within burial contexts or iconographic images; nor should we fail to take into account the relationships between image or object and body, whether we speak of the individual as a body, or the burial and its larger social function. By reading these entangled and bundled bodyscapes together, we are better-equipped to understand the intricacies of how individuals, especially those outside of conceptual binaries, could exist as simultaneously liminal yet enmeshed within wider social discourse. This is framed by remembering that sets of practices do not necessarily equate with identity, even as they mark bodies as different. Nor do histories written from particular perspectives necessarily represent the nuances of the people and practices they recount. In an article entitled “Alternative and Ambiguous Gender Identities in Postclassic Central Mexico,” McCafferty and McCafferty (2009) were in accordance with Sigal and Arvey that “alternative identities were more socially accepted within the context of pre-Columbian society than portrayed in the chronicles, and some were, in fact, sanctioned by religious rituals” (197). Kimball’s (1993:20) last lines in an article on Aztec homosexuality are these: “Male and female homosexuality were both known, even though generally disapproved. There is no evidence for any kind of suppression of homosexuality such as occurred after the Spanish Conquest.”

Until we cease looking for what we expect, the diversity of past peoples’ experiences will be confined by those expectations. We inadvertently write the past the way we experience the present and not necessarily the way it was lived. Those interpretations can then be misappropriated in discussions of modern peoples. By applying critical perspectives to our interpretations of past peoples’ understandings of sex, gender, and sexuality, among many other aspects of community and individual experiences, we can work toward fuller and more diverse representations of those pasts.

Acknowledgment. This article benefited from editorial comments from Chelsea Blackmore. In part, the formation of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group has helped reinvigorate public discussions of this kind within the SAA. We appreciate the opportunity to contribute to this issue and look forward to expanded research on these topics.

References Cited

Arvey, Margaret Campbell

Brain, Jeffrey P., and Philip Phillips

Dowson, Thomas A.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne

Fletcher, Alice, and Francis La Flesche

Geller, Pamela L.

Gilchrist, Roberta

Hollimon, Sandra E.

Kimball, Geoffrey

Linton, Ralph
1922 The Sacrifice to the Morning Star by the Skidi Pawnee. Leaflet No. 6. Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.

López, Alfredo
McCaflerty, Sharisse D., and Geoffrey McCafferty

Marshall, Yvonne, and Benjamin Alberi

Monaghan, John

Roosevelt, Anna Curtenius

Rubin, Gayle

Sigal, Pete

Voss, Barbara

Voss, Barbara, and Robert A. Schmidt

Watts, Christopher

compartmentalizes Aboriginal Traditional Ecological Knowledge and removes it from its cultural context.

For the past 20 years I have had the privilege of teaching and working with many Aboriginal communities in BC, the Yukon, and Northern Ontario. Other community-based research projects that I have worked on include cultural resource management (CRM), traditional use studies, environmental assessments, and capacity building. As a Sessional Instructor, I have taught Native Studies, Anthropology, History, and Archaeology courses at SFU, Thompson Rivers University, and Nicola Valley Institute of Technology. I am also a registered professional archaeologist in BC and I conduct a variety of archaeological assessments, as well as teaching the provincially certified Resource Inventory Standards Committee (RISC) course. The RISC training provides Aboriginal students with provincial certification in archaeology field methods to assist archaeologists in CRM projects. The success of the RISC training course has served as an introduction to archaeology from which students have gone on to pursue post-secondary degrees in archaeology.

One of the most memorable archaeological projects I undertook since receiving my scholarship was for the Ministry of Transportation’s proposed road-widening project in Spences Bridge, Nlaka’pamux territory. The project took place in 2006 and the field crew included 12 First Nation members from six communities who assisted in excavating three sites to be impacted by proposed construction. First Nation crew members participated in mapping, profile illustration, artifact analysis, photography, database development, grid layouts, flotation, note-taking, building screens, and more. I think we were the first Aboriginal archaeology crew conducting a CRM project in Canada and many of my crewmates continued on to pursue careers doing CRM, traditional knowledge studies, and other research projects in their own communities. Experiences like these inspire my research, teaching, and the trainings I administer to First Nation communities. I hope that more Aboriginal people will become involved in archaeology and that this trend will continue in both archaeology and environmental assessments!
Like the recent debate over the presence of homosexuals in the U.S. military, the issue has not so much been whether lesbian and gay anthropologists exist, but whether and under what circumstances our existence ought to become manifest [Lewin and Leap 1996:3].

Published nearly 20 years ago, Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists is one of the first volumes to explore not only the field of gay/lesbian anthropology, but also the connections between the researcher’s identity, ethnographic representation, and fieldwork practice. Although a great deal has changed in the intervening years, its message continues to resonate. There is no question that the status of LGBT people has improved dramatically in many parts of the world. But social and legal advancements have not completely erased the history and structures of inequality that continue to affect our community and others like it. Some of us live in the open, relatively unafraid, but this is wholly dependent on variables such as race, class, and gender identity. From daily microaggressions to overt violence against transwomen of color, there is much that still needs to be addressed.

But what does this have to do with archaeological fieldwork? Fieldwork remains a cornerstone of our discipline. But it can also be an exclusionary space, a point challenged time and again by feminist, indigenous, and post-colonial scholars (Atalay 2010; Conkey and Gero 1997; Lydon and Rivzi 2010) and more recently clarified in a broader examination of sexual harassment within the field sciences (Clancy et al. 2014). For the confines of this article, we explore the perils and problems of fieldwork from the point of view of queer archaeologists. This article explores the complex struggles faced by LGBTQI archaeologists as a way to make visible the structural inequities that continue to frame fieldwork. How do biases and daily microaggressions impact those of us whose identities do not conform to the social and cultural expectations of field directors, crews, or the regions and countries in which we work? How are race and class implicated in our discussions of queer identities and fieldwork? How does heteronormativity explicitly and implicitly shape fieldwork and continue to exclude or keep queer students and scholars closeted?

All too often, sexuality and gender identity are rendered invisible in the broader critiques of archaeological practice and theory. Much like sexuality research in archaeology, the topic of sexual and gender identity occupies a contradictory and uncomfortable space in our discipline (Rubin 1984). Schmidt and Voss (2000:3–4) see this lack of engagement as a reflection of Western attitudes that both essentialize sex and deem it to be something inappropriate, even dangerous: “Many scholars are thus hesitant to discuss sexuality in their research, either through personal reluctance or through concern for their careers and social standing.” Although sexual orientation and gender identities are not only about the act of sex, heteronormativity assumes that these are interchangeable concepts in which masculinity and femininity correlate to opposite sex attractions and cisgendered presentations. Non-normative practices are relegated to the private sphere; something that we “choose” to reveal or hide and therefore irrelevant to the structure, practice, and implementation of our work. When we ignore or devalue certain topics, we not only obscure the complexity of the past but all too often marginalize our students, co-workers, and the public at large:

When those who have the power to name and to socially construct reality choose not to see you or hear you, whether you are dark-skinned, old, disabled, female, or speak with a different accent or dialect than theirs, when someone with the authority of a teacher,
say, describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing [Rich 1986:199].

This translates directly into the practice and inclusivity of fieldwork. Who practices archaeology (as with any other discipline) and how it is practiced matter. Archaeology, in particular, has and continues to define itself as a scientific practice, one that “requires” objectivity and a distancing between the researcher and the research project. While feminist and indigenous scholars have long critiqued such notions, much of our discipline remains embattled over notions of “real” science and what constitutes important and valued questions within it (Wylie 1992). We like categories and heuristic models in archaeology. As Joan Gero (2012) notes, field methodology itself tends to both masculinize and objectify data into categories of “A/not A.” This not only eliminates intermediary positions, but it constructs and defends “universal objects of knowledge” (Gero 2012). So what does this have to do with queer bodies and queer archaeologists? Such methods reinforce either/or interpretations both in and out of the field and allow little room for ambiguity in the material and features collected or analyzed. When applied to issues of identity at large, or gender and sexuality specifically, binaries tend to reinforce rather than dismantle heteronormative models of human behavior and social organization. Rich’s quote above amply demonstrates this conundrum. Studies show that when positive portrayals of marginalized populations are excluded from popular narratives (like cultural sites, television shows, museum exhibits, and textbooks), members of those groups suffer lower self-esteem (see Gomillion and Guiliano 2011). Seeing oneself as part of the story, as part of history, is important to feeling part of a society. In addition, inclusion of minorities in popular narratives helps increase awareness and acceptance of diversity in broader society.

Why Fieldwork?

Fieldwork is a unique experience, one that is sometimes unfathomable to those outside of our discipline. Not only does it remain the most valued part of archaeological practice (which is problematic in itself), but it is also seen as essential to student professionalization. The time when we document, excavate, and collect materials becomes the basis for our datasets. Fieldwork brings together people with diverse sets of skills, experiences, and backgrounds, and it places us in unaccustomed terrain—from sharing the constrained spaces of living quarters and archaeological units to working under difficult conditions and interacting with a wide array of people on a daily basis. Archaeological fieldwork is a social experience, often more intense and intimate than a typical work place. And to be blunt, it continues to be a very heteronormative and masculinist practice (Gero 1985).

While our practice has changed for the better in some ways, all too often “war” stories are shared and tacit acceptance is given to “what happens in the field stays in the field.” Heteronormative models of sexuality and gender identity play a huge role in the construction of fieldwork. Standards of beauty, heterosexual sex, the common occurrence of field hook-ups, and the sharing of living and work spaces force us to consider how actual daily practices beyond digging are gendered, racialized, and sexualized.

To queer fieldwork is to understand not only the way in which LGBTQI bodies are policed and harassed, but also the way in which fieldwork excludes these forms of sexuality and gender identity. For queer people, these situations can create unease—with whom do we share our identities, if at all? Do we remain closeted, if that is even a possibility? What am I forced to omit or lie about just as part of normal conversation? How will my identity affect relationships with the community, with the people I am working with, with my superiors? Depending on the location, do I need to worry about my safety or the safety of those around me? Changes in the discipline and in society at large have created a space in which queer archaeologists are becoming increasingly vocal and visible, but many still frequently ask themselves these questions. The following is a selection of personal narratives from the authors illustrating the ways that many of us have dealt with such issues within our own set of field experiences. While the authors represent a cross section of experiences from the academy, cultural resources management (CRM), and government work, our experiences in no way reflect the complete range of experiences encountered by queer people. However, we hope that our stories illustrate some of the challenges we collectively face, while also creating a space to discuss the complex and often uncomfortable negotiations, recognitions, and needs of our diverse community, queer or otherwise.

Personal Narratives

DE: In some ways, I have had an easier time being queer in CRM than others. One reason is that I was in the first generation of CRM archaeologists. As a result, I advanced quickly from field tech to positions such as crew chief and field director. Having an established supervisory role meant that I was less likely to face any explicit homophobic comments or behaviors, at least from crews I supervised. Among my peers (i.e., other archaeologists in senior positions or other consultants), many seemed to avoid me at meetings and confer-
ences. While I occasionally sensed discomfort by some (always men), it never became a point of contention. Part of this too, I think, was that people were never confronted by the reality of my sexual identity. I was a “safe” queer, if you will—I didn’t have boyfriends/partners/husbands to go to meetings or social events with me; thus, people were never confronted with my sexuality in these professional and personal spaces.

