Chapter 1
Introduction: New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology

Akira Matsuda and Katsuyuki Okamura

What is Public Archaeology?

Since its very beginning, archaeology has in many senses always related to a much wider constituency than just archaeologists. Archaeological excavations, for example, have affected and been affected by the lives and activities of people in nearby communities. Archaeological objects have been traded and collected by and displayed to the general public. Archaeological research has produced a broad range of information and knowledge, which has not only contributed to the formation of public understanding of the past, but also has become the basis of people's collective identities. This relationship between archaeology and the public was, however, for a long time overlooked by the great majority of archaeologists, who considered it irrelevant to the aim of their study: the understanding of the past. The establishment of public archaeology in the 1970s–1980s and its subsequent development in the 1990s and early twenty-first century was an attempt to change this state of the discourse. The advocates of public archaeology have argued that archaeology's relationship with the broader community should be the subject of debate and scrutiny in its own right (Schadla-Hall 1999, 2004).

How, then, is "public archaeology" defined? This question is actually a matter of discussion, as the term appears to mean different things to different people (Ascherson 2006: 50–51); indeed, in the present book Pyburn (Chap. 3), Wang (Chap. 4), Lea and Smardz Frost (Chap. 5), Kwon and Kim (Chap. 7), Shoocongdej (Chap. 8), Burke, Gorman, Mayes, and Renshaw (Chap. 11), Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Ferguson, and Gann (Chap. 18), and Saucedo-Segami (Chap. 19) each offer differing, but not necessarily incompatible, accounts and views on possible definitions.

A. Matsuda (✉)
School of World Art Studies and Museology, University of East Anglia,
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, UK
e-mail: akiramtsd@gmail.com

K. Okamura and A. Matsuda (eds.), *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*,
DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-0341-8_1, © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2011

When the term "public archaeology" was coined by McGimsey (1972) in the early 1970s, it primarily meant archaeologists' efforts to record and preserve archaeological remains that were being threatened by development works, on behalf and with the support of the public (McGimsey 1972: 5–6; see also Merriman 2004a: 3; Schadla-Hall 1999: 146–147). This view is still widely shared in the USA, where public archaeology has traditionally been associated with cultural resource management (CRM) undertaken in the public interest (Cleere 1989: 4–5; Jameson 2004: 21; McDavid and McGhee 2010: 482; McManamon 2000: 40; White et al. 2004). But elsewhere in the world, the term has acquired a range of new meanings (Ascherson 2006, 2010; McDavid and McGhee 2010: 482). For example, the first issue of a journal dedicated to the subject, established in 2000 and titled *Public Archaeology*, lists the themes to be covered as: archaeological policies, education and archaeology, politics and archaeology, archaeology and the antiquities market, ethnicity and archaeology, public involvement in archaeology, archaeology and the law, the economics of archaeology, and cultural tourism and archaeology (*Public Archaeology*, 2000: inside cover).

The multiple issues pertaining to public archaeology suggest that the subject has a huge purview, but this can also be a source of confusion. For example, when asked to explain what public archaeologists actually *do*, a whole variety of answers may come up: for example, "communicate archaeology to the public," "examine how archaeology relates to the public," "carry out archaeology with/for the public," and "restore archaeology to the public." Some might find it difficult to say even whether public archaeology is a field of research or of practice. Despite this apparently quite confusing situation, we wish to propose a broad and inclusive definition of public archaeology for this book. The reason is very simple: "public" and "archaeology" have different meanings in different cultures and countries.

From a global perspective, it is difficult to presume on a single mode of archaeology for three reasons. Firstly, the theoretical underpinnings for archaeology vary across the world. In North America, for example, archaeology has traditionally been strongly influenced by anthropological thinking, whereas elsewhere in the world, and particularly in Europe, the subject has been closely associated with history (Hodder 1991: 9–11; Pyburn, Chap. 3: 30). In addition, processual and postprocessual theories have strongly affected the agenda of academic archaeology in North America, Britain, and Australia, but much less so in other parts of the world (Ucko 1995).

