Unsettled Archaeology with a Resettled Community: Practicing Memory, Identity, and Archaeology in Hebron

Michelle Tari Davies[†]

Abstract. The Hebron Family Archaeology Project is a multi-year project which works towards increasing our understanding of twentieth-century life in Hebron, a former Inuit community in northern Labrador whose residents (*Hebronimiut*) were forcibly relocated in 1959. The primary goal of the project is to provide opportunities for the residents of Hebron to return to their homeland and to record the stories and memories of Elders before they are lost. Based on the expressed interests of community members, the scope of research has shifted from household excavation to non-invasive archaeological recording methods, family-based interviews, and increasing accessibility. Project goals and methods are flexible in nature in order to suit the needs of the people I am trying to serve, and my role as a researcher has changed as a result. While these factors have unsettled the original goals of the project, ultimately, they have provided critical guiding lessons to develop an Inuit-driven narrative that will be relevant and accessible to present and future generations of Hebronimiut.

Résumé. Le Projet d'archéologie familiale d'Hébron est un projet pluriannuel qui vise à accroître notre compréhension de la vie du XXe siècle à Hébron, une ancienne communauté inuite du nord du Labrador dont les résidents (Hébronimiut) ont été relogés de force en 1959. L'objectif principal du projet est d'offrir aux résidents d'Hébron l'occasion de retourner dans leur terre natale et d'enregistrer les histoires et les souvenirs des aînés avant qu'ils ne soient perdus. Sur la base des intérêts exprimés des membres de la communauté, la portée de la recherche a été déplacée de l'excavation de foyers à des méthodes d'enregistrement archéologique non invasives, des entrevues familiales et une accessibilité accrue. Les objectifs et les méthodes du projet sont de nature flexible afin de répondre aux besoins des gens que j'essaie de servir et mon rôle de chercheur a changé en conséquence. Bien que ces facteurs aient déstabilisé les objectifs initiaux du projet, en fin de compte, ils ont fourni des orientations essentielles pour élaborer un récit dirigé par les Inuits qui sera pertinent et accessible aux générations présentes et futures d'Hébronimiut.

Unsettled Archaeology with a Resettled Community

Hebron is a former Labrador Inuit community, located approximately 200 km north of Nain in Nunatsiavut, Labrador (Figure 1). The region was an Inuit homeland long before the arrival of Moravian missionaries in 1831; however, the establishment of the mission drew a thriving community, growing to over 300 people at its peak (Loring and Arendt 2009:35). The larger region is a significant extension of the community, as Labrador Inuit had family fishing camps,

[†] Nunatsiavut Government/Memorial University, P.O. Box 70, Nain, NL A0P 1L0 [michelle.davies@nunatsiavut.com]

Figure 1. Northern Labrador with location of sites mentioned in the text.

cabins, and traditional hunting areas around Hebron for hundreds of years, prior to the arrival of Europeans (Brice-Bennett 1977:112). Most people did not spend all year in the community, though some of the most prominent memories that people share are from when families returned from their fishing camps at Christmas time; a long-standing social tradition that forged a strong sense of community and shared identity. In the summer of 1959, the community was closed without consultation or consent, and families were forced to relocate south; an event which forever marked the lives of the people of Hebron and their descendants.

When I first moved to Nain to work with the Nunatsiavut Archaeology Office, I absorbed a sense of urgency as first-hand memories and knowledge about Hebron were in danger of disappearing from the loss of Elders. As an outsider to the community, I was initially

quite cautious to engage with such a sensitive topic. It seemed to be a deep scar in Nunatsiavut that would take a long time for me to suitably understand. However, a significant part of my role as a civil servant is public-facing, and I grew to learn that I gained a richer understanding of the archaeological past in Labrador from listening and building local knowledge of the past with community members. I was considering ways to integrate these developing relationships with the public engagement work we were conducting in the archaeology office, perhaps in the form of a community archaeology project, but had not yet discovered the appropriate opportunity.

