Collaborative research partnerships between academic anthropologists and host or descendant communities are becoming more popular in anthropology. The reviewed books demonstrate there are different understandings of what collaboration means for professional identities and expertise across subfields. Therefore, such partnerships are unlikely to promote cross-subfield integration. Nevertheless, while their collaborative styles diverge, the reviewed authors are motivated by a shared interpretation of disciplinary responsibilities and opportunities that emerges from anthropology’s longstanding commitment to fieldwork and also reflects post-World War II historical transformations. Their shared interpretation raises challenging questions for the discipline at large about professional practices like evaluation.

KEYWORDS audience, collaborative anthropology, disciplinarity, evaluation, expertise, research methods, subfields

Address correspondence to Saul Schwartz or Rena Lederman, Department of Anthropology, Princeton University, 116 Aaron Burr Hall, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA. E-mail: sschwart@princeton.edu or lederman@princeton.edu
INTRODUCTION

The books reviewed here propose research methods labeled “collaborative” (Lassiter 2005) or “Indigenous” and “decolonized” (Reyhner and Lockard, eds. 2009b; Smith and Wobst, eds. 2005c). They suggest that research partnerships between academic anthropologists and members of the communities that have traditionally hosted their research are becoming popular across sociocultural, linguistic, and archaeological anthropology despite ongoing controversy about their professional legitimacy (Lassiter 2008a). All of the reviewed works restrict their focus to collaborations between anthropologists and people whom anthropologists formerly construed as objects or facilitators of their research (as informants, native speakers, descendants, or host communities). They set aside collaborations between anthropologists and other academics, along with work by applied and practicing anthropologists employed in non-academic settings, and joint research and writing by anthropologists and peer or elite interlocutors, like scientists and bankers.

Comparing these works draws attention to two relationships that have long vexed anthropology. The first, at the heart of collaboration itself, is that between academic and host community expertises and resulting conflicts and compromises over divisions of labor and expectations for reciprocity. The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography (Lassiter 2005) and Indigenous Archaeologies (Reyhner and Lockard, eds. 2009b) recognize that anthropologists and their collaborators may differ over means and ends. Both books treat such differences as problems to be resolved by aligning professional disciplinary culture with local community values and priorities. These authors define as “research” activities that could also, or alternatively, be considered advocacy, service, or employment. This understanding of collaboration poses a paradox: professional anthropology’s foundational goal of contextualizing “the native’s point of view” in comparative and theoretical terms (e.g., Malinowski 1984[1922]:25) appears incompatible with collaborative researchers’ desire for anthropology to serve community goals.

This paradox is less evident in Indigenous Language Revitalization (Smith and Wobst, eds. 2005c), which mostly situates collaborative divisions of labor between linguists and language activists as an established but occasional method for contributing to linguistics. Distinguishing linguistics as a scientific vocation from linguistics as a service to heritage language communities, some authors present their mutual engagements in terms of reciprocity. That is, instead of anthropologists expressing solidarity with consultants by working together on the same projects, “reciprocity” (e.g., Mauss 1990[1924]) establishes solidarity through exchanges of gifts and services between anthropologists and consultants working on convergent but basically distinctive projects.

The second vexed relationship is that among disciplinary subfields (Lederman 2005b). Insofar as biological anthropologists work with living
humans, the challenges some face (e.g., Olsen 1989) are akin to those of applied, practicing, and collaborative sociocultural anthropologists. Similarly, bioarchaeologists share many of the challenges faced by other archaeologists when forming collaborative relationships with people who assert descendant interests (e.g., reburial and repatriation). Archaeological, linguistic, and sociocultural anthropology, represented by the volumes reviewed here, show that collaboration has different implications for professional obligations and identities in each of these subfields. However, they also demonstrate that practitioners across the subfields share commitments to a concept of research ethics that is inextricable from political activism and social justice.

This review provides readers with a description of the reviewed works' arguments and our interpretations from historical and cross-disciplinary perspectives. Because collaboration can mean privileging non-academic goals over academic ones, reading these books single-mindedly for their implications for subfield integration (a mostly academic concern) views them against their grain. What is more, because these works are critical of conventional academic standards of evaluation, as we show, reviews like this one face a double bind. Consequently, while we are not uncritical of collaborative methods, our goal is to avoid prescriptive judgments and instead provide contextual understandings that will serve the needs of readers with diverse interests and orientations.

COLLABORATIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

In the first half of The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography (Lassiter 2005) Luke Eric Lassiter surveys precedents for collaborative research in early American anthropology (especially work with Native American communities, e.g., Lewis Henry Morgan and Ely Parker, Franz Boas and George Hunt) and in more recent feminist and postmodern approaches. The second half of the book concerns collaborative practice, with chapters on ethics, personal experience and intersubjectivity, accessible writing, and the production and interpretation of collaborative texts.

Throughout, a central goal is to specify what makes collaborative ethnography different from the "intimate relationships" that have long "define[d] anthropological research" (2005:x). First, systematic conscious intent is key: collaborative ethnography "deliberately and explicitly emphasizes collaboration at every point in the ethnographic process, without veiling it" (2005:16). Second, Lassiter uses "collaborative ethnography" to refer specifically to anthropologists' work with "nonprofessionals" and "local community consultants," not to other kinds of partnerships in which anthropologists are involved (2005:xii, 16–17).

