

- Fabra M., and M. Zabala**, 2019: Recuperar, estudiar, gestionar, dialogar. Nuevas estrategias desde la Arqueología Pública con restos sensibles, in G.G. Figueroa and M. Dantas (eds), *Una arqueología entre todos. Perspectivas y casos de estudio en el centro y noroeste de Argentina*, Buenos Aires, 17–38.
- Lumbreras, L.G.** 1975. *La arqueología como ciencia social*, Lima.
- Millán, M., M.G. Chaparro and M. Mariano**, 2019: Diálogos interculturales sobre territorios ancestrales en la provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina, *Íconos – Revista de Ciencias Sociales* **63**, 161–184.
- Politis, G.G.**, 2001: On archaeological praxis, gender bias and Indigenous peoples in South America, *Journal of Social Archaeology* **1**, 90–107.
- Redonda M.**, 1999: Hallazgos arqueológicos, entre la ciencia y la identidad, *Andes* **10**, 245–248.
- Reinhard, J., and C. Ceruti**, 2005: Sacred mountains, ceremonial sites, and human sacrifice among the Incas, *Archaeoastronomy* **XIX**, 1–43.
- Salerno, V.M., and C. Leiva**, 2017: El pasado es nuestro futuro. Memoria y arqueología en ‘El Antigal’ de San Pedro, *Anuario de Arqueología* **9**, 25–38.
- Tantaleán, H., and M. Aguilar**, 2012: La arqueología social latinoamericana. De la teoría a la praxis. Una introducción, in H. Tantaleán and M. Aguilar (eds.), *La arqueología social latinoamericana. De la teoría a la praxis*, Bogotá, 19–31.
- Zabala, G.P.** 2019: Las Declaraciones de Barbaros: Pueblos Indígenas y Antropología Latinoamericana, *Cultura en Red* **5**, 127–150.

María Gabriela Chaparro is a researcher at the National Council of Science and Techniques Research (CONICET) based at the Instituto de Investigaciones Arqueológicas y Paleontológicas del Cuaternario Pampeano (INCUAPA), assistant professor of Legislation and Management of Cultural Resources at the Department of Archaeology and professor of the Ph.D. program in Archaeology, Faculty of Social Sciences (FACSO), University of the Centre of Buenos Aires Province (UNCPBA), Argentina. Her research interests include public archaeology, museum studies, social assessments and Indigenous claims on heritage issues.

Archaeological Dialogues (2024), **31**, 24–31
doi:[10.1017/S1380203825100160](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203825100160)

Indigenous archaeology further East. Experiences from the far Northeastern corner of India

Tiatoshi Jamir 

Professor of Archaeology, Department of History and Archaeology, Nagaland University, Kohima, Meriema, Nagaland 797001, India,
Email: tiatoshi@nagalanduniversity.ac.in

Keywords: Northeast India; Nagaland; Indigenous archaeology; decolonization; community-based archaeology; Naga ancestral sites

Introduction

To my mind, every Indigenous archaeology practiced across the length and breadth of the world is uniquely situated within its own socio-cultural and political milieu. In this respect, no processes within its practice are identical in nature. Proceeding a step further from Felix Acuto’s experience of Latin American Indigenous archaeology, this discussion piece examines the nature of the Indigenous community’s involvement in archaeological research within a South Asian context, locating the frame within Northeast India, particularly Nagaland. This takes a rather more interesting turn when the engagement constitutes an archaeology ‘with, for and by Indigenous peoples’ themselves who belong to a certain Indigenous community, who are either inside or outside of the participant community. Engaging local people in archaeological excavations has long been