PiusituKaujuit Asianguvalliajuillu/Tradition and Transition is a research partnership announced in 2015 between the Nunatsiavut Government and Memorial University. It provided a unique opportunity to dedicate time and funding towards a community-based project in Hebron. It has been a worthwhile challenge to develop relevant and appropriate research at Hebron, and over time I have recognized increased satisfaction from the community when we are able to define and achieve shared research goals. Determining those shared goals has not been an altogether straight path, and I see the "unsettling" theme applied in three different, but connected, ways to the Hebron Family Archaeology Project. Hebron is literally an unsettled community, and there are significant challenges related to engaging with the community, which is now dispersed across Newfoundland and Labrador. There are also sensitivities relating to the intergenerational traumas which resulted from the social and economic consequences of their displacement. It relates to my unsettled methodology: every year, as new participants join the project, the way that the

research is conducted changes in both small and dramatic ways to suit the needs of the people I am trying to serve. Finally, it relates to my own unsettled feelings in conducting the research. Although I live and work in the community, I am often confronted with my own feelings of imposterdom in telling the story of Hebron, and challenged by my shifting understanding of community-based research through the intimate work of discovering truly shared research goals. The following paper is a reflection on the process of developing the Hebron Family Archaeology Project with community partners, and the experiences which have ultimately led to re-thinking my own role as a researcher.

The Hebron Relocation of 1959
The memory of Hebron is often tied to one traumatic event, from which a multi-faceted legacy and a resilient sense of identity has unfolded among the descendants of the community. In the spring of 1959, at a time when most of the community members were preparing to leave for their fishing camps after Easter celebrations, an announcement was made that the store and the Moravian mission would be closing. There was a communal sense that this was going to happen, and the Chief Elder, Levi Nochasak, had previously penned a letter on behalf of the people from Hebron asking to receive sufficient notification in the event that the community was to close (Brice-Bennett 2017:98). Archived correspondence between authorities representing the mission, the province, and the International Grenfell Association (IGA) indicate that the decision to move was largely based on health concerns of overcrowding and the cost of keeping the community open. It is clear that none of the authorities engaged

with the community members or prioritized their concerns and desires before relocation was unilaterally enforced (Brice-Bennett 2017:93). The decision to close Hebron would be determined by a few individuals who never visited the community or discussed the matter with its residents. An often-repeated element of Hebron's oral history is the manner of the announcement, which took place in the church at an Easter service rather than in the community hall—effectively removing any opportunity for discussion or opposition.

The closing was rushed during the summer months after the IGA nurse was withdrawn from Hebron and, expecting to move that summer, families had already begun demolishing their own houses to manufacture moving boxes (Brice-Bennett 2017:96). The communities to which they were moved were unprepared, and many people from Hebron were without work and had to live in overcrowded houses or tents for the first few years after relocation (Evans 2012:112). Inuit from Hebron would have shared many similar cultural practices to Inuit in communities further south, such as traditional hunting, fishing, and Moravian church practices, though there were difficulties adjusting to new hunting grounds resulting in impoverishment and segregation (Brice-Bennett 2000). Devastated by poverty, hunger, and alienation, the long-lasting social and economic consequences of relocation are perhaps most starkly revealed by the disproportionately high mortality rates of Inuit from Hebron after relocation, and the intergenerational trauma which persists among many of their descendants (Brice-Bennett 2000, 2017; Evans 2012). The decision evokes a pattern of similar damaging federal government programs in the north, such as the controversial relocation program of eight Inuit families from Inukjuak to Grise Fjord and Resolute in the high arctic in the early 1950s (Evans 2012:115; Qikiqtani Inuit Association 2014).

Labrador Inuit quickly organized to address the issues caused by relocation, and by the 1970s were discussing them in community halls and through local media. In 1973, the Labrador Inuit Association (LIA) was formed, largely due to the unfair treatment of Inuit from Nutak and Hebron (Evans 2012:142). The political momentum which grew from the grievances of provincial relocation programs propelled Labrador Inuit to submit a land claim, initially filed in 1977 (Brice-Bennett 2017:205). An emotional reunion at Hebron in 1999, organized by Torngâsok, the cultural branch of LIA, further publicized the injustices of the relocation program, and resulted in an apology and compensation from the provincial government (Evans 2012:142). After 30 years of negotiations, LIA members ratified the Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (LILCA) in May 2004. It was approved the next June by the Canadian Senate and came into effect on December 1, 2005, making Labrador Inuit the first Inuit group to achieve self-governance (Brice-Bennett 2017:205). The legacy of Hebron, so often tied to the dispossession of an Inuit homeland, can also be a source of pride and identity among many descendants today.