The Chicago Guide opens with a caution from Ralph Kotay, one of Lassiter's Kiowa consultants: "I'm always willing to give out information like
this. But...I don’t want anything else said above this. Some people who write books, I’ve read their stories where they build things up that’s not there. When people don’t know [any better], anytime they hear these things, they believe what you say or write” (2005:4). Lassiter interprets Kotay’s comments as “an implied moral message about the nature of my commitment to him and to his community—that is, that I should draw my interpretation of Kiowa song from his perspective rather than my own, and that any public representations of Kiowa song...should privilege the same perspective” (2005:11). Kotay’s remarks encouraged him to write his dissertation about “tensions between the academy and the so-called ethnographic site” surrounding understandings of religious experience and the politics of representation (2005:4–7).

Consultants like Kotay appear to counterpose academic and community interpretations not in order to set them side by side or in dialogue, but in order to reject academic interpretations as controlling and irrelevant. They desire their cultures presented in their own voices. Kotay’s concerns resonate throughout The Chicago Guide, which also draws on Lassiter’s undergraduate ethnographic experience with a Narcotics Anonymous meeting and his recent involvement researching and writing The Other Side of Middletown (Lassiter et al., eds. 2004) with the African American community in Muncie, Indiana, USA.

Ultimately, Lassiter’s central argument—that anthropologists may harmonize the dissonance between professional and non-professional cultures by restraining their anthropological imaginations and privileging consultants’ interpretations—is ethical and political:

> Collaborative ethnography revolves first and foremost around an ethical and moral responsibility to consultants—who are engaged...as co-intellectuals and collaborators who help to shape our ethnographic understandings, our ethnographic texts, and our larger responsibility to others as researchers, citizens, and activists. Constructed in this way, collaborative ethnography is first and foremost an ethical and moral enterprise, and subsequently a political one. [Lassiter 2005:79]

Lassiter’s brief for writing with and for consultants and privileging their interpretations (2005:7–11) challenges academic conventions. Nevertheless, it is grounded in disciplinary history (2005:25–75) and it carefully presents collaboration as an expansion of conventional ethnographic practice, not a replacement for it. For example, the preface asserts that “unlike those who dismiss collaborative research outright, I do not take an absolutist approach. I never argue here...that collaborative ethnography is always appropriate for all types of research” (2005:xi). Underlining this point, he describes how conventional approaches were integrated into the Middletown collaboration: in the wake of a contentious community debate, he and his students...
conducted “a balanced, ethnographically based attitudinal survey of local business owners” (2005:xi) to provide data toward resolving the controversy. “Collaborative ethnography,” he notes, “was not the appropriate model for this project” (2005:xii).

Lassiter also acknowledges that partnerships with communities are especially difficult to maintain early in academic careers. As an untenured professor revising his dissertation for publication, Lassiter wrestled with the conflicting evaluations of his consultants and academic advisers. He had an informal agreement with his consultants to remove certain passages during these revisions but faced daunting academic pressures. “As an idealistic graduate student,” Lassiter writes, “I had never thought I would care much about what other academics thought; but now my newly attained junior faculty status brought changes” (2005:93). Concerned about his prospective tenure review, he reinserted the material in an introduction. When his consultants read the book, they teased him for writing “academadese” and “sounding like a white man,” and Lassiter regretted what he had done: “In the interest of my own academic concerns, I had broken a moral contract with my consultants... To this day I feel troubled by my decision” (2005:95).

This personal narrative foreshadows a chapter on “ethnographic honesty” (2005:98–116) as the basis for intersubjective understandings. Honesty may make ethnographers feel vulnerable but it is a condition for collaborative interpretations and representations. This argument leads into a chapter on accessible writing (2005:117–132), another condition for community participation in ethnographic production. More broadly, accessible writing puts into practice the widespread anthropological belief in the discipline’s “ethical and political mission of democracy, social justice, and equity” (2005:121).

Lassiter’s narrative can leave readers with troubled feelings about the dilemmas collaborative ethnographers face when incompatible community and scholarly obligations cannot be reconciled (e.g., 2005:139–141). He admits that solutions are easier to see in retrospect. Counseling that to be honest with others about one’s goals and expectations requires “being true to oneself” (2005:141), he points to the importance of well-developed relationships not only with collaborators but also with professional colleagues. Professional obligations can appear simply burdensome for graduate students and untenured faculty; however Lassiter’s invocation of the guidance and inspiration he received from his dissertation adviser (2005:xiii), to whom Lassiter dedicates his book, suggests other possibilities. Fieldwork dialogues with consultants create friendships, commitments, and moral responsibilities at the same time as they create ethnographic knowledge (2005:11–12). Similarly, dialogues characteristic of ethically responsible mentoring and collegial relations create conditions for scholarly knowledge production at the same time as they enable fruitful consilience between professional and field obligations. The challenge for collaborative ethnographers is to explain professional obligations to consultants and community commitments to colleagues.
While “collaboration,” in Lassiter’s sense, is certainly an important thread of *Indigenous Archaeologies* (Smith and Wobst, eds. 2005c), the central themes of this collection are the Indigenization and decolonization of archeological theory and practice. As editors Claire Smith and H Martin Wobst explain, “the capital ‘I’ emphasizes the nationhood of individual groups while use of the plural ‘peoples’ internationalizes Indigenous experiences, issues and struggles, and acts against the notion of an Indigenous homogeneity” (Smith and Wobst 2005a:16 n. 1). The capital “I” in “Indigenous” may also reflect Australian usage: nearly two-thirds of *Indigenous Archaeology*’s 41 authors live or work in Australia (and see, e.g., Why Warriors Pty. Ltd. n.d.). Since only some of the authors referred to in this review follow the upper-case usage, we employ the lower-case unless we are quoting or referring to them.