Secondly, the practice of archaeology differs greatly from one country to another due to the varying economic and socio-political conditions under which archaeologists work. In the so-called developed countries, the great majority of archaeological excavations and discoveries occur in the rescue archaeology sector, where consequently most archaeologists find their jobs. This implies that archaeology as a profession is bound up with development works, and if the number of these decrease, archaeology would face sustainability issues (Aitchison 2009; Okamura, Chap. 6; Schlanger and Aitchison 2010). In economically disadvantaged countries, on the other hand, few archaeologists rely on working on rescue excavations as their source of income, reflecting the smaller scale of development

works undertaken. It is normally at governmental agencies, universities, research institutions, and museums that most professional archaeologists are employed and positioned, and they are constantly under pressure to cope with the scarcity of human and financial resources necessary to conduct proper research. In some countries, tourism that capitalizes on archaeological resources yields a significant part of the national or local income (see the example of Thailand in Shoocongdej, Chap. 8) and this influences the practice of archaeology by requiring concentration on well-preserved, high-profile sites. In addition, if large amounts of archaeological materials are still unexcavated, and especially if they have potentially high market value, archaeologists are likely to need to fight against looting, which can also affect their practice.

Thirdly, what archaeology means to the public in each country is contingent on the history of its development in the local context. The public perception of archaeology is often inextricably intertwined with local traditions of interpreting and interacting with the past through material culture. Such local/indigenous views often stem from traditions that are much older and more powerful than "scientific" archaeology (Gazin-Schwartz and Holtorf 1999; Layton 1994; Matsuda 2010b; Smith and Wobst 2005). Each nation's history, and particularly the question of whether it has been a colonizing nation or one that was colonized, inevitably influences the meaning of archaeology for it. For countries that possess a substantial amount of archaeological materials brought there from other countries, the meaning and significance of archaeology is something entirely different to what it is in the countries where those materials were originally located. People in this second group now need to travel to countries of the first group to access these archaeological materials, which in many cases are supreme examples and which they might view as purloined objects. Clearly, archaeology is not *equal*, either in association or accessibility, across the world.

The meaning of the public is also understood differently in different parts of the world. The English word "public" has two separate and yet interrelated meanings or connotations, "officialdom" and "the people," and this double connotation seems to account, in part, for the ambiguity that surrounds the term "public archaeology" (Carman 2002: 96–114; Matsuda 2004; Merriman 2004a: 1–2). Since public archaeology was originally established and developed in English-speaking countries, non-Anglophone countries have had to find an appropriate translation on introducing the subject into their own *archaeologies* (Shepherd 2005: 3), and in this process the double meaning of "public" has in some cases posed a challenge. For European languages that have a word equivalent to "public," it may not have been such a concern (but see Saucedo-Segami, Chap. 19: 252), but for many non-European languages the ambiguity of "public archaeology" has been hard to capture. In Japa-nese, for example, the English word "public" is conventionally translated as *kŏkyŏ*, which is much closer in connotation to "officialdom" than to "the people." Consequently, the only way of suggesting the double concept of "the public" in Japanese is to use the English word transcribed phonetically (*paburikku*); thus, public archaeology becomes *paburikku kokogaku*. In another East Asian language, Chinese, the translation of "public" is equally problematic, but the solution found in this case is

to offer two different translations of public archaeology for different situations: *gongzhong kaoguxue* (archaeology of the public) or *gonggong kaoguxue* (shared archaeology). As Wang (Chap. 4: 52) explains:

> The two terms have different meanings, thus allowing differing interpretations in different contexts by different people. For the government, it [i.e. public archaeology] is about controlling archaeology through legislation and funding. For the archaeologist, it is about communication and networking. For the general public, it is about the right to share.
>
> (N.B. The brackets and the words in them are added by the authors)

Ultimately, what "public" means inevitably reflects how a particular society has developed in differing political and social contexts, which have also influenced how archaeology and related activities operate and develop. Once this is taken into consideration, the translation of "public archaeology" becomes even more complicated and the introduction of the ideas behind the term into non-Anglophone countries even more challenging. The temptation that often arises here is to focus only on what exists in presumably *any* country, which is the official provision and control of archaeology in the public interest, and treat it as the universal definition of public archaeology. Adopting such a narrow and authoritative definition, however, results in the exclusion of various possibilities of public archaeology, particularly those that could encourage and empower members of the public to build up and express their own accounts of the past (Holtorf 2005a).