Towards a Community-based Archaeology Project in Hebron
When the Hebron Family Archaeology Project began in 2016, I had been living and working in Nain for two years as a civil servant. I had held archaeological permits, organized community meetings and workshops, and was starting to

practice a few words in Inuktitut. I was feeling more comfortable in both my professional and social roles in the community. Having spent my formative years in a predominantly white, middle-class suburb outside of Toronto, it took some time to adjust to the different social and economic realities of Nain. The Nunatsiavut Government has rights and responsibilities over Lands and Natural Resources, Health and Social Development, Education, Culture, Language, and Tourism, among other essential departments (LILCA 2005). However, persistent social issues, including poverty, food insecurity, loss of language, public health and housing crises, as well as disproportionately high youth suicide rates, may be considered symptoms of inequality and the persistent impacts of colonialism in the region, in particular, the forced relocations of Hebron in 1959, and Nutak in 1956 (Brice-Bennett 2017; Evans 2012:141; ITK-NISR 2018:9).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, I learned of these issues secondhand, as my social group tended to consist of community members of a similar age and socio-economic group. The segregated subculture of white southerners in northern communities is a recognizable social dynamic which can intensify the class structure of the community, and can make it difficult to engage with some of these issues in a meaningful way (Brody 1991; Fay 2008:79). The decision to close and resettle the community was a colonial exercise, rooted in a patronizing sense of stewardship that assumed the best for the community and resulted in far-reaching, intergenerational consequences (Brice Bennett 2017; Evans 2012). Any attempt to begin a community-based participatory research project would need to be thoughtfully developed so as not to cause further harm.

I assumed that such a project would follow the same community engagement protocols we typically followed before conducting archaeological research along the coast, as outlined in the permitting requirements of LILCA (LILCA 2005:Chapter 15). This process involves seeking input from the host community, conducting field work through survey and excavation methods as required, bringing artifacts back to Nain for analysis, presenting results, and submitting interim and final reports to the Archaeology Office. From previous experience, I felt relatively confident in my role as an archaeologist: to recover, analyze, and interpret material culture in order to develop a meaningful narrative about the past. I was about to learn that this typically acceptable and standard approach would, in effect, muddy the process of a community-based project at Hebron, and that I would take on a much different role than the one I had anticipated.

There is no single clear path to practice community-based participatory research, though useful guidelines have been thoughtfully developed as archaeologists have embraced the incorporation of different cultural perspectives in the construction of the past (Atalay 2012; Brady 2009; Fay 2008; Lyons 2013; Schaepe et al. 2017). Each instance may be considered a local negotiation of how research is conducted about the lives and heritage of a particular community, and requires considerable time and effort in order to identify the shared goals of the community and the researcher (Atalay 2012; Lyons 2013:7). Communities come to the negotiating table with particular ways of identifying, knowing, and understanding the past, and community-based archaeological practice aims to re-enfranchise marginalized communities to tell their own

stories (Lyons 2013). Labrador Inuit continue to express interest in travelling to Hebron, sharing stories, and learning about the past, before those stories are lost. Developing methods to capture those stories requires an understanding of the trauma of resettlement, the ongoing role of social memory and identity in the narrative of Hebron, and re-evaluating the relationship between community and researcher.

Memory at Work. The first year of the Hebron Family Archaeology Project was designed to capture a multivocal past as remembered by those who had lived in the community. In the first few community meetings to discuss the shape of the project, our first shared goal centred on capturing the memories and oral histories of the Elders who had experienced life in Hebron. I had also proposed the collaborative recovery and interpreta-

tion of artifacts from Hebron through household excavations. While this was met with no outright objection, there was no resounding endorsement, either. As a result, the first year of the project prioritized mapping the locations of family houses and conducting interviews. Participants were selected with the help of a volunteer selection committee made up of people from Hebron or their descendants in each of Nunatsiavut's communities. From this foundational work, we hoped to grow a living memory map of areas and practices significant to people from Hebron, and to seek the express permission of families directly related to the households before any excavation took place (Davies 2017).