Including contributions first presented at symposia held in Cape Town in 1999 and in San Francisco during the AAA Annual Meeting the following year, the volume is divided into four sections. The first considers conditions for decolonizing archeological theory and the fourth concerns the ethics of archeological practice. Section II focuses on the repatriation of human remains, especially in the United States, while Section III explores cultural resource ownership and management around the world, with contributions on Australia, Africa, and the African Diaspora.

Articulating their point of departure with a startling claim, “At heart, archaeology is a colonialist endeavour,” the editors highlight “the potential for conflict…at the core of Indigenous archaeology” (2005a:5). A number of contributors (Nicholas 2005; Wobst 2005; Zimmerman 2005) discuss epistemological and political dissonance between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples.

This volume treats dissonance as a problem to be resolved by assimilating scholarly objectives to those of descendant communities. As Smith and Wobst put it:

> We expect that, for different groups, archaeologists will be carrying out quite different ‘Indigenous archaeologies.’…Archaeologists have an obligation to facilitate the agenda of Indigenous groups with regard to their past and, thus, will become increasingly diversified in their practice, if only through the diversity of questions that Indigenous populations will want them to answer. This, too, will help to decolonize archaeologists—their agendas will begin to differ more within the academy, and increasingly they will look indistinguishable from the agendas of the societies with whose past they work. [2005b:394]

Similarly, Ken Isaacson and Stephanie Ford (2005:361) advocate that archaeologists “bridge the barriers that traditionally separate private and professional lives,” so that “the future of the Indigenous community in which they work becomes a future in which they have a vested personal interest.”
While Smith and Wobst advocate that archaeologists become even more differentiated from one another than they already are, Isaacson and Ford's recommendation brings archaeologists closer to sociocultural anthropologists insofar as the latter have long acknowledged the entanglement of professional and personal relations in their research practices (e.g., Brettell, ed. 1993; Casagrande, ed. 1960; McLean and Leibing, eds. 2007). Encouraging archaeologists to extend their research to include activities that foster meaningful relationships with indigenous persons and groups, Isaacson and Ford predict “Indigenous archaeology will benefit the most from the use of an in-depth, holistic research approach, which includes tracing family trees and recording oral histories—areas that are normally thought of as ethnology, linguistics or history” (Isaacson and Ford 2005:358). Moreover, archaeologists should also “help Indigenous people fund, establish, and manage educational, economic, cultural heritage, and community welfare programmes and enterprises” (2005:362).

Isaacson and Ford are not alone in radically reimagining archaeological practice. Sally K. May, Donald Gumurdul, Jacob Manakgu, Gabriel Maralngurra, and Wilfred Nawirridj (2005:127) even suggest that, at this historical juncture, more can be learned archaeologically from repatriation work in all its dimensions than from conventional archaeological studies. Darby C. Stapp and Julia G. Longenecker (2005:179) similarly advocate upending the relationship between traditional scholarship and cultural resource management, along with a complete reconceptualization of who is teaching whom (see also Ouzman 2005:215–221).

While these visions appear to disintegrate archaeology as we know it, the volume’s effect on the subfield may be to extend its repertoire both inside and outside the academy. For example, several contributions envision future archaeologists working closely with adjacent disciplines. Wobst’s discussion of anachronisms and ethnocentrisms in archaeological theory and methods proposes integrating “material culture studies with fields of study that have been concerned with ‘non-material’ realms, such as historical linguistics, language, poetry, music, dance, place name studies, oral history, folklore, myth, and others” (2005:28). Similar sentiments are voiced by Margaret M. Bruchac (2005) on oral traditions or “deep time stories” and landscape in Algonkian Indian history; and by Stapp and Longenecker (2005:178–181) on “cultural resource stewardship,” which situates archaeologists alongside ethnographers and architectural historians in service to descendant communities and wider publics by preserving archeological sites and making them accessible.

So while sociocultural and archaeological anthropologists clearly face similar political and professional challenges in collaborative work, the move to interdisciplinary indigenous archaeologies does not bring archaeology any closer to sociocultural anthropology than it does to folklore, oral history, or legal and social justice studies (e.g., Rigney and Worby 2005; Watkins 2005b).
This collection occasionally refers to precedents closer to home—such as ethnoarchaeology (Jackson and Smith 2005; Zimmerman 2005) and post-processualism (Isaacson and Ford 2005)—and it explores ethnographically rich concepts like “memory” and “time” (Bruchac 2005; Nicholas 2005; Wobst 2005; Zimmerman 2005). However, the authors’ main concerns do not draw them to relevant ethnographic literatures (e.g., ethnohistory). The few references to ethnoarchaeology suggest both its relevance to the future of indigenous archaeologies and to integrated anthropology: ethnoarchaeologists share sociocultural anthropologists’ research experience of learning from community members (e.g., Jackson and Smith 2005:343). But because disciplinary precedents like this are not explicitly highlighted, readers are not encouraged to seek them out.

One genuine convergence between collaborative sociocultural and archaeological projects is in transforming indigenous people from objects of academic analysis into co-researchers and writers. The inclusion of non-academic authors side-by-side with both indigenous and non-indigenous professional archaeologists in Indigenous Archaeologies parallels Lassiter’s account of his comprehensive collaborations with African American residents of Muncie, Indiana, who were involved in project design, research, analysis, and writing. Both the benefits and risks possible in realizing that goal are displayed for readers to sort through.

