

The Social and Political Sculpting of Archaeology (and Vice Versa)

El modelado social y político de la Arqueología (y viceversa)

CLAIRE SMITH

Department of Archaeology
Flinders University
GPO Box 2100,
Adelaide 5001, South Australia
claire.smith@flinders.edu.au

This article reflects on how archaeology globally has been sculpted by its social and political uses and how archaeology itself has shaped the various worlds in which it is situated. The thematic areas that are analysed are decolonising archaeology; community and engaged archaeology; archaeology for social justice; archaeology of the contemporary past; film, television and serious games; the internet and social media; and monuments as commemoration and heritage erasure. Drawing these analyses together, this paper offers a new definition of contemporary archaeology as ‘the study of human behaviour, past and present, through the analysis of material culture, both real and virtual, as situated within cultural landscapes’.

KEY WORDS

SOCIAL ARCHAEOLOGY, GLOBALIZATION, DECOLONIZATION, INDIGENOUS, SOCIAL JUSTICE, CULTURAL HERITAGE

Este artículo reflexiona sobre cómo se ha ido modelando la arqueología a escala global a partir de sus usos sociales y políticos y cómo la misma arqueología ha moldeado los diversos mundos en los que se sitúa. Las áreas temáticas que se analizan son la descolonización de la arqueología; comunidad y arqueología comprometida; arqueología para la justicia social; arqueología del pasado contemporáneo; películas, televisión y juegos educativos; Internet y medios de comunicación social, y monumentos como conmemoración y supresión del patrimonio. A partir de estos análisis, este trabajo ofrece una nueva definición de la arqueología contemporánea como ‘el estudio del comportamiento humano, pasado y presente, a través del análisis de la cultura material, tanto real como virtual, situada dentro de los paisajes culturales’.

PALABRAS CLAVE

ARQUEOLOGÍA SOCIAL, GLOBALIZACIÓN, DESCOLONIZACIÓN, INDÍGENA, JUSTICIA SOCIAL, PATRIMONIO CULTURAL

The past is dead and gone, but it is also very powerful. It is so powerful that an entire nation (Zimbabwe) can name itself after an archaeological site. It is so powerful that archaeological sites are surrounded by police and are the subject of attempted occupations by New Age travellers. It is so powerful that even individual groups of artefacts like the Parthenon frieze are the subject of major international disputes.

M. Johnson, *Archaeological Theory* (2010: 1).

This passage highlights not only the power of the past, but also the power of archaeology. This power comes less from the scientific value of archaeological knowledge than from its social and political uses. These uses have changed through time, shaping the discipline: the archaeology of today is not the archaeology of yesterday. In this article I present my assessment of how archaeology globally has been sculpted by its social and political uses. I also consider how archaeology itself has influenced social and political processes in the various worlds in which it is situated. The studies discussed in this paper were selected according to the following criteria: 1) to demonstrate the breadth of social and political archaeology in the present; 2) to highlight how our understandings of what constitutes archaeological practice can differ in different parts of the world; and 3) to capture emergent trends. Finally, drawing these analyses together, this paper offers a new definition of archaeology that is suited to the contemporary world.

A growing concern with the social and political ramifications of archaeological practice produced a plethora of new approaches during the 1980s and 1990s, particularly in the English-language literature. The major concerns were equity issues relating to gender (e.g. Ovrevik, 1991; Hanen and Kelley, 1992; Nelson *et al.*, 1994), the absence of women in archaeological explanations of the past (Conkey and Spector, 1984; Gero and Conkey, 1991; Scott, 1986; Balme and Beck, 1993; Claassen, 1994; Nelson, 1994), ideology and unmasking relations of domination (Trigger, 1980; Bapty and Yates, 1990; Sheppard, 1990; Paynter and McGuire, 1991; Kohl and Fawcett, 1995; Bernbeck and McGuire, 2011; and reconstructing the minds of past peoples (e.g. Leone 1982; Leone *et al.*, 1987; Renfrew 1982). In more recent years, archaeologists have shown a growing interest in how their discipline intersects with a wide range of matters, such as decolonization (Lilley, 2000; Moro-Abadía, 2006; Lydon and Rivzi, 2010; Schmidt and Píkirayi, 2016), the social and political dimensions of archaeological practice (Arnold, 1999; Lozney, 2016), multivocality (Habu *et al.*, 2008; Hodder, 2008), identity (Weiss, 2007; Domingo, 2008; McDonald, 2013); human rights (Anderson, 2002; Stone 2012), cultural and intellectual property (Nicholas and Bannister, 2004; Nicholas and Hollowell, 2004), repatriation (Forde *et al.*, 2002; Wilson, 2009) and ethics (Vitelli and Colwell-Chanthaphonh, 2006; Ireland and Schofield, 2015; Kato, 2017). These theoretical and methodological shifts intersect with a more general concern with ethical globalization, in which human rights are applied in fields beyond their more traditional political and legal realms. Taken together, these studies provide evidence of a range of ways in which contemporary attitudes to race, politics, religion, gender and so forth affect how we interpret the past.

To a significant extent the social, political and ethical agendas of archaeology have been led by the World Archaeological Congress (WAC). While few scholars were discussing social and political issues prior to the establishment of WAC in 1986, these issues were fundamental to its genesis and ongoing sculpting (see Ucko, 1987; Layton *et al.*, 2016). The second statute of the World Archaeological Congress states that the Congress is based ‘on the explicit recognition of the historical and social role, and the political context, of archaeological enquiry, of archaeological organizations, and of archaeological interpretation’. The establishment of WAC made a small contribution to a large social problem:

The decision to ban South African and Namibian colleagues from WAC-1 did not, in itself, topple Apartheid but rather it made a tiny contribution that helped define and underscore the unacceptability of Apartheid and contributed an extra straw to eventually break its back (Stone, 2016: 64).

The first Congress meeting, WAC-1, held in Southampton, U.K. in September 1986, provided one of the first opportunities for Indigenous peoples and scholars from low income countries to express their views in a major international setting (Ucko, 1987; Stone, 2016). The WAC Executive was shaped to ensure global representation and continued access to Indigenous voices was ensured through designated places on the Executive. Since then, WAC Congress organisers have raised funds to support the participation of between 200 and 400 Indigenous peoples and scholars from economically disadvantaged countries at WAC Congresses. Their work has been published in the One World Archaeology book series as well as in the WAC journal *Archaeologies* and other WAC book series. The WAC book series give place to considerations of power and politics in framing archaeological questions and results, and draw intellectual richness from the contributions of archaeologists globally as well as from minorities who were once silent.

Decolonising Archaeology

The self-reflexive awareness of the social and political role of archaeology that emerged in archaeology during the 1980s and 1990s engendered a decolonisation of archaeological theory and practice. This is particularly evident in regards to research with Indigenous populations in high-income countries, such as Canada, Australia and the United States, though there is also a trend towards the decolonisation of archaeology in countries that were once colonial territories. The decolonisation of archaeology is characterised by a concern with rethinking colonial histories (Mihesuah, 1999; Lilley, 2000; Ouzman, 2003; Stahl, 2009; Mizoguchi, 2015), deconstructing power relations between Indigenous peoples and archaeologists (Smith and Wobst, 2005a; Atalay, 2006), shared histories (Harrison, 2004; Isaacson and Ford, 2005) and shaping archaeological practice so that it benefits

Indigenous communities (Lilley, 2000; Ardren, 2002; Nicholas and Bannister, 2004; Smith and Jackson, 2008; Roberts and Campbell, 2012). Given archaeology's role in establishing and ratifying the stereotypes of colonialism (Moro-Abadía, 2006; Crossland, 2013: 124), it seems reasonable to expect archaeologists to assist in the decolonisation of archaeology.

The decolonised practice of Indigenous archaeology increasingly touches on issues relating to social justice and human rights, such as racism and social and economic marginalisation. Contemporary archaeological research is focusing on the ethics of archaeological practice, especially in terms of copyrighting the past (Nicholas and Bannister, 2004; Anderson and Christen, 2013); the repatriation of Indigenous ancestors and items of cultural patrimony (Fforde *et al.*, 2002; Lonetree, 2006; Wilson, 2009); and who benefits from research (Atalay *et al.*, 2014; Brady and Kearney, 2016; Kato, 2017). Integral to this process is understanding how cultural knowledge has been retained and transmitted within both Indigenous and Western cultures, and, by extension, the complex interplay of historical factors that have contributed to contemporary cultural and intellectual property issues.

While the question of 'Who owns the past?' has been an issue in Indigenous and colonial archaeology for some decades (e.g. McBryde, 1985; Kehoe, 1989; Gathercole and Lowenthal, 1990), discussions have focused largely on issues relating to physical property, such as repatriation, museum and curation practices (Fforde *et al.*, 2002). Recent attention is focusing on the intangible aspects of Indigenous cultural knowledge, including deconstruction of the notion of Indigeneity, ethics and cultural rights, and the co-creation of knowledge (Nicholas and Bannister, 2004; Roberts and Campbell, 2012; Ferguson *et al.*, 2015; Hillerdal *et al.*, 2017).

In the late 1990s, on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, lawyer Teri Janke undertook a major study of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property issues. She concluded that Indigenous cultural and intellectual property includes: literary, performing and artistic works (including music, dance, song, ceremonies, symbols, designs, narratives and poems); languages; scientific, agricultural, technical and ecological knowledge (including cultigens, medicines and sustainable use of flora and fauna); spiritual knowledge; all items of moveable cultural property; Indigenous ancestral remains; Indigenous human genetic materials (including DNA and tissues); cultural environment resources (including minerals and species); immovable cultural property (including sites of significance, sacred sites and burials); and documentation of Indigenous peoples' heritage in all forms of media (including scientific, ethnographic research reports, papers and books, films, and sound recordings) (Janke, 1999: 11-12).

Several international conventions and studies have resulted in key declarations, charters and issues papers for the treatment of cultural and intellectual property rights (e.g. the Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples; the Julayinbul Statement on Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights; the UNESCO Model Law for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture; the Declaration on the Safeguarding of Indigenous Ancestral Burial Grounds as Sacred Sites



Fig. 1. Indigenous people in an interconnected world: Bulainjan and Glen Wesan, Beswick/Wugularr community, Northern Territory, Australia, 2008. Photo: C. Smith.

and Cultural Landscapes). Cultural and intellectual property rights span diverse disciplines: from law, anthropology, archaeology, and visual arts, to community development, policy studies, human rights, and research ethics. They cut across geographic boundaries. Stakeholders include individual researchers, local communities, regional heritage centers, federal agencies, and international organizations, as well as developers, tourism firms, and media producers (see Nicholas and Hollowell, 2004). The social sciences, in particular, have witnessed an immense increase in interest in cultural and intellectual property rights issues at local, national, and international levels, as these rights increasingly intersects with the practice of, and contemporary uses of, cultural heritage. This process is reinforced by Indigenous people's increased access to digital communication. They are ready participants in digital communication (e.g. fig. 1), particularly in high-income countries that have the required infrastructure.

In many parts of the world, the control of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property is increasingly shaping the character of research relations, policies, and access to knowledge (Ferguson, Koyiyumptewa, and Hopkins, 2015; Nicholas and Markey,

2015; Rimmer, 2015). As Indigenous knowledge is incorporated into archaeological practice, some systems of classification will link, crosscut, or even contravene ‘normal’ archaeological classes and types. For example, archaeologist Tara Million uses her Cree heritage to guide her practice from research design to excavation and analysis (Million, 2005). Guided by Cree philosophy, Million developed a circular research model with four quadrants: Native community, academics, the archaeological record, and interpretation. Deriving from this model is an archaeological practice in which she undertakes excavation in circles, rather than squares. Million’s work demonstrates that developing an Aboriginal archaeology involves numerous challenges and negotiations, as is evident in the following passage:

My archaeological projects and publications are based on building a bridge between two conflicting and competing value systems: Aboriginal and mainstream Western academic [...]. I am being pulled in several contradictory directions. Cultural values are being brought to the table and are informing the requests expressed by each individual. Aboriginal and academic [...] I chose instead to compromise and negotiate with these two specific cultures (Million, 2005: 51).