John Jararuse and Jerry Tuglavina, two Elders who had experienced childhood in Hebron, were selected for their famous memory recall and storytelling skills (Figure 2). Before we arrived, John

FIGURE 2. John Jararuse and Elias (Jerry) Tuglavina mapped the locations of family homes in Hebron during the first year of the project.

and Jerry agreed that there would be a dozen households to record, and that it would take us half a day to finish the work. However, Hebron is a landscape enmeshed with personal experiences, and is rich with the power to evoke memories. Memories are mediated through storytelling, memory props, and symbolic imagery, which may all be accessed through performative archaeology: the physical acts undertaken in unearthing the past, producing memory publicly, and identifying the symbolic resonance of artifacts to a specific audience (Jones and Russell 2012:270; Rubertone 2008:13). As we walked through the former community together, their memories resurfaced and grew beyond their own expectations. We recorded a total of 38 family homes, the school, the two distinct locations of the community hall, the location of structures relating to the US Army during World War II, as well as structures near the beach related to the fishing industry that sustained the community during the mid-twentieth century. While walking through the church on the first day of the fieldwork, one Elder picked up a sieve that was used to scatter sand on the church floor in order to keep it clean and dry. Stories around collecting sand at the beach and the identification of a sandbox in an annex beside the church soon followed, demonstrating the power that a single object can have towards memory production (Davies 2017). The map was well received after we returned, and community members suggested only small alterations as I traveled to each community to present the results of the first field season. It was my hope that we could take this information back to the communities in order to select a family to take part in the excavation of a home, and to record more stories and memo-

ries that artifacts may have produced the following field season.

Confronting Different Heritage Values. The experiences of Maggie and Billy Jararuse, the second family to participate in the Hebron Family Archaeology Project, led to a complete redesign of the project goals after we were confronted with the emotional weight of disturbing the remains of a house that may have held connections to more than one family. It also revealed a community project goal that was not obvious to me, as the selection committee voted for Maggie and Billy, knowing that they had not ever had the chance to visit their parents' homeland, and had no direct memories of Hebron to capture. The committee had helped to design the goals of recording Elders' oral histories, but also recognized the value in sharing the experience of Hebron with a generation well removed from the period of occupation (Figure 3). The family eagerly absorbed the landscape, and they were particularly moved by the experience of standing in the physical locations of their family homes and fishing camps. However, as they settled in and reconsidered how many other families were connected to the land and their own family home, disturbing the ground became an impossible burden. Multiple families had claim and personal meaning tied to the properties, and the family exercised their right to withdraw consent for excavation (Davies 2018). Instead, they took part in familiar embodied practices: fishing for char, picking mussels, making dried char, as well as living and walking through the landscape. In particular, an unexpected visit to Tikigatsukulluk, a small fishing camp just north of Hebron, was simultaneously the most joyful and difficult experience of the trip for Billy,

Figure 3. Maggie and Billie Jararuse and their daughter Billie-Jean Tuglavina (at left) stand on the remains of their family home in Hebron.

whose family spent most of their time in that location. The indirect memory of injustice from relocation was given a new significance in this locale, as the family experienced the bounty and beauty of their family homeland and all that was lost after relocation.

We spent the week recording the locations of fishing camps in the greater region and examined artifacts on the land, at the houses, and in the church. In examining the objects of which they had no concrete memories, but which held ancestral significance for them nonetheless, meaning was created anew. A form of "disjunctive" memory, which merges personal and social memory, was focused through material culture to create a new sense of connection to the past (Joyce 2003:118). The initial goal of the project was to focus on the excavation of the houses recorded during the first year of the project, and to produce opportunities for families to help interpret the artifacts from their family homes. However, the meaningful connection to objects from Hebron may also be achieved through examinations of what has already been deemed significant to community members, such as family heirlooms and a local collection of surface finds which have been collected over years of visitation to Hebron and are now displayed on a few tables in the church (Figure 4).