In my 40 years in CRM, I have known a few out lesbians on field crews, but until recently never met an out gay man on a field crew. I think this is due in large part to archaeology, especially CRM, still being permeated with a cowboy mentality, which encourages a pronounced machismo. Fieldwork is often physically and mentally demanding, and you are judged by how well you can meet those demands. Unfortunately, particularly for men, there is a lingering stereotype that queers lack the fortitude to perform well in these situations. Unfortunately, as long as we stay closeted, those stereotypes will continue.

RB: I worked for the National Park Service (NPS) in the early 1990s doing field archaeology and curation for over six years as both an undergraduate and a graduate student. Working for the NPS was attractive because it advanced my interest in archaeology and satisfied my calling to serve, especially as I knew I wouldn’t be able to do so in the military. At this time and for several decades previously, active efforts to separate LGBT individuals from military service defined a “straight and narrow” pathway to honorable discharge. LGBT people in federal employment experienced similar issues, as recognition of same-sex relationships was non-existent and threats of separation loomed over those that might be “too out” to fit in. Mixed into this were also considerable classist and sexist microaggressions on the part of those in power (NPS administrators and directors, law enforcement rangers, and public interpretive rangers) versus the “behind the scenes” researchers, maintenance workers, and clericals. Academic researchers held the center—trying to “fit in” with the dominant power structure, while also seeing the importance of maintaining good connections with the workers that would make sure their equipment and fieldworkers were treated adequately.

Outright bias and microaggressions were readily apparent. Day-to-day work in remote geographic locations requires considerable trust in one’s managers and colleagues as a means to carry out your work, but also to ensure safety and security as you do it. Women and LGBT workers were subjected to a wide range of harassment, including delayed resupply, missed transportation, and lost equipment and personal items. As a student, I rarely experienced direct harassment or discrimination based on my sex or sexuality on campus. Fieldwork, however, was a space of increasing loneliness and occasional hostility. In the field, I experienced how women in particular needed to navigate through a heterosex-ual dating game where academic focus and productivity had to be balanced against pressures to maintain beauty, social availability, and acceptance within the group. As an out queer person, I felt the disappointment of losing connection with my classmates and the insecurity of being outside the safety of the group. Students whom I had developed friendships with often distanced themselves while in the field as I did not fit into the predominantly straight/white/conservative “dating pool” of the field.

While it may have been marginally okay to be a queer as a student working for the NPS, being trans was most certainly not. As I began navigating my own developing consciousness regarding my gender identity and expression, I found myself under increasing pressure to assimilate. This was most clearly demonstrated to me when my appointment was coming to an end as an archaeological technician. Unlike my fellow cisgendered male field crew members whose appointments were extended or renewed, I was offered a job as a secretary—a reminder that my sexuality and gender presentation did not fit in and was not welcome in the field or at work. While I was fortunate to not have experienced violent assault, I became keenly aware of how these situations could occur, and how nearly impossible it would have been to receive justice under the existing workplace discrimination policies.

CB: “Every person who has carnal intercourse against the order of nature with any person or animal shall be liable to imprisonment for 10 years.” This statement is taken from the Belize Criminal Code, Section 53. It was one of the first things I looked up before starting my dissertation fieldwork in 2003. At that point, I was barely out to myself, let alone my colleagues. While I was surrounded by lots of wonderful people when working in Belize (those in the community and on the project), I kept my sexuality to myself for a long time. I was simply unsure of how people would react and how those reactions might affect my ability to finish my dissertation research. Fortunately for me, I was going to school in California (relatively progressive), had a supportive family, and faculty supervisors who would help me in any way. But my fear of being out had as much to do, if not more, with the sexist and homophobic undertones I had experienced during previous archaeological projects in the United States. It was hard to ignore it when strong women, regardless of their sexuality, were called dykes by male professors, when I encoun-
In Belize, it was hard to ignore the conservatism of some people (as much as it was when I went back to Florida to visit family!), and it was hard not to worry about what would happen if I opened up to those that I considered my field family. All in all, the people I chose to tell were overwhelmingly supportive and kind; many even encouraged me to bring my partner down to visit. While my experiences were relatively positive, I was also quite guarded in who I told and how I talked about my partner. Outside of circles of people I trusted, I lied when working overseas (as I often do traveling to other socially conservative places, including within the United States). I used male pronouns to talk about my partner because it was simply easier and frankly safer. And I am hardly the first woman, queer or not, to invoke a mythical husband/boyfriend while traveling alone. Although I had relative support amongst my colleagues, friends, and family, I had little in terms of a queer community, knew few other queer archaeologists, and was unsure of how to address my fears to my mentors and supervisors. I kept these things to myself. And for anyone who knows me, being quiet is not my strong suit! I found my voice eventually by throwing myself deep into feminist and queer theory. I made my own community, starting with the ideas and politics of those who inspired me.

LD: I came out as pansexual/queer during my sophomore year of my undergraduate education, a few months before my first fieldwork experience in rural Wisconsin. Over the next few years, I was fortunate to develop an excellent support system of family members, friends, and academics. As an able-bodied, white, cisgender woman, I intrinsically embody privilege that many of my queer colleagues and friends do not. A large aspect of that privilege is my ability to pass as straight in most situations, something that has shaped my experience in the field.

My research is located in the Midwestern United States, almost always in rural areas that can be more conservative in terms of their social politics and attitudes toward race and sexuality. Fieldwork necessitates that I am hyperaware of my surroundings and how I present myself. I question whether or not I can be comfortable, policing my actions and thoughts and dealing with feelings of shame, anxiety, and fear (of self and others) as I analyze each person and situation. This uncertainty and hesitancy has damaged some of my relationships, both with partners and co-workers. When I am not open about myself, this creates barriers in establishing new relationships, especially when inquiries about one’s personal life come up. For example, during one field project in which the crew all lived together, I left for a weekend to spend time with my partner (a female). When people casually asked about my weekend plans, I distinctly remember debating whether or not to tell the truth, gauging my trust in each person.

Overall, my experiences of being queer in the field are positive, likely because I pass as straight. Being able to pass is, in a sense, a privilege, as it keeps me safe in situations where others may not be. But being defined as straight also means that my sexuality and gender identity are sometimes rendered invisible—toe queer for some and too straight for others.

**Queer Bodies and Queer Challenges**

Our identities shape how we experience fieldwork, which spaces are welcoming to us, and which are closed to us. The systems in which we live, work, and exist—both in our discipline and in society at large—are often not established for us; their creation was not designed to protect us or to encourage us to thrive. Exclusionary practices are hardly unique to queer people; nor can they be understood in isolation from race, class, gender, and ethnicity. Thus, to understand the problems and concerns of queer people, we have to be cognizant of these intersections as much as the operating mechanisms of privilege and oppression. All we need to do is to look at current debates over immigration, police violence, or the incredible costs of being a transwoman of color, to name just a few issues. So, to speak of sexuality and gender presentation requires us to think about the ways in which race and class are implicated in our discussions. Throughout history (recent and ancient), racial and class categories have been sexualized and gendered in very specific ways, most often in opposition to or outside the norm of white hetero-sexual men (hooks 1984).

One of the most common refrains when sexuality and gender identity are discussed is that queer people can hide their identities, that these identities are not really visible in the same way that race and gender are. First, this assumes that sexuality and gender representation are somehow divorced from race and class. Second, why is this even considered an appropriate option? There are many within the queer community that cannot hide—who they are is visibly different. Their body and their presentation do not necessarily fit into...
our society’s gender and sexual binaries and, thus, place them at an automatic disadvantage. This is a problem that continues to exist within archaeology around all aspects of identity—the queer identity being only one among many. How we present ourselves, who we are, and what we look like do matter. Worrying about one’s identity, presentation, body, or skin color causes distraction and unease that affects not only one’s research, but also a person’s sense of well-being. This has been documented by researchers studying sexual harassment in the workplace and the effects of racism on emotional health (Akom 2008). Moreover, lack of access to culturally competent health and mental healthcare keeps many LGBTQI (and especially transgender) people poor. Health and mental health disparities associated with poverty are often cyclical—lack of treatment increases the economic burden of illness.

There are simple things that project directors and colleagues can do to make fieldwork a more inclusive and safe space. First, all of us, no matter how progressive we think we are, need to examine our privilege. What are the assumptions that we all carry into the field about people’s sexuality, their gender identity and presentation, their class, race, and ethnicity? In field school situations, as well as some CRM firms, housing is often defined based on presumed heterosexual gender roles. As Rodriguez (2015) argues, “for students and professionals who do not fall into comfortable man/woman categories gendered housing can cause discomfort or a sense of being invisible by the act of being reduced into either ‘man’ or ‘woman’.” As part of the Fort Davis Archaeological Project (FODAAP), initiated by Laurie Wilkie and Katrina Eichner in 2011, this issue was dealt with using application questions and personal interviews in which students were asked about their pronoun and housing preferences as a means to create a space of acceptance for all team members (Rodriguez 2015). As previously noted, fieldwork is often a period of intense social interaction in which people frequently share both work and personal spaces. For many who define themselves as gender queer, being comfortable in their living and work spaces is essential.

Field directors should be cognizant of the laws and social mores related to gender and sexuality in the geographical areas in which they work. While this might seem obvious, how many of us have actually reflected on how gender and sexuality are perceived, particularly when working in other countries? According to statistics gathered by the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (Carroll and Itaborahy 2015), 75 United Nation States have laws that criminalize same-sex acts and, of these, five officially sanction the death penalty in such cases. Of course, violence against LGBTQI peoples is not isolated to rural field sites or non-Western countries. According to a 2014 report by the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP), 1,359 incidents of anti-LGBTQI violence occurred last year in the United States. While this was a 32 percent decrease from 2013, the number of homicides increased 11 percent in 2014, and the severity of violence experienced by LGBTQI and HIV-affected communities remained consistent with the previous year. As of October 16, there had been at least 23 trans-women and gender nonconforming people murdered in 2015, the majority of whom were black and/or Latina (National LGBTQI Task Force). This is nearly double the number of homicides documented in the previous two years, spanning both urban and rural spaces. This violence disproportionately impacts LGBTQI and HIV-affected communities of color, LGBTQI and HIV-affected youth and young adults, transgender people, especially transgender women and transgender people of color, and gay men.