Smith and Wobst view the inclusion of indigenous authors as a central contribution of their collection: “This book is groundbreaking most strikingly because it is the first volume on Indigenous archaeology that has more Indigenous than non-Indigenous authors” (2005a:7). Welcoming indigenous peoples as full participants in international discussions and global alliances acts to transform knowledge distribution and authorship, and provides a “direct view” of indigenous culture rather than “one which is filtered through the interpretive lens of the researcher” (2005a:13). What is more, because many chapters are written by archaeologists whose research concerns their own indigenous community’s past, “the papers in this volume belie any absolute dichotomy between archaeologists and Indigenous peoples” (2005a:11).

Promoting active indigenous participation demanded “developing a format that facilitates Indigenous voice.” This entailed considerable experimentation (and consequent risk of failure):

Influenced by a post-processual interest in the value of a range of speaking positions, our decision led to a difference in the shape of this volume, away from a purely academic structure to one that includes a variety of sources, including interviews, poems and visual pieces... The juxtapositions of these different forms of communication facilitate a more nuanced understanding of the issues under discussion, allowing readers to call on their intuitive skills as well as their reasoning. In this way, these topics
become more accessible to the public as well as the Indigenous peoples whose cultural and intellectual property is the subject of research. [2005a:7]

This experimentation includes conversations/interviews (Birt and Copley 2005), one of which is presented in Kriol and English (Wiynjorroc et al. 2005); maps, photographs, and handwritten postcards illustrating a discussion of Harlan Smith’s field correspondence with Franz Boas (Carlson 2005); and public speeches and documents (Hemming and Trevorrow 2005; Van Pelt 2005).

However, linking “intuition” and accessibility begs key questions concerning how to effect the meaningful engagement of a diverse readership of Indigenous and unmarked (indeed, global) publics, and academic and non-academic archaeologists (and so on: although the volume’s steep price tag will likely limit that diversity).

For example, many poems are encountered amidst the volume’s chapters (Harris 2005b,c,d,e,f,g,h; Kirkby 2005a,b; Reed-Gilbert 2005a,b; Watkins 2005a). Yet they are unnumbered and receive fleeting reference in the introduction. In contrast, the other contributions appear as numbered chapters, following a traditional academic format, and are discussed in the introduction. The reasons for this difference are unexplained: should one infer that poems need no introduction, that one is meant to read them as one reads any poem, or as one may have learned to read, say, Langston Hughes or Louise Erdrich? Are they offered to simulate for readers the exclusions and provocations that the articles wrestle with analytically? Is the significance of the poems simply their challenging presence? Answers to these questions are unclear; however, it is clear that the volume’s goals of accessibility and participation are in conflict with one another when readers and participants derive from different cross-national subcultures (indigenous and otherwise).

What of the indigenous archaeologists whom the editors frame as incarnations of the integration of archaeology and indigenous peoples? They articulate the contradictions of their social identities and forms of expertise within and between their respective interventions in a manner consistent with longstanding discussions of “native anthropology” (e.g., Jones 1970). Heather Harris’s many contributions are particularly thought-provoking. On one hand, her academic-format chapter (2005a) highlights epistemological incommensurabilities among the temporal worldviews of archaeologists and “time before time” concepts of descendant communities. From this vantage point, the conflict can be overcome when archaeologists normalize the need to become educated about indigenous experience. On the other hand, her poem, “Archaeology camp” (2005d)—whose “we” is at least as “archaeological” as it is “Indigenous”—holds out hope for reconciling the authority of oral tradition (“we know the past from stories elders tell”) and archaeology (“and now we seek the record of that story laid in the ground” (2005d:3–4).
“Archaeology camp”—positioned as the collection’s first contribution—ends whimsically. However, by bringing “time before time” to life, Harris’s other poems communicate her activating anger. Elsewhere, hopes for reconciliation are qualified by visions of connections across dramatic historical rifts (Mathis and Weik 2005) and references to wide divisions within indigenous communities (Zimmerman 2005:302–303).

Similar tensions emerge in other essays by indigenous archaeologists. Tara Million’s (2005:40–41) creative contribution presents a “circular research model” sensitive to both native and academic interests, but a separation (not an integration) of academic and indigenous worldviews is also evident here. Million’s research model is inspired by a “paradigm shift…from a Western linear worldview to an Aboriginal circular worldview” (2005:44); and she presents three “separate and equal” conclusions (2005:52–54): “a mainstream Western archaeological ending that is formal, concrete, and prescriptive”; a personal vision–quest narrative in Aboriginal voice; and a visual finale—a photo of the author, triumphant (perhaps: simultaneously the archaeologist completing her circular excavation/reburial and Thunderbird Woman claiming her name). Million understands her work as an effort to “bridge” conflicting value systems, requiring the creation of a “<i>lingua franca</i> that incorporates both of my cultures, archaeological and Aboriginal, yet is neither one nor the other” (2005:51). But these side-by-side conclusions suggest the persistence of distinct languages within an only partially creolized academic/indigenous discourse.