commonplace in Indian archaeology. In most of excavations by John Marshall and Mortimer Wheeler of Harappan urban sites, one cannot fail but notice the ubiquitous frame of black-and-white photographs – local workers clad in white dhoti and turbans, seen in various working postures and gaits inside the trenches, aiding in daily routine digs with brushes and brooms, circular trays filled with soil and occasional scatterings of pickaxes and spades. With shifting powers from the British Raj and Indian archaeologists now taking charge of the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) after Wheeler's departure, it is still disheartening to notice that such imageries continue to persist in numerous field reports even within a post-colonial experience (for a critical appraisal, see Avikunthak 2021). What the images evoke is the sort of community engagement that the country has experienced for more than 150 years of Indian archaeology in practice. One may never know clearly for sure what the nature and extent of the local people's participation in such large-scale digs was during colonial times, but this entices us to ask the few obvious questions – is such research made explicit within a participatory praxis, or can it be equally engaging and collaborative with equitable research aims? Or did such initiatives dismantle power structures and relations between local workers and the archaeologists leading the excavations? Until recently, community consultation and engagement have rarely been a part of the archaeological research agenda in India, with a few exceptions addressed by Rizvi (2006; 2020), Selvakumar (2006), Jamir (2014) and Menon and Varma (2019). Unfortunately, even today, archaeology in South Asia continues to demonstrate a lack of collaborative archaeological practice and instead continues to replicate colonial models of interaction with local communities (Rizvi 2008, 127). I, however, view the role of Indigenous community engagement in archaeological research as a starting point for decolonizing archaeological practice in Northeast India, particularly in Nagaland (Jamir 2024). Therefore, to underscore a contrast, I wish to draw a few case examples from the region of Northeast India.

Setting the stage

For a European who conducted expeditions to the Naga Hills, the region was a 'museum-piece', and the objects (both archaeological and ethnographic) and numerous photographs that depicted Naga ways of life, displayed or archived in the West, authenticated the primitive stages of human development (Jamir 2021). Even as early as the 1930s, the level of public awareness of the Nagas was such that even an untitled sketch of a Naga man in a popular-market boys' book, *The Golden Budget for Boys*, published by Blackie & Son in London around 1930 was intended to portray the main themes of the book – including the extent of empire, notions of masculinity, the relationship with native peoples and the role of the white man (for details on this illustration, see West 2011: 93, Fig. 5.1; cited in Jamir et al. 2014).

Racial categorization is also replete in the early ethnography of Northeast India. The 'Mongolian Fringe' was the title of an official paper from 1940 by Olaf Caroe, the foreign secretary of the British–Indian government in New Delhi, referring to parts of Northeast India, which according to Baruah, reflects the unabashedly racialized view of the world that characterized this genre of imperial geopolitical writing (Baruah 2013). There were also two key notions in the European discourse on modernity, even during early antiquarian times, which were crucially supported by modern archaeology, including anthropology: race and teleological development (Källén and Karlström 2010). It is here that archaeology and anthropology became discursive devices for the justification of colonial policies based on ideas of human inequality (Fabian 1983). To the British, the Nagas were variously perceived as 'wild', 'savage', 'primitive' and 'uncivilized', and if Nagas were to be of any use to the British, they had to be first 'civilized' (Lotha 2007, 46). Naga objects that appeared in European museums overseas not only confirmed the fondly held image of the 'noble' but also the 'primitive' and 'savage', and their ideas about the Nagas as 'other' were evident in the monographs and 'protectionism' of Mills

and Hutton, and particularly of Fürer-Haimendorf (Stockhausen 2008, 64). Hutton and Mills saw this pre-British period as somehow pristine and static: 'Change' was brought by Europeans in the form of the administration's prohibition of headhunting and the missionaries' prohibition of feasts of merit and manifestations of sexual prowess as a means of attaining status (West 1994, 68). In their opinion, there has been '*little change, fortunately*, from the time of Megasthenes in the Naga Hills' (Hutton 1928, 228, emphases added). The general attitude at that time was that Northeast India was an unprogressive cultural backwater or *cul de sac*, a region incapable of bringing on innovations of its own. These sorts of colonial stereotypes of the Nagas continue to resonate in casual discussions even today. A case in point is Manpreet Singh's article, 'The soul hunters of Central Asia' (2006), published in *Christianity Today*, which describes the Naga homeland as 'once notorious worldwide for its savagery' but now 'the most Baptist state in the world.'

In addition, for those categorized as 'northeasterners' within India, the transition to metropolitan city centres such as Delhi and Bangalore can be a precarious one; students of the Northeast region have succumbed to injuries after being beaten because of the manner of their clothing, hairstyles and physical features, with the aftermath of such deaths sparking student protests on the streets of Delhi (Gergan and Smith 2021). Films such as *Stranger in My Land* (2014), based on the real events of Duyu Tabyo's life, draw on the discrimination suffered by the people of Northeast India. Also, the comedy-drama film *Axone* (2019) (or *Akhuni*) tells a subtle story of relationships, culture and cuisine, thus framing a mode of resistance against the oppression of migrants from the Northeast.