Despite the significant change in field plans and the move away from excavation, I was still keen to return with some objects that would interest community members back home. After all, what was archaeology without some recovery and professional analysis of material culture? I considered wrapping up some artifacts that had already been

FIGURE 4. A local display of artifacts in the church at Hebron.

collected at the church, such as a rusted rifle, a lead weight from the fish plant, and various wood working tools, among others. However, I was gently reminded by a participant that it would be more appropriate to consult with the community again before deciding to change the research design. This was without a doubt the best approach, though I could not anticipate any negative reactions to the material being removed, conserved, and displayed for the broader community in Nain. I had felt so sure of the benefits of community-based archaeology at Hebron, and the therapeutic effects of both excavation and personal interpretation of material culture. As we drove the boats back to Nain empty-handed, I was left wondering: how much of the picture was I still missing?

Decolonizing Archaeological Research Practices. Decolonizing methodologies provide a path to centre Indigenous worldviews, concerns, and concepts in archaeological research practices (Atalay 2012; Smith 2012). It is not centred on the rejection of western ways of knowing; rather, it is meant to intertwine community and archaeological knowledge, to create rich, relevant interpretations of the past (Atalay 2012:27). It does, however, involve doing our best to remove western colonial influence in archaeological practice, and requires a methodology that relinquishes at least partial control over all or part of the project, from collaboratively designing research questions, through developing appropriate field practices and methods of data collection, to sharing the dissemination and benefits of research results appropriately (Brady 2009:35). Unfortunately, archaeology operates in contexts which persist in their marginalization of Indigenous peoples, and even truly collabora-

tive archaeology may not fully escape the complex legacy of colonialism which is upheld through inequitable political, legislative, and educational structures (Nicholas and Hollowell 2007:61; Supernant and Warrick 2014:565). However, by shifting control to marginalized groups and working within those structures towards a shared agenda, archaeologists can help to empower communities, and create spaces for transformative social action (Lyons 2013:13). This shift in control works to decolonize the process and structure of research, and champion the right for Indigenous peoples to define and describe their own past (Deloria 1992).

During the 2018 community engagement sessions, I directly asked if people were interested in seeing artifacts from the church at Hebron brought back for conservation and community-led interpretation. There was some discussion around whether the artifacts were made and used by Inuit: they appeared to have been brought in by the Moravian missionaries and did not represent the kind of activities that people usually associate with life at Hebron. I only managed to recognize a general feeling of disquiet in the group, but could not place the source. After the meeting, a community member came to me to reveal the potential reasons for the rejection of these artifacts—a few Elders saw them as having negative or haunted associations from the old community. A traditional taboo against interfering with ancient graves also applied to old houses and tools in other Arctic regions, and the transgression of taboos in the past could bring about bad luck or hardship (Griebel 2013:236). Ethnographic research in Labrador reveals a twentieth-century practice of leaving grave objects undisturbed or else replacing an object with a token in exchange,

which is likely rooted in a deeper history (Hawkes 1916:136). At a later meeting in Hopedale, another Elder revealed that she had objects from Hebron that she wished to see returned, in order to give them an appropriate resting place. I asked if she would be interested in documenting the meaning of these objects before they were returned, which was met with direct approval. Two years after presenting the ready-made goals of what I thought was required for an archaeological project, I feel as though I am finally beginning to understand what research interests and concerns may truly stem from the Hebron community. It is increasingly likely that these goals lean away from removing artifacts and towards a form of repatriation.

Collaborations which seek to address the imbalance between the discipline and descendant communities must be tailored to the specific interests of the community, requiring significant time and energy from both researchers and descendant groups (Nicholas et al. 2011:12). In some cases, such as at Hebron, the interests vary between different communities and individuals, though these are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Collaboration is not universally applied, but exists on a continuum from colonial control on one end of the spectrum, to community control on the other. The degree to which a community resists, participates in, or collaborates with the research often correlates with the emphasis on a multivocal practice to expand a shared understanding of the past (Colwell 2016:116).

If the goal of Indigenous and community-based archaeologies is to redress the power imbalance in the production of knowledge, then a relationship of equality should be ensured at all stages of the research process (La Salle 2010:406).