Conclusion

Although we are only four LGBTQI archaeologists, we hope our experiences highlight some of the challenges queer people face as they navigate fieldwork. We encourage principal investigators, field directors, and supervisors to maintain the standards of professionalism guided by policy and training in sexual harassment, diversity, and inclusion, as laid out in our various governmental, corporate, and academic institutions. Moreover, we ask that each person question their assumptions about sex, gender, and sexuality and reflect on how various facets of our identities—race, class, ableism, etc.—intersect and affect the lives of queer people (as well as other marginalized groups). In short, what happens in the field should not stay in the field. All of us, whether we are in positions of power or not, need to seriously consider how our assumptions and subsequent decisions impact our students, colleagues, and employees. By recognizing our privilege and being willing to learn, which includes making and acknowledging mistakes, we can continue to create a discipline that actually reflects the diversity and breadth of the human experience.
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After the chatter of the students has quieted down, the instructor takes a moment before she begins to speak. This brief silence contains something unsettling. In it, we recognize how the “directivity” (Freire 2014:21) of teaching gets established and how power is distributed vertically in our classrooms. The authority lies, almost exclusively, with the teacher-expert, who imparts knowledge to student-learners not only by making choices regarding course contents, but also by directing discussion and controlling conversation. Such a top-down teaching model privileges traditional knowledge forms, thus limiting the space for marginalized voices. Approached in another way, however, this brief moment at the beginning of a class—before the hierarchies of the classroom are fully established—may also offer an opportunity. By giving us a chance to reflect on where we want our teaching and learning experience to take us, it contains political possibilities beyond formal educational frameworks. The instructor’s pause holds the promise of a different classroom structure, one that provides space for engaged conversations—for ways of “talking together” (bell hooks, cited in Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015:68)—that can open up new pathways of thinking for both students and educators.

This paper considers possibilities for queering conventional classroom structures through a collaborative writing effort. Authored by two students (Samantha Easy and Geneviève Godin) and their former professor (Maria Theresia Starzmann), it discusses the classroom experiences of students, analyzing how teaching methods and goals resonated with class participants. Our analysis builds on insights gained from an undergraduate archaeology course on “Gender in Archaeology” taught within the Anthropology Department at McGill University. Underpinning the course was the idea that knowledge about gendered and sexual identities is not self-evident but socially constructed. This allowed us to critically examine not only how notions of normativity are historically contingent, but also how they shape normative archaeological research and teaching practices. In highlighting the ways in which political goals are folded into the production of knowledge about the past, the pedagogical goal was to critically examine mainstream archaeological theories on gender and sexuality and to question the assumptions regarding these topics that students bring to class. By inviting students to critically reflect on how we know what we know, the goal for them was to move from the level of individual experience to rethinking “power at the structural or systemic level” (Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015:74).

The thoughts, opinions, and experiences presented here are based on survey data as well as student statements from written responses and in-class discussions. We are primarily concerned with the student experience of learning about gender and sexuality in an archaeology course, as well as with the pedagogical practices that shape this experience. From our conversations, which involved both the professor and students, the issue of accountability emerges as a central component of teaching and learning about gender and sexuality, as do the present-day implications of investigating gender’s manifestations in the past. Of crucial importance is the recognition that the knowledge we produce cannot be divorced from the context from which it emerges. What is more, as we are inevitably political in our academic practice (Christensen 2010), teaching comes with its own particular struggles and risks. The efforts of those who engage in transformative education therefore cannot be reduced to the “radical whims of idealist[s]” (Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015:64), but are tied to the particular subject positions we inhabit.

As we join this debate about gender and sexuality in archaeology, we do so not merely as academics, but as political beings who partake in a real world that is often unsettled,
conflicted, and deeply troubled. We realize that even scholars who are committed to inclusivity in the interpretive process often claim authority over its products, so that they continue to exclude marginalized voices, like those of LGBTQI students and professionals, from archaeological practices and narratives. In other words, because academic practices take place within and actively shape social structures, we are wary of how conventional practices of archaeological knowledge production can constitute “otherness” through research agendas that shy away from challenging heteronormativity.

Rethinking the Classroom

Certain authoritative structures run deep in our discipline, and they are particularly robust where the teaching of marginalized histories is concerned. As the prerogative of interpretation in archaeology has for a long time remained within specific demographics determined by race, class, and gender, archaeological narratives are overwhelmingly written in highly normative, exclusivist, and androcentric ways.

Although there is a rich body of scholarship that critically deals with issues of gender and sexuality in archaeology (see, e.g., the contributions in Schmidt and Voss 2000), few scholars address how to teach students about these subjects and how to integrate them into a critical archaeological pedagogy (but see Bender and Smith 2000; Claassen 1992; Conkey and Tringham 1996; Romanowicz and Wright 1996). This is problematic given that the content of our courses and our performance as instructors are deeply intertwined, for in education what we say is what we do, or, as Paulo Freire (2014:27) put it, “my speech is already my practice.”

Since the question of how we teach archaeology remains largely unaddressed, the risk is that what we teach is presented to students as self-evident. In standard archaeology courses, knowledge about past gendered experiences is still all too often delivered in the form of a “remedial” gender archaeology (Arnold 2005:85). Although they incorporate the role of women in past societies, such approaches do not question heteronormativity and, as a result, leave archaeological knowledge production firmly entrenched in the political economy of patriarchy, which also structures the hierarchy between students and professor.

How, then, may we teach a different kind of archaeology—one that considers non-normative ways of being, as well as a diversity of experiences in past societies—without imposing the instructor’s views upon the students? In other words, how can instructors help students to think independently instead of just “banking” (Nikonanou et al. 2004:51) agreed-upon knowledge about the past?

While it is impossible to erase all hierarchies between students and professors in the highly authoritative learning environment of North American universities, there are ways to create more participatory classrooms and to develop emancipatory methods of teaching. By queering existing hierarchies and power structures in our classrooms, it becomes possible to subvert conventional teaching practices in ways that allow us to critically examine and break down how normativity and otherness are constructed. To start out, we might want to question the very terms of the classroom “by contesting the binary positions of teacher and student” (Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015:65). Once we reveal to students how knowledge about gender and sexual roles, ideologies, or performances in past societies is constructed, and how some archaeological narratives get established as dominant, instructors can give up control over authorship. In other words, when instructors provide students with the tools to critically examine scientific knowledge claims, they come to realize, as one student put it to us, that “maybe there aren’t any ‘right’ answers or just one ‘right’ answer.”

This opens up space for questioning the assumptions on which archaeological narratives are based and for formulating alternative interpretations. Additionally, such a perspective can encourage students to reflect on their own ways of knowing; in doing so, they may consider the degree to which they themselves subscribe to or take for granted heteronormative values.

In practice, this means that professors invite students to express and explore the ideas and feelings about the world that they bring into the classroom (Dhillon et al. 2015). This sort of self-examination is not meant as a “confessional performance” (Elliston 2006:42), in which one simply narrates personal experiences, instead of locating them in relation to one’s subject position. Critical self-examination provides students with the space to identify and confront the stereotypes or prejudices they hold and, in doing so, to reflect on, as one student wrote, “what little I knew and how much I have progressed” in the classroom. Archaeology can offer valuable insights here. Case studies from other cultures and time periods—where gender and sexuality were often conceptualized and performed in ways entirely different from contemporary Euro-American understandings—present us with a multitude of gendered identities rather than confirming ideal-types. In this sense, archaeological knowledge may probe the limits of heteronormative existence and allow students to confront the discrepancies between their own and
others’ lived experiences, thereby not only recognizing “my
previous understanding of gender issues as limited,” as one
student suggested in her response paper, but also “learning
about myself.”

Such insights affect change both within and outside the dis-


cimiento of archaeology. First, once we recognize the diversity of
gendered and sexual performances in our own lives, we
can avoid projecting our most limiting ideas about gender—
most significantly, the rigid notion of a gender binary
(male/female)—back into the past. A radical openness to
alternative viewpoints and identities becomes the basis for
challenging our dominant gender system, so that students
can begin to articulate “redemptive counter-histories” (Alber-
ti and Back Danielsson 2014:2990), which account for gen-
ders and sexual fluidity or ambiguity in past societies.

Second, making critical self-examination a part of teaching
gender in archaeology not only creates consciousness for
non-normative ways of being in the world, but also may help
students to develop self-awareness. Thus, when students rec-
ognize that their taken-for-granted notions about gender and
sexuality are not universally shared, they confront their own
assumptions and, in the process, acknowledge and reassess their subject positions. If learning about gender and
sexuality in archaeology means, for example, that a student
no longer finds herself “assuming [that someone identifies
as] ‘he’ or ‘she,’” or if she feels more “compassionate and
able to understand how a copious amount of factors affect[s]
views, experiences and overall lives,” then learning proves to
be a truly transformative process.

Classroom Conversations
Transformation is rarely a unidirectional process, however.
Every time students shift their subject positions, this opens up
new avenues for others in the classroom, too. The most hum-
bling moments for instructors are not when students come up
with the expected answers, but when they manage to set aside
their fears and push back, ask critical questions, or make
room for marginalized voices in the classroom. These are the
moments when students turn into teachers, allowing the
teacher “to re-think himself or herself” (Freire 2014:18).

Talking About Gender
This article is, in a sense, the result of such a shift in subject
positions, offering reflections on empowering teaching prac-
tices and transformative processes of learning. The insights
presented here are gained, in part, from sustained conversa-
tions between students and their instructor over the course
of a semester; they are also based on a systematic analysis of
students’ viewpoints, which we collected in a brief anony-
mous survey. The survey, which was distributed during the
last class of the semester, was followed by an in-depth class
discussion that allowed students to elaborate on their survey
responses as well as to bring up other comments and con-
cerns about the course.

We also draw upon some ideas that students offered in two
written response papers, which were shared online at the
beginning and in the middle of the semester and which were
not graded. In their first response, students briefly explained
why they had decided to enroll in an archaeology course on
gender and outlined their expectations for the semester. Mid-
way through the semester, each student had the opportunity
to reevaluate and add to their first response. In this second
response, students were explicitly encouraged to engage in
critical self-examination, reflecting on the degree to which
they felt the course had allowed them to arrive at a trans-
formed understanding of gender roles and identities (past or
present), led them to revise taken-for-granted assumptions
about gender and sexuality, or encouraged them to reevalu-
ate, if not shift their subject positions.

The responses provided in these two short statements
informed the structure and scope of the survey. While we
developed a series of closed- and open-ended questions to
examine where students see gender and sexuality fitting into
archaeology, including understandings of past marginalized
or LGBTQI identities, we also wanted to find out about the
gendered experiences and subject positions of those in the
classroom today. More specifically, we considered whether a
student’s gender identification had an impact on their partic-
ipation in a given course. Through these questions, we
sought to explore whether archaeology classrooms can pro-
vide a learning environment that is welcoming to students
who perform a non-binary gender or to those who espouse
archaeological interpretations that subvert the political econ-
omy of patriarchy and heteronormativity. This aspect of our
survey dealt explicitly with students’ experiences of a “coer-
cive silence” (Esther Newton, cited in Elliston 2006:44)
regarding gendered and sexual subjectivities in academic
spaces; we examined whether students had, for example,
ever refrained from bringing up issues of gender and/or sex-
uality in a university class. Finally, we were curious to find
out to what extent learning about gender and sexuality in an
archaeology class had an impact on students’ lives beyond
the classroom, thus exploring to what degree the pedagogy
of the course was truly transformative.
Out of a total of 18 students enrolled in “Gender in Archaeology,” 16 responded to our survey, with an additional seven responses drawn from individuals who had taken the course in a previous semester. While the overall response rate to the survey was relatively high, we would like to note that the small data set our analysis is based on constitutes a limitation, as does our lack of exploration of the intersections of gender with other aspects of identity, such as belonging to a particular racial, ethnic, national, religious, or economic group. Of all the students who participated in the survey, 19 self-identified as female while only four self-identified as male, and none selected “other” (with a write-in option) as their preferred gender self-identification. Given the very small number of male-identified participants in the study, we did not systematically test how men and women might respond differently to our questions.