The discipline of archaeology is undergoing a quiet transformation. This is not only in terms of practice but also due to the discipline’s embrace of the intellectual possibilities of an archaeology that is shaped by the knowledge and interests of descendent communities. This broadening of the archaeological imagination is evident in the recent work being produced in Australia and New Zealand, for example in a series of papers by Liam Brady, John Bradley and Amanda Keaney, who argue for a broadening of archaeological concepts and methods through the incorporation of Indigenous ways of knowing and using the world (see Brady and Bradley, 2014; Brady and Kearney, 2016; Brady *et al.*, 2016).

This is a two-way process. Around the world, the increased involvement of communities in archaeology has produced a number of important co-publications between Indigenous people and archaeologists (e.g. Davidson *et al.*, 1995; Dongoske, 2000; Loring and Ashini, 2000; Isaacson and Ford, 2005; Ferguson, Koyiyumptewa and Hopkins, 2015). In many countries, Indigenous people are finding value in archaeology, through its capacity to support native title land claims (e.g. Lilley, 2000), assist with language revitalization and cultural learning by local communities (e.g. Ardren, 2002) or provide interpretative materials for tourism ventures (e.g. Roberts and Campbell, 2012). The process of collaboration can be complicated but it is worth the effort, especially if benefits can flow in both directions:

Coping with such complications will be a small price for archaeologists to pay if the melding of a vibrant, archaeologically informed history with contemporary perspectives can produce cosmopolitan new knowledge that helps modern indigenous communities show that they have never been “people without history” at the same time that it renders archaeological interpretation more nuanced at the human level (Lilley, 2009: 63).

The important point is that this collaboration is a process of mutual influence. While Indigenous people shape the work of archaeologists, archaeologists also shape, and often share, the aspirations of Indigenous people and, of course, some people are both Indigenous and archaeologists (see Nicholas, 2010).

Community and Engaged Archaeology

Over the last two decades, community archaeology has grown into a distinct sub-discipline of archaeology, with its own specialist journal, *The Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*. There are varying reasons for this emergence. Its strong representation in Australia and New Zealand (see Marshall, 2002) could be due in part, at least, to increased collaboration with Indigenous peoples. Conversely, in Britain, the growth in community archaeology emerged from the long and still strong tradition of amateur archaeologists that exists across much of the UK and Europe. In the United Kingdom, this tradition formally started with the establishment of the Society of Antiquaries of London in 1717. Amateur societies have undertaken a number of high quality excavations since the mid-19th century. Though the relationship between amateurs and professionals at times has been fraught, the rise of community archaeology may be attributed to the wide networks of volunteers and the organizations, such as English Heritage and Scottish Heritage, that have fostered these networks.

Community archaeology is much more than the simple involvement of non-archaeologists in archaeological work, as it entails the community having partial control over the project (Marshall, 2002: 212). Various models have been proposed, outlining procedures for establishing a project, field practices, data collection, analysis, storage and dissemination, and public presentation (Moser *et al.*, 2002; Pope and Mills, 2004). Though the notion of community archaeology may appear to be simple enough, in practice the archaeologist has to deal with an array of social and political contexts and sensitivities. As Anagnostopoulos (2016) points out, 'a course of action that may be valid in one setting may strengthen institutionalized hierarchies in another, or produce unexpectedly detrimental results for the groups involved, or the local environment'.

Community archaeologists regularly deal with sensitive social and political histories and their practice is shaped by this. For example, McDavid's (2002) project at the Levi Jordan Plantation, in Brazoria, Texas, USA, created a collaborative website that documented the politically and emotionally charged archaeologies and histories of this eighteenth-century sugar plantation. In this example, multivocality was 'not just the passive presentation of 'different voices', but the ongoing, active involvement of many diverse people in determining what ultimately shows up on the screen' (McDavid, 2002: 307). While multivocality can play an important role in revealing and validating community views, it is important to separate these views from archaeological findings. Writing in

regards to archaeology in Africa, Bayo Folorunso warns against academic voices being subsumed by community voices:

“Multivocality” should not mean imposing the community’s interpretation on a scientifically derived interpretation as was done at Old Bulawayo [Zimbabwe]. Community interpretations and views are to be represented in the results of our researches but not substituted for our own interpretations. The monumental error in reconstruction at Old Bulawayo was the direct result of the flawed premise that “community participation strikingly contrasts with the elitism of conventional archaeological practice” (Folorunso, 2008: 477-478).

The collaborative methods of community archaeology vary in different parts of the world. The United Kingdom, for example, has a well-established network of community heritage volunteers, organised partly through the Council for British Archaeology. This network was incorporated into the methods developed by Glass, Saunders and Schofield (2014) in their pilot study of the First World War. In addition to site visits and the examination of both local and national archives this study tested the utility of working with volunteers from local heritage groups to identify, research and record relevant sites in their locales. The researchers found that:

[...] the involvement of local people and groups utilising archives and collections within their regional areas are the key to undertaking a successful examination of the First World War Home Front. These represent an ‘underground’ information source that is rarely found to such a degree in archives and museums. Small publications of limited print runs that have been created and published by local societies since the end of the First World War are goldmines of information, but are often barely known beyond country borders (Saunders, Schofield and Glass, 2014: 98).

The major development in community archaeology over the last decade is the movement from consulting with stakeholders to collaborating with stakeholders, as identified by Zimmerman and Branam (2014). During this time many community archaeology projects have seamlessly segued into the closer collaboration of engaged archaeology. This process has been influenced by cosmopolitanism, gendered archaeology, Indigenous empowerment and a growing concern with ethical globalization. Engaged archaeology can be defined as archaeology that is ‘shaped by the social and political concerns of the people with whom archaeologists intersect’ (Smith, 2015b). Like all archaeology, engaged archaeology differs according to the particular situation. In addition to variation according to archaeological sub-discipline (classical, Indigenous, historical, maritime, forensics and so on), the practice of engaged archaeology differs according to country, community and other social factors. The critical change is that archaeologists have moved beyond the simple recognition of the social and political contexts of archaeological interpretations to shaping archaeological practice according to the values, visions and agendas of those with whom they engage. This engagement is changing the shape of archaeological practice.

Engaged archaeological practice is shaped by the communities with whom archaeologists work. In response to the priorities and agendas of different stakeholder groups, engaged archaeology can entail stepping beyond conventional disciplinary boundaries. This means that an archaeologist may have to use their disciplinary skills for ‘non-archaeological’ purposes, such as using their writing skills to assist a community to raise funds for non-archaeological projects. Moreover, they may have to acquire a suite of non-archaeological skills to address the issues facing the communities with whom they work.

There are two principal approaches to engaged archaeology: thematic studies and individual case studies.

Thematic approaches to engaged archaeology draw upon a number of case studies, with the aim of addressing overarching problems. The clearest example of a thematic approach to engaged archaeology is the Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage (IPinCH) project. This collaborative international project developed community-based initiatives in Japan, Australia, New Zealand and North America and an online searchable database and archive (<http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/>). Directed by George Nicholas, of Simon Fraser University, in British Columbia, Canada, the IPinCH project explored ‘the rights, values, and responsibilities of material culture, cultural knowledge and the practice of heritage research’ (IPinCH, 2017). Though the project is technically finished as a grant, aspects of it continue in various guises. This collaboration developed an international, inter-disciplinary network of scholars in the area of cultural and intellectual property. It produced a plethora of deeply researched case studies and useful materials. For example, the booklet *Think Before You appropriate. Things to Know and Questions to ask in Order to Avoid Misappropriating Indigenous Cultural Heritage* (IPinCH 2016) provides cultural information on the traditional ownership of designs with practical advice on how to avoid inadvertently appropriating Indigenous cultural and intellectual property. It argues for responsible collaboration that redresses the current ‘imbalance of power in favour of those who are inspired by a particular cultural expression, to the detriment of those who provided this source of inspiration’ (IPinCH 2016: 6).

Another theme in engaged archaeology is that of Indigenous place names. The study of place-names is a good example of engaged archaeology breaking down inter-disciplinary boundaries. Heikkila and Fondahl (2010) state that use of the study of place names has appeared in research fields as diverse as linguistics, environmental studies and archaeology (Heikkila and Fondahl, 2010: 105). Though the specific information may not be widely understood, Indigenous place-names have the capacity to communicate knowledge about the natural world, Indigenous languages, oral histories and traditional ecological knowledge. In addition, place-names are important for counter mapping, which depicts the values and assets of communities consistent with their own worldviews. This approach is particularly important in representing the heritage of Indigenous communities (e.g. Byrne, 2012; Byrne and Nugent, 2014), addressing homelessness (Kiddey, 2014) and the preservation of intangible cultural heritage (King and Eoin, 2014).

An outstanding example of a case study in engaged archaeology is the recent work undertaken by Peter Schmidt, outlined in his book *Community-Based Heritage in Africa* (Schmidt, 2017). Returning to Katuruku village in northwestern Tanzania where he had worked 27 years previously, Schmidt found most of the elderly keepers of oral traditions had been lost to HIV/AIDS. In a public area of the village that had been cleared for this purpose, Schmidt screened a 16mm film, *The Tree of Iron*, on the history and social meaning of iron-working in the region. The process by which he became re-engaged in heritage work in response to requests from elders who approached him after the screening is described poignantly:

The few elders present, the same group that had engaged me before the film, approached me after the film. They took me aside near my vehicle and encircling me, they pleaded, “Please help us get our history back. You knew our fathers. You know our oral traditions. You are now the keeper of our oral traditions.” Stunned, I stood for several moments, wondering what to say [...]. As the exchange continued, it dawned on me that I was being thrust into a new role. Was I being seen as an archivist of village and regional history? [...] What transpired that night in Katuruka changed my life [...] I had not planned any additional research in this community. Our visit was simply a personal journey of remembrance [...]. The elders’ highly emotional appeal created a moral dilemma: how could I deny them their request when their fathers had once helped me record their oral traditions? (Schmidt, 2017: 31-32).

In a different part of the world, Sara González and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) co-direct the Field Methods in Indigenous Archaeology (FMIA) training program. FMIA seeks to move beyond the conventional model of extractive research within archaeology—whereby knowledge is taken from tribal communities—to a reciprocal model that enhances the capacity of the Grand Ronde THPO to care for tribal cultural resources. It does so through a pedagogical model emphasizing not only archaeological training, but also daily lessons from the wider Grand Ronde community. Over the course of the project, students attend community events such as Veteran’s Powwow, Competition Powwow, and Youth Culture Camp, contribute to canoe journey preparations, and help collect culturally important plant resources on the reservation. Through community involvement, students learn that the historically important places and practices under study remain integral to the contemporary Grand Ronde community. It also provides insight into Tribal Historic Preservation in the United States. Grand Ronde, like many tribes, adopts expansive conceptions of historic preservation that include archaeology as well as cultural revitalization, language education, management of natural resources, and documentation of oral histories. Doctoral candidate Ian Kretzler describes the process as follows:

I understand that my doctoral research may take longer than some other graduate students. Some days we don’t even do archaeology. We’ve done a lot of events with the community. We’ve helped them pack for canoe journeys, we’ve attended pow-wows and culture camps. We’ve participated in learning some of the games and songs that are taught to kids on the reservation. We are trying to deviate from an extractive model of research and contribute to the



Fig. 2. Participants of Flinders University's Ethnoarchaeology Field School run in partnership with Barngarla Native Title Holders Aboriginal Corporation. Port Lincoln, April 2017. Photo: Claire Marshall (provided courtesy of Evelyn Walker).

capacity of the tribe to care for its own heritage. We are really trying to put in practice the two-way street. They teach us and we provide our skills as archaeologists. It means that sometimes we are not just doing archaeology. That is what tribal historic preservation looks like for some tribes. It is not archaeology. It is linguistics, natural resources, oral histories and collaboration in cultural revitalization and protection (Ian Kretzler, 31st March 2017, pers. comm.).