While Smith and Wobst argue for resolving this problem by assimilating archaeological agendas to indigenous ones—with indigenous archaeologists as embodiments of this possibility—their contributors (indigenous and otherwise) echo the contradictions and negotiations that Million’s chapter succinctly and vividly communicates. These persistent tensions complicate the meaning of collaborative research and the possibility of indigenous archaeology: in a word, contributors and readers have lots more work to do. Million’s joyful visual conclusion may serve as a condensed representation of a tendency in <i>Indigenous Archaeologies</i> to emphasize successful collaboration and its political and ethical advantages, and to repress its complex, painful methodological conundrums. We agree with Wendy Beck et al. (2005:240) that “more ‘warts and all’ accounts of the hard parts” of collaborative research, such as Lassiter offers (described above), could lead to more nuanced notions of collaborative, post-colonial methodologies.

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION

Like <i>Indigenous Archaeologies</i>, <i>Indigenous Language Revitalization</i> (Reyhner and Lockard, eds. 2009b) provides insight into the dynamics of partnerships between academics and indigenous communities, although its
approach differs from the other works we have discussed. The volume is a collection of papers from the 14th and 15th annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages conferences held in Mount Pleasant, Michigan, in 2007 and in Flagstaff, Arizona, in 2008. Like others in the series, this compilation of conference proceedings is available from Northern Arizona University’s College of Education and online as a free download, clearly demonstrating the contributors’ commitment to accessibility.

The book’s main concerns are “language activism” and practical strategies for stabilizing and revitalizing indigenous languages. Editors Jon Reyhner and Louise Lockard give a special place to “elders who continue to speak their languages with the hope that their language survives another generation” (2009a:v). In the introductory section, Darrell Kipp (2009) and Margaret Noori (2009) describe approaches to teaching heritage languages in educational and domestic settings. Section II focuses on “linguists and language activists working together.” Section III presents case studies from New Zealand, Hawai‘i, and Alaska on challenges facing revitalization efforts, including teaching and learning pronunciation (King et al. 2009) and motivating second language learners (King 2009). Section IV discusses the role of technologies in language revitalization with case studies from North America and Hawai‘i (e.g., Galla 2009). The final section on assessment contains a detailed case study of a Seneca language and culture school (Borgia 2009).

Many chapters pay special attention to differences between linguists and language activists. In Lenore Grenoble’s words, “linguists and language activists generally have fundamentally different goals and different attitudes about the best way of accomplishing them” (2009:61). Linguists are interested in documentation and description; language activists are interested in revitalization.

Unlike many other contributors to Indigenous Language Revitalization, Grenoble shares Lassiter’s and Smith and Wobst’s desire to “rethink paradigms of research and Western methodologies so as to ensure that community members are full members of research projects and their questions and issues create and drive research agendas even when external linguists are involved” (2009:61–62). Toward this end, Grenoble proposes educational reforms since most linguists are trained in elicitation and analysis but lack skills useful to revitalization (e.g., creating orthographies, pedagogical materials, and dictionaries) (2009:65).

Other contributors see collaboration not as a paradigm shift but as an established but occasional method for collecting data when linguistic and revitalization agendas converge. Describing their work compiling a Labrador Inuittitut story database, Joan Dicker, Ewan Dunbar, and Alana Johns (2009:155) note that linguists employed by universities are evaluated on the bases of teaching and publishing whereas “communities have long-term language teaching goals. Where the two goals intersect, it is possible to have mutually useful collaboration. One of the challenges is to determine whether
or not there is indeed intersection of goals so that precious time and effort is not wasted” (a point that recalls Lassiter’s account of his Middletown work, reported above). Mizuki Miyashita and Shirlee Crow Shoe (2009) present a similar perspective: successful collaborative projects rely on relationships of mutual trust and clearly identified goals.

Grenoble and other contributors to section II challenge readers with their conflicting messages. Keren Rice (2009) captures the divergent goals of linguists and language activists with a metaphor of “two solitudes.” Field linguists are interested in the “documentation and analysis of language” and in language diversity as a window into the human mind. They are motivated by cross-cultural concerns that parallel those of academic archaeology and sociocultural anthropology. Language activists are interested in “language as spirituality, culture and recognition”; they are motivated by felt responsibilities to future generations (2009:40–43). Rice is hopeful that the “two solitudes” separating linguists and language activists can be dissolved through recognition of mutual need and relationships of respect and reciprocity; ironically however, while “words expressing solitudes have been spoken by Indigenous peoples and academics both; most of the words in this paper about bridging those solitudes come from academics” (2009:56).

For all its irony, this separation may be overdrawn: while all the chapters in Section II are authored by academic linguists, some are clearly also activists. Margaret Noori’s thoughtful, clever, and moving essay—one of the two introducing the volume as a whole—is particularly instructive. She reveals language activism already within academic linguistics (Anishinaabemowin language courses are taught at the University of Michigan) and academic linguistics within language activism (she draws on linguistics overtly in encouraging Anishinaabemowin language at home with her family: “my peers might call this applied linguistics, my kids call it homework” [Noori 2009:15]). Her “love poem to the symbol of our community language classes”—offered both in Anishinaabemowin and in English—similarly brings together linguistics and language activism by figuring the language table as university: “Language Table, Our Sweetheart, / You are not only a flat board. / You are a meeting place. / You are a university. / All our prayers and dreams / gather there / inside your wooden heart.” (2009:20). Noori’s concluding thought—“Miigwetch gii bizindaawiyeeg. Thanks to yous for reading”—demonstrates that “our words are an epistemology” and communicates delight in translating across languages and cultures (2009:21). With a marked second person plural (yous), she evokes a community of readers supporting language revitalization.