Finally, it is significant to mention that this course is offered as an upper-level undergraduate seminar, which fulfills a requirement toward the B.A. degree for students majoring in Anthropology at McGill University, so that most course participants were in their graduating year. As such, each class usually counts a number of honors students, as well as students who have previously taken courses on gender, whether in anthropology or a related field, such as sociology, women’s studies, or psychology. For the most part, these students demonstrate extreme dedication to the subject matter, which might account for the fact that many came prepared to shed, or had already laid aside, a number of frequent misconceptions, including that “(1) gender and sex are the same thing; (2) there are only two genders corresponding to two sexes; (3) once an individual is assigned to a gender category (at birth) gender shifts do not occur; (4) Euro-American attitudes toward gender are universal” (Arnold 2005:86).

Engaging Students

Encouraging students to question academic knowledge production is a means to shed light on the ways in which so-called objective truths are context-dependent. As we question normativity in our own experiences, we begin to challenge the ideas we encounter in academic classrooms and to deconstruct the arguments that are presented to us. An increased awareness of the production of knowledge creates opportunities for students to navigate academic spaces not as mere consumers of truths, but rather as individuals who interrogate their positionality, responsibility, and accountability. In their responses to our survey, students unanimously agreed that this awareness extended beyond the classroom in which they learned about gender. That being said, they also maintained that their attempts to engage with non-normative experiences, identities, and LGBTQI issues were not universally welcomed by their professors.

While the majority of students we spoke to reported learning about gender at some point in their archaeology classes, they conceded that the topic was generally presented to them in a way that depicted gender as intrinsically linked to, or even synonymous with, womanhood. In such cases, classroom time was often dedicated to learning about either the subjugation or the empowerment of women. Despite this emphasis on womanhood, by representing women as the only ones who are gendered, heteronormative expressions of maleness remain the unquestioned norm across time and space. What is more, this view severely constrains students’ possibilities for exploring non-normative experiences that unfold beyond the gender binary or, for that matter, lie outside the stereotype of women as either liberated or submissive. Such an approach to teaching obscures the processes of knowledge production in academia, thereby leaving unscathed the structures that promote and reproduce a restricted framework for exploring gender and sexuality in archaeology.

Overlooking the impact of the instructor, it might be assumed that what students primarily engage with in the classroom is the content of the material. Yet, the instructor’s active presence is a critical aspect of the transmission of knowledge (Arnold 2005). When asked about the issue of power in the classroom, the students we spoke to expressed the very real concern that being critical of a professor’s opinions, perspectives, or teaching materials could have serious consequences. Students who perceive their grade as leverage over them know that attempts to engage with non-normative ideas or practices might have negative repercussions for their future careers, academic or otherwise.

Classroom hierarchies are not only defined by the positions of professor and student, however. Gender identification within the classroom is an often unacknowledged presence that can reinforce or destabilize existing hierarchies. Our survey results demonstrate that students’ experiences of power within the classroom were seriously affected by the gender of their instructor. Thus, most students (almost 70 percent) answered that the fact that the instructor of their course was a woman made the classroom feel more comfortable and less hierarchical. With the majority of students in the course self-identifying as female, we initially assumed that students’ gender identities would have a more significant influence on the classroom climate than the instructor’s gender. Yet, there was no clear consensus among students on whether the gender of their peers affected the classroom climate—roughly half (48 percent) felt that it made participa-
tation in the class easier when more female-identified students were present, while the rest were either unsure (13 percent) or felt that it made no difference (39 percent). Based on our data, the fact that the majority of students were women did not affect the learning environment nearly as much as the fact that the instructor was a woman.

Nevertheless, students’ learning experiences are continually mediated by their own gendered identities and experiences. If we aim to create inclusive learning environments, we must not merely acknowledge that students are gendered beings, but also practice methods that ensure that all students, no matter their gender identifications, feel comfortable participating in the classroom. With this in mind, at the beginning of the semester the students in this course were asked to explicitly state which pronouns they would prefer the instructor and their fellow students to use when referring to them. Most students (65 percent) reported that being asked to provide the instructor with a preferred name and pronoun made the classroom climate more comfortable for them. While the remainder responded that it made no difference (26 percent) or that they were unsure how they felt about this policy (9 percent), none of the students responded that it made their experience in the classroom less comfortable.

As students, we found that this act opened up space for the presence of non-binary gender identities while acknowledging that the gender of class participants is a part of the learning environment. Pedagogical methods such as this one can encourage students to become more engaged by making the subject material relatable and relevant to their experiences. Thus, when advocating for the consideration of gender politics within higher education, we find it critical to recognize that learning is not limited to the content of the course syllabus, but is also affected by the classroom environment.

Engendering Learning

With an understanding that the instructor’s identity and teaching practices have a powerful impact on the classroom climate, we turn to the course material itself. Although we feel strongly about the positive impact of teaching gender, it can also expose individuals to negative experiences. Students mentioned that attempts to critically engage with gender politics in the classroom are routinely met with resistance, which can take many forms. In our survey, over half (52 percent) of the students said that they had refrained from bringing up an issue related to gender or sexuality in another class at McGill for fear that they might be unintentionally offensive, might use the wrong terminology, or that others might make derogatory comments in response. Essentially, students are aware of the cost of “having a political opinion,” as they put it, which is here defined as destabilizing the “socially acceptable lenses” by which we view the archaeological past.

Other negative experiences include the questioning of one’s identity and the legitimacy of one’s voice, as well as a pervasive reluctance to bend the rigid framework of normativity on the part of instructors and students alike. Because adopting normative opinions and thereby upholding the status quo is often the best means to achieve success in the classroom, students are likely to agree with a professor’s opinion regardless of their personal beliefs. Constructive alignment can function as a disciplinary and regulatory mechanism for “unruly” thinking, and it can serve as a deterrent to speaking up for those students who feel that normativity in theory and practice is comfortable, while non-normativity—or not “fitting in,” for example, because someone identifies as LGBTQI—is scary or risky. This is even more the case in a neoliberal learning environment where increasing class sizes, shifts toward consumer-based modes of teaching, standardized presentations and testing of knowledge, and pedagogical techniques based on rote memorization make taking intellectual risks “not strategic in terms of meeting the formal requirements of a degree program” (Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015:64).

Positive experiences, conversely, tend to be the result of learning about gender theory, as opposed to participating in gender politics. Classes that promise to include lessons on gender theory and sexuality studies typically reach maximum capacity shortly after registration opens, while the prospect of taking an actual political stance in the classroom remains daunting for many of the students we interviewed. Theory, it is commonly believed, can be explored within the bounded intellectual space it occupies, from a safe distance. It allows us to be critical scholars without necessarily confronting our own accountability, or requiring us to act on it. It does not demand that we mediate the class material through our experiences as gendered beings, nor does it rely on us confronting the many ways in which we are inserted into and uphold existing power structures. Hence, students often understand normativity to be comfortable, rewarding, and not explicitly disrupted by theory. For many students, learning about gender theory is seen as a factual and objective endeavor—that is to say, a “more of a ‘look, don’t touch’ kind of science”—unlike gender politics, which are experienced viscerally by virtue of their presence in our everyday lives.
This does not mean, however, that there is an insurmountable gap between theory and practice. Students who took our survey indicated that, after completing the course, they were no longer content with the traditional, fact-based approach to archaeology. In our class discussion, one individual argued that we cannot distance ourselves from the knowledge we create, stating that she perceived a “facade of objectivity within archaeology.” Other students too expressed a strong interest in destabilizing knowledge by exposing it as context-dependent and in questioning their responsibility in relation to the knowledge they encounter and produce. Many agreed that, because they had not previously considered how narratives of the past are constructed, they were not aware of how archaeological knowledge may be used to reflect on ourselves as scholars. They felt that the field of anthropology generally engages with issues of positionality and reflexivity, but that archaeology classrooms continue to create an image of the discipline as objective and empirical. Consequently, this pushes aside any discourses on lived experiences in the present and denies the possibility of engaging with topics such as gender or sexuality in the past.

When students do not feel the need to mirror their instructor’s opinion—or, as one of the students we spoke with described it, when they “feel eligible to have an opinion”—they are empowered to bring their own experiences into the classroom and therefore become active participants in both their education and in archaeological knowledge production. Gender is a means of organizing social experiences, of understanding how individuals are expected to interact within society and to construct their lives. The narratives that are created around and about people, including ourselves, as gendered beings are inescapable, and this class made them more visible. Students took the class with the expectation of learning about gender in and of itself and instead acquired the means to open themselves up to the possibility of questioning normative structures, both in the past and in the present.

Maintaining the theory and practice divide is therefore not a constructive endeavor, as it prevents us from entering the transformative process of learning to comprehend the world differently. The act of queering the classroom disrupts not only our prior knowledge of gender and sexuality, but also our expectations for the practice of archaeology itself. As students, we recognize the existence of socially acceptable lenses through which one can look at the past, but we find that they restrict the range of potential educational goals. What is more, they support existing power hierarchies by failing to identify and question them. As an outcome of this class, we are sensitive to the difference between being taught how the world functions from our professor’s perspective and being provided with the tools to rethink how we see it ourselves. We hope that, as we pursue our education, we will be encouraged to actively and critically seek out knowledge under the guidance of informed instructors.

Seeing Gender

Despite the transformative potential of teaching and learning about gender and sexuality in archaeology, it is not unheard of that students resist more critical approaches to the topic that do not conform to their preconceived notion of what higher education should be like (Fraser and Lamble 2014/2015). In our specific case, several students were of the opinion that, while gender is an important subject to study, it may not have a place in all spheres of archaeology. In response to this critique, we raise the issue of “seeing” in the classroom. Non-normative experiences surround us, whether we are aware of them or not, and “it is their very invisible presence that demonstrates the power of heteronormativity to mask that which does not conform, and to naturalize that which does” (Afshar 2004:33, emphasis in the original). The frameworks that govern the production of archaeological knowledge and the power structures of academia are rarely seen but relentlessly felt.