Field schools are one of the main ways that archaeologists are able to respond to community-initiated requests for research. In South Australia, the Ethnoarchaeology Field School run by Heather Burke of Flinders University at Port Lincoln in 2017 was designed to help the Barngarla Aboriginal community record and research the site of Clamor Schurmann's Barngarla Language School (fig. 2). Schurmann was one of the first Lutheran missionaries to South Australia in 1838 and was appointed Deputy Protector of Aborigines in Port Lincoln in 1840 to mediate the cycle of violence that characterised European-Aboriginal contact on the Eyre Peninsula and other parts of Australia at the time (see Nettlebeck and Foster, 2007; Burke *et al.*, 2016). He established a school in 1850 for Barngarla children, where he taught them in their own language, and made extensive records about Barngarla language and customs. Today, Schurmann and his work are still

central to Barngarla identity, linked to the active reclamation of Barngarla as a dormant language and the re-establishment of people's connections to local cultural heritage places. By excavating the site where Schurmann lived and worked Barngarla people were able to better understand and connect with the conditions of his life and of their forebears. The field school assessment was designed to produce outputs for the community, particularly interpretive materials that the Barngarla could use to promote their history and heritage (Burke, 2017).

How is engaged archaeology different from 'normal' archaeology? The critical difference is in the changing role of archaeologists. When undertaking engaged archaeology archaeologists are likely to become cultural facilitators; students as well as educators; and active participants in community-generated activities. While archaeologists who work in multiple locations often develop detailed knowledge of many places and form deep long-lasting relationships with multiple communities, there is a deeper engagement that comes with working with communities to directly address the social, economic and political challenges that they face. Also, though many archaeologists work on a single site or in small region all their lives this does not mean that they are undertaking engaged archaeology. The test is the degree to which the research or community projects are initiated and shaped by community people to address their non-archaeological concerns. There are costs for archaeologists in terms of losing control over direction, practice and product. However, the broadening and deepening of experience that comes from actively engaging with another's concerns enriches the relationships between archaeologists and community members. Finally, since engaged archaeology is intimately involved with the social and political issues of the day, it often intersects with social justice issues.

Archaeology for Social Justice

The turn to an engaged archaeology informs one of the most exciting developments in archaeology today, an archaeology for social justice. Social justice is defined by the Oxford Dictionaries (2017) as 'justice in terms of the distribution of wealth, opportunities, and privileges within a society'. In archaeology, the social justice movement is informed by a decolonisation and re-centering of Indigenous archaeology, developments in gendered and feminist archaeology and increasing global concerns with social justice issues.

A leading role for Indigenous archaeology in the development of an archaeology for social justice was argued by Smith and Wobst in the epilogue to their edited book *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*:

Many of the developments discussed within an Indigenous context here can be applied to colonial situations throughout the world: for example, the repatriation of the Parthenon (aka Elgin) Marbles, the ethical practice of archaeology in less economically advantaged coun-

tries and questions relating to community archaeology and heritage. Led by developments in Indigenous archaeologies, the next step is an archaeology committed to social justice (Smith and Wobst, 2005: 394).

Though Indigenous archaeology provided important impetus and initial direction, the contemporary concern with archaeology for social justice also has been shaped by feminist and queer studies that highlight issues of equity and human rights (e.g. Hanen and Kelley, 1992; Nelson *et al.*, 1994; Blackmore and Rutecki, 2014) and wider concerns about structural violence (e.g. Bernbeck, 2008; Starzmann, 2010). In addition, an interest in social justice has imbued the genesis and development of the World Archaeological Congress over the last 30 years, (see Ucko, 1987; Smith, 2015a; Layton *et al.*, 2016). During this period, WAC has exhibited a steady commitment to diversity and to redressing global inequities and to enhancing the intellectual richness of archaeology through conferences, publications and scholarly programs. This aim is clear in the resolutions that are put forward in the plenary sessions of WAC Congresses. It is clearly enunciated in the mission statement for Global Libraries Program, which states that:

The Global Libraries Program aims to develop the archaeological literary collections of economically-disadvantaged institutions. By supporting such libraries, we hope to assist archaeological and cultural heritage management students and professionals to undertake and excel at their study and work.

The movement to addressing social justice issues as part of archaeological discourse and practice is apparent in WAC publications, such as the One World Archaeology Series and gained recent impetus from the three-volume WAC set *Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice Series*, edited by Gnecco and Ireland (2015). In addition, this concern has manifested in discussions on the WAC list serve (<https://listserver.flinders.edu.au/mailman/listinfo/wac>) and in the Archaeologists for Global Justice list serve (“arch-justice”), established by Umberto Albarella in 2007 (www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/global-justice.html). Recent topics discussed on these lists range from a request for literature on looting and concerns about the closure of an archaeology degree on Bangor University India, to a request for assistance from the Library of Antiquities in Ramallah, Palestine and discussion on how to support archaeologists in Turkey following the restrictions placed on them by the Turkish government after the failed coup of July 2016.

How is a concern with social justice playing out in contemporary archaeological research? One of the clearest examples is the work undertaken by Zimmerman and others (Zimmerman and Welch, 2006; Zimmerman *et al.*, 2010; Kiddey, 2014) on the archaeology of homelessness. Zimmerman (2016) records five categories of homelessness that are identified by homeless people in Indianapolis. The first are ‘*panhandlers*’, people who beg for money or food. The money they procure can help them to arrange temporary sleeping arrangements with friends or family members. The second is ‘*those that live in their vehicles*’,

and are mostly families. The third is *'those that live in shelters'*, usually people who are new to being homeless, with few resources and no support from family. The fourth is *'bandos'*, people who live in houses or apartments in abandoned buildings. The fifth is *'those that live outdoors'*, people who live in public places, such as parks, shopfronts or sidewalks. The primary goal of this work is to determine whether 'archaeological methods, ethnography, material culture study, and spatial analysis can provide information that other social sciences and social service agencies done have or may not understand' (Zimmerman, 2016: 269). In pursuit of this social justice agenda Zimmerman concludes that:

What we have learned in our projects is that the lives of homeless people are very much more complicated than many homeless industry specialists understand [...] archaeology can indeed provide useful information and can be part of solutions to several issues relating to delivery of specific services. Archaeology can provide a counter-narrative that can be used by Maurice and other advocates for the homeless to counter the very powerful narratives about the homeless and their daily lives that are limited or erroneous at best, and at worst, used by some social service agencies, law enforcement, media, and the homeless industry as the basis for discriminatory social policy, criminalization and isolation (Zimmerman, 2016: 269).

While homelessness is a global phenomenon, it has local manifestations. Different cultural responses to comparable situations can be perceived in a comparison of the material culture of homelessness in Osaka, Japan, Indianapolis USA and Darwin, Australia (fig. 3). Spacey states that:

Japanese courts have defended homeless rights on several occasions. For example, courts ruled that homeless tents on public land can't be arbitrarily dismantled by police. Police must follow the same due process as an eviction from a regular rental apartment [...]. Japanese homeless people are remarkably polite and quiet. They never ask for money. This is somewhat ironic because Japanese people would be likely to donate if asked (Spacey, 2014).

The tolerance that Japanese people exhibit towards homeless people is in stark contrast to the situation in Darwin, Australia, where it is an offence to camp or sleep in public places and homeless people are at risk of fines they cannot pay and are routinely harassed by the police (see Pollard *et al.*, 2017). Kellie Pollard is conducting doctoral research on the lives of homeless people who live in Aboriginal fringe camps around Darwin, known as the 'long grassers'. Her collaborative study with the Larrakia Nation Aboriginal Corporation has identified cultural continuities between the lives of Aboriginal people living in remote communities and those who live in the long grass. These include a fusion of traditional and contemporary economies, situating camps so they are close to family members and a resourceful adaptation to changing circumstances. Pollard *et al.* (2017) conclude that use of the public space known as 'the long grass' is a continuum of Aboriginal cultural practice and that from this perspective the response of authorities 'is a denial of Indigenous agency, culture and rights to country'.



Fig. 3. The material culture of homelessness: a. Osaka, Japan; b. Indianapolis, USA; c and d. Darwin, Australia. Photos courtesy of Darren Lawson (Japan), Larry Zimmerman (USA) and Kellie Pollard (Australia).

Undertaking archaeology for social justice is no simple matter. A conflict between achieving archaeological objectives and pursuing a social justice agenda is exemplified in the work of Andrew Warner, who lived with the Beswick/Wugularr community of the Northern Territory, Australia, to conduct Honours research from 2001-2003:

Rather than archaeology *of or with* Indigenous Australians, I wanted to do archaeology *for* Indigenous Australians. I wanted to find out what they wanted from an archaeologist; could I do archaeology *for* Indigenous Australians? In this particular community, at that time, the answer was no.

They wanted me to do lots of other things though. People wanted me to help out at the office. They wanted a lift into town, help with the logistics of organising ceremonies and to take them on fishing trips. Everyone wants to go out to country. The old people wanted to teach culture. They didn't need white people to tell them about their culture and their history. But for me, archaeology is the stone that makes the soup. Archaeology can give you the means and the resources and justification to provide those services in a regular and reliable way (Andrew Warner, 16th April 2017, pers. comm.).

In this case, the archaeology was an important starting point, but ultimately gave way to a social justice agenda. Warner provided critical assistance in a range of areas to the community and essential support for the *Gunapippi* ceremony which took place in 2003. He did not submit an honours thesis, but he established strong and long-lasting relationships with community members. However, one lesson to be drawn from this is that while archaeology can be a means to further the social and political needs of communities it is important to achieve archaeological outcomes if the community support is to be sustained.

An area in which a social justice agenda has been a major driver is that of forensic archaeology, especially in regards to mass murders and executions. As Taavitsainen states:

In human terms, the need for archaeological and physical-anthropological exhumation is obvious and needs no explanation. The nations, ethnic groups, families, and individuals that experienced the terror have finally been given a chance to know the fate of their lost members and loved ones and their possible places of burial and to complete the process of individual and collective grieving (Taavitsainen, 2014: 1048).

Important work in this area has been undertaken by Jankauskas (2009), who highlights the practical difficulties involved in identifying the victims of Nazi and Communist regimes in Lithuania. Different but equally important issues are raised in Zoe Crossland's work (e.g. Crossland, 2000; 2002; 2009) in regards to the 9,000 people who 'disappeared' under the Argentinian military government that ruled from 1976 to 1983. Ongoing investigations are being undertaken by the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team (Equipo Argentino de Antropología Forense, EAAF), a non-governmental, not-for-profit, scientific organization that uses forensic anthropology and archaeology that investigates human rights violations in Argentina and worldwide (see EAAF, 2017). Taken as a whole,

Crossland's work provides a strong theoretical basis for understanding the 'body as evidence' and the social, cultural and political differences behind the competing demands of governments, courts, human rights groups and family members in relation to the 'forgetting' or remembering of such violence. The capacity of archaeology to redress the injustices of the past is clear, not only in terms of allowing families to conduct appropriate burial rights for the bodies of their loved ones (Crossland, 2011) but also because excavated evidence from mass graves and clandestine burials provides information that is critical to the international prosecution of human rights abuses and individual criminal cases (see Crossland, 2013).

In South America, a social justice agenda was explicitly embraced by Gustavo Politis, Almudena Hernando, Alfredo González-Ruibal and Elizabeth Beserra Coelho in their ethnoarchaeological research with the Awá, a Tupi-Guarani hunter-gatherer group from the northeast of Brazil. Politis (2015: 52) states that one of the explicit objectives of this research 'was to generate useful information that would assist the Awá to improve their living conditions, and to take effective political actions in order to protect them'. One of the strategies adopted in order to achieve this was to have all papers generated by the project translated into Portuguese so that the data and proposed interpretations were available in Brazil to support the design of protection and sustainability projects.