In view of the above, as the editors of this book, we consider that in approaching public archaeology from a global perspective, we should adopt a definition that is as broad and inclusive as possible. Thus, we define public archaeology as a subject that examines the relationship between archaeology and the public, and then seeks to improve it. A few points should be made about this tentative definition. Public archaeology is conceived here as a dynamic endeavor, which consists of an ever-evolving two-stage cycle comprising both research and action. First, there is research into the archaeology–public relationship, which is then followed by action to improve that relationship, and there is again research, followed by action, and so on. Research involves collection and analysis of data and may take the form of scholarly or practice-based work, but importantly it has to be intended to bring about change – some improvement – in archaeology's relationship with the public. It is worth noting that much recent discourse on public archaeology has indeed not simply involved describing various archaeology–public relationships but has been about actively changing these relationships and developing them.

Change in the archaeology–public relationship does not automatically arise from research: it requires action that is informed by that research. Such action can be made in the form of practice, for example, offering education and information on archaeology to the wider public, involving members of the public in archaeological investigation, and engaging in public discussion and lobbying and also yet more scholarly "critique" (Grima 2009: 54). We consider that taking such actions, as opposed to merely observing the archaeology–public relationships, is an essential element of public archaeology. Ultimately, then, we see public archaeology as a commitment made by archaeologists to making archaeology more relevant to contemporary society.

Multiple Approaches to Public Archaeology

By accepting a broad and inclusive definition of public archaeology, one can assume that the subject can be approached in multiple ways. What, then, are these approaches? Drawing on discussions around how science relates to society at large, Merriman (2004a: 5–8) and Holtorf (2007: 105–129) present two and three models, respectively, to explain how archaeologists engage with the general public. It is useful to briefly review each of the models, as they in effect represent different approaches to public archaeology.

Merriman's "deficit model" suggests that archaeologists should engage with the public so that "more people will understand what archaeologists are trying to do, and will support their work more" (Merriman 2004a: 5; see also Grima 2009). In this model, public education plays an important role in informing the public how they can – and to some extent, should – appreciate archaeology. What Merriman calls the "multiple perspective model," on the other hand, suggests that archaeologists should seek to engage with the public to "encourage self-realization, to enrich people's lives and stimulate reflection and creativity" (Merriman 2004a: 7). According to this model, archaeologists should help people to achieve this broader realization instead of simply forcing them to "follow a single agenda" (Merriman 2004a: 7).

Holtorf proposes "education model," "public relations model," and "democratic model." His "education model" posits that archaeologists seek to make as many people as possible "come to see both the past and the occupation of the archaeologist in the same terms as the professional archaeologists themselves" (Holtorf 2007: 109) while his "public relations model" suggests that archaeologists should try to improve the public image of archaeology to encourage more social, economic, and political support for it (Holtorf 2007: 107, 114–119). In contrast to these two models which both see the public as the subject of education or lobbying – in other words, as an entity who is to be informed by archaeologists – Holtorf's "democratic model" suggests that archaeologists should seek to invite, encourage, and enable everyone to freely "develop their own enthusiasm and 'grassroot' interest in archaeology" (Holtorf 2007: 119).

Comparing the five models shown above, one may notice that Merriman's deficit model can be split conceptually into Holtorf's education and public relations models, while his multiple perspectives model is quite comparable to Holtorf's democratic model (Fig. 1.1). This suggests that Holtorf's three models present a *refined* version of Merriman's two models. Considering that such refinement of archaeology–public models helps make a more nuanced understanding of public archaeology, we wish to propose yet additional refinement here, which is to distinguish between the "critical" and the "multivocal" approaches in Merriman's multiple perspective/Holtorf's democratic model. Although both approaches are often regarded as progressive and "leftist" in theoretical terms, one can discern a difference between them, which is, in effect, parallel to the difference between critical and hermeneutic epistemologies in archaeological theory (Hodder 2002; Preucel 1995).

	More practice-oriented		More theory-oriented	
Four approaches to public archaeology	**Educational approach**	**Public relations approach**	**Critical approach**	**Multivocal Approach**
Corresponding models suggested by Merriman (2004a)	Deficit model		Multiple perspective model	
Corresponding models suggested by Holtorf (2007)	Education model	Public relations model	Democratic model	

Fig. 1.1 Different approaches to public archaeology

The critical approach, as its name suggests, is grounded on a critical epistemology and focuses on the question of "whose interests are served by a particular interpretation of the past" (Hodder 2002: 79; see also Hamilakis 1999a, b; Shackel 2004: 3–6; Shanks and Tilley 1987; Ucko 1990: xiii–xvi). Echoing the "critical theory" developed in the social sciences (Calhoun 1995; Horkheimer 1995 [1937]), this approach aims to reveal and challenge the socio-political mechanism sustaining specific archaeological practices and interpretations, which help reproduce the domination of the socially privileged over the socially subjugated. Examples of the critical approach can be found in works undertaken under the banners of critical and post-colonial archaeology (Leone et al. 1987; McDavid 2004; Shackel and Chambers 2004), "archaeology from below" (Faulkner 2000), and others (Bender 1998).