Locating Indigenous archaeology in Northeast India

My first thoughts are drawn to the discovery and excavation of an archaeological site in Mizoram, one of the hill states of Northeast India. The site of Vangchhia in Champhai District of Mizoram is situated in the eastern part of the state on the Indo-Myanmar border and is well known for its rich cluster of stone monuments (Malsawmliana 2014; Singh 2019). The national importance of the site was notified in 2014 and was subsequently surveyed and excavated by the Archaeological Survey of India from 2014 to 2018. The site is composed of a large cluster of megaliths carved with an impressive array of petroglyphs such as human figures, motifs of various animals, weapons and ornaments; evidence of burials; raised stone walls; a water pavilion; and numerous posthole features. Two inconsistent dates are reported from two different laboratories: an older date of cal A.D. 620 $\pm$ 50 years (BS-3974) and a later date of cal A.D. 1445–1620 (Beta-434044) (Nayan 2018). Ever since its excavation and the evidence that unfolded, the site of Vangchhia has been contentious for one fundamental reason – its sensational christening in the excavation report as an interesting and unique 'lost Civilization' that came to light for the first time in the history of Mizoram (Nayan 2018, 28). While the intention of the excavator was to reveal the glorious past of the Mizo community, the rhetoric of a 'lost Civilization' triggered a backlash when the excavation made headlines in national media such as *The Hindu*, *The Times of India*, and other digital platforms such as *The Better India News*, *The North East Today*, and *Facebook*. Besides the elaborate petroglyphs on the monuments, what got one's attention was the 'water pavilion' that was likened by some to a Mughal pavilion and interpreted as an Ingenious traditional water harvesting system. In my field experience at the Naga ancestral site of Chungliiyimti, similar features of varying sizes and depths cut through the soft sandstone bedrock in linear rows and also widely dispersed in considerable numbers were excavated. These features served as post-holes for residential structures facing in a roughly east–west direction. Located in between these rows of post-hole features were a few rock-cut drainages where charred botanical remains were retrieved (Jamir et al. 2014). Given the nature of such comparable archaeological evidence from other parts

of Northeast India, particularly Nagaland, I would reinterpret the Vangchhia ‘water pavilion’ evidence as post-hole features representing residential structures.

I struck upon a close conversation with Dr. Malsawmliana, president of the Mizo Archaeological Society, who revealed greater details of Vangchhia and their displeasure with the way the site archaeology was represented:

Many Mizo scholars are of the strong opinion that the remnant of megalithic structures is a part of their past ancestral heritage and not of a lost civilization as portrayed post-excavation. Similar carved stone monuments from the southern and central parts of Mizoram are also comparable to Vangchhia. There are also oral historical accounts associated with the old settlement of Vangchhia and the re-establishment of a new village under the same name less than 1 km away from the site. The new village is also seen clustered with the same type of monuments. Sadly, several monuments were taken by its descendants to the new village to construct graves. The results of two inconsistent dates are already out for the site. We are in discussion to further respond to this idea of a ‘lost Civilization’ (Dr. Malsawmliana, personal comm. 2024).

The aforementioned backdrop is an appropriate case in point to demonstrate the way in which the Indigenous past is represented within Indian archaeology and, quite evidently, the excavators not integrating a community-oriented and participatory archaeology with the Indigenous people of Vangchhia. Such callous perpetuations by institutions and mainstream media alike will have detrimental effects in denying the Indigenous people their past and their presence in the region. Worst of all, this reflects an attempt by institutions in a post-colonial state to appropriate and subordinate the history of Indigenous peoples, and there should, therefore, be efforts to decolonize the parochial ideas of institutions and their knowledge production in relation to the Northeast region. Another pertinent case is the vandalism and relocation of jars observed at sites such as Bolasan, Kobak and Dubungling in North Cachar Hills (now Dima Hasao Autonomous Council), Assam. Had a more community-inclusive archaeology been engaged by the ASI, its protected stone jar monument of national importance status could have still impeded destruction (Mitri et al. 2022, 14).