Protection and sustainability are social justice issues in Africa, as well. In many African countries, archaeologists are frustrated by the failure to develop a professional industry in cultural resource management. Bayo Folorunso, of Nigeria, has expressed great concern about the looting of sites, the lack of a cultural heritage management industry, which he attributes largely to a failure of leadership among academics, and massive unemployment among archaeology graduates:

Looting of archaeological sites is widespread and unchecked. Instead of a unified front of archaeologists demanding professionalism in the approach to heritage management matters and a cultural resources management oriented archaeology in the country, which is the ethical and moral thing to do, some academics are desperately seeking to ally archaeology with tourism in the rat race for economic gains [...]. Archaeology will continue to be undeveloped in Nigeria if the academics who are supposed to provide leadership and direction... abandon the ethical option of a cultural resources management archaeology which would create employment for hundreds of archaeology graduates in the country who are unable to practice archaeology because of lack of employment positions [...]. The private sector archaeology is far from being developed in Nigeria despite the need for it because of wanton destruction of archaeological sites by land developers and industrial concerns [...] (Folorunso, 2011: 809-10, 822).

In pursuit of greater equity within his country, Folorunso calls for reform at all levels: government, universities, individual scholars and international agencies:

Unfortunately, Nigeria has been producing scientists who would immediately immigrate to countries with more stable economies, where their services would be appreciated and rewarded

as opposed to their home country where the few corrupt leaders and their collaborators had seized the apparatus of governance and condemned every other person to eternal poverty with the help of international monetary agencies (Folorunso, 2011: 822).

These issues are widespread in many countries in Africa. In such situations, society shapes archaeology, but archaeology has little opportunity to shape society.

Though it varies in different parts of the world, archaeology is increasingly informing social justice agendas. The most notable areas of success have been Indigenous rights to the repatriation of the remains of their forebears (e.g. Fforde *et al.*, 2002), the protection of cultural heritage in times of conflict (e.g. Stone, 2012) and the international prosecution of human rights abuses (e.g. Crossland, 2011; 2013). Moreover, the long-term perspective that is provided by archaeology reminds us that things change, that what appears to be normal, eternal or invincible will come to an end. Finally, since social justice archaeology aims to redress inequities in the distribution of wealth, opportunities and privileges that exist in the present, it is often embedded in the study of the contemporary past.

Archaeology of the Contemporary Past

One of the most interesting developments in archaeology over the past few decades is the development of an archaeology of the contemporary past, defined by Harrison and Schofield (2009: 186) as ‘the archaeology of places and events that relate to the period of recent or living memory’. The development of this sub-discipline can be divided into two major phases. The first phase was the development of an ‘archaeology of us’ (or modern material culture) in the late 1970s and early 1980s undertaken by North American archaeologists (e.g. Rathje, 1979; Schiffer and Gould, 1981). The second phase developed in the first part of the 21st century, signalled by publications such as *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past* (Buchli and Lucas 2001), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World* (Graves-Brown *et al.*, 2014) and the *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, established in 2014.

Recent archaeological studies in this genre have focussed on an array of subjects: production and consumption; ruins, battlefields and power stations; statues and memorials; zoos; furniture and clothing; homes, abandoned homes and homelessness; cars, highways and space travel; factories, city parks and malls; graffiti, paintings and sculpture; phones, radio and television; and photographs, film, social media and virtual worlds (Graves-Brown *et al.*, 2014; Harrison and Schofield, 2010). These diverse studies are joined by a focus on the material culture of the present and a concern with the social and political dimensions of archaeological practice.

The study of everyday objects can provide new insights into the contemporary world. It can help us identity the core values of a society—those things that are so normalised



Fig. 4. The material world of polite Japan, 2016. a. Bag rest. b. Divided use footpath with blind guide. c. Shoe box. d. Taxi in white. Photos: C. Smith.

that local people don't notice them. In Japan, for instance, many material objects are designed to show care for other's possessions, guide people so that they avoid unpleasant surprises, and help others to keep themselves, their loved ones and their possessions clean. Examples of this concern with the polite care of strangers include ubiquitous grooved lines on payments to assist blind people; shoe boxes in restaurants, shrines and homes; shelves to hold handbags at shop counters and taxis with white-gloved drivers and seats covered in white cloth (fig. 4). While Japan is a complex and multifaceted society with histories of racism and discrimination, there is a core emphasis on politeness.

Another trend in archaeology of the contemporary past concerns responses to prevailing events, such as natural disasters or catastrophic events. Less than two days after the triple disaster of earthquake, tsunami and nuclear meltdown that occurred in Fukushima, Japan, on 11th March 2011, a group of Japanese archaeologists, historians and cultural informatics specialists began Twitter and Facebook discussions about how they could assist. This resulted in the formation of a Consortium for Earthquake-Damaged Cultural Heritage (CEDACH), formally established on 21th March 2011 (Okamura *et al.*, 2013). The critical point here is that the role of this consortium was not only in the documentation and restoration of cultural heritage but also to inform the public of natural disasters that have

brought similar devastation in the past. At a more explicitly theoretical level, Schlanger *et al.*, (2016) have argued for using catastrophe as a basis for envisaging a 'contemporary future' that admits both the feats and failures of late modernity (Schlanger *et al.*, 2106). The work undertaken by Japanese archaeologists and their international colleagues has established a new field of research, 'disaster-related heritage studies', in which the methods of conservation, risk management and education about heritage damaged by past disasters are systematized (Okamura *et al.*, 2013: 266). Okamura *et al.* state that:

Earthquakes of the magnitude experienced in March 2011 are estimated by seismologists to have happened in the affected area about once every 1000 years. The last earthquake on this scale occurred in AD 869, during the Jogan era of the Heian period. Because of the rarity of seismic events of this scale, most of the public today had no idea that a tsunami tidal wave could reach as far inland as was inundated in 2011 [...]. It seems that it was only archaeologists who could have made it known to the general public that tsunamis of the scale of the 2011 disaster have inundated the Sendai plain in the past (Okamura *et al.*, 2013: 261-62).

The archaeology of the contemporary past has a great deal to contribute to understanding the identities that are being formed by contemporary societies, particularly in relation to the establishment and negotiation of social norms. In particular, it can help us attain a deeper understanding of the critical social and political issues of the day, such as racism, discrimination and mass emigration, and to identify material ways to reinforce social cohesion. The challenge for archaeological studies of the contemporary past is to tell something new, rather than simply reinforce what is already known. Harrison and Schofield (2010) argue that the archaeology of the contemporary past 'has a social and political awareness that appears more acute and more focused than before' and that 'perhaps it is not too much of an exaggeration to say that this new generation of contemporary archaeologies can contribute in some small way to addressing specific problems and challenges that face contemporary and future society'. One weakness in current approaches to the archaeology of the contemporary past include an equation of 'us' with the 'West' (González-Ruibal, 2014) and an over-representation of Anglophone scholars in edited works on this subject (cf. Burström, 2015). If archaeology of the contemporary past is to truly flourish as a sub-discipline, it will need to be embraced by the perspectives of European, Asian, South American and African scholars.

Film, Television and Serious Games

As Holtorf (2004a: 42) states 'Archaeology is a particularly fascinating occupation of our age'. There are two aspects to current trends. The first is the ways in which archaeology and notions of ancient worlds are embedded in particular forms of popular culture, such

as film and computer games. The second is the manner in which archaeologists interact with, and respond to, popular culture, as part of a complex interplay between past and present (cf. Bolin, 2004). Ancient worlds are portrayed in a wide range of popular culture: computer games, internet sites, virtual worlds, travel brochures and other advertising, films, television shows, documentaries, fiction, comics and magazines. How archaeology is portrayed in contemporary media has an impact on people's views about conserving archaeological sites and informs stereotypes of archaeologists as hero or detective (Zarmati, 1995; Holtorf, 2004a; Mickel, 2015) and gendered identities of archaeologists (Baxter, 2002). As Holtorf (2004b) points out, portrayals of archaeology in popular culture can be either an opportunity or an obstacle to professional archaeologists.

Many young people first encounter archaeology through television or video games. Some games are constructed around ancient worlds. Popular examples are *Tomb Raider*, in which English aristocrat and archaeologist Lara Croft seeks ancient treasures, released in 1996; *Assassin's Creed*, set in the cities of Jerusalem, Acre, Damascus, and the township of Masyaf in 1191AD, released in 2007; and treasure hunter Nathan Drake from the *Uncharted* series, released in 2007. While these games create opportunities to learn about the past, they have little regard for accuracy or cultural understanding and perpetrate largely unwarranted stereotypes of archaeologists. In relation to film, Hiscock concludes that an 'emphasis on supernatural and extraterrestrial events in archaeological movies reflects the reality that cinema explores the interests of the public rather than the nature of archaeological practices or discoveries' (Hiscock, 2014: 2781). Similarly, in her analysis of Lara Croft's 'female masquerade for the concealed masculine protagonist', Zorpidu (2004: 106-107) argues that unbalanced archaeological knowledge and a failure to reflect on gender 'has serious implications not only for the reconstruction of past social forms but also for present gender issues'.

More recently, *Survival Island 3-Australia Story 3D*, a mobile game designed by a female Russian developer, was removed from iTunes and Google Play store following an online campaign (<https://www.change.org/p/amazon-killing-indigenous-australians-is-not-a-game>). In this survival game, players were rewarded with food or weapons for killing Aboriginal people. While criticisms of the game for promoting racial violence and negative stereotypes of Aboriginal people (e.g. Graham, 2015) might have been anticipated, the strength of these reactions in Australia related to the history of massacres in that continent, as recently as the Coniston Hill massacre in 1933 (Nettlebeck and Foster, 2007). Given the violent history of European settlement in Australia (e.g. Burke *et al.*, 2016), the lack of cultural and historical understanding that underpins such depictions can be devastating to those who are characterised as the natural victims of colonial violence.

One trend is the use of serious games to teach about cultural heritage, Indigenous cultures and archaeological practice. Strong archaeological interest in computer games that use archaeology can be discerned through perusal of the internet site, *Archaeogaming* (2015). Most recently, Clark has produced a wonderful compendium of activities and games for people who work with heritage to help them to connect better with the herit-



Fig. 5. Serious games: the Iñupiat video game *Never Alone (Kisima Ingitchuna)*. Reproduced courtesy of E-Line Media.

age values of normal people. Within the context of a ‘new, digital connected world’, she identifies a change from ‘push’ to ‘pull’ in heritage, from ‘a time when heritage experts told communities what was important and why’ to ‘understanding what is important to people and their needs, and finding ways to harness their talents and create ownership’ (Clark, 2017: 6). She argues that:

The starting point for any decision about heritage is understanding those values – what matters to people and why. Those values justify protecting heritage, and also help inform decisions about how to manage it. Equally not understanding what is important to people can lead to poor decisions. (Clark, 2017: 6).

Some outstanding material has been produced by Indigenous people. The world of the Iñupiat people from Alaska is explored in *Never Alone (Kisima Ingitchuna)*, a game in which players pursue the quest of an Iñupiat girl, Nuna, who travels with her pet Arctic fox. As Nuna seeks to stop a cruel blizzard that threatens her village, she is faced with a range of challenges, many of which can be overcome with cultural knowledge. The rewards are storytelling by elders and community members. Archival footage and brief interviews with Iñupiat elders and storytellers are interwoven with cultural facets of Iñupiat life. The commanding graphics (fig. 5) and the gaming experience is deepened by visual and aural communication. It is commanding teaching material. In his review of this game, Reinhard (2015) suggests that the player will be ‘awed completely by Iñupiat art and storytelling, drumming, and some of the best sound design I have ever heard’. The game helps to pre-

serve Inuit history, he observes, while teaching lessons of conservation and preservation and acts as a gateway into serious research on the Iñupiat (Reinhard, 2015). While the design of this game draws upon research undertaken by anthropologist Aaron Crowell and ethnomusicologist Aron Fox, it is a deep collaboration between the game designers and community elders. The proceeds from *Never Alone* fund the Iñupiat Tribal Council's education mission. In 2015, *Never Alone* won the British Academy of Film and Television Arts (BAFTA) award for Best Debut Game (<http://awards.bafta.org/award/2015/games/debut-game>).