Creating visibility in the field of gender may then begin with the recognition of heterosexuality as the invisible norm, but it extends all the way to our more tacit assumptions as well. In other words, the study of gender and sexuality is not solely a way to make LGBTQI instructors and students visible, especially since it is possible—even if unlikely—that no individual in the classroom identifies as such. It also functions as a blueprint for deconstructing other taken-for-granted presuppositions, thereby legitimizing non-normative experiences and performances, both in our scholarly work and within academic spaces more generally. The invisible presence of gender, which Willa Cather described as “the inexplicable presence of the thing not named” (cited in Somerville 1994:246), is what we hope to see and eventually to name. When gender, sexuality, and LGBTQI identities are moved out into the open, these issues can no longer remain concerns that are exclusive to a feminist archaeology, but must be part of all archaeologies.

As we make visible what is not merely hidden but considered unthinkable, we can open up spaces for teaching and learning about gender and sexuality in archaeology that transform both our theory and our practice in critical ways. Seeing, as one student put it, has “opened my mind to ... the hierarchical and categorical normalizations of gender—I see these things everywhere in my daily life now. I can’t ‘unsee’ them.”
We trust that enabling students to discern hierarchical normalizations can open up broader discussions surrounding how the past is constructed and by whom. What is more, seeing can neither be contained within nor limited to academic spaces. Learning about gender and sexuality in archaeology, therefore, renders us accountable political actors within academia and beyond.
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ALLIES: Typically any non-LGBT person who supports and stands up for the rights of LGBT people, though LGBT people can be allies, such as a lesbian who is an ally to a transgender person (International Spectrum 2015).

People often assume that LGBTQI groups—Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex—are for LGBTQI peoples only. Yet, allies and those interested in both human justice and theoretical applications of queering archaeology have a crucial place and perspective within the Queer Archaeology Interest Group (QAIG). Queering archaeology is relevant to our entire discipline, from the diversity of its members to the interpretation of the past itself. Here we will highlight the importance of actively supporting our LGBTQI friends, colleagues, and students, while queering the past and challenging our notions of gender, sex, and sexuality in archaeological interpretations. In addition, we will address how allies play an essential role in helping queer archaeologists navigate institutional challenges within academic and compliance archaeology.

The authors of this article are founding members of QAIG. We are straight and “cisgendered”—that is, our individual identities conform to society’s expectations of male and female corresponding to biological sex. We also enjoy the unearned privileges of being white, middle class, able-bodied, English-speaking U.S. citizens. This paper is a response to a question we posed to ourselves: How can LGBTQI allies advocate for and help advance queer archaeology without appropriating queerness, or speaking over LGBTQI archaeologists? In this article, we focus on three main concerns: homophobia as a core part of archaeology’s disciplinary culture, denial of and blindness to straight/cis privilege, and the prevalence of microaggressions against LGBTQI-identifying people. Here we will offer some ideas and frameworks that have helped us to think about this, followed by some ideas on how we might be better allies. As a “guide,” this is by no means the last word, as we are still learning—but we do hope it will set the stage for more conversation about allyship within archaeology.

HOMOPHOBIA AND CIS-SEXISM IN ARCHAEOLOGY

Traditionally, archaeology is not a queer-friendly space. Fueled by machismo, it has created a hostile environment for those who do not fit the historic straight-white-male mold (Agbe-Davies 2002). QAIG was formed in part to combat this aspect of our discipline’s historical and contemporary culture. In the last 15 years, several attempts have been made to formalize such an interest group, but fears of being “outed,” general homophobic attitudes within archaeology, and the resulting difficulty in LGBTQI people being able to network kept this from being a reality until 2014. Even with these changes, QAIG members were initially questioned by other archaeologists about why this organization needed to exist and, more specifically, why non-LGBTQI archaeologists would take part.

The disciplinary culture of archaeology is deeply rooted in fieldwork—long favoring fieldwork as “real” archaeology, in contrast to equally important practices in the lab, office, or classroom. Archaeologists are often associated with adventure, physicality, self-sufficiency, and hard drinking: traits that together are largely associated with a particular brand of heterosexual masculinity (Moser 2007). Historically, archaeology has embraced this image, consequently excluding those who do not fit it, in particular women (Claassen 2000) and, we would argue, queer-identifying people. This is not a phenomenon isolated to archaeology—in general, dominating forms of masculinity have developed relationally to the subordination of queer men (Demetriou 2001). Not only is this an issue for archaeologists who have been forced to downplay or
restrain their gender identity or sexual orientation for the sake of their career (Dowson 2000), it is an issue for archaeology more broadly, to whom these voices and perspectives have been diminished or lost because they were not valued.

Privilege
The next factor is one that is sometimes difficult to discuss—privilege. The term privilege has gained notoriety for the responses it elicits, sometimes inciting anger, at others times dismissal or disbelief. By privilege, we mean the unearned benefit or advantage one is granted simply by one’s identity as interpreted by broader cultural and social institutions. Privilege is experienced differently based on one’s race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability (to name a few). These experiences are contextual and intersectional—coming together in different ways and at different times for different people. It is difficult to recognize one’s own privilege because the social and cultural capital it affords is taken for granted and naturalized in our day-to-day lives. Despite this illusion, many people are denied access, for example, to equalities in pay, fair treatment by the criminal justice system, quality education, reliable healthcare, and safe living and working environments, for no other reason than their lack of being in a privileged category (Van Wormer and Link 2015). Straight/cisgendered privilege categories are some of the most pervasive because their normalized and naturalized states mark those who do not fit these categories not only as different, but as deviant, perverse, dangerous, and/or abnormal (Warner 2000). Even in the current political climate, where many of these privileges and assumptions have been subject to legal and social debate, it is worth noting some examples of straight/cisgender privilege inspired by Peggy McIntosh’s (1988) influential work (Table 1).

It is not difficult for those of us with privilege to deny its existence: after all, its existence immediately benefits us in ways that we experience from birth. Privilege is a part of “our” lived experience, so much so that it is easy to assume it is part of everyone’s, though clearly it is not. Often those who deny the power of privilege refer to discussions about it as “political correctness,” and dismiss those who protest its reality as “too sensitive.” This tactic, which simultaneously reaffirms those denying the existence of privilege as reasonable and civilized, has a long and successful history. Queer-identifying people, people of color, women, disabled people, undocumented immigrants, people of many religious faiths, and many others are intimately familiar with how privilege works, and the many dangers it poses to them. Safety is one of the privileges that many LGBTQI and other marginalized people lack on a daily basis. Gay and transgender youth are particularly vulnerable to harassment and assault and are overrepresented in foster care, juvenile detention, and among the homeless (PFLAG NYC 2015). These experiences do not simply disappear as individuals grow older or begin professional careers, nor are they isolated to LGBTQI youth.

This brief discussion of privilege has thus far treated the concept from a broad perspective, without commenting on its relevance to archaeology. Arguably a product of colonialism and historically the purview of heterosexual white men, archaeology is fundamentally composed as a discipline from those enjoying positions of tremendous privilege. Our observations from professional meetings, workshops, and collaborations suggest to us that, while progress has been made on reducing gender disparity within the discipline, archaeology is still very much a straight, cisgendered space. Although insightful critiques of disciplinary culture (e.g., Moser 2007) exist, concepts such as privilege have not yet substantially penetrated into collective disciplinary consciousness, nor has there been widespread acknowledgment of their detrimental effects. If we deny our own privilege, we deny the reality of those without it, thus devaluing many of our colleagues, students, and employees as people.

### Microaggressions
Many people with privilege think of discrimination as overt acts; derogatory slurs and acts of violence, for example. But discrimination also operates through microaggressions, the casual expressions of subtle discrimination that people in marginalized groups experience each and every day, throughout their entire lives (Sue 2010). They may be directed at sexual orientation, gender identity, or other targets such as race or disability. Nadal (2014) offers a survey of microag-

---

**Table 1. Examples of Straight/Cisgender Privilege (McIntosh 1988).**

* The privilege of being open about your sexual orientation or gender identity without having to worry it will result in economic, emotional, or physical consequences.
* The privilege of having your sexual orientation/gender identity be assumed.
* Seeing straight/cisgender people regularly and positively portrayed in the media.
* Being able to express affection with your significant other in public without fear of judgment, discrimination, or violence.
* Not having to defend your heterosexual or gender identity; not being asked to think about why you are straight/cisgendered.
microaggressions commonly experienced by LGBTQI-identifying people (Table 2).

**Table 2. Microaggressions Commonly Experienced by LGBTQI-identifying People (Nadal 2014).**

- Use of heterosexist or transphobic terminology.
- Assumption of universal LGBTQI experience (the “typical gay man” or “typical lesbian”).
- Discomfort with or disapproval of LGBTQI experience.
- Assumption of sexual pathology or abnormality.

Those who commit microaggressions are often completely unaware that they are doing so, or of the damage they cause to those who experience them. Even when microaggressions are unintentional, their “slow accumulation … over a lifetime is in part what defines a marginalized experience, making explanation and communication with someone who does not share this identity particularly difficult. Social others are microaggressed hourly, daily, weekly, monthly” (Microaggressions Project 2015). Straight and cisgendered archaeologists, even those of us who identify as allies and support LGBTQI rights, engage in this behavior. One queer-identifying archaeologist recently blogged:

As an archaeologist, I’ve been let down by peers, colleagues, and friends who claim to be liberal allies. I’ve seen men assume an effeminate gait for a few laughs. I once heard a colleague question the “manliness” of trans men. In the field, subtle forms of homophobia surface in microaggressions. Field housing assignments and a dearth of gender neutral bathrooms at conferences unwittingly ostracize trans and gender queer archaeologists. *Over time, all the little things add up* (Arjona 2015, emphasis added).

To understand their disabling power, we examined many examples of microaggressions chronicled in articles, academic research, and social media (Microaggressions Project 2015). It was illuminating, not least because we recognized many that we had, at one time or another, committed. Microaggressions take three primary forms—microinsults, microinvalidations, and microassaults (Sue 2010:21-41). *Microinsults* are unconscious communications that are insensitive or rude, and thus demean a person’s identity or heritage. For instance, often when something is annoying or frustrating it is labeled as “gay.” Further microinsults include asking an LGBTQI-identifying person “Why does everything have to be gay with you?” or stating “Gay people are so much fun!” *Microinvalidations*, the second form, are communications that negate a person’s identity. For example, “I like you, you don’t act gay,” “But you’re too pretty to be gay!” or “Asexual? I’m sorry that you’re broken.” Microinvalidations are also employed to dismiss and demean those who recognize and protest discrimination, for instance “You’re just overreacting,” or “Don’t become one of those militant gay people.” Finally, *microassaults* are conscious and intentional actions that also demean someone’s identity, but are more overt. They include using derogatory names, making demeaning jokes (even in “fun”), like, “not all gay men are sissies, but all sissies are gay,” or commenting “and we all know bisexuals are just on the road to being gay,” and “minor” physical contact, such as bachelorette parties going to gay bars and inappropriately touching or groping employees and patrons. Of all forms of microaggression, these are the closest to “old-fashioned” racism.