For example, the Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage Project (IPinCH) is a multi-institution collaboration between more than 50 archaeologists, museum experts, and lawyers who are working to explore the values underlying ethical knowledge exchange relating to cultural heritage. The IPinCH approach to identifying community concerns includes initial surveys and vetting by the community to ensure no sensitive data is released (IPinCH 2016). This practice reflects a constructive engagement that addresses the needs of the community and the researchers equitably, ensures community control over the data at all points in the project, and guarantees that local values are upheld throughout the research process (Nicholas and Hollowell 2007; Nicholas et al. 2011:21). Control over the very information Indigenous peoples share during a research project is perhaps the most fundamental way that archaeologists can begin to redress the colonial imbalances of research and work to develop more ethical and equitable relationships with communities (Bell and Shier 2011:38; Nicholas and Hollowell 2007:60). More broadly, asking fundamental questions, such as who has shaped the research topic, who controls the funding, who will do the analysis and interpretation, who benefits from the research, and what influences perspective, can shift research from self-interested extraction to self-representation and sovereignty for Indigenous groups (La Salle 2010:414). The power over research funding and practices needs to be in the hands of those affected by it to reform the colonial epistemology inherent in the research system (La Salle 2010:416).

Re-Thinking the Role of the Researcher. The third year of the Hebron Family Archaeology Project was a practice in relinquishing control. Community consultations leading up to the field season were focused on identifying shared goals between myself and the community. In particular, we discussed how to manage and care for objects without removing them from Hebron, and how to increase people's access to the research data and the site for land-based social programming in the future. Rather than removing objects, research would focus on having a family identify objects which may be of interest for photography, on-site conservation, and analysis. Community members also expressed interest in continuing to record family fishing camps, local place names, and family interviews, as well as increasing long-term accessibility to Hebron.

A family of four was selected by the committee: John Jararuse and his nephew Martin R. Jararuse, as well as his wife Josephine and her daughter Susie. John, having participated in the first year of the project, likely remembers how encumbered I was during that first field season, juggling my GPS, tapes, cameras, and notebooks as I tried to record every aspect of the project myself. This year, having established the shared goals of capturing stories, places, and memories of Hebron, I relinquished my control over aspects of data collection and placed the video camera in the hands of the family (Figure 5). Susie and Josephine were both brimming with questions, with or without me, in the community, in the church, and in the fishing camps. John and Martin were naturally more comfortable to share information with family members, and interviews flowed in Inuktitut. The family selected artifacts in the church that may be of interest for analysis and helped to design a case for artifacts that was made of old church

Figure 5. John Jararuse, Martin R. Jararuse, and Susie Semigak conducting interviews by their family home in Hebron.

windows (Brake et al. 2019). By personally stepping back from an authoritative research role, there was now more space for the family to engage more fully and to claim ownership over the direction of the research.

In order to conduct sustainable, ethical research with Hebronimiut, I endeavored to remove myself as the single authorized voice in the construction of the past. The social value of heritage overlaps with archaeological ways of making meaning, and there are often different values playing out in relation to the archaeological record as Hebronimiut continue to dwell on a designated archaeological site (Figure 6). People and communities draw meaning and identity from heritage places, and these cultural resources are weighed against the preservation of archaeological remains (Ferris and Welch 2014:224).

The process of community consultation must therefore shift to a deeper form of collaboration for researchers to accurately determine and understand the complex web of interests, obligations, concerns, and responsibilities that individuals and communities weave around their own heritage resources. The range of values assigned to the past can be acknowledged through the service of archaeology, and the motivations for doing archaeology may therefore be redefined and made more relevant to descendant communities (Ferris and Welch 2014:226).

The tenets of community-based archaeology clearly outline the role of the researcher, who is responsible for explicitly integrating cultural protocols and values into the research design and disseminating results in culturally appropriate ways (Smith 2012:16).

FIGURE 6. Drying rows of pitsik (dried char) display a highly valued activity and ongoing connections to Hebron.

Fostering dialogue with the community and surrendering at least partial control of key aspects of the research process, including design, methods, funding, and dissemination, are some of the ways that archaeologists can begin to work with communities, rather than simply inform them of research taking place (Fay 2008:10; McNiven and Russell 2005; Zimmerman 2013:100). By shifting a sense of accountability away from research institutions and towards the communities, archaeologists can begin to re-situate marginalized interests, narratives, and benefits (Ferris and Welch 2015:73). Archaeologists have useful skills in detailed recording and can apply new technologies to act as technicians for the project interests of a community, rather than the drivers of research which neither benefits nor interests them (La Salle 2010:416). Finally, the

sharing of knowledge and results is not a one-time exercise at the completion of a project, but can be considered a long-term commitment and exercised during multiple stages of the research. By moving beyond the sharing of superficial information to the way that the information was constructed, archaeologists can meaningfully engage communities in defining their own pasts and help to democratize the process of knowledge construction (Smith 2012:17).