The Internet and Social Media

Contemporary archaeology is being sculpted by the internet and social media. This is apparent not only in the array of internet sites and social media tools used to support or promote archaeology but also in the materials we now analyse. The internet is now a legitimate object of archaeological study. Graves-Brown's articulation of an 'archaeology of the internet' identifies it as a locus of social and political struggle:

The Internet can be studied by archaeologists at a number of levels. These include both its physical and virtual infrastructure and the virtual artefacts of all kinds created by and through this infrastructure. The nature of the Internet is always changing [...] These processes are driven by both global/national politics and the desire of capital extract profit from the Internet, countered by those who retain the utopian ideal of free "peer-to-peer" exchange of information (Graves-Brown, 2014: 4006).

In this passage Graves-Brown broadens our understanding of artefacts to include virtual artefacts. As he points out, the politics of the internet revolve around access and ownership and there are significant populations in both high-income and low-income countries that are disenfranchised by a lack of access to the internet. The relevance of this to archaeology is not only in relation to global reach but also in terms of those who are not reached—who are excluded by these modern systems of communication.

While the internet is challenging the authority of mass communication, this is a complicated process. Though uni-directional communication by a limited number of established sources is increasingly being replaced by multi-directional communication among many, this is not a simple trajectory. The establishment of 'blogs' has provided alternative sources of information, shifting reporting from the ostensibly objective viewpoints of mainstream journalists to a complex mix of subjective perspectives from a variety of players (Bennett, 2013: 37). Further, blogging allows audiences to interact with published news reports and to forward them through their own networks, generating its own form of broad communication. However, an emerging problem is that these networks tend to encompass the same sets of values and opinions and do not include

alternative perspectives to challenge or broaden people's outlooks. People choosing to live 'in a bubble' is one explanation put forward for the failure of media analysts to correctly predict the outcome of the 2016 presidential election in the U.S.A. (Vogel and Isenstadt, 2016).

Eck (2014) documents the variety of ways that archaeologists use diverse forms of media to more widely and rapidly promote the documentation and preservation of sites 'at risk from neglect, war, vandalism, misuse, land development, agriculture, looting, and artificial and natural alterations and disasters'. He argues that the use of social media 'provides a new arena for the evolution of the role of the media in assisting the archaeological community in calling the public's attention to the need to understand, conserve, protect, and document the cultural heritage of the people of all nations (Eck, 2014: 6131). These developments are being led by a limited number of countries. In Japan, for example, the 'preservation by record' of a site is used routinely to preserve knowledge of sites that are destroyed as part of development (Nakanishi, 2016).

While social media can be used to preserve knowledge of archaeological sites, it can also pose a threat to sites. A recent study by Smith *et al.* (2016) identifies the emergence of socially-mediated terrorism, defined as 'the use of social and networked media to increase the impact of violent acts undertaken to further a social, political and/or religious cause with the aim of creating physical, emotional or psychological suffering that extends beyond the immediate audience' (Smith *et al.*, 2016: 164). This study analyses how Da'esh/the Islamic State uses social media to amplify the effects of cultural heritage destruction in order to manipulate local, national and international audiences. The authors distinguish three strategies involving cultural heritage: smoke, mirrors and mock destruction, which exaggerates perceptions of power and tests the impact of potential destruction; shock, awe and censure, which uses international outrage to cloak the Islamic State with an aura of invincibility and highlight the impotence of its opponents; and financing the Kaliphate, in which the looting of archaeological sites has become a business. In the past, cultural icons have been destroyed with the primary aim of subjugating local populations/audiences. Smith *et al.* (2016) argue that Da'esh promotes cultural heritage destruction to local, regional and international audiences with reactions from one used to subdue, embolden or intrigue another. As such, they argue that networked social media is a currently under-rated threat to cultural heritage in conflict zones. It should be noted, however, that it can also be used to monitor damage and destruction and to exert the 'soft power' of enhanced communication between opposing sides (Smith *in press*).

Monuments as Commemoration and Heritage Erasure

The archaeological study of monuments provides insights into social and political processes. Throughout the world, monuments are used to shape social values and endorse the

memories of a group. Monuments are established by governments or have government endorsement as part of a process of creating historical memory (Halas, 2008). They help legitimize, affirm and strengthen the presence of established regimes within a community, communicating the shared values, identity and histories of ruling groups (Whelan, 2002: 508). Monuments are multivalent symbols that transmit reminders of people, events, and associations, as well as ideology, across public spaces. From this viewpoint, they include statues, buildings and megaliths that are built by ruling groups, but excludes cemetery headstones and small plaques, which are established by family or community groups. Some monuments, such as the Coliseum in Rome, are recognized primarily for their antiquity while others, such as the Statue of Liberty in New York, symbolize key events in the life of a nation. Dedicated to individuals, groups or events, monuments are a physical focal point for social and political reminiscing and, sometimes, for action. They emit physical reminders of people, events and associations, as well as ideology, across public spaces, imbuing the surrounding landscape with meaning. They are used to legitimize, affirm and strengthen political regimes, communicate shared values (as determined by the state) and celebrate the sanctioned histories of dominant groups (cf. Whelan, 2002: 508).

Monuments can be a material embodiment of turning points in history. Such turning points are subject to mythologization (Zerubavel, 1995: 9) and often they are reinforced through material means. A compelling example of the role of monuments in changing social and political circumstances is the rise and fall of communism. An integral part of communist strategies was the normalisation of unequal powers between Russia and subsidiary countries. This process was furthered through the ubiquitous erection of statues of Lenin in Soviet bloc countries. As Klein (2000: 131) states, these statues were 'not just a mnemonic device to help individuals remember, but memory itself' (Klein, 2000: 131). They functioned to visually embody Russian leadership and to reinforce a network of social links between communist bloc countries. They also served the more liminal message of the constancy of Russian oversight.

The role of materiality in reshaping historical memories is apparent in the de-commemoration of communism in former communist countries in Eastern Europe. In Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and other Eastern European countries, the end of communism sparked a de-commemorating of remembrance practices that found material expression in the removal of monuments associated with communism and the construction of new monuments aligned to national identities and fresh aspirations. In these countries the rapid removal of statues of Lenin symbolized hard-fought independence from Russia. This was accompanied by a kind of euphoria, as indicated in the statement by Daiva Venckus (19th April 2017, e-mail. comm.) that 'When Lenin was cut at the knees and his torso swinging on the crane, everyone was jumping up and down shouting, "Lietuva! Lietuva!" Everyone hugged one another'. Such decommemoration is part of a process referred to by the Romans as *damnatio memoriae*, in which the memory of a person or group is damned by erasing all evidence of their names and/or images from public monuments and documents



Fig. 6. The decommemoration of communism: Bronze head of Lenin in the 'graveyard' of Soviet statues at the Estonian History Museum, Maarjamae Palace, Tallin, Estonia. Photo: Ferran Cornella (courtesy Wikimedia Commons).

(Saur, 2003; see also discussion in Arnold, 2014). A number of these statues have been stored in museums such as the Estonian History Museum in Tallin (fig. 6).

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (fig. 7) infused the global imagination at two levels: as the actual dismantling of a wall and physical freeing of a people and as a symbolic embodiment of the dismantling of communism. These images were etched into global memories as a symbolic embodiment of change. Embedded in the communicative power of materiality, the fall of the Berlin Wall eclipsed the Polish uprisings that had previously been the dominant symbol of the fall of communism.

Throughout former Communist bloc countries, new hegemonic national myths are finding diverse material expressions. This is important to the re-inscribing of national identities. However, this fragmentation has the potential to challenge national identities (see Zhurzhenko, 2011). Examination of the list of national monuments designated by the National Heritage Board of Poland (Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa, 2017) reveals many monuments that would not have been sanctioned under communism. These include the Benedictine Abbey Complex at Lublin and the Cathedral Basilica of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Łowicz; mosques and mizars at Bohoniki and Kruszyniany; and the Silesian Parliamentary building at Katowice. Themes that emerge include the commemoration of religion, particularly Catholicism, Polish valour and Polish independence. These themes celebrate and reinforce Polish national identity, historically centred on martyrdom, heroism and independence (Halas, 2008: 109-110).

How such political processes are viewed in the collective memories of different groups can be difficult to judge but there are material indicators. Significant populations of ethnic Russians live in former communist satellite countries, often without the right to citizenship. In 2007 ethnic Russians rioted in Tallinn, Estonia, when authorities removed the Bronze Soldier statue, erected in 1947 to commemorate Red Army soldiers who died fight-



Fig. 7. A symbolic embodiment of change: demolition of the Berlin Wall, 1989. Photo: Raphaël Thiérmard (courtesy Wikimedia Commons).

ing Nazi Germany. One man died in the riots and dozens were injured. The statue crystallized dissent. Interpretations of the monument fractured along two lines: the Bronze Soldier as a tribute to the courage of Russian soldiers who fought against Nazi Germany and the Bronze Soldier as a symbol that glorified the Russian occupation of Estonia (Tanner, 2007). The situation was exacerbated by the concomitant removal of Soviet soldiers buried nearby to a military grave and Russia took this up as a human rights issue for ethnic Russians in Estonia. After a brief period in indecision, the statue of the Bronze Soldier was relocated to a military cemetery in Tallinn (Lowe, 2009).

As signifiers for governments, monuments can become targets of community opposition. Sometimes it is easier to attack the representations of government than the government itself. This is highlighted in the complaint to UNESCO by a Russian lawmaker in the Ukraine, where numerous monuments to ‘Great Patriotic War Heroes’ across the country were destroyed by angry protesters in the wake of Russian annexation of the Crimea (Chernichkin, 2014). Desecrating a monument or tearing it down and eliminating it from the landscape is an exercise of power. Monuments are expressions of power, physical manifestations of success stories in a world of competing histories. They stake claims to society’s resources and insinuate selected cultural understandings of history into a group’s consciousness.

While memories can be fluid or changeable, they are less so if anchored materially. Moreover, as Fibiger (2015: 390) comments, heritage can be transformed through its erasure. Fibiger cites destruction by the Bahrain government of the Pearl Monument in Manama, which was a locus of pro-democracy protests in 2011 and was itself emblematic of Arab unity in the Gulf countries. Fibiger (2015: 391) argues that the process of destroying this site not only failed to erase its heritage values, but also transformed it into a heritage of the attempted uprising and its martyrs. This example highlights the power of such icons to provide an affective presence through their very absence (see also Holtorf, 2006; Holtorf and Kristensen, 2015).

Discussion

Vere Gordon Childe depicted archaeology as follows:

The objects of archaeology are any alterations in the earth's crust and in natural objects upon it in so far as they have survived at all. Archaeology, in fact, furnishes a history of human activity, provided always that the actions have produced concrete results and left recognizable material traces. It turns into history whenever it remembers that the objects it studies embody the thoughts and intentions of human beings and societies (Childe, 1944: 1-2).

From Childe's viewpoint, archaeology is the study of human history as it is informed by the material traces of the past. This view has endured. *Arqueología*, according to *Real Academia Española* (RAE, 2014), is the 'ciencia que estudia las artes, los monumentos, y los objetos de la antigüedad, especialmente a través de sus restos' (science that studies the arts, monuments and objects of antiquity, especially through their remains). This definition is consistent with the *Oxford English Dictionary's* definition of archaeology as 'the study of human history and prehistory through the excavation of sites and the analysis of artefacts and other physical remains' (OED, 2017). It is consistent with many published definitions of archaeology (e.g. Bahn, 2002: 2; Grant, Gorin and Fleming, 2002: xxxi).

In spite of their general acceptance, these definitions do not adequately capture archaeology as it is practised today. What can the studies discussed in this paper contribute to such definitions? Taken together, they suggest that our definition of archaeology needs to change in a number of ways. Firstly, it needs to incorporate the contemporary past. This has been recognised by the Society for American Archaeology, which now defines archaeology as 'the study of the ancient *and recent* human past through material remains' (SAA 2017, italics added). Secondly, a contemporary definition of archaeology needs to incorporate the possibility of artefacts being virtual as well as real (cf. Graves-Brown, 2014) and to encompass digital media as an object of study. Thirdly, this definition needs to incorporate the notion of cultural landscapes as well as objects. While the latter was

recognised by Childe (1944), above, it vanished from general definitions of archaeology as the discipline developed. Given the transformations that have occurred over the last few decades, a more realistic definition of contemporary archaeology might be ‘the study of human behaviour, past and present, through the analysis of material culture, both real and virtual, as situated within cultural landscapes’.