The damage that microaggressions cause, especially if unacknowledged and unaddressed, is well-documented with respect to mental and physical health, work productivity, inequities in education, employment, healthcare, and more (Sue 2010, 2014). For those who endure them, they create a “hostile and invalidating climate for marginalized groups, sap their spiritual and psychic energies, and their cumulative nature can result in depression, frustration, anger, rage, loss of self-esteem, anxiety, etc.” (Sue 2014:17). They can jeopardize an organization’s ability to fulfill its mission and serve its members, employees, or clients (Bugarin 2014). They can block individual potential because they strike at the core of individual identity, while blocking organizational potential by demoralizing individual members. Not surprisingly, they often elicit an emotional response—anger certainly, but just as often shame, humiliation, or feelings of being unworthy or excluded. In short, microaggressions are real, they are offensive, and they hurt those “we” call colleagues, students, employees, and friends. However, we can work across lines of difference to create institutional structures within our associations, academic departments, companies, and governmental organizations that interrupt these microaggressions, and mitigate their destructive effects.

**Allyship: Taking Action**

LGBTQI access to equal rights is arguably better today than ever before in many parts of the world. For example, the United Nations Human Rights Campaign passed a resolution for universal LGBTQ rights and the legalization of gay marriage has been ratified in more than 20 countries. This progress is unequivocally due to the work and activism of countless LGBTQI-identifying people, some who are well known to history and many who have remained effectively anonymous—especially trans-identifying individuals and
people of color. It is within the context of their actions, and those of their allies, that support for LGBTQI issues and rights has grown exponentially in the twenty-first millennium. In reference to gender identity and sexual orientation, we define an ally as a heterosexual and/or cisgendered person who opposes LGBTQI oppression and supports LGBTQI rights. Our sense is that while many members of the SAA think of themselves as LGBTQI allies, few are moved to overt action. This is likely due to multiple factors: lack of awareness of LGBTQI issues within archaeology, a reluctance to become involved in a struggle that does not directly affect us, and the belief that there are more pressing matters archaeology needs to address. Whatever the reason, we argue passive allyship is not sufficient. We must be good allies, and to do so we must take action.

To contextualize being a good ally within archaeology and the framework of QAIG, how can LGBTQI allies advocate for and help advance queer archaeology without appropriating queerness or speaking over LGBTQI archaeologists? Appropriation occurs when allies (or people posing as allies) exploit the LGBTQI community or take over the spotlight under the guise of helping. These sorts of actions often render others invisible and minimize the voices and concerns of actual LGBTQI people. Being a good ally means celebrating diversity and recognizing privilege, but most importantly bolstering the voices of our queer colleagues without appropriation—in essence, listening more and talking less. A quick online search demonstrates there is no shortage of guidelines for good allyship: queer blogs, LGBTQI rights organizations, LGBTQI resource centers, and even some mainstream media sources list the qualities of a good ally, including Melissa Harris-Perry (2013), from whom we borrowed the title of this work. From these sources, we have compiled a non-exhaustive list (Table 3).

Additionally, we suggest the discipline of archaeology lends itself to a set of more particular guidelines for actively being a good ally (Table 4). Allyship in archaeology requires some situational flexibility; as we support our LGBTQI colleagues, we must take into account the potential risks our actions might have on their personal safety. Actions that may be appropriate within an academic department, where one may or may not have the protection of tenure, may differ from those within regulatory archaeology. What may be perfectly acceptable in our offices and classrooms may pose significant risks in rural field situations. Being a good ally means maintaining situational awareness not only for our own well-being and safety, but that of the LGBTQI colleagues we are supporting.

### Table 3. “Guide” to Being a Good Ally.

1. We must actively recognize queerness. Just as self-professed colorblindness serves no purpose in achieving racial justice, refusing to acknowledge a person’s self-identified queerness is of no use in fighting LGBTQI oppression. As one influential queer blogger of color puts it, “Being different is not the problem. The idea that being the same as you is what gives us the right to exist is the problem” (McKainzie 2013).
2. We must educate ourselves with LGBTQI history, concepts, and terminology. LGBTQI communities are not responsible for our education.
3. We must learn how to respond to getting called out on issues like privilege and microaggression. Rather than reacting instinctually with anger or dismissal, we need to listen to the criticism, apologize, and correct ourselves.
4. We must retrain ourselves to avoid committing microaggressions: phrases like “that’s so gay!” are casually reproduced to the point where they have become habitual.
5. We must identify and confront LGBTQI oppression on a systemic level rather than a personal one. Fighting with homophobic relatives on Facebook is not adequate. To affect change, more is needed on our parts—political action and financial support of LGBTQI organizations are far more effective.
6. We must recognize LGBTQI rights are not about us. Homophobia and transphobia affect society at large (whether we realize it or not), but we are not the ones who suffer from them. LGBTQI rights are not about our feelings. They are not about our struggles.
7. We must never out a person.

### Queering Archaeology

The transformative potential of a queer archaeology simultaneously broadens and deepens our interpretations of the past and influences our vision of today. Being a good ally further informs our understanding of the past, because queer theory seeks “to destabilize assumptions that framed sexual and gender identities as constant, stable, irreducible truths” (Blackmore and Rutecki 2014:19). By acknowledging the importance of queering the past and the present, we attribute agency and diversity to the myriad ways people have lived their lives and understood their worlds through multivocal interpretations of gender, identities, sex, sexuality, families, lifeways, and much more. As Blackmore (2011:90) elaborates, “queering the past forces us to interrogate our own assumptions and situated identities. Without such critical examinations, archaeology remains an antiquarian pursuit, rather than an emancipatory practice—one that situates our
epistemologies and refocuses our discussion to an analysis of difference.” By reflecting on the biases we introduce into our interpretations of the past, we can better understand the ways those interpretations buttress stagnant misperceptions of LGBTQI people in the present. A critical queer archaeology can undermine inaccurate, transhistoric ideas of sex, sexuality, and gender applied not only to the past but also to the identities of living peoples. Further, Voss (2008:330) argues, “human sexuality was as richly varied in the past as it is in the present day, so much so that current theories of human sexuality may be inadequate to characterize past social relationships and sexual identities.” Drawing from Wylie’s discussion of analogical reasoning, ethnographic observations reveal possibilities in archaeological interpretations (Wylie 1985). To extend this one step further and engage analogical reasoning with our daily lives, being a good active ally, recognizing unseen privilege, and microaggressions will deepen our understanding of the present, and by doing so, reveal a multitude of lenses through which we can read archaeological contexts—thus illuminating a fuller spectrum of humanity in the past. Much as the engagement with feminism, female voices, and studying gender in archaeology has changed the way we understand the past and introduced new questions and perspectives to archaeology (Gilchrist 1999)—so too does queering the past.

Final Thoughts
We hope the ideas explored here provide some useful frameworks for becoming better allies—indeed, writing about them has refined our own sensitivity to the heterosexism that still pervades society. Despite recent legal and social victories, the effects of heterosexism, privilege, and microaggressions are felt in real and tangible ways by our LGBTQI friends, colleagues, coworkers, students, and advisors.

Although it is entirely appropriate to understand how these social forces work by theorizing, researching, and building a relevant literature, real transformation is not an intellectual or academic exercise. Becoming a good active ally of any sort is, at its center, both a private and social journey. Much of the important work towards being a good ally is internal, as we rethink how both our conscious and unconscious values and our daily practices reproduce privilege. By first becoming aware, we can then take small, everyday actions to change these practices. We can interrupt and eventually destroy the negative forces that keep us apart, estranged from, and suspicious of those who are different.

In social terms, regardless of subject position, we can be agents of change within our own small and particular circles. Using our voices, actions, social networks, and influence has the ability to create ripples of small change within our personal networks. Whether we choose to form our allyship through our academic, intellectual, private, or social lives, dismantling privilege and achieving justice will not come quickly or easily. Small, routine acts of allyship, solidarity, and support are important. Simply being a friend can open minds to other lived realities. We will all encounter LGBTQI-identifying people in classrooms, at meetings, in trenches, at the microscope, walking corn-fields, etc. Each encounter is a new opportunity to be a good or a better ally. These decisions define what kind of ally each of us chooses to be. Join us in being good, active allies.
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Send Us Your Posters!

Don't forget to submit your Archaeology Week/Month poster to SAA for the 2016 contest. This year’s contest will judge posters dating between April 2015 and March 2016.

- Submit a cover sheet with contact name, title, mailing address, email, and phone number. Please include written permission to display images of winning posters on the SAAWeb and in the newsletter of the SAA Council of Affiliated Societies.
- Mail one copy—unfolded and unmounted—of your state poster to: Maureen Malloy, SAA, 1111 14th St. NW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005-5622.
- E-mail a digital copy of the poster to Maureen_Malloy@saa.org

All submissions received by the deadline will be displayed in the exhibit hall at the annual meeting in Orlando on April 6-10, 2016. Meeting participants will have the opportunity to vote for their favorite poster and the top three winners will be announced at the SAA business meeting on Friday, April 10, 2016.

Check out the archive of winning posters on SAAWeb at http://www.saa.org/publicftp/PUBLIC/resources/ArchMonthforpublic.html
The archive contains winning images dating back to the first competition, held in 1996.
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Making a Place in the Field
A Report from the First Queer Archaeology Interest Group Forum

Annie Danis

Annie Danis (anniedanis@berkeley.edu) is a graduate student in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley.

During the 80th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in San Francisco, over 50 people met to have a conversation. It began with a deceptively simple question: “What constitutes queer experience in the field?” While this was not a new conversation for many in the room, it was the first time that it had been part of the official SAA program. The forum, titled Out in the Field: Queer Experiences and Challenges in Archaeology, featured discussants Dr. Anna Prentiss (University of Montana), Dawn Rutecki, M.A. (Indiana University), Dave Ellis, M.P.A. (Willamette Cultural Resources Associates), Dr. Eleanor King (Howard University), Kelsey Reese, M.A., R.P.A. (Southwest Archaeological Consultants), Shawn Lambert, M.A. (University of Oklahoma), and Dr. Terry Hunt (University of Oregon). I and co-organizer Kyle Bocinsky (Crow Canyon Archaeological Center) acted as moderators.

The range of discussants offered a variety of viewpoints from both academic and CRM settings, and the room was arranged into a large circle to facilitate a more effective dialogue between discussants and audience members. The conversation was extended further by using Twitter to connect to those unable to attend, leading to a vibrant discussion with those beyond the room’s walls.