The multivocal approach, on the other hand, is based on a hermeneutic epistemology and aims to explore diversity in the reading of past material cultures. In practice, public archaeologists adopting this approach seek to identify and acknowledge various interpretations of archaeological materials made by different social groups and individuals in various contexts of contemporary society (for example, Hodder 1998a; Holtorf 2005b: Chap. 6). In other words, they seek to gain an *overall* understanding of what past material cultures mean to people, which can be contrasted with the aim of the critical approach, which is to highlight a *specific* meaning of the past, sometimes to socially privileged groups to counter their socio-political domination (Faulkner 2000) and at other times to socially marginalized groups to help them achieve due socio-political recognition (Bender 1998; McDavid 2004). Essentially, the divide between the critical and multivocal approaches suggested here could be compared to the difference between two positions on the intellectual "left": the traditional left and the postmodern liberal left.

Thus, drawing on and refining Merriman and Holtorf's models, we can identify four approaches to public archaeology: (1) educational, (2) public relations, (3) critical, and (4) multivocal (Fig. 1.1). It should be stressed that all approaches are intended to make archaeology more relevant to the general public. Yet, the decision of which approach to take – or more realistically, which approach to prioritize over others – inevitably results in the development of a distinctive form of public archaeology in each context. In light of this, one of the important tasks to undertake in addressing public archaeology from a global perspective is to identify which approach is

predominant in each country/area and to consider the implications. For example, if the education or public relations approach receives most emphasis, it would be reasonable to assume that public archaeology in that country/area is more practice-oriented; and similarly if the critical or multivocal approach is prioritized, public archaeology is likely to be more theory-oriented: these are important indicators of how archaeology operates and is situated in each society. By thus examining the characteristics and discourses of public archaeology in different countries/areas and then comparing them across the world, we are eventually able to understand where the subject stands today in the global context.

Why Examine Public Archaeology from a Global Perspective?

There are several pioneering publications that address from an international viewpoint specific aspects of public archaeology – for example, archaeological education (Stone and Molyneaux 1994; Stone and Planel 1999), community archaeology (Marshall 2002), and CRM (Cleere 1984, 1989; McManamon and Hatton 2000; Messenger and Smith 2010). However, the subject as a whole has not been examined from a global perspective in depth yet (but see Merriman 2004b). Since this book is intended as a catalyst to initiate a comparative examination of public archaeology across the world, it is worth considering why it is important to adopt such a global perspective.

The first thing to recall is that public archaeology has developed neither uniformly nor equally across the world. Lacking a clear, universally accepted definition, the subject has emerged at different times in different countries and areas, often thanks to the efforts of key devoted individuals who have worked to better situate archaeology in modern society (see, for example, the case of Canada in Lea and Smardz Frost, Chap. 5). While, as already stated, public archaeology was originally proposed in association with CRM in the USA in the 1970s, it was soon introduced into Britain, Australia, and other English-speaking countries, gradually expanding its scope much beyond CRM. The paper (Chap. 5) of Lea and Smardz Frost offers a detailed examination and critique of this process in Canada.

Around the beginning of the twenty-first century, public archaeology started attracting the interest of archaeologists in the non-Anglophone world, and efforts were made to incorporate it into local archaeologies. It would be safe to say that the global spread of public archaeology is still ongoing, as attested to by recent and emerging publications on the subject by archaeologists in various parts of the world (Bonacchi 2009, Fredrik and Wahlgren 2008; Funari 2001, 2004; Green et al. 2001; Guo and Wei 2006 [cited in Wang, Chap. 4]; Matsuda 2005, 2010a), including individual chapters in this book.

In view of the above, one could argue that the importance of addressing public archaeology from a global perspective derives from the need to examine the extent to which the subject has become familiar to archaeologists in various countries/areas in the world, as well as how it has been accepted and adapted in each local context. To emphasize this point, it is useful to consider whether the factors that

have contributed to the development of public archaeology in North America, Britain, and Australia can be applied in other parts of the world.