In any case, in argument with Rice’s assertion that “linguists and Indigenous communities need to work together to help revitalize Indigenous languages” (2009:37), the neighboring chapter by Margaret Speas is skeptical that revitalization projects need academic linguists as such, whose expertise concerning language structures does not necessarily translate into useful
social practices: “asking a linguist to help you develop a language program is a bit like... asking a gynecologist how to meet women” (2009:24).

Indeed, *Indigenous Language Revitalization* provides examples of co-authored collaborative research not only between linguists and individual consultants (e.g., Dicker et al. 2009; Miyashita and Crow Shoe 2009) but also with indigenous legal entities (e.g., De Korne and The Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians 2009), and within and between indigenous communities themselves. Ngareta Timutimu, Teraania Ormsby-Teki, and Riri Ellis (2009:109) describe a “collaborative research project” totally by, for, and of the Ngāi Te Rangi tribe of Tauranga Moana, New Zealand, aimed at encouraging Māori language use at home. In this project, “The research manager, research director, project leader, and researchers are all Ngāi Te Rangi” (2009:113). Ngāi Te Rangi people conceived it and carried it out according to “research principles...consistent with our own beliefs and values” (2009:114): “Our ownership of this project and its outcomes is hugely significant” (2009:113). Similarly, Larry Kimura and Isiik April G. L. Counceller (2009:121) describe “collaboration” between the Hawai’ian Lexicon Committee and Alutiiq New Words Council to compose words with community legitimacy for new concepts and technologies.

Speas, Timutimu et al., and Kimura and Counceller demonstrate that many language activists possess enough linguistic training to pursue revitalization goals themselves. This challenges academic linguists to articulate what exactly they can contribute to revitalization efforts. Paul V. Kroskrity (2009:71) asserts that “ideological clarification” of local theories of language is necessary because their conflicts “impede local efforts at linguistic revitalization.” Speas (2009:26) disagrees: “disabusing members of Native communities of their ‘misconceptions’ about language and sharing the truth with them” is not the best way for linguists to contribute to language revitalization. Restricting herself to activities “that directly involve my expertise as a linguist” increases the likelihood that she will only do “what I think the community needs rather than what community members tell me they actually need” (2009:30).

Of course, she acknowledges that linguists trained in, say, theoretical syntax and not in crafting dictionaries or collecting texts might offer other services that enable community members to focus on revitalization: babysitting, getting coffee for meetings, mailing out flyers, bookkeeping and paperwork, writing grants, lobbying, and advocacy. Speas, then, presents a reciprocity model for relations between linguists and heritage language communities: gifts and services can be exchanged with or without collaborative research.

Despite their disagreements, neither Speas nor Kroskrity questions the value of difference between linguistic and activist expertise. Indeed, this is the message of most authors in the volume. Linguistics and language revitalization each entail certain obligations and expertise. When goals converge,
collaboration is possible; when goals diverge, collaboration may be impossible. In a word, this collection does not argue that academic specialist and activist agendas should be harmonized by having academic linguists as such pursue language revitalization: as persons with community ties, academics can still contribute to revitalization efforts without necessarily drawing on their linguistic expertise.

In contrast to Lassiter’s *Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography* and *Indigenous Archaeologies*, then, the linguists in *Indigenous Language Revitalization* see the source of their discipline’s value in its complementarity to indigenous (or other) public values. We take these alternative collaborative styles across anthropology’s sociocultural, archaeological, and linguistic subfields to indicate a lack of disciplinary consensus concerning how best to put into practice an otherwise widespread recognition of the importance of non-specialist engagement and access.

**COLLABORATION IN HISTORICAL AND CROSS-DISCIPLINARY CONTEXT**

To appreciate the grounds for this shared recognition, it is useful to consider contemporary collaborative styles in light of disciplinary history, particularly if we view that history comparatively in relation to trends in the behavioral and social sciences. Early modern social and cultural anthropologists construed both themselves and the people they studied as knowers, while distinguishing their respective kinds of expertise. For example, in his introduction to *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1984[1922]), Malinowski represents ethnographic fieldwork as the basis for an objective science distinct from “the biased and pre-judged opinions inevitable in the average practical man” (1984[1922]:5). To this end, he argued, systematic observation is not enough: it is also necessary to record “the native’s point of view” in his own words. Nevertheless, the ends of ethnography exceed any “native’s point of view” insofar as the words and experiences of average citizens become sources for social structural and cross-cultural analyses: cultural insiders’ perspectives are instrumental means to comparative ethnographic ends, not ends in themselves.

Similarly, linguistic anthropologists depended on native speakers as expert language users while describing them as unconscious of the language structures that formal linguistic analyses reveal. Boas believed the “great advantage” of linguistics over ethnology was that “linguistic classifications never rise into consciousness, while in other ethnological phenomena, although the same unconscious origin prevails, these often rise into consciousness, and thus give rise to secondary reason and to reinterpretations” (Boas 1911:67, 70–71). Edward Sapir sometimes expressed profound anxiety about the “restless attempt to drag all the forms of behavior into consciousness” (1928:36) but concluded that only specialists should burden
themselves with awareness of otherwise unconscious patterns of behavior, linguistic behavior being his primary example (1928:44–45). These ideas of Boas and Sapir have enduring resonances in linguistic anthropology (e.g., Bauman and Briggs 2003; Collins 1998:261–262).