The other concern relates to the marginalization of history, culture and the people of the region. Post-colonial Indian states have largely viewed the Northeast as the political and cultural ‘other’ – its past ignored, further leading to fallout on peace-building measures to settle the decades-long armed political conflict, and stereotyped as a hub of insurgency. Very often, its people are ridiculed as Chinese, and during the pandemic, many people from the northeastern states were assaulted, called ‘coronavirus’ and even spat on, as they were being blamed for spreading the virus, which had its origins in China (Zahan 2022). ‘The tradition of history writing’, maintains Uttam Bathari, an Indigenous Northeast historian, ‘is highly biased in favour of literary sources... Thus, the social memories of these oral communities do not pass the standard of evidence crucial for the reconstruction of their pasts, turning them into *people without history*’ (cited in Zahan 2022, emphases added).

Such ignorance of the region in mainstream history and textbooks drove Rajon Das, a 22-year-old engineering student from the National Institute of Technology (NIT), Silchar, to embark on a walk through all Northeastern states as a mark of protest demanding the inclusion of chapters on the history of the Northeast region in the national educational curriculum (Zahan 2022). While the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) claims that the region finds ‘adequate space’ in its publications, the reality paints a very lopsided picture. The NCERT instead published a supplementary textbook titled *North East India – people, history and culture* in 2017, which was not part of the core curriculum but only supplementary (Pratha 2024).

Indigenous knowledge and archaeology of Naga ancestral sites

The idea of community participation in government-initiated projects and policies is not new to Northeast India. Community collaboration and support have been successfully implemented in numerous biodiversity conservation projects in Nagaland and other Northeast Indian states (Jamir 2024). In the context of Nagaland, one cannot do archaeology without consultation, support and, most of all, collaboration with descendant communities. In the case of the community archaeology projects that we have engaged in for close to almost two decades, collaboration, relationality, mutual trust and long-term sustained interculturality with Naga Indigenous communities and archaeologists have always been an integral part of our research. Because of such considerations in our research, we have developed and maintained decades-long friendships with local stakeholders, and these enduring friendships still continue to this day.

Descendant communities are mainly drawn to at least two areas of archaeology, which fascinate them – culture history and chronology and how their ancestral past can be approached from multiple perspectives. In addition to the oral tradition strongly anchored to land and territories, the archaeological knowledge empowers Indigenous communities to take control of their land and heritage. Hence, such engagement is a meaningful involvement linking the study of their own history through their own narrative and not from an outsider's perspective. Furthermore, these collaborations largely contribute to the decolonization of history that informs the way a particular community was previously represented, entangled not only in colonial accounts but also in the way they are projected by non-Indigenous scholars, even in post-colonial times.

Our archaeological research on Naga ancestral sites helped Indigenous communities realize their deep pre-colonial past. This realization emerged as a result of the community's accounts of the rich oral historical sources associated with Naga ancestral sites. Indigenous epistemology has always come to aid archaeological research in Northeast India. Traditional knowledge held by community elders has always been a reliable primary source in ancestral site surveys. These accounts enrich our understanding of the ancestral landscapes and their worldview that makes a sense of their place. Any inconspicuous feature unlocated on topographic maps yet significant in the community's oral tradition was identified as a potential site for study, even to the extent of naming archaeological sites on survey maps and site reports, which might appear casual to archaeologists. Because the ancestral landscape is so closely entangled with traditional accounts of sites, descendant community consultation is paramount, as any error in the specific use of a site name will result in strong dissent from the community.

Another constituent feature of incorporating Indigenous epistemologies is the traditional knowledge referring to the notion of time in Naga culture. This involves the oscillation of the Putu Menden or the Ao Naga traditional village institution that runs for 30 years before the new office takes over the charge of running the village affairs. Yet, a much deeper understanding of time is Aso, equated to 100 years (Anungla Aier, personal comm. 2010). Interestingly, a local historian, Panger Imchen (1990), writing in one of the Ao Naga vernacular books, *Ao Mongsen Lipok*, points to the completion of 3 Asos prior to the institution of the Putu Menden in ancient Chungliyimti and also 10 Asos at a time when the Senden Riju (traditional assembly) evolved. Relying on oral historical accounts, Imchen (1990) therefore drew a broad timeline beginning from A.D. 100–1025, the period that the Aos lived in Chungliyimti (Imchen 1990, 32). Such traditional accounts seemed to complement several of the radiocarbon dates of the site well (Jamir et al. 2014). Another narrative is the Indigenous reference to the idea of cultural progress, which, in this case, relates to a linear evolution. According to the Ao and Sangtam Naga folklore, the ancestral village Chungliyimti experienced at least three periods of evolution. The first was *Mütitakong*, when man, animal and spirits lived together in harmony. The prefix *Mütita* loosely translates as 'unseparated or undivided', while *kong* refers to 'landmasses such as mountain ranges'. This was succeeded by *Sümedem* (a condition of harmony without discords) and, thereafter, the Chungliyimti phase, by which time people began to gradually disperse (Aier 2018, 35, 90–91).