To begin, we asked: What is it really like to be a queer archaeologist? What are the challenges? What needs to change? The responses were personal and, not surprisingly, quite varied. Some were fraught and some were hopeful, but overall it was clear that “queer field experiences” could not be summarized easily. Several people spoke of their desire to leave archaeology because of homophobia, while others spoke of friends and colleagues who had already made that choice. People discussed their struggles to find support as they navigated various challenges, professional and personal. Tweets reported comments from within the forum and underlined the effects of such experiences: “I feel like if I wasn’t queer, I never would have strayed from archaeology,” and “Everyone in this room is a survivor” (@QueerArch). These sentiments reflected both the vulnerability of those in attendance and the sense of community that quickly arose from the sharing of stories and experiences. Informally, these kinds of discussions have taken place in hallways, living rooms, dig-houses, and offices for years, but this was a new space for most. The legitimization of an SAA forum and the recent establishment of the interest group created a new sense of belonging. Moreover, the vulnerability in the room indicated the importance of such discussions: to create a place to be queer archaeologists, to take up visible space within SAA and within archaeology as a field, and to be heard by others within the community. Comments, in general, emphasized the imperative of addressing the safety and inclusion of queer archaeologists not just for a show of diversity, but as a serious concern for the future of the discipline and its practitioners.

To help the room understand the realities and diversity of queer experience, Anna Prentiss presented statistics on violence and discrimination against trans people (one sector in the diversity of identification encompassed by the term “queer”). She applied national statistics to transgender membership within SAA and considered how these statistics might be reflected in archaeology. The numbers she shared were powerful. There were more than 200 trans-identity related murders in 2014 (Trans Respect versus Transphobia Worldwide 2014). Data from the National Center for Transgender Equality in 2011 showed that 50 percent of trans-identified people in the U.S. have been harassed at work, 7 percent assaulted at work, and 6 percent sexually assaulted at work (Grant et al. 2011). The threat or experience of such violence has created a distressingly hostile climate of fear and shame that contributes to suicide attempts in the range of 10–20 percent for LGB people and 41–78 percent for trans-identifying people (Haas et. al. 2014).

Projecting national averages from Lynn Conway’s 2001 study for the general U.S. population onto a 7,000-person membership, we can expect there to be between 24 to 96 trans-identifying archaeologists in SAA. This is a population whose needs and challenges are rarely acknowledged, let alone dealt with in our field. Seemingly mundane experiences for many, like bathroom visits, can become a source of trauma, violence, and discrimination when the needs of trans-people are left uncovered. A first step was the QAIG’s recommendation for the SAA to provide gender-neutral facilities at all their meetings, and which will be available at Orlando 2016.
Prentiss closed her commentary with a provocative statement. We need both qualitative and quantitative narratives about queer experience in archaeology. We need to share the real, felt, lived histories of queer archaeologists. This includes the bad experiences—being hesitant to apply to a CRM job or field school for fear of discrimination, dealing with combative and unsupportive senior faculty on tenure reviews, bigoted student comments, and the pain of fielding threats from people in research locales. But it also includes the hopeful experiences. We need to hear the stories of graduate school communities supporting transitions and trials and of departments successfully calling out anti-gay faculty. We also need numbers. Quantification is a tricky subject, to be sure. While our discipline knows the power of numbers to answer questions, numbers can also codify and simplify identities and experiences. I, like many, remain wary of the tendency of institutions and policymakers to rely too heavily on numbers and to ignore narratives of discrimination, pain, and disenfranchisement that do not fit on spreadsheets. If we want to be able to produce numbers to estimate how many queer archaeologists there are and to track their success rates in graduate school and the job market, we need to think carefully about the categories we use and the role these numbers might play. Who counts as LGBTQI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual, Queer/Questioning, Intersex), and who gets left out? And how do we quantify these numbers while also remaining cognizant of intersectionality—the ways that race, gender, class (and more) intersect and shape queer experiences?

The potential benefit of surveys should not be overlooked. The power and utility of such statistics was illustrated by the “Gender Disparity in Grant Research Submission” forum (Mills and Goldstein 2015), which presented the results of the SAA Task Force on Gender and Rates of Grant Submissions. The striking combination of statistical and narrative histories of women’s experience in applying for grants included both quantitative and qualitative data that prompted some serious questions about how to close the gender gap. Beyond being clear and necessary for the kind of reporting that archaeological and educational institutions expect, numbers do provide a form of safety and a validation of structural barriers. Being out in the world or the workplace is not an option for everyone. The sad reality is that being a visible member of the queer community can cause real physical and psychological harm. Numbers help to create a protected visibility and a broader awareness of the issues and concerns of queer archaeologists.

Beyond statistics, one place where we can start new conversations is in field schools, the places where archaeological identities are formed. Katrina Eichner and Erin Rodriguez, graduate students from the University of California, Berkeley, shared their experience in developing an inclusive field school pedagogy at Fort Davis, Texas (Rodriguez 2015). Acknowledging in concrete ways the issues of affordability, gender and housing, and diet is key. In Rodriguez’s model, this takes the form of dialogue and choice: minimizing and discussing with participants the costs associated with the project, asking for students’ preferred pronouns (not gender) on forms, asking about housing preferences rather than assigning based on assumptions, providing gender neutral housing options, and creating a system that allows individual choice in meal-planning. Rodriguez and Eichner are not the only archaeologists using such frameworks. Their comments, however, prompted many in the audience to call for an online clearinghouse where such data would be accessible, aiding others in building queer-friendly spaces and research practices.

The all-encompassing nature of field schools makes it a unique opportunity for directors to influence the learning, working, and living environment of their students. The intense engagement with archaeological research and with other archaeologists can be a pivotal moment for most students. They see first-hand whether or not the discipline provides a place of acceptance and inclusion. And it is because of these experiences, in part, that people choose to sign up or drop out. In this sense, archaeological field schools are ideal places to build a queer-friendly discipline. But this has to go beyond statements of inclusion, non-discrimination, or diversity, as participants in the forum were quick to point out. We need clear pedagogical and organizational resources for field school directors, so that these practices can become more commonplace.

Fieldwork experiences during academic research or in the course of CRM contracts follow similar models of intense interpersonal engagement and isolation from the outside world, which poses challenges for many. The issues faced by field school participants extend to the reality of being a professionally employed archaeologist. Comments from the forum also highlighted the challenges posed by the shifting nature of CRM fieldwork, which relocates people, even temporarily, from the security of their social and professional safety networks. The possibility of discrimination or violence can make queer CRM archaeologists unwilling and unable to join particular firms or crews or to work in unfriendly parts of the country. Concerns raised about the safety and inclusion of queer archaeologists are even more pressing in light of a recent article that documents sexual assault in anthropology and other disciplines (Clancy et. al. 2014). While not focusing on queer researchers specifically, the report highlights the brutal reality of pervasive sexual harassment and violence in field settings. These risks extend beyond field research and permeate lab and classroom settings as well. Mentorship was identified as a key to changing a potentially dangerous and non-inclusive culture.
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Echoing concerns raised in the business meeting of the Queer Archaeology Interest Group the day before, the forum also included a call for more education. Specifically, audience members argued for “best practice” models that would aid people in creating open working and learning environments, as well as mechanisms for addressing overt bias and microaggressions. Moreover, participants discussed how to build networks and communities “at home.” Not all departments have queer faculty who understand the issues of navigating academic job searches, let alone more than one faculty member who can offer collegial support or reflection throughout an academic career. In CRM, too, the grapevine may whisper about firms that are more or less inclusive, but this information remains word of mouth. The creation of QAIG is in part a response to this call. Their goals include:

1. Establishing a network of scholars interested in sexuality studies and other forms of queer research,
2. Developing a support and mentorship program for LGBTQIQ archaeologists as a means to connect senior, junior and student archaeologists,
3. Facilitating the involvement of LGBTQIQ archaeologists in all aspects of the SAA.

Organizers are working toward establishing more routine communication networks between LGBTQIQ archaeologists and allies to foster broader discussions like those noted above, as well as developing resources and information sheets for addressing common concerns. As a young academic in the Bay Area, I can’t speak with authority on how much the climate has changed for queer archaeologists across the board in the past 5, 10, or 20 years. Senior members of the panel applauded the many positive changes, but always with a nod to further improvement. Barriers remain. Prejudice is real; visibility brings risks; identities are personal as well as professional. It is not enough to talk about inclusivity, though it is a start. The challenge requires action, and action requires resources. These actions and resources need not be broad and sweeping, but can begin in the small, everyday actions and interactions of the archaeological community. Even the formation of the QAIG took multiple attempts before the necessary 20 signatures were obtained to form an official SAA interest group. As evidenced by the packed house in the forum last April, however, the space is needed and welcomed by many. I have been fortunate that I have not experienced the kinds of discrimination and violence shared in the forum. While my experiences have been largely positive, I have been subject to subtle, insidious forms of exclusion. My sexuality has been questioned, and my identity has been made a site of difference. Although archaeology has been relatively friendly for me, this is not the case for many others. That is what this forum represented: a chance to recognize that we are not alone. In that room, we created a microcosm for the very kinds of communities and initiatives we had proposed during the business meeting. The forum clearly represented the need to make the queer community visible within the SAA and the strength to make it a more safe and accepting place.

The kind of support that is needed to accomplish this requires the active participation of allies as much as queer-identifying people. Moreover, we have our own blind spots within the queer community and need to work on building resources and visibility for queer people of differing backgrounds and identities. Our challenge, then, as archaeologists (not just queer archaeologists), is to build a discipline that is open to as wide a variety of people as the contexts, people, and subjects we study.
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The COTSEN Institute of Archaeology at the University of California, Los Angeles announces
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Nomination forms and additional information about the Lloyd Cotsen Lifetime Achievement in World Archaeology is available at www.ioa.ucla.edu
In 2012, the Archaeological Collections Consortium (ACC) was formed as a national group of representatives from the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), and the American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA). The ACC’s goal is to instill collaboration among and between these organizations to address overlapping collections-related challenges. Specifically, the consortium is charged with (1) identifying overall objectives related to archaeological and museum collections; (2) serving as a unified voice for collections-related issues that are relevant to SHA, SAA, ACRA, and their constituents; and (3) developing and acting on a common platform of goals and objectives designed to benefit the discipline and ultimately the general public for whom collections are curated in the public trust.

Since 2012, the consortium has met quarterly via conference call and once in person each year. One early meeting outcome was a collective realization that the use and interpretation of key terms was highly variable. In some instances, we found ourselves talking past each other simply because of differences in interpretation of seemingly basic terms such as “deaccession” or even definitions of what a “collection” is. Furthermore, there were terms regularly used by some ACC members that were effectively not in other’s lexicon (e.g., “orphaned collections”). The realization that unfolded was that the different sectors in which ACC members work (e.g., academic, government, museum, CRM industry) have a direct impact on the vocabulary used in discussions of collections management.

To address this basic semantics challenge, ACC has developed working definitions for a glossary of key terms used in the management of archaeological collections. The ACC product is presented below and is not intended to replace the widely used glossary of terms that the National Park Service has previously published (http://www.nps.gov/archeology/collections/glossary.htm). Rather, our intent is to capture the subtle variability in the terms that archaeologists from different sectors use to discuss issues surrounding curation and collections management.

While we recognize that the ACC glossary is not intended to be the definitive source to which all archaeologists refer, we propose it as a living document that should be periodically reviewed, and a guide designed to help those working in different stages of the archaeological process communicate more effectively. Our hope is that by sharing our experiences and presenting these definitions of key terms, we can build common ground to collectively address the challenges we face in managing our archaeological heritage.