In the early 20th century, sociocultural and linguistic anthropologists were not very different from their counterparts in psychology, sociology, and related fields. However, subsequent developments rendered anthropology distinctive. In particular, as experimental methods became normative in psychology, as sample surveys and formal questionnaire interviewing became normative in sociology—and especially as controlled conditions became a methodological standard—a categorical distinction came to be made between researchers as expert knowledge producers and research participants as objects of knowledge production. In contrast to the increasingly sharp knower/known distinction associated with experimentalism and social survey research, professional anthropologists of all kinds relied for their primary data on fieldwork: research conducted on the home turf of the people whose circumstances are being studied, under conditions controlled at least as much by them as by the researcher. To this day, fieldwork remains the normative means to the end of a comparative understanding of human nature, culture, and history; and anthropologists persist in construing both themselves and their informants or community consultants as knowers, albeit with different kinds of expertise (e.g., Bernard and Salinas Pedraza 1987; Lambek 1997; Radin 1927; Turner 1960).

Against this historical background, the books under review are evidence of the distance the discipline has traveled in fully realizing the radical step it took, with Malinowski and other founders of modern anthropology off the proverbial veranda and into the worlds of the peoples they sought to understand. That step propelled professional anthropologists into reciprocal social relationships whose character is defined and constrained simultaneously by researchers and the peoples hosting them.

Fieldwork is, to our knowledge, a surprisingly under-appreciated commonality among disciplinary subfields. Insofar as all anthropologists do fieldwork, they become dependent, one way or another, on their host communities, even when those communities are not the topic of their research. These relationships have been more explicit in the professional discourse of sociocultural anthropologists than they have for other subfield practitioners: in archaeology, for example, while local communities were often indispensable to archaeological research (Carlson 2005), reflexive reflection on the research contributions of host and descendant communities awaited so-called post-processualism beginning in the 1970s (Shanks n.d.), developments in contract archaeology (e.g., those associated with Cultural Resource Management: Stapp and Longnecker 2005), and legislative interventions like the 1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Watkins 2005b). This suggests that, compared with sociocultural and
linguistic anthropology, in archaeology a more qualitative distinction between specialist and lay expertise was taken for granted until relatively recently (see also Ray 2009:1–3). Similarly, biological anthropologists doing research on primate behavior and paleoanthropologists and archaeologists doing research on human evolution have long relied in many practical ways on local human populations and host governments; but their relationships with their hosts have been transformed, in recent years, as the latter’s ideas about cultural properties, tourism, and the like have changed (e.g., see Haviland et al. 2008:155).

By insisting that fieldwork demands humility toward those who host it (e.g., Zimmerman 2005:301–314), the reviewed books demonstrate that anthropologists across the subfields are now in a position—historically, ethically, methodologically, theoretically—to understand and even welcome their hosts’ expectations concerning meaningful returns, including those involving the anthropologist’s research and writing. Working this out, collaborative anthropologists face the classic challenge of reciprocity: of balancing solidarities with differentiation (Durkheim 1984[1893]; Mauss 1990[1924]; Weiner 1985). We consider this a productive challenge if it prompts anthropologists to clarify the substance and value of their contribution.

Commitments to “collaborative ethnography,” the creation of an “Indigenous archaeology,” and activism around heritage “language revitalization” are also evidence of cross-subfield responses to the shifting social contexts of anthropological work over the past six decades and the resulting dilemmas of “reception” (by which we mean how audiences selectively access, contextualize, and use anthropological knowledge). Concern with reception has taken other forms as well: for example, Lassiter (2008b) takes pains to distinguish collaborative ethnography’s commitment to full-scale co-production with communities from the more limited aims of “public anthropology” (e.g., Borofsky 2010), a term that became popular in the late 1990s to refer to efforts by academic anthropologists to communicate in popular outlets (e.g., newspapers) rather than limiting publication to specialist media. Advocacy for public anthropology has also been a factor prompting anthropologists with other self-designations (e.g., “applied,” “practicing,” “participatory action,” “engaged”) to reassert the long history and contemporary expansion of extra-academic relationships in which anthropologists of all subfields have engaged (e.g., Singer 2000).

These widespread anthropological responses, emerging in the wake of politically charged anthropological reflexivity in the 1960s and subsequently (Lederman 2005a), reflect a cross-disciplinary sea change prompted by extra-academic forces, like post-World War II decolonization and the U.S. civil rights movement. Transformations within anthropology are akin, for example, to U.S. historiography’s democratizing movement from political and diplomatic history to social and “people’s” histories; and literary scholarship’s analogous struggles around reorganizing curricula based on Western literary canons to make room for “women’s,” “Black,” and “World” literatures.
Lassiter’s interaction with Ralph Kotay (described at length above) echoes Kevin Dwyer’s 1970s conversations with Faqir Mbarek, who begins by deflating Dwyer’s hopes for dialogic engagement (e.g., “As for me, I know that I’m not concerned with a single one of your questions” [1977:144]) or, more recently, the exchange between Michael Lambek (1997) and Emmanuel Tehindrazanarivelo (1997), in which Tehindrazanarivelo rejects Lambek’s attempts to engage in reciprocal ethnographizing, instead proposing rebiky, his own cultural model of engagement (see also Becker 1995:18–19 for powerful examples from a linguistic anthropologist’s perspective, attentive to the reciprocal losses inherent in mutual translations of texts across linguistic and cultural spaces). Almost 20 years ago, Caroline Brettell’s collection (1993) opened a vantage point on reception that implicated ethnographers and the people whose circumstances they study, by considering what happens “when ‘they’ read what ‘we’ write.” Over the past generation, not only have Western anthropologists been reconceptualizing their field consultants as potential readers, they have also become more fully aware of the value of “indigenous” or “native” anthropologies (e.g., Jones 1970) and the diversity of national anthropologies (e.g., Brazilian, Japanese, Australian; e.g., Lins Ribeiro and Escobar, eds. 2006). As familiar “us”/“them” distinctions among their interlocutors, co-authors, and colleagues have become blurred or unstable, anthropologists have productively rethought their professional identities and ethnographic media.