Browsing through the literature analyzing the growth of public archaeology in these regions or countries since the 1970s (Ascherson 2000; Jameson 2004; Merriman 2002, 2004a; Schadla-Hall 1999, 2006; Shackel 2004), one can identify three factors that might explain it: (1) the development of archaeological theories, in particular those of postprocessual archaeology, which have stressed that archaeological practice and interpretation are not independent of contemporary ideologies and that there can be many approaches to the understanding of material remains, including those that are not based on the methods and methodology of archaeology; (2) the postcolonial discourse regarding the "politics of the past" (Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990), which many archaeologists have had come to terms with in relation to the interpretation and management of archaeological heritage; and (3) the increasingly market-driven economy in modern society that has led on the one hand to the development of the heritage industry, and on the other hand to the increased awareness of the need to conduct archaeology in publicly and financially accountable manner.

However, it is questionable whether the three factors outlined above can be directly applied outside North America, Britain, and Australia. As already mentioned, postprocessual archaeology was influential in those three regions, but was much less so elsewhere in the world (Hodder 1991; Ucko 1995). Consequently, discussions regarding the politics of the practice, interpretation of archaeology, and multivocality of archaeological evidence have not been actively pursued by archaeologists in non-Anglophone countries, as they do not necessarily consider such issues as among archaeology's main concerns.

The degree to which the postcolonial discourse of the politics of the past has been addressed within archaeology also varies significantly across the world, reflecting different experiences of the colonial past, and sometimes even its absence, in each country/area. For example, while many archaeologists today pay attention to indigenous peoples' rights to retain and access ancestral materials in the Americas, Australasia, and Africa, such rights are little considered and discussed in relation to the ancestral materials of the Europeans; this is arguably because the "indigenous peoples" of Europe – however they may be defined – have traditionally been privileged over more recent "immigrants" (Tarlow 2001: 252; see also Kuper 2003: 390; Merriman 2004a: 14). East and Southeast Asian countries experienced yet other variations of colonialism (Barlow 1997; Bastin and Benda 1968), but despite that they are rarely referred to in discussions on archaeology and postcolonialism. Generally speaking, archaeologists in those countries seem to be somewhat diffident about engaging with their colonial pasts (but see Mizoguchi 2010; Pai 2010).

Unlike the two factors already mentioned in the development of public archaeology in Anglophone countries, the expansion of a market-driven economy is arguably a truly global phenomenon. It is safe to say that nowadays there is more pressure on archaeology than ever, across the globe, to justify the costs entailed by its activities. This is particularly the case where large amounts of public funds are spent on archaeological work, but even if the costs are borne by private sponsors, such sponsors

are not likely today to let archaeologists concentrate solely on scholarly work but rather require them to demonstrate the benefits of their work to a wider audience. In a related development, archaeology is becoming more open to exploitation by the heritage industry. An increasing number of individuals, including archaeologists, and corporations have become interested in developing business through selling "archaeological commodities" (Moshenska 2009) in various ways. It is important to remember, however, that the global expansion of the market economy has, again, differently affected different parts of the world, with subsequently differing effects on archaeology across the globe. For example, one could suppose that the public in countries with more open markets is likely to expect archaeology to yield benefits more directly, even in a monetary sense. Such expectation would be smaller in counties that have markets more tightly regulated by the state.

Thus, the three factors that have contributed to the growth of public archaeology in North America, Britain, and Australia are likely to affect the development of the same subject differently in other parts of the world. The shift to a market-driven economy that is happening worldwide has increased the pressure on archaeology in most, if not all, countries to stop serving only the intellectual community of scholars and to explicitly demonstrate its value for contemporary society and enhance that value further; Shoocongdej's paper (Chap. 8), for example, refers to the extensive use of archaeology for the development of heritage tourism in Thailand. In this context, public archaeology is likely to be considered useful by both archaeologists and the general public alike, since it *appears* to be able to effect an increase in the "public benefits" of archaeology (Little 2002). Thus, in the coming years, we can expect more elements of public archaeology to be included in archaeological projects across the world, not least because this could also be a way of securing funding for archaeology.