Archaeology today is not the archaeology of one hundred years ago, or even the archaeology of twenty years ago. While it was once ‘the study of the material remains of past human actions’, today it is much more than this. It is the study of the contemporary past as well as ancient remains. It is repatriating objects and human remains to Indigenous populations, and analysing the social, economic and political contexts involved, not just studying these things. It is exploring cultural landscapes and experiencing the past through performance, phenomenology and sensuous archaeology. It is recognising that the objects of archaeology exist in virtual, as well as real, worlds, and dealing with heritage erasure as well as heritage protection. Sometimes, archaeology is working closely with community groups on projects that, at first glance, are not archaeological, but which may allow archaeological projects to go forward. Archaeology, like the world around us, is in a constant state of ‘becoming’. In many parts of the world, it has developed a clear social and political purpose. The diversity of archaeology globally can be related to the ways that it has been sculpted by its social and political uses in different places, times and circumstances. In addition, archaeology has its own role to play in sculpting the world around us.

Acknowledgements

I thank Inés Domingo (ICREA/ University of Barcelona) and Gisela Ripoll (University of Barcelona) for inviting me to submit this paper to *Pyrenae*. I am grateful to Peter Stone (Newcastle University), Ian Lilley (University of Queensland) and Gary Jackson (Flinders University) for their comments on drafts of this paper. Ian Kretzler and Sara González (University of Washington) kindly provided information on the Field Methods in Indigenous Archaeology (FMIA) training program. I thank the Aboriginal people with whom I have worked who have helped shaped my thinking for over two decades. I particularly thank Vincent Copley senior (Ngadjuri Elders Heritage and Landcare Council), Rachael Kendino, Wendy Willika, Nell Brown, Jeannie Tiati and Joslyn McCartney (Barunga Community Elders). These communities have consistently provided in-kind support for my research with them. My views are also informed by my colleagues on various committees of the World Archaeological Congress, particularly Bayo Folorunso (University of Ibadan), Arek Marciniak (University of Poznan), Larry Zimmerman (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis), Obare Bagodo (Université Nationale du Bénin), Stephen Loring and Dorothy Lippert (Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History).

The photo in Figure 2 was taken by Claire Marshall and provided by Evelyn Walker and the Barngarla Native Title Holders Aboriginal Corporation. The images used in Figure 3 were kindly provided by Darren Lawson, Kellie Pollard and Larry Zimmerman. Figure 5 is reproduced courtesy of E-Line Media. The photo in Figure 6 is by Ferran Cornellà (Own work) [CC BY-SA 3.0 ee (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/ee/deed.en>)], via Wikimedia Commons. The photo in Figure 7 is by Raphaël Thiémarc from Belgique (Berlin 1989, Fall der Mauer, Chute du mur) [CC BY-SA 2.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0>)], via Wikimedia Commons. All other photos were taken by Claire Smith.

References

- ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, A., 2016, Public Engagement in Heritage Studies: Local Communities and Archaeology, Keynote Speech for the 3rd IHC International Conference in Heritage Management, Elefsina, Greece, September 2016.
- ANDERSON, D., 2002, Entitlements, Identity and Time: Addressing Aboriginal Rights and Nature Protection in Siberia's New Resource Colonies, in E. KASTEN (ed.), *People and the Land. Pathways to Reform in Post-Soviet Siberia*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin, 99-123.
- ANDERSON, J. and CHRISTEN, K., 2013, 'Chuck a Copyright on it': Dilemmas of Digital Return and the Possibilities for Traditional Knowledge Licenses and Labels, *Museum Anthropology Review* 7 (1-2), 105-126.
- ARCHAEOGAMING, 2015, Archaeogaming: Exploring the archaeology of (and in) video games, <<https://archaeogaming.wordpress.com/>>, consulted 26th January 2015.
- ARDREN, Y., 2002, Conversations about the Production of Archaeological Knowledge and Community Museums at Chunchucmil and Kochol, Yucatán, México, *World Archaeology* 34 (2), 379-400.
- ARNOLD, B., 1999, The Contested Past, *Anthropology Today* 15, 1-4.
- ARNOLD, B., 2014, Erasure of the Past, in C. SMITH (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Global Archaeology*, Springer, New York, 2441-2448.
- ATALAY, S., (ed.) 2006, Decolonizing Archaeology, Special Issue, *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (3).
- ATALAY, S., CLAUSS, L.R., MCGUIRE, R.H. and WELCH, J.R., 2014, *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- BAHN, P., 2002, *Archaeology: The Definitive Guide*, Cameron House, Wingfield, S.A.
- BALME, J. and BECK, W., 1993, Archaeology and Feminism – Views on the Origins of the Divisions of Labour, in H. DU CROSS and L. SMITH (eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique*, Occasional Papers in Prehistory No. 23, Australian National University, Canberra, 61-74.
- BALME, J. and BECK, W., (eds.) 1995, *Gendered Archaeology. The Second Australian Women in Archaeology Conference*, ANH Publications, Canberra, 43-47.
- BAPTY, I. and YATES, T., 1990, *Archaeology after Structuralism*, Routledge, London.
- BARAM, M., 2015, Review of *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, edited by P. GRAVES-BROWN, R. HARRISON and A. PICCINI, *Archaeological Journal* 172 (2), 490-491.

- BAXTER, J., 2002, Popular Images and Popular Stereotypes. Images of Archaeologists in Popular and Documentary film, *SAA Archaeological Record* 2 (4), 16-17.
- BENNETT, D., 2013, Exploring the Impact of an Evolving War and Terror Blogosphere on Traditional Media Coverage of Conflict, *Media, War and Conflict* 6, 37.
- BERNBECK, R., 2008, Structural Violence, *Archaeologies* 4 (3), 390-417.
- BERNBECK, R. and MCGUIRE, R.H., 2011, *Ideologies in Archaeology*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- BEVAN, R., 2016, *The Destruction of Memory: Architecture at War*, 2nd edition, Reaktion Books, London.
- BLACKMORE, C. and RUTECKI, D.M., 2014, Introducing the Queer Archaeology Interest Group, *The SAA Archaeological Record* 14 (5), 18-19.
- BODENSTEIN, F. and PAGANI, C., 2014, Decolonising National Museums of Ethnography in Europe: Exposing and Reshaping Colonial Heritage (2000-2012), in I. CHAMBER, A. DE ANGELIS, C. IANNICIELLO, M. ORABONA and M. QUADRARO (eds.), *The Postcolonial Museum: The Arts of Memory and the Pressures of History*, Ashgate, Surrey, 39-49.
- BRADY, L.M., and BRADLEY, J.J., 2014, Images of Relatedness: Patterning and Cultural Contexts in Yanyuwa Rock Art, Sir Edward Pellew Islands, SW Gulf of Carpentaria, Northern Australia, *Rock Art Research* 31 (2), 157-176.
- BRADY, L.M., and KEARNEY, A., 2016, Sitting in the Gap: Ethnoarchaeology, Rock Art and Methodological Openness, *World Archaeology*, <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2016.1193042>>.
- BRADY, L.M., BRADLEY, J.J. and KEARNEY, A., 2016, Negotiating Yanyuwa Rock Art: Relational and Affectual Experiences in the Southwest Gulf of Carpentaria, Northern Australia, *Current Anthropology* 57 (1), 28-52.
- BRODIE, N., KERSEL, M., LUKE, C., and TUBB, K., (eds.) 2006, *Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and the Antiquities Trade*, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- BUCHLI, V. and LUCAS, G., 2001, *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*, Routledge, London.
- BURKE, H., 2017, What does engagement look like? Community-Based Field Schools. Flinders University blog, <www.flinders.edu.au>, consulted 20th April 2017.
- BURKE, H., ROBERTS, A.L., MORRISON, M., SULLIVAN, V., and the River Murray and Mallee Aboriginal Corporation, 2016, The Space of Conflict: Aboriginal/European Interactions and Frontier Violence on the Western Central Murray, South Australia, 1830-1841, *Aboriginal History* 40, 145-179.
- BURSTRÖM, M., 2015, Review of *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, edited by P. GRAVES-BROWN, R. HARRISON and A. PICCINI, *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology*, <<https://www.equinoxpub.com/home/jca-book-reviews-oxford-handbook-archaeology-contemporary-world-edited-paul-graves-brown-rodney-harrison-angela-piccini/>>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- BYRNE, D., 2014, *Counterheritage: Critical Perspectives on Heritage Conservation in Asia*. Routledge, London.
- BYRNE, D. and NUGENT, M., 2004, *Mapping Attachment. A Spatial Approach to Aboriginal Post-Contact Heritage*, Department of Environment and Conservation (NSW), Sydney.
- CALLON, M. and LATOUR, B., 1981, Unscrewing the Big Leviathan, How Actors Macro-Structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them To Do So, in K. KNORR and A. CICOUREL (eds.), *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Londres, 277-303.
- CHERNICHKIN, K., 2014, Russian Lawmaker Complains to UNESCO About Demolitions of Soviet Monuments in Ukraine, *KyivPost*, 8th March 2014, <<https://www.kyivpost.com/article/content/ukraine-politics/russian-lawmaker->

- complaints-to-unesco-about-demolitions-of-soviet-monuments-in-ukraine-338750.html>, consulted 25th March 2017.
- CHILDE, V.G., 1944, *Progress and Archaeology*, Watts and Co., London.
- CLAASSEN, C., (ed.) 1992, *Exploring Gender Through Archaeology*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- CLARK, K., 2017, *Valuing Heritage. Creative Games and Activities for People who Care About the Past*, Berghahn Books, Oxford, <https://www.academia.edu/30976720/Valuing_Heritage_-_creative_activities_and_games_for_people_who_care_about_the_past>, consulted 19th April 2017.
- COLWELL-CHANTHAPHONH C., 2003, Dismembering/Disremembering the Buddhas? Renderings on the Internet during the Afghan Purge of the Past, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3 (1), 75-98.
- COLWELL, C. and FERGUSON, T.J., 2014, The Snow-Capped Mountain and the Uranium Mine. Zuni Heritage and Landscape Scale in Cultural Resource Management, *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 2 (4), 234-251.
- CONKEY, M.W. and GERO, J., 1997, Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26, 411-37.
- CONKEY, M.W. and SPECTOR, J., 1984, Archaeology and the Study of Gender, *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 7, 1-38.
- CROSSLAND, Z., 2000, Forensic Archaeology and the Disappeared in Argentina, *Archaeological Dialogues* 7 (2), 146-159.
- CROSSLAND, Z., 2002, Violent Spaces: Conflict over the Reappearance of Argentina's Disappeared, in J. SCHOFIELD, W.G. JOHNSON and C.M. BECK (eds.), *Material Culture, the Archaeology of Twentieth Century Conflict*, Routledge, London, 115-131.
- CROSSLAND, Z., 2009, Of Clues and Signs: The Dead Body and its Evidential Traces, *American Anthropologist* 111 (1), 69-80.
- CROSSLAND, Z., 2011, The Archaeology of Contemporary Conflict, in T. INSOLL (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 285-306.
- CROSSLAND, Z., 2013, Evidential Regimes of Forensic Archaeology, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42, 121-137.
- CUNLIFFE, E., 2014, Archaeological Site Damage in the Cycle of War and Peace: A Syrian Case Study. *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies* 2 (3), 229-247.
- DAVIDSON, I., LOVELL-JONES, C. and BANCROFT, R., (eds.) 1995, *Archaeologists and Aborigines Working Together*, University of New England Press, Armidale.
- DOMINGO, I., 2008, From the Form to the Artists: Changing Identities in Levantine Rock Art (Spain), in I. DOMINGO, D. FIORE and S.K. MAY (eds.) *Archaeologies of Art: Time, Place and Identity*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, 99-129.
- DOMINGUEZ, V., 2017, World Anthropologies. Special Section on Cultural Heritage/ Management, *American Anthropologist* 19 (1), 120-141.
- DONGOSKE, K. E., ALDENDERFER, M. and DOEHNER, K., (eds.), 2000, *Working Together: Native Americans and Archaeologists*, Society for American Archaeology, Washington.
- EQUIPO ARGENTINO DE ANTROPOLOGÍA FORENSE (EAAF), 2017, Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, <<http://www.eaaf.org/>>, consulted 20th April 2017.
- ECK, C.R., 2014, Preserving Heritage: The Role of the Media, in C. SMITH (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, Springer, New York, 6131-6141.
- FERGUSON, T.J., KOYIYUMPTTEWA, S.B. and HOPKINS, M.P., 2015, Co-creation of Knowledge by the Hopi Tribe and Archaeologists, *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3 (3), 249-262.
- FFORDE, C., HUBERT, J. and TURNBULL, P., (eds.) 2002, *The Dead and Their Possessions*, Routledge, London.