**accession, v.**
**Definition**
The formal, documented process of legally adding an object or group of objects and associated records to a repository collection.

**Discussion**
The accession process begins with assigning a unique control number to a collection received from one source at one time, for which the repository has custody, right, or title. Accessioning usually involves documentation of ownership and long-term responsibility of a collection. There are many cases in which repositories accept physical custody of collections and accession them to document that custody arrangement.

Accessioning does not always equate to legal ownership. Clear distinctions about ownership must be established during the accessioning process. This is typically done through an agreement document.

**acquisition, n.**
**Definition**
The act of taking physical possession of objects and associated records.

**Discussion**
This process involves preliminary evaluation of and negotiating for the care of objects and associated records prior to undertaking the legal accessioning process. Methods of acquiring collec-
tions may include field collection, transfer, donation, and exchange.

**associated records, n.**
*Definition*
The original records (or copies thereof) that are prepared and assembled and document efforts to locate, evaluate, record, study, preserve, or recover a prehistoric or historical resource (adapted from 36 CFR Part 79.4(a)(2)).

**Discussion**
Associated records (paper and/or electronic formats) may include field notes and site forms, artifact inventories, maps, photographs, scopes of work, permits, project reports, laboratory records, historical documents, repository curatorial forms, and other related documents.

collection, n.
*Definition*
The objects that are excavated or removed during a survey, excavation, or other study of a prehistoric or historical resource and associated records that are prepared or assembled with the investigation.

**Discussion**
There are two basic types of collections, new and existing. New collections are those that are currently in the process of being systematically excavated and recovered, analyzed, and prepared for curation, or in the process of being accepted into a repository. New collections become existing collections once they have been formally accessioned into a repository. Some older, existing collections are referred to as legacy collections, which may or may not be processed according to professional curatorial standards. (see also orphaned collection, defined below).

collections reburial, n.
*Definition*
The re-interment of a collection, or portion thereof, previously recovered from an archaeological investigation. This does not include cultural items subject to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

**Discussion**
Legally sanctioned collections reburial began with the enactment of NAGPRA legislation. However, archaeological professionals have adopted this process to rebury collections not subject to NAGPRA. There are currently no standards and best practices for this process, which may be in conflict with federal law and the ethical standards adopted by professional archaeological organizations. This is an area of critical urgency that requires attention.

curation, n.
*Definition*
The long-term process of managing and preserving objects and associated records according to professional standards.

**Discussion**
This process involves documenting, cataloging, preserving (e.g., storage in secure and environmentally controlled facilities, and conservation), periodic physical inventory, and providing access so that the collection can be used for research, education, interpretation, heritage uses, and other functions by a variety of publics. It is preferable that objects and associated records from a single investigation are curated in the same repository.

deaccession, v.
*Definition*
The formal process used to remove permanently a collection or portion thereof, from a repository.

**Discussion**
Decisions to deaccession a collection or portion thereof should be undertaken judiciously and must be made by a committee that does not benefit in any way from the deaccession. A deaccession determination must be fully documented and made after careful review and advice from professionals. At a minimum, documentation should include the reason for the deaccession, the specific objects slated for deaccession, the method(s) of disposition, and the location of any records associated with the collection, including those associated with the deaccession action. The proposed Federal deaccessioning regulations were published in the Federal Register in November of 2014 and are currently in the process of revision for final publication.

museum, n.
*Definition*
A permanent collections-based, non-profit institution with a public outreach mission that employs professional staff to care for, manage, interpret, and exhibit collections.

**Discussion**
Museums are a type of repository. Museums that serve as archaeological repositories must have appropriate language in their contracts or agreements to document and preserve collections that they curate on behalf of other entities such as the government.

no-collection strategy, n.
*Definition*
A deliberate decision to leave objects in the field and conduct in-field artifact analysis onsite.
Discussion
No-collection strategies have been employed for nearly 40 years without extensive study. The implications of this practice on the archaeological record are not fully understood, but preliminary studies have identified detrimental impacts. There are currently no standards and best practices for this strategy, which is in conflict with federal law and the ethical standards adopted by professional archaeological organizations. This is an area of critical urgency that requires attention.

orphaned collection, n.
Definition
A group of objects and/or associated records with unclear ownership that have been abandoned in a repository, museum, or other facility, such as a laboratory in a cultural resource management firm.

Discussion
There are several reasons that collections become orphaned. These include lack or loss of documentation; the collection owner was never identified or notified; closure or merger of CRM firms; closure of museums; retirements in academia; and loss of staff and “institutional memory.” In some cases, those legally responsible for orphaned collections refuse to assume financial responsibility for their curation.

repository, n.
Definition
A facility or institution that professionally manages collections on a long-term basis.

Discussion
A broad range of institutions may serve as repositories, including federal, state, tribal and local museums, university departments, historical societies, and archives.

sampling, v.
Definition
The deliberate process—often based on mathematical probability theory, a regular pattern, or existing knowledge of data patterning—of identifying and selecting a representative subset of data and accumulated physical collections that are recovered from an archaeological investigation.

Discussion
Sampling of archaeological artifacts may occur in the field or during laboratory analysis and prior to depositing and accessing a collection into a repository. This is done by applying specific criteria to the collection, such as identifying objects that have relatively limited scientific or historical value or those that are profoundly deteriorated. Other terms, such as culling or selective removal, are used as synonymous terms for sampling, but do not apply a deliberate scientific selection process.

Note
1. The current ACC members and authors of this article are Ralph Bailey, Danielle Benden, S. Terry Childs, Teresita Majewski, Christopher Pulliam, Kevin Smith, Michael “Sonny” Trimble, and Mark Warner.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS CONSORTIUM

Discussion
No-collection strategies have been employed for nearly 40 years without extensive study. The implications of this practice on the archaeological record are not fully understood, but preliminary studies have identified detrimental impacts. There are currently no standards and best practices for this strategy, which is in conflict with federal law and the ethical standards adopted by professional archaeological organizations. This is an area of critical urgency that requires attention.

orphaned collection, n.
Definition
A group of objects and/or associated records with unclear ownership that have been abandoned in a repository, museum, or other facility, such as a laboratory in a cultural resource management firm.

Discussion
There are several reasons that collections become orphaned. These include lack or loss of documentation; the collection owner was never identified or notified; closure or merger of CRM firms; closure of museums; retirements in academia; and loss of staff and “institutional memory.” In some cases, those legally responsible for orphaned collections refuse to assume financial responsibility for their curation.

repository, n.
Definition
A facility or institution that professionally manages collections on a long-term basis.

Discussion
A broad range of institutions may serve as repositories, including federal, state, tribal and local museums, university departments, historical societies, and archives.

sampling, v.
Definition
The deliberate process—often based on mathematical probability theory, a regular pattern, or existing knowledge of data patterning—of identifying and selecting a representative subset of data and accumulated physical collections that are recovered from an archaeological investigation.

Discussion
Sampling of archaeological artifacts may occur in the field or during laboratory analysis and prior to depositing and accessing a collection into a repository. This is done by applying specific criteria to the collection, such as identifying objects that have relatively limited scientific or historical value or those that are profoundly deteriorated. Other terms, such as culling or selective removal, are used as synonymous terms for sampling, but do not apply a deliberate scientific selection process.

Note
1. The current ACC members and authors of this article are Ralph Bailey, Danielle Benden, S. Terry Childs, Teresita Majewski, Christopher Pulliam, Kevin Smith, Michael “Sonny” Trimble, and Mark Warner.
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Nancy Ruth Coinman (née Braun) passed away on Monday, July 6, at her home in Mimbres, New Mexico, after a three-year struggle with cancer. Born in St. Paul, Minnesota, Nancy spent most of her early years in Albuquerque and Las Cruces, establishing a life-long connection with the state she loved. She married a Navy pilot, Mike Coinman, in 1967 after graduating from New Mexico State University with a degree in English Literature. Mike died two years later in a plane crash in San Diego. After his death Nancy remained in California teaching primary and secondary school in the San Diego area for more than a decade. During this time she travelled extensively in Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America. A notable road trip in 1977 took her north from Johannesburg through the heart of Central Africa, East Africa, and the Middle East, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan. As a consequence of these travels and the many and diverse people she met, Nancy became interested in anthropology.

Archaeology was a second career for Nancy. Initially drawn to the American Southwest, her Master’s thesis (1984) examined the basis for some of the inferences derived from ceramic distribution pattern studies at the North Pueblo at Nuvakwetata (the Chavez Pass Ruin), at the site as a whole, and at other sites in the Chavez Pass region. Part of a research design developed by the late Fred Plog and aimed at identifying the causes of the shift from scattered hamlets to site clusters to nucleated villages and towns, Coinman’s work called into question some of the conclusions of earlier workers and successfully integrated technological, typological, and design element analyses to situate the North Pueblo in its larger regional socioeconomic context.

Coinman received her Ph.D. in Anthropology from Arizona State University in 1990 and was subsequently hired at the University of Tulsa (1990–1993), moving to a tenure-track position at Iowa State University in 1993. Her doctoral research involved various aspects of the Levantine Upper and Epipaleolithic, where she had conducted field and laboratory research since the mid-1980s. Between 1997 and 2000, she co-directed, with Deborah Olszewski (University of Pennsylvania Museum), the Eastern Hasa Late Pleistocene Project (EHLPP) in west-central Jordan. Funded by the National Science Foundation, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and the National Geographic Society, the research sought to arrive at a better understanding of forager adaptations when paleolake Hasa and a series of smaller lakes, ponds, springs, and marshes dominated the landscape of the eastern end of the Wadi Hasa drainage. Surveys and excavations at open sites around the ancient shoreline and at rockshelters in nearby tributary drainages documented changes in site location, hunting strategies, and stone tool technologies as the environment in the Hasa responded to global climate change from ca. 40–12 ka BP. Nancy showed that these environments acted as attractors throughout prehistory, and that forager adaptations in the region differed substantially from those of the Mediterranean Levant, where lakes were uncommon.

Nancy retired in 2009 and moved to her beloved Mimbres, where she became active in local archaeology, serving as a board member for the Grant County Archaeological Society, volunteering on a number of archaeological projects, leading field trips, and giving presentations on her past research. She was active in community service in Mimbres, in addition to being a passionate hiker, gardener, and artist. Always full of new ideas and the energy to sustain them, Nancy created a lasting impression on anyone who met her. She remained active and engaged with Mimbres archaeology and the community until just months before her death.

Coinman cared deeply about education and students. Prior to her death, she established an endowment at Iowa State University to help students in archaeology and biological anthropology conduct their research. She also curated her collections from the Hasa project at the Department of Anthropology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and set up a fund to support student research on the collections—a fitting conclusion to a life devoted to teaching and to sharing her knowledge, enthusiasm, and experience with others.

—Geoffrey Clark, Barbara Roth, and Matthew Hill
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