A more fundamental issue, however, is what will be happening under this "useful-looking" façade of public archaeology – i.e., whether the subject will change *in substance* as it spreads worldwide, and if so, how. As stated above, public archaeology has so far developed predominantly in Anglophone countries, where postprocessual archaeology and the postcolonial discourse have been influential. It is yet to be seen how the subject will develop further as it becomes introduced in new areas of the world, where archaeology is underpinned by different theories and operates under different socio-political conditions; this point is clearly highlighted in the papers of Wang (Chap. 4), Okamura (Chap. 6), Kwon and Kim (Chap. 7), Shoocongdej (Chap. 8), and Saucedo-Segami (Chap. 19), which present distinctive conditions of public archaeology in China, Japan, South Korea, Thailand, and Peru, respectively.

To further complicate the situation, some archaeologists carry out international excavation projects and engage in public archaeology activities abroad, as exemplified in Matsuda's case study (Chap. 13). Most international excavation projects are conducted by archaeologists from economically advantaged countries in economically disadvantaged countries (see Saucedo-Segami, Chap. 19: 252; Shoocongdej 2006), and this obvious legacy of colonial archaeology has in recent years been put into question by archaeologists of a critical and reflexive mind (Gero 2006). Partly in response to this, various types of supplementary or "offsetting" public

archaeology activities are implemented today alongside the main archaeological research work in international excavation projects. These activities range from simple outreach, collaborative work to be undertaken together with local communities (Moser et al. 2002), to ethnographical and sociological research on the interaction between archaeological work and local people (Bartu 2000; Matsuda, Chap. 13; Shankland 1996, 2000). Such public archaeology initiatives are bound to change the relationship between archaeology and the public in each locality and, if their results are significant, may also affect the way public archaeology develops in the host country. With the progress of globalization, one can expect more international excavation projects in the future, and this is yet another reason why it is important to address public archaeology from the global perspective.

How to Cope with Different/Fragmented Pasts?

An important issue to ascertain in global public archaeology is whether the allegedly "democratic" critical and/or multivocal approaches discussed earlier can be accepted, perhaps with some adjustment, outside the Anglophone world. The theoretical tenet underpinning both approaches – the past can be differently interpreted by different social groups – has yet to firmly take root even in the public archaeology of Anglophone countries, and this is largely due to the difficulty in agreeing on the criteria to use in assessing the appropriateness of each interpretation of the past (Lampeter Archaeology Workshop 1997: 172–173). Put simply, these criteria can be material evidence, scientific accuracy, cultural context, representativeness, social justice, or a mix of these; this clearly suggests that interpreting the past is not merely a scientific act, but also cultural and social one. Dealing with different accounts of the past that belong to different social groups, thus, often results in entanglement in politics, whether local, national, or international. The global spread of public archaeology is interesting in this respect, as it inevitably raises questions in each country/area about the extent to which archaeology or archaeologists should be involved in the "politics of the past."

Chapters in this book suggest that there are largely two ways for public archaeologists to deal with "different pasts." One way is to seek to create a narrative of the past with which multiple interest groups can identify, as exemplified by the case studies of New Caledonia by Sand, Bolé, and Ouetcho (Chap. 9) and Gorée Island in Senegal by Thiaw (Chap. 10). Integrating divergent accounts of the past is politically important, as it helps overcome division and antagonism between identity groups (Archibald 1999: Chap. 5) and creates a common bond among them. But it is a challenge that requires a series of compromises. Thiaw (Chap. 10: 135) describes his attempt to make an inclusive, shared history of Gorée Island as follows:

> (T)he history of Gorée has been characterized by the multiple interests of groups with differing social status, as well as racial, cultural, and national identities. Over the years, each of these different identities has developed a selective commemorative agenda, which at the same time silences the experiences and memories of others. The question is: how to appreciate and commemorate the experiences and contributions of all, without marginalizing any?

Also, there is a more fundamental question of whether archaeology should actively take part in the political process of uniting people. Sand, Bolé, and Ouetcho (Chap. 9: 123) articulate the "dilemma" that they felt in working in multicultural and multiethnic New Caledonia in the form of a question:

> (I)s it archaeologists' role to provide the civil society of their archipelago with historical data, offering a vision that is culturally constructive and socially useful, but which at the same time is undeniably politically "manipulated"?