- FIBIGER, T., 2015, Heritage Erasure and Heritage Transformation: How Heritage is Created by Destruction in Bahrain. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (4), 390-404.
- FOLORUNSO, C.A., 2008, Comment on Community Involvement in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management by S. CHIRIKURE and G. PWITI, *Forum On Anthropology in Public, Current Anthropology*, 49 (3), 477-478.
- FOLORUNSO, C.A., 2011, The Practice of Archaeology in Nigeria, in L.R. LOZNY (ed.), *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, Springer, New York, 807-826.
- GALTUNG, J., 1969, Violence, Peace, and Peace Research, *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3), 167-191.
- GATHERCOLE, P. and LOWENTHAL, D., 1990, *The Politics of the Past*, Routledge, London.
- GERO, J.M. and CONKEY, M.W., (eds.) 1991, *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- GIBBON, G. 2013, *Critically Reading the Theory and Methods of Archaeology: An Introductory Guide*, AltaMira Press, Lanham.
- GNECCO, C. and IRELAND, T., 2015, *Ethical Archaeologies: The Politics of Social Justice*, Springer, New York.
- GONZÁLEZ-RUIBAL, A., 2006, The Past is Tomorrow. Towards an Archaeology of the Vanishing Present, *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 39 (2), 110-125.
- GONZÁLEZ-RUIBAL, A., 2014, Archaeology of the Contemporary Past, in C. SMITH (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, Springer, New York, 1683-1694.
- GORMAN, A.C., 2005, The Cultural Landscape of Interplanetary Space, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 5 (1), 85-107.
- GRAHAM, C., 2015, Bludgeon to Death an 'Aborigine': the Virtual Apple iPhone Game the Whole family can Play, *New Matilda*, <<https://newmatilda.com/2016/01/15/bludgeon-to-death-an-aborigine-the-virtual-game-the-whole-family-can-enjoy/>>, consulted 25th March 2017.
- GRANT, J., GORIN, S. and FLEMING, N., 2015, *The Archaeology Coursebook*, Routledge, New York.
- GRAVES-BROWN, P., 2014, Archaeology of the Internet, in C. SMITH (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, Springer, New York, 4002-4006.
- GRAVES-BROWN, P., HARRISON, R. and PICCINI, A., 2015, *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- HABU, J., FAWCETT, C. and MATSUNGA, J.M., (eds.) 2008, *Evaluating Multiple Narratives Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, Springer, New York.
- HALAS, E., 2008, Issues of Social Memory and Their Challenges in the Global Age, *Time and Society* 17, 13-18.
- HANEN, M. and KELLEY, J., 1992, Gender and Archaeological Knowledge, in L. EMBREE (ed.), *Meta Archaeology*, Kluwer, Netherlands, 195-225.
- HARRISON, R., 2004, *Shared Landscapes. Archaeologies of Attachment and the Pastoral Industry in New South Wales*, University of NSW Press, Sydney.
- HARRISON, R. and SCHOFIELD, J., 2010, *After Modernity: Archaeological Approaches to the Contemporary Past*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- HEIKKILA, K. and FONDAHL, G., 2010, Indigenous Toponyms as Pedagogical Tools: Reflections from Research with Tl'azt'en Nation, British Columbia, *Fennia* 188 (1), 105-22.
- HILLERDAL, C., KARLSTRÖM, A. and OJALA, C.-G. (eds.), 2017, *Archaeologies of "Us" and "Them": Debating History, Heritage and Indigeneity*, Routledge, London.
- HODDER, I., 2008, Multivocality and Social Archaeology, in J. HABU, C. FAWCETT and J.M. MATSUNGA (eds.), *Evaluating Multiple Narratives Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*, Springer, New York, 196-200.
- HOLTORF, C., 2004, Doing Archaeology in Popular Culture, in H. BOLIN (ed.), *The Interplay of Past and Present*, Huddinge, Södertörns Högskola, 40-48.

- HOLTORF, C., 2005, *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: Archaeology as Popular Culture*, AltaMira, Walnut Creek.
- HOLTORF, C., 2006, Can Less be More? Heritage in the Age of Terrorism, *Public Archaeology* 5, 101-109.
- HOLTORF, C. and KRISTENSEN, T.M., 2015, Heritage Erasure: Rethinking 'Protection' and 'Preservation', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (4), 313-317.
- INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MONUMENTS AND SITES (ICOMOS), 2002, *International Cultural Tourism Charter. Principles and Guidelines for Managing Tourism at Places of Cultural and Heritage Significance*, ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Committee, Paris.
- IRELAND, T. and SCHOFIELD, J., 2015, *The Ethics of Cultural Heritage*, Springer, New York.
- ISAACSON, K. and FORD, S., 2005, Looking Forward—Looking Back. Shaping a Shared Future, in C. SMITH and H.M. WOBST (eds.), *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London, 352-366.
- ISAKHAN, B., 2013, Heritage Destruction and Spikes in Violence: The Case of Iraq, in J.D. KILA and J. ZEIDLER (eds.), *Cultural Heritage in the Crosshairs: Protecting Cultural Property During Conflict*, Brill, Leiden, 219-248.
- ISAKHAN, B., 2016, Heritage under Fire: Lessons from Iraq for Cultural Property Protection, in W. LOGAN, M.N. CRAITH and U. KOCKEL (eds.), *A Companion to Heritage Studies*, John Wiley and Sons, London, 268-279.
- JANKE, T., 1999, *Our Culture. Our Future. Proposals for the Recognition of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property*, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, Canberra.
- JOHNSON, M., 2010, *Archaeological Theory*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- KATO, H., 2017, Archaeological Heritage and Hokkaido Ainu: Ethnicity and Research Ethics, in C. HILLERDAL, A. KARLSTRÖM and C-G. OJALA (eds.), *Archaeologies of "Us" and "Them": Debating History, Heritage and Indigeneity*, Routledge, London, 218-232.
- KIDDEY, R., 2014, *Homeless Heritage: Collaborative Social Archaeology as Therapeutic Practice*, University of York, U.K. (PhD Thesis).
- KING, R. and EOIN, L.N., 2014, Before the Flood: Loss of Place, Mnemonics and 'Resources' Ahead of the Metolong Dam, Lesotho, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14 (2), 196-223.
- KLEIN, K.L., 2000, On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse, *Representations* 69, 127-150.
- KLEJN, L., 2012, *Soviet Archaeology: Trends, Schools, and History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- KOHL, P.L. and FAWCETT, C., 1995, Archaeology in the Service of the State: Theoretical Considerations, in P.L. KOHL and C. FAWCETT (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 3-18.
- LAYTON, R. and THOMAS, J., 2001, Introduction: The Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property, in R. LAYTON, P.G. STONE and J. THOMAS (eds.), *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, Routledge, London, 1-21.
- LEONE, M.P., 1982, Some Opinions about Recovering Mind, *American Antiquity* 47, 742-760.
- LEONE, M.P., POTTER, P.B. Jr. and SHACKEL, P.A., 1987, Toward a Critical Archaeology, *Current Anthropology* 28 (3), 283-302.
- LITTLE, B. and SHACKEL, P., 2007, *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, AltaMira Press, Lanham.
- LILLEY, I., 1999, *Native Title and the Transformation of Archaeology in the Postcolonial World*, University of Sydney Press, Sydney.
- LILLEY, I., 1999, Strangers and Brothers? Heritage, Human Rights and a Cosmopolitan Archaeology in Oceania, in L. MESKELL (ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, Duke University Press, Durham, 48-67.
- LONETREE, A., (ed.), 2006, Critical Engagements with the National Museum of the American Indian, Special Issue, *American Indian Quarterly* 30 (4).

- LORING, S. and ASHINI, D., 2000, Past and Future Pathways: Innu Cultural Heritage in the 21st century, in C. SMITH and G. WARD (eds.), *Indigenous Cultures in an Interconnected World*, Allen and Unwin, Crows Nest, 167-189.
- LOWE, C., 2009, Kremlin Loyalist Says Launched Estonia Cyber-attack, Reuters, 13th March 2009, <<http://uk.reuters.com/article/tech-us-russia-estonia-cyberspace-idUKTRE52B4D820090313>>, consulted 25th March 2015.
- LOZNY, L.R., 2016, *Archaeology of the Communist Era. A Political History of Archaeology of the 2nd Century*, Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
- LYDON, J. and RIZVI, U. (eds.) 2010, *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- MARCUS, A., 2016, *Mapping Social Cohesion. The Scanlon Foundation Surveys 2016*, Faculty of Arts, Monash University, Caulfield East.
- MARSHALL, Y., 2002, What is Community Archaeology? *World Archaeology* 34 (2), 211-219.
- MAY, S., 2009, *Collecting Cultures: Myth, Politics, and Collaboration in the 1948 Arnhem Land Expedition*, AltaMira, Walnut Creek.
- MBEMBE, A., 1992, Provisional Notes on the Postcolony, *Africa, Journal of the International African Institute* 62 (1), 3-37.
- MCBRYDE, I., (ed.), 1985, *Who Owns the Past?* Oxford University Press, New York.
- MCDONALD, C., 2002, Archaeologies that Hurt. Descendants that Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology, *World Archaeology* 34 (2), 303-314.
- MACDONALD, S., 2013, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*, Routledge, London.
- MCNIVEN, I. and RUSSELL, L., 2005, *Appropriated Pasts. Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.
- MIHESUAH, D., 1999, *American Indians. Stereotypes and Realities*, Clarity Press Inc, Atlanta.
- MICKEL, A., 2015, Archaeology's Epic Battles with Storytelling and Stereotypes, *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 48 (2), 81-84.
- MILLION, T., 2005, Developing an Aboriginal Archaeology: Receiving Gifts from the White Buffalo Calf Woman, in C. SMITH and H.M. WOBST (eds.) *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London, 43-55.
- MIZOGUCHI, K., 2015, A Future of Archaeology, *Antiquity* 89,12-22.
- MOSER, S., GLAZIER, D., PHILLIPS, J.E., EL NEMR, L.N., MOUSA, S., AIESH, R.N., RICHARDSON, S., CONNER, A. and SEYMOUR, M., 2002, Transforming Archaeology Through Practice: Strategies for Collaborative Archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt, *World Archaeology* 34 (2), 220-248.
- MORO-ABADÍA, O., 2006, The History of Archaeology as a 'Colonial Discourse', *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 16 (2), 4-17.
- MUCKLE, R., 2014, *Introducing Archaeology*, 2nd Edition, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- NAKANISHI, Y., 2017, Archaeological Administration and Japanese Archaeology, *Japanese Journal of Archaeology* 4, 171-184, <<http://www.jjarchaeology.jp/contents/current.html>>, consulted 20th April 2017.
- NARODOWY INSTYTUT DZIEDZICTWA [NATIONAL HERITAGE BOARD OF POLAND], 2017, Zabytki w Polsce [Monuments in Poland], <http://www.nid.pl/pl/Informacje_ogolne/Zabytki_w_Polsce/>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- NELSON, M., NELSON, S.M. and WYLIE, A. (eds.), 1994, *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
- NELSON, S.M., 1994, *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*, AltaMira, Walnut Creek.
- NETTLEBECK, A. and FOSTER, R., 2007, *Out of the Silence. The History and Memory of South Australia's Frontier Wars*, Wakefield Press, Adelaide.