Social dynamics and positionality

In the course of our engagement with Indigenous communities, how do we position ourselves as Indigenous archaeologists within a macro- and micro-scale social context? This is an area of engagement that is rarely considered in most community archaeology projects worldwide. Perhaps this experience also runs parallel to most Indigenous colleagues who engage in archaeological and anthropological research in other states of Northeast India.

A Naga identity is deeply drawn to the clan, village, tribe and land that they are affiliated with. When introducing a new person for the first time, it is customary for one to provide not only their name but also the clan, village and tribe that they belong to. Situating this within the ethnolinguistically diverse Naga groups, because a village is essentially composed of various exogamous clans, there is a general feeling of 'us' and 'them', underscoring the nature of affiliation within these dichotomies amongst clans in a village, amongst villages within a tribe and across tribes. It becomes imperative to recognize such binaries when any kind of research is undertaken on the local history and culture of a particular tribe. While we position ourselves as Indigenous archaeologists, suspicion and distrust still linger for fear of misrepresentation of a community's history and culture. The persistence of such entrenched attitudes continues as a result of past colonial representations of the Nagas. Cognizance of such situations helps us reorganize our thinking and the theoretical stance underpinning such community archaeology programs.

Let me examine this through a reflexive lens. Within a macro-scale context, I am indeed a 'Naga' and not an 'outsider', while within a micro-scale context, depending on the ethnic identity I position myself, I am viewed as an 'outsider' or 'insider'. Conversely, this is so because I am an Ao Naga and not a Chang; neither am I a Pochury nor a Sangtam Naga. This also is the issue with the means of communication. Each community speaks its own native language, and interactions outside of one's own community are entirely communicated in Nagamese, a lingua franca of the Naga Hills. Such binaries oscillate relative to the context in which one finds oneself working with a particular community (in the context of Paharis of Bangladesh, see Uddin 2011) and are hence contextually situated depending on one's ethnic affiliation. This effort to position and negotiate ourselves within the dichotomy of 'us' and 'them' helped us better understand the local dimensions of social realities, which in turn fostered deeper engagement and meaningful conversation in all community archaeology programs (Jamir and Tetso 2024). More importantly, such participation not only enhances knowledge co-production and legitimizes Indigenous knowledge systems but also vastly influences the transmission and continuity of Naga culture. Above all, these active and meaningful conversations helped to dispel the most commonly held notion: that archaeologists excavating at their ancestral sites are in search of some secret treasure troves. Instead, the people continue to demonstrate an increasing interest in the scientific pursuit of research, such as the dating of the site, and the archaeobotanical evidence that helped shed light on the early agricultural history of their ancestors and how the community origin myths relate to the discovery of certain agricultural crops that corroborate the archaeological findings. Such experiences are drawn from our community archaeology research at Naga ancestral sites such as Chungliyimti, Hutsü and its adjoining sites and Changsang Mongko (Jamir 2023; Jamir and Tetso 2024).

Repatriation of Naga ancestral remains

As part of a means of decolonizing museum practice, the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford recently initiated a dialogue with the Nagas to repatriate Naga ancestral remains to communities of origin as part of a 'process of redress, social healing, and the mending of historically difficult relationships' (cited in Longkumer and Kikon 2022, 2); meanwhile, others are critical of the need to contextualize the historical narratives of the Nagas by calling for a more relevant procedure for the ongoing Naga repatriation process (Zhimomi 2023). Dialogues and consultations are

ongoing with the Naga people, and we hope that the repatriation and restitution of the Naga human remains back to source communities will not only help expand a much deeper engagement in decoloniality but also offer an opportunity to reassert control and rights over our own Naga heritage by bringing home what was lost to the museums overseas. In this context, the Forum for Naga Reconciliation (FNR), as the main facilitator, is developing and enabling a Naga response around the future care of Naga ancestral human remains [Recover, Restore and Decolonise (RRaD) Team 2023].