However, it is important to add that framing the contemporary professional challenge, as these books do, also significantly narrows its scope. Anthropology was never solely the study of indigenous, formerly colonized, or marginalized populations. Moreover, paralleling the developments described above, many anthropologists followed Laura Nader’s (1969) exhortation concerning post-colonial research priorities by “studying up.” They followed colonials home to metropolitan centers and began fieldwork among scientists, politicians, bankers, and other erstwhile familiars. This kind of research can involve partnerships, too. For example, Paul Rabinow’s work with biotechnology innovators at the Cetus Corporation produced not only joint conference presentations by Rabinow and a Cetus scientist but also a book written for lay readers (Rabinow 1996). However, the ethics of these research relationships may differ from those with which the reviewed works are concerned (see Peacock 2008:173–174). In summary, collaboration with indigenous people is a critical step but it is not the only one necessary to meet contemporary professional challenges (e.g., Lederman n.d.).

EVALUATING COLLABORATIVE WORK

We began this essay with a question about the impact of collaborative methods on relations among anthropological subfields. Judging from The Chicago
Guide to Comparative Ethnography, Indigenous Archaeologies, and Indigenous Language Revitalization, anthropological subfield integration is not necessarily advanced by professional-community partnerships. Anthropological collaborators may sometimes draw on sources and approaches associated with more than one branch of their discipline (e.g., Jackson and Smith 2005). But they are just as likely to reach out to other disciplines and to extra-academic specializations (like cultural resource management). In these ways, to collaborate effectively, anthropologists must be ready to put conventional disciplinary priorities on a backburner.

Finally, in working to alter who carries out and uses anthropological research and why, the reviewed books prompt us to consider the standards by which collaborators evaluate their work. We offer an example in the next two paragraphs, and we conclude with an observation concerning the limitations of strictly professional or community standards for evaluating by-definition hybrid academic-community endeavors.

Lassiter distinguishes between authentic and merely rhetorical collaboration. His opening chapter begins with a passage by Vincent Crapanzano (1986) urging anthropologists to view themselves and their informants in “an I-you relationship, a dialogue, two people next to each other reading the same text and discussing it face-to-face” (Lassiter 2005:4). In that passage, Crapanzano accepts Clifford Geertz’s well-known figure of culture as “an ensemble of texts” but rejects Geertz’s metaphoric placement of the anthropologist who “strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom [those texts] properly belong” (Geertz 1973:452–453: We believe that a more accurate reading of Geertz’s line would recognize that it articulates ideas about study-population ownership and the anthropologist’s partially obscured vision that is central to collaborative ethnography).

Following Crapanzano, Lassiter understands the metaphor to situate anthropologists “above” (superior to) their interlocutors. Collaboration resituates anthropologists “from ‘reading over the shoulders of natives’ to ‘reading alongside natives,’ literally” (Lassiter 2005:3). “Literally” is key here: Lassiter considers metaphoric representations of collaboration insufficient. Real-world intellectual co-production is also needed (2005:160; also 72, 163): “few ethnographers . . . have sought to extend the metaphor of dialogue to its next logical step—the collaborative reading and interpretation, between the ethnographer and his or her interlocutors, of the very ethnographic text itself” (2005:3).

Unlike metaphoric dialogue, real-life co-production can prompt a rethinking of accustomed modes of evaluation. Research produced for academic anthropologists is evaluated by consequential academic agents like tenure committees and manuscript reviewers. Research produced for consultants, indigenous peoples, or publics is evaluated by these agents outside academic structures according to a divergent array of nonacademic criteria. How, where, and by whom should research produced for both academic
and community audiences be evaluated? If consultants are co-authors, should they also serve on dissertation committees (as one of Lassiter’s graduate students tried to arrange [2005:149–150]; see also Waiko 1992) or write book reviews in academic journals like this one? Alternatively, or simultaneously, should collaborative research be evaluated collaboratively, in the specific sense of giving priority to standards of value set by the project’s host communities?

These questions have reflexive implications that, while perhaps obvious, are worth a brief note. Tackling this review prompted us to assess our qualifications. One of us (Schwartz) has engaged in collaborative language revitalization work; the other (Lederman) has mentored anthropologists practicing in nonacademic settings. This review is itself a product of apprenticeship, mentoring, and mutual learning by a graduate student and faculty adviser—a relationship with potential power imbalances not entirely different from those that prompted the collaborations we review. Our own intellectual and practical negotiations fostered a sympathetic appreciation for the greater challenges shouldered by the reviewed authors.

In the final analysis, these volumes, and the conferences and community-based activities preceding and following them, demonstrate that collaborative co-productions cultivate their own kinds of expertise and evaluative practices. They speak for themselves in hybrid forums of their own making. Meanwhile, this essay has offered situated translations of each book, a comparative review of the books’ distinctive styles of subfield collaborations, and an historical and cross-disciplinary framework for understanding their shared motivations and significance.
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