There is good reason to be cautious about the political use of archaeology, since its "misuse" can have detrimental effects for people (for example, Arnold 1990; Lal 2001; Rao and Reddy 2001; Sharma 2001), sometimes even putting them in physical danger, especially when nationalism is involved (Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Kohl et al. 2007). However, if we accept that *any* archaeology operates under the social and political influence of contemporary society (see Kwon and Kim, Chap. 7: 90; Shoocoongdej, Chaps. 8: 97–99) and that it can in turn contribute to sustaining and modifying, at least in part, that social structure, the issue is no longer about how to avoid entanglement in politics, but rather about how to "take a stand" (Hodder, Chap. 2), assuming the social responsibility of archaeology to engage with different groups and different pasts. On this, Hodder contends (Chap. 2: 26):

> It is not enough to argue that the archaeologist is a relative powerless mediator who simply brings stakeholders together. It is not possible to be a neutral go-between. Archaeologists do have influence as professional experts, and they have to recognize that their actions as experts have effects on the world for which they are partly responsible.

The other way of dealing with different pasts is to try to give voice to previously neglected ones. This may mean to support and promote politically suppressed pasts – in line with the critical approach – or alternatively to explore socially relevant accounts of the past that have been excluded from archaeological consideration because of their nonscientific nature. As an example of the former, Badran's paper (Chap. 15) suggests that one of the four reasons for the exclusion of ancient pasts in the Jordanian primary citizenship curriculum is the "ideological use of the past" for the purpose of nurturing Arab nationalism and supporting Hashmite rule. She argues for the introduction of archaeology in formal education in Jordan so that pupils can "appreciate the full extent of the riches of the past," including the non-Arab and non-Islamic pasts. In a slightly different but analogous example, Murata (Chap. 17) traces the trajectory of history education in the Japanese school curriculum and points out the "bizarre fusion of nationalism and neo-liberalism" in Japan's education policy in recent years. As a strategy to counter the increasingly nationalist bent in the curriculum, he argues for the strengthening of local-based learning through archaeology in school education.

Examples of the latter are given in four papers in this book. Burke, Gorman, Mayes, and Renshaw (Chap. 11) carried out an examination of the oral histories of the Rapat air-raid shelters in Adelaide and recognized the importance of the "social myths" relating to the shelters for the local community. This led the authors to reconsider the role of archaeology in people's "collective act of remembering," and they reached the conclusion that archaeologically investigating the "truth" of the

shelters would result in the debunking of certain social myths, thereby potentially weakening local people's relationship to their community. Shepherd's (Chap. 12) account of the dispute over the exhumation of Prestwich Street human remains in Cape Town highlights the contrast between the scientific nature of archaeology that wants to "disclose" the past relating to the remains and the community's desire to keep that past silent, secret, and closed. His argument that an enlightenment-style "will to knowledge" cannot always meet the needs of the community to collectively remember the history – in particular pain and trauma – associated with place is clearly consonant with the argument of Burke, Gorman, Mayes, and Renshaw. Both seek to reconcile the archaeological past – or archaeologists' past – with non-archaeological, but socially meaningful, alternative pasts.

A similar stance is taken by Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Ferguson, and Gann (Chap. 18), who embrace the concept of multivocality in pursuing collaborative archaeology at the San Pedro Valley. Arguing that multivocality is "no simple plurality, but an *engagement* of different voices arising together to tell a whole and complex story" (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al., Chap. 18: 241, italics in original), they aim to develop their archaeological and ethnohistorical research into an educational project, addressing the national public, Native American communities, and the current residents in the Valley through the use of the Internet. As they suggest, the Internet can offer a platform whereby multiple groups express and discuss their views of the past, thanks to its multimedia interactivity (see Hodder's early account on this in Hodder 1997: 698–699), and as such has the potential to greatly help public archaeologists engage with different pasts, even in the global context.

Abu-Khafajah's (Chap. 14) ethnographic work carried out in the Amman Citadel in Jordan focuses on the "meaning-making process" that is at play in local people's interpretation of the citadel. Her work highlights the varying meanings ascribed to it, and as such can be considered as an attempt to highlight the views of the past that are relevant to the local community but have conventionally been neglected due to their nonscientific nature.