In a country where the practice of archaeology continues to privilege a colonial tradition, even in post-colonial India, what is desirable to explore in the Northeast region of India is an inclusive archaeology involving Indigenous communities that underpins a more collaborative and community-oriented approach. The centrality of some of these evolving concerns now attains some depth in stimulating debate regarding the repatriation of Indigenous peoples' remains to Northeast India, cultural patrimony, Indigenous knowledge systems and collaborative and community-based participatory research involving people whose cultures we encounter.

Acknowledgements. I wish to acknowledge the active participation of all Naga villages involved in the community archaeology initiatives of Naga ancestral sites.

References

- Aier, A., 2018: *Studies on Naga oral tradition. Memories and telling of origin myth and migration* (Vol-1), Dimapur.
- Avikunthak, A., 2021: *Bureaucratic archaeology. State, science, and past in postcolonial India*, Cambridge.
- Axone, 2019 [English/Hindi]. Directed by Nicholas Kharkongor, Saregama India and Yoodlee Films.
- Baruah, S., 2013: The Mongolian Fringe, *Himal Southasian* 26, 82–86.
- Fabian, J., 1983: *Time and the other. How anthropology makes its object*, New York.
- Gergan, M. D., and S. H. Smith, 2021: Theorizing racialization through India's 'Mongolian Fringe', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 45, 361–382.
- Hutton, J. H., 1928: Prehistory of Assam, *Man in India* VIII, 228–232.
- Imchen, P., 1990: *Ao Mongsen Lipok*, Mokokchung.
- Jamir, T., 2014: Ancestral sites, local communities and archaeology in Nagaland. A community archaeology approach at Chungliyimit, in T. Jamir and M. Hazarika (eds.), *50 years after Daojali-Hading. Emerging perspectives in the archaeology of Northeast India*, New Delhi, 473–487.
- Jamir, T., 2021: Locating the practice of ethnography and archaeology in Nagaland. Early collections and recent trends, *Puratattva* 51, 66–188.
- Jamir, T., 2023: Indigenous archaeology, in J.J.P. Wouters and T.B. Subba (eds.), *The Routledge companion to Northeast India*, London/New York, 256–261.
- Jamir, T., 2024: Decolonizing archaeological practice in India. Views from the community archaeology initiatives in Nagaland, *Ethnographisch-Archaeologische Zeitschrift (EAZ)* 57, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.54799/JLZB5846>.
- Jamir, T., and D. Tetso, 2024: Situating the 'local' within the 'locale'. Local communities and community-based Indigenous archaeology in Nagaland, Northeast India, in C. Smith, K. Pollard, A.K. Kanungo, S.K. May, S. Varela and J. Watkins (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of global Indigenous archaeologies*, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197607695.013.61>.
- Jamir, T., D. Vasa, and D. Tetso, 2014: *Archaeology of Naga ancestral sites. Recent archaeological investigations at Chungliyimit and adjoining sites* (Vol-1), Dimapur.
- Källén, A., and A. Karlström, 2010: 'We should remember with gratitude' – reflections on archaeology in Laos, in B. Bellina, E.A. Bacus, T.O. Pryce and J.W. Christie (eds.), *50 years of archaeology in Southeast Asia. Essays in honour of Ian Glover*, Bangkok, 301–311.
- Longkumer, A., and D. Kikon, 2022: The unfinished business of colonialism. Naga ancestral remains and the healing of the land, *The Morning Express*, July 2, 4, 1.
- Lotha, A., 2007: *History of Naga anthropology (1832–1947)*, Dimapur.
- Malsawmliana, 2014: *Megalithic culture of Mizoram*. New Delhi.
- Menon, J., and S. Varma, 2019: Archaeological places. Negotiations between local communities, archaeologists and the state in India, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 19, 141–161.
- Mitri, M., T. Jamir, H. Mepusangba, T. Syiemlieh, L. Darnei, T. Thakuria and L. Kharpuri., 2022: Recent research on the stone jars of Northeast India. Evidence from East Jaintia Hills of Meghalaya, *Archaeological Research in Asia* 31, 100393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ara.2022.100393>.
- Nayan, S., 2018: A brief report on excavation and new discoveries at Vangchhia, Mizoram. Sessions 2015–16 and 2017–18, ASI Aizawl.