My own role in the Hebron Family Archaeology Project continues to be an unfolding process, and each individual interview, field season, and community meeting helps to calibrate the project so that it aligns with the interests of people from Hebron (Brake et al. 2019; Davies 2017, 2018). However, the culturally appropriate dissemination of the research results is an outstanding issue

to be determined with the community. While Informed Consent Forms outline the ways in which the data may be used, such as in meetings, presentations, reports, and on websites, it may not be a sufficient safeguard to protect culturally or personally sensitive information. It is clear that my role also includes facilitating ongoing communication so that this information may be vetted by the community before it is disseminated, and control centred with the people of Hebron.

Future and Long Term Plans for Hebron. As the Hebron Family Archaeology project continues, I have asked the Selection Committee to take on more of a decision-making role for the research activities in upcoming field seasons, which includes setting direct goals relating to the documentation, preservation, and potential repatriation of artifacts to Hebron. Discussion surrounding control over funding and the appropriate dissemination of results will be fundamental to working towards the goal of a community-based archaeology project that is truly controlled by the community. In working to decentre my own authority and control over the project, the right for Inuit from Hebron to define and describe their own past can be a shared goal that is both sustainable and ethical and may continue to grow in culturally appropriate ways long after the research project concludes. It is my hope that this project will provide an avenue for an Inuit-driven narrative about twentieth-century life in Hebron, which will be supported and grown from the archaeological, historical, and oral history record and shared with Nunatsiavut communities.

References Cited

Atalay, Sonya
  2012 *Community-Based Archaeology: Research With, By, and For Indigenous and Local Communities.* University of California Press, Berkeley, California.

Bell, Catherine, and Caeleigh Shier
  2011 Control of Information Originating from Aboriginal Communities: Legal and Ethical Contexts. *Etudes/Inuit/Studies* 35(1–2):35–56.

Brady, Liam M.
  2009 (Re)Engaging with the (Un)Known: Collaboration, Indigenous Knowledge, and Reaffirming Aboriginal Identity in the Torres Strait Islands, Northeastern Australia. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 2:33–64.

Brake, Jamie, Michelle Davies, Kyle Crotty, and Noah Nochasak
  2019 Nunatsiavut Archaeology Office

Field Work 2018. In *Provincial Archaeology Office 2018 Archaeology Review* 17, edited by Stephen Hull, pp. 7–26. Provincial Archaeology Office, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador.

Brody, Hugh
1991 *The People's Land: Inuit, Whites and the Eastern Arctic.* Reprinted. Douglas & McIntyre, Vancouver, British Columbia. Originally published 1975, Penguin Books, Markham, Ontario.

Brice-Bennett, Carol
1977 *Our Footprints Are Everywhere: Inuit Land Use and Occupancy in Labrador.* Labrador Inuit Association, Nain, Newfoundland and Labrador.

2000 *Ikkaumajannik Piusivinnik/Reconciling with Memories: A Record of the Reunion at Hebron 40 Years after Relocation.* Labrador Inuit Association, Nain, Newfoundland and Labrador.

2017 *Dispossessed: The Eviction of Inuit from Hebron, Labrador.* Isberg, Quebec, Quebec.

Colwell, Chip
2016 Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45:113–127.

Davies, Michelle T.
2017 Preliminary Research for the Hebron Family Archaeology Project in 2016. In *Provincial Archaeology Office 2016 Archaeology Review,* Vol. 15, edited by Stephen Hull, pp. 35–41. Provincial Archaeology Office, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador.

2018 Archaeological Surveys and Oral Histories from the Hebron Family Archaeology Project in 2017. In *Provincial Archaeology Office 2017 Archaeology Review,* Vol. 16, edited by Stephen Hull, pp. 42–48. Provincial Archaeol-
ogy Office, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador.

Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1992 Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future. *American Antiquity* 57(4):595–598.

Evans, Peter
2012 Abandoned and Ousted by the State: the Relocations from Nutak and Hebron, 1956–1959. In *Settlement, Subsistence and Change Among the Labrador Inuit,* edited by David Natcher, Lawrence Felt, and Andrea Procter, pp. 111–148. University of Manitoba Press, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Fay, Amelia E.M.
2008 Creating a Community Archaeology in Nain. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador.

Ferris, Neal, and John Welch
2014 Beyond Archaeological Agendas: In the Service of a Sustainable Archaeology. In *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects,* edited by Sonya Atalay, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, pp. 215–237. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

2015 New Worlds: Ethics in Contemporary North American Archaeological Practice. In *Ethics and Archaeological Praxis,* edited by Cristobal Gnecco and Dorothy Lippert, pp. 69–94. Springer, New York, New York.

Griebel, Brendan
2013 Recharting the Courses of History: Mapping Concepts of Community, Archaeology, and Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit in the Canadian Territory of Nunavut. PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

Hawkes, Ernest William
  1916 *The Labrador Eskimo.* Geological Survey Memoir 91, No. 14, Anthropological Series. Department of Mines. Government Printing Bureau, Ottawa, Ontario.

Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage (IPinCH)
  2016 Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage: Theory, Practice, Policy, Ethics. Electronic document, http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/, accessed November 2, 2019.

Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami–National Inuit Strategy on Research (ITK–NISR)
  2018 Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami: National Inuit Strategy on Research. Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Electronic document, https://www.itk.ca/national-strategy-on-research, accessed June 30, 2019.

Jones, Siân, and Lynette Russell
  2012 Archaeology, Memory and Oral Tradition: An Introduction. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 16(2):267–283.

Joyce, Rosemary
  2003 Concrete Memories: Fragments of the Past in the Classic Maya Present (500–1000 AD). In *Archaeologies of Memory,* edited by Ruth M. Van Dyke and Susan E. Alcock, pp. 34–55. Blackwell, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (LILCA)
  2005 Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement (c. 15) Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. Electronic document, https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1293647179208/1293647660333, accessed June 30, 2019.

La Salle, Marina
  2010 Community Collaboration and Other Good Intentions. *Archaeologies* 6:401–422.

Loring, Stephen, and Beatrix Arendt
  2009 "…they gave Hebron, the city of refuge…" (Joshua 212:13): An Archaeological Reconnaissance at Hebron, Labrador. *Journal of the North Atlantic*, Special Volume 1:33–56.

Lyons, Natasha
  2013 *Where the Wind Blows Us: Practicing Critical Community Archaeology in the Canadian North.* University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Arizona.

McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell
  2005 *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology.* AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.

Nicholas, George, and Julie Hollowell
  2007 Ethical Challenges to a Postcolonial Archaeology: The Legacy of Scientific Colonialism. In *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, edited by Yannis Hamilakis and Philip Duke, pp. 59–82. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Nicholas, George, Amy Roberts, David Schaepe, Joe Watkins, Lyn Leader-Elliot, and Susan Rowley
  2011 A Consideration of Theory, Principles and Practice in Collaborative Archaeology. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 26(2):11–30.

Qikiqtani Inuit Association
  2014 *Qikiqtani Truth Commission: Community Histories 1950–1975.* Inhabit Media, Iqaluit, Nunavut.

Rubertone, Patricia E. (editor)
  2008 *Archaeologies of Placemaking: Monuments, Memories and Engagement in Native North America.* One World Archaeology Series Vol. 59. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Schaepe, David M., Bill Angelbeck, David Snook, and John R. Welch
2017 Archaeology as Therapy: Connecting Belongings, Knowledge, Time, Place, and Well-Being. *Current Anthropology* 58:502–533.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai
2012 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. ZED Books, New York, New York.

Supernant, Kisha, and Gary Warrick
2014 Challenges to Critical Community-based Archaeological Practice in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:563–591.

Zimmerman, Larry
2013 On Archaeological Ethics and Letting Go. In *Appropriating the Past: Philosophical Perspectives on the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by Geoffrey Scarre and Robin Coningham, pp. 98–118. Cambridge University Press, New York, New York.