- NICHOLAS, G. (ed.), 2010, *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- NICHOLAS, G., 2017, Intellectual Property Issues in Cultural Heritage (IPINCH), <<http://www.sfu.ca/ipinch/>>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- NICHOLAS, G. and BANNISTER, K., 2004, Copyrighting the Past? Emerging Intellectual Property Rights Issues in Archaeology, *Current Anthropology* 45 (3), 327–350.
- NICHOLAS, G. and HOLLOWELL, J., 2004, Intellectual Property Rights in Archaeology? *Anthropology News*, 45 (4), 6.
- NICHOLAS, G. and MARKEY, N., 2015, Traditional Knowledge, Archaeological Evidence, and Other Ways of Knowing, in R. CHAPMAN and A. WYLIE (eds.), *Material Culture as Evidence: Best Practices and Exemplary Cases in Archaeology*, Routledge, London, 287–307.
- OKAMURA, K., FUJISAWA, A., KONDO, Y., FUJIMOTO, Y., UOZU, T., OGAWA, Y., KANER, S., and MIZOGUCHI, K., 2013, The Great East Japan Earthquake and Cultural Heritage: Towards an Archaeology of Disaster, *Antiquity* 87, 258–69.
- OUZMAN, S., 2003, Indigenous Images of a Colonial Exotic: Imaginings from Bushmen southern Africa, *Before Farming* 23 (1), 1–17.
- OVREVIK, S., 1991, Sex Ratios in Archaeological Organisations in Norway, University of Bradford, U.K (Masters Thesis).
- OXFORD DICTIONARIES, 2017, Social Justice, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/social_justice>, consulted 16th April 2017.
- PAYNTER, R. and MCGUIRE, R., 1991, *The Archaeology of Inequality Material Culture, Domination and Resistance*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- PEARSON, M. and SHANKS, M., 2001, *Theatre/ Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- POLITIS, G., 2015, Reflections on Contemporary Ethnoarchaeology, *Pyrenae* 46 (1), 41–83.
- POLLARD, K., SMITH, C. and RALPH, J., 2017, Contested Spaces: The ‘Long-Grassers’, Living Private Lives in Public Places, *The Conversation*, 20th March 2017, <<https://theconversation.com/contested-spaces-the-long-grassers-living-private-lives-in-public-places-72199>>, consulted 26th March 2017.
- PLETS, G., 2015, Ethno-Nationalism, Asymmetric Federalism and Soviet Perceptions of the Past: (World) Heritage Activism in the Russian Federation, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 15 (1), 67–93.
- PLETS, G., 2016, Heritage Statecraft: When Archaeological Heritage Meets Neoliberalism in Gazprom’s Resource Colonies, Russia, *Journal of Field Archaeology* 41 (3), 368–383.
- POPE, P.E. and MILLS, S.F., 2004, *Outport Archaeology: Community Archaeology in Newfoundland* [online], Newfoundland Archaeological Heritage Outreach Program, St. John’s, up-to-date 25th May 2004, <<http://www.arts.mun.ca/nahop/OutPortArch.html>>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- RALPH, J. and SMITH, C., 2014, We’ve Got Better Things to do Than Worry About Whitefella Politics’: Contemporary Indigenous Graffiti and Recent Government Interventions in Jawoyn Country, *Australian Archaeology* 78, 75–83.
- RATHJE, W.L., 1979, Modern Material Culture Studies, in M.B. SCHIFFER (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, Vol. 2, Academic Press, New York, 1–37.
- REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA (RAE) 2014 *Diccionario de la Lengua Española* (23.^a ed.), <<http://www.rae.es>>, consulted 25th March 2017.
- REINHARD, A., 2015, Review of *Never Alone* [game], *Internet Archaeology* 38, <<http://dx.doi.org/10.11141/ia.38.6>>, consulted 25th March 2017.
- RENFREW, C., 1982, *Towards an Archaeology of Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- RIMMER, M. (eds.), 2015, *Indigenous Intellectual Property: A Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., Cheltenham.
- RIZVI, U., 2015, Crafting Resonance: Empathy and Belonging in Ancient Rajasthan, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 15 (2), 254–273.

- ROBERTS, A.L. and CAMPBELL, I., 2012, The Ngaut Ngaut Interpretive Project: Collaboration and Mutually Beneficial Outcomes, *The SAA Archaeological Record* 12 (4), 29-31.
- SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY (SAA), 2017, Archaeology for Educators: What is Archaeology?, <the study of the ancient and recent human past through material remains>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- SAUNDERS, N.J., SCHOFIELD, J. and GLASS, E., 2014, *The Home Front (1914-1918) and its Legacies: A Pilot Study for a National Public Archaeology Recording Project of First World War Legacies in Britain, 2014-2018*, English Heritage, Swindon.
- SAUER, E., 2003, *The Archaeology of Religious Hatred in the Roman and Early Medieval World*, Tempus, Stroud.
- SCHIFFER, M. and GOULD, D. (eds.) 1981, *Modern Material Culture Studies: The Archaeology of Us*, Academic Press, New York.
- SCHLANGER, N., NESPOULOS, L. and DEMOULE, J.-P., 2016, Year 5 at Fukushima: A 'Disaster-Led' Archaeology of the Contemporary Future, *Antiquity* 90 (13), 409-424.
- SCHMIDT, P., 2017, *Community- Based Heritage in Africa*, Routledge, London.
- SCHMIDT, P. and PIKIRAYI, I. (eds.) 2016, *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa. Decolonising Practice*, Routledge, London.
- SCHOFIELD, J., 2005, *Combat Archaeology: Material Culture and Modern Conflict*, Duckworth, London.
- SCHOFIELD, J. and COCROFT, W. (eds.) 2007, *A Fearsome Heritage: Diverse Legacies of the Cold War*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- SCOTT, J., 1986, Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis, *American Historical Review* 91, 1053-1075.
- SHANKS, M., 2012, *The Archaeological Imagination*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- SHEPPARD, P.J., 1990, Soldiers and Bureaucrats: The Early History of Prehistoric Archaeology in the Magreb, in P. ROBERTSHAW (ed.), *A History of African Archaeology*, James Currey, London, 173-188.
- SILLIMAN, S.W., 2005, Culture Contact or Colonialism? *American Antiquity* 70 (1), 55-74.
- SILLIMAN, S.W., 2010, Indigenous Traces in Colonial Spaces: Archaeologies of Ambiguity, Origin and Practice, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 10 (1), 28-58.
- SILVERMAN, H. and RUGGLES, D.F., 2007, *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*, Springer, New York.
- SMITH, C., 2015a, Global Divides and Cultural Diversity: Challenges for the World Archaeological Congress, *Archaeologies* 11 (1): 4-41.
- SMITH, C., 2015b, Engaged Archaeology: Thinking Outside the Box, in R. CROOKE, K. EDWARDS and C. HUGHES (eds.), *Breaking Barriers. Proceedings of the 47th Annual Chacmool Conference*, The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Alberta, 2-18.
- SMITH, C., in press, Conflicting Values and Da'esh's Socially Mediated Terrorism, in P. YU, G. SMITH and C. SHEN (eds), *The Relevance and Application of Heritage in Contemporary Society*, Routledge, London.
- SMITH, C. and JACKSON, G., 2008, The Ethics of Collaboration. Whose Culture? Whose Intellectual Property? Who Benefits?, in C. COLWELL-CHANTHAPHONH and T.J. FERGUSON (eds.), *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendent Communities*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, 171-191.
- SMITH, C. and WOBST, H.M. (eds.) 2005a, *Indigenous Archaeologies*, Routledge, London.
- SMITH, C. and WOBST, H.M. (eds.) 2005b, The Next Step: An Archaeology for Social Justice, in C. SMITH and H.M. WOBST (eds), *Indigenous Archaeologies*, Routledge, London, 392-394.
- SMITH, C., BURKE, H., DE LEIUVEN, C. and JACKSON, G., 2016, The Islamic State's Symbolic War: Daesh's Socially Mediated Terrorism as a Threat to Cultural Heritage, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 16 (2), 164-188.

- SPACEY, J., 2014, Homelessness in Japan: Invisible and Tolerated, Japan Talk, 11th November 2014, <<http://www.japan-talk.com/jt/new/homelessness-in-japan>>, consulted 19th April 2017.
- SPRINGER, S., 2010, *Cambodia's Neoliberal Order: Violence, Authoritarianism, and the Contestation of Public Space*, Springer, New York.
- STAHL, A., 2009, The Archaeology of African History, *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 42 (2), 241-255.
- STARZMANN, M.T., 2010, Structural Violence as Political Experience in Palestine: An Archaeology of the Past in the Present, *Present Pasts*, <www.presentpasts.info/articles/10.5334/pp.29/>, consulted 16th April 2017.
- STONE, P., 2012, Human Rights and Cultural Property Protection in Times of Conflict, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18 (3), 271-284.
- STONE, P., 2016, 'All Smoke and Mirrors...' The World Archaeological Congress, 1986-2004, in R. LAYTON, S. SHENNAN and P. STONE (eds.), *A Future for Archaeology*, Routledge, New York, 53-64.
- STONE, P. and FARCHAKH BAJJALY, J., 2008, *The Destruction of Cultural Heritage in Iraq*, Boydell Press, Woodbridge.
- TAAVITSAINEN, J.P., 2014, Burial Archaeology and the Soviet Era, in C. SMITH (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, Springer, New York, 1048-1052.
- TANNER, J., 2007, Estonia Moves Soviet Statue to Cemetery, *The Washington Post*, 30th April 2007, <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/30/AR2007043000478.html>>, consulted 24th March 2017.
- TRIGGER, B.G., 1980, Archaeology and the Image of the American Indian, *American Antiquity* 40, 662-676.
- UCKO, P., 1987, *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*, Duckworth, London.
- VOGEL, K.P. and ISENSTADT, A., 2016, How Did Everyone Get it Wrong?, *Político*, 1st September 2016, <<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/how-did-everyone-get-2016-wrong-presidential-election-231036>>.
- VITELLI, K. and COLWELL-CHANTHAPHONH, C., 2006, *Archaeological Ethics*, 2nd Edition, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.
- WEISS, L., 2007, Heritage-Making and Political Identity, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 7 (3), 413-431.
- WHELAN, Y., 2002, The Construction and Destruction of a Colonial Landscape: Monuments to British Monarchs in Dublin Before and After Independence, *Journal of Historical Geography* 28 (4), 508-533.
- WILSON, C., 2009, Implications and Challenges of Repatriating and Reburying Ngarrindjeri Old People from the 'Edinburgh Collectio', *Museum International* 241 (2), 37-40.
- ZAMATTI, L., 1995, Popular Archaeology and the Archaeologist as Hero, in J. BALME and W. BECK (eds.), *Gendered Archaeology*, ANU, Canberra, 43-47.
- ZIMMERMAN, L.J., 2016, Homeless, Home-making and Archaeology: "To be at Home Wherever I Find Myself", in T.F. SØRENSEN and M. BILLE (eds.), *Elements of Architecture*, Routledge, London, 256-272.
- ZIMMERMAN, L. and BRANAM, K., 2014, Collaborating with Stakeholders, in J. BALME and A. PATERSON (eds.), *Archaeology in Practice: A Student Guide to Archaeological Analyses*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., Chichester, 1-25.
- ZIMMERMAN, L.J. and WELCH, J., 2006, Toward an Archaeology of Homelessness, *Anthropology News* 47 (2), 54-55.
- ZIMMERMAN, L.J. SINGLETON, C. and WELCH, J., 2010, Activism and Creating a Translational Archaeology of Homelessness, *World Archaeology* 42 (3): 443-454.
- ZHURZHENKO, T., 2011, "Capital of Despair" Holodomor Memory and Political Conflicts in Kharkiv after the Orange Revolution, *East European Politics and Societies* 25 (3), 597-639.