- Pratha**, 2024: The erasure of North East India's history from NCERT syllabus. A glaring omission, May 7. <https://prathaindic.in/the-erasure-of-north-east-indias-history-from-ncert-syllabus-a-glaring-omission/>.
- Rizvi, U. Z.**, 2006: Accounting for multiple desires. Decolonizing methodologies, archaeology and the public interest, *India Review* 5, 394–416.
- Rizvi, U.Z.**, 2008: Decolonizing methodologies as strategies of practice: operationalizing the postcolonial critique in the archaeology of Rajasthan, in M. Liebmann and U.Z. Rizvi (eds.), *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*, California, 109–127.
- Rizvi, U.Z.**, 2020: Community-based and participatory praxis as decolonizing archaeological methods and the betrayal of new research, in K. Supernant, J.E. Baxter and S. Atalay (eds.), *Archaeologies of the heart*, Switzerland, 83–96.
- RRaD Team**, 2023: Repatriation. The Naga process. Learning from Mon District, *The Morung Express*, Friday, June 23. <https://morungexpress.com/repatriation-the-naga-process-learning-from-mon-district>.
- Selvakumar, V.**, 2006: Public archaeology in India. Perspectives from Kerala, *India Review* 5, 417–446.
- Singh, M.**, 2006: The soul hunters of Central Asia, *Christianity Today* February 1, 51–57. <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2006/february/38.51.html>.
- Singh, S.S.**, 2019: New discoveries of petroglyphs in Vangchhia. A preliminary study, *Journal of Neolithic Archaeology (Special Issue)* 5, 135–144.
- Stockhausen, A von.**, 2008: Creating Naga. Identity between colonial construction, political calculation, and religious instrumentalisation, in M. Oppitz, T. Kaiser, A. von Stockhausen and M. Wettstein (eds.), *Naga identities. Changing local cultures in the North East of India*, Zürich, 57–79.
- Stranger in My Land** 2014 [English/Hindi]. Directed by Duyu Tabyo, CoreConcept Entertainment and Padi Genda Pictures.
- Uddin, N.**, 2011: Decolonising ethnography in the field. An anthropological account, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 14, 455–467.
- West, A.**, 1994: Writing the Nagas, *History & Anthropology* 8, 55–88.
- West, A.**, 2011: *Museums, colonialism and identity: A history of Naga collections in Britain*. London.
- Zahan, S.A.**, 2022: Why Northeast's past is not attractive to the mainland historians, *Outlook*. June 23. Last accessed July 1. <https://www.outlookindia.com/national/why-northeast-s-past-is-not-attractive-to-the-mainland-historians-magazine-204051>.
- Zhimomi, S.**, 2023: A critique of FNR's statement on Naga repatriation, *Nagaland Post* June 7, 6.

Tiatoshi Jamir is Professor of Archaeology in the Department of History & Archaeology, Nagaland University, Kohima Campus, Kohima, Nagaland. His primary area of practice is on the ethnoarchaeology of Naga stone monuments; Holocene prehistory of NE India and hunter-gatherer archaeology, and Community-based Indigenous archaeology of Naga ancestral sites.

Archaeological Dialogues (2024), 31, 31–34
doi:[10.1017/S1380203825100123](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203825100123)

A look at intercultural archaeology from the Colombian Caribbean

Wilhelm Londoño Díaz 

Universidad del Magdalena, Santa Marta, Magdalena, Colombia
Email: wlondono@unimagdalena.edu.co

Keywords: Heritage; Archaeology; Indigenous People; Caribbean; Colombia

Acuto's manuscript is a gateway to understanding what could be called 'Indigenous Latin American Archaeology' (or 'Indigenous Archaeology in Latin America'). This manuscript summarizes several arguments that have shaped the theoretical panorama of Latin American Indigenous archaeology in recent decades. The first argument is of a historical order. Clearly,