A key factor in successful engagement with different pasts must be to clearly define the role that archaeologists should play in public discussions concerning the interpretation of the past. In such discussions, archaeologists can be, for example, educators, instructors, consultants, facilitators, or collaborators. Surely, their role needs to be defined in consideration of the cultural, social, and political contexts in which the discussions take place, and in certain circumstances they may have to play a double or triple role at the same time. However, it is worth remembering that, whatever role they play, archaeologists are distinguished from the rest of the public by their possession of a knowledge of archaeological methods and methodology and that this knowledge can become a source of authority in discussing the interpretation of the past with other people. Knowledge is power (Foucault 1980) and as such can be both useful and oppressive. While the knowledge of archaeology does not, and should not, grant archaeologists the right to control public discussions on how to interpret the past, it does, and should, help them argue for *some* authority in these discussions (Hodder 1998b: 217). Clearly, a past that is archaeologically interpreted is still *one* past. Yet, it is a past on the basis of which archaeologists need to

engage with other alternative pasts. If we accept that public archaeology is an attempt to make the discipline of archaeology more relevant to contemporary society, those who espouse it need to be reflexive, rather than deconstructive, in their attitude to archaeological methods and methodology.

For the same reason, one could argue that the need to cope with different pasts does not diminish the importance of offering the public archaeological education. Henson (Chap. 16) suggests that too much emphasis on epistemology and hermeneutics in archaeology – i.e., "how we do archaeology" and "how we interpret our findings" – could lead us to neglect "why we do archaeology in the first place." He goes on to stress the empowering effect of archaeological education and argues that by learning archaeological skills, people become able to "take part for themselves" in making sense of the past. Muraki (Chap. 20) expresses a similar opinion in his review of the participatory excavation program at the Miharashidai site in Japan. He equates public participation in archaeological excavation with the sharing of the "pleasure" of excavation and contends that "participants can learn the skills to learn about archaeology, history, and the past by themselves, enjoyably" (Muraki, Chap. 20: 273). Both Henson and Muraki are, however, manifestly against the imposition of archaeologists' views on the public. Indeed, as Muraki points out, in order for archaeological education to be successful, it is essential that there is a "close relationship" and "two-way communication" between archaeologists and participants. From this viewpoint, archaeological education does not differ much from engagement with different pasts, in that both approaches need and encourage dialogues between archaeologists and members of the public.

While it has so far been argued that public archaeologists should engage with different groups and divergent interpretations of the past, it is also important to note a problem inherent in this position. When talking about "different groups," we tend to assume that each group can somehow be clearly defined. However, in reality, such definition is often difficult. As Pyburn (Chap. 3: 31) contends:

> any individual is a member of multiple flexibly bounded communities, and negotiating personal loyalties and distributing personal resources among various groups is one way of describing ordinary life.

One could argue that defining groups clearly is difficult for two reasons: individuals belong to multiple groups at the same time and each group, including the socially dominant and marginalized, is often fragmented (see, for example, Franklin 2001), especially when seen in today's postmodern context. This suggests that the "different groups" with whom public archaeologists are to engage are *working* concepts, which need to be posited and roughly defined each time in order that some form of the engagement with actual people is possible, but are in fact never fixed and coherent.

The critical question that follows this, then, is whether the emphasis on the engagement with "different pasts" is actually a play of *différance* (Derrida 1982; see also Hodder 1999: 156), in other words, an endless deferral of any fixed meaning of the past. As far as the pursuit of difference continues, there will always be *other* groups with *other* interpretations of the past. Should public archaeology engage

with all of them – *could* it, indeed? The global spread of public archaeology inevitably raises this question, as it addresses other archaeologies, other publics, and other pasts. Put simply, what past(s) should public archaeologists engage with, on what grounds, and on behalf of whom?

Conclusion

Originally conceived in the 1970s in the USA as archaeologists' commitment to preserving archaeological remains, public archaeology has subsequently developed in other English-speaking countries, gradually expanding its scope and addressing various aspects of the relationship between archaeology and contemporary society and is today being introduced into non-Anglophone countries. The varying socio-political conditions under which archaeology operates in each country/area are likely to contribute to the formation of distinctive forms of public archaeology in each setting. In assessing this global development of public archaeology, it is useful to pay attention to the balance and order of priority of the four approaches to the subject that have emerged in North America, Britain, and Australia, namely, educational, public relations, critical, and multivocal approaches, as they provide a clue as to how archaeology is situated in each society.

The global spread of public archaeology inevitably highlights different archaeologies, different publics, and different pasts, and public archaeologists need to find a way of coping and engaging with them. In doing so, they need to base their argument and practice on the methods and methodology of archaeology – this also has the effect of making the discipline of archaeology more relevant to contemporary society. However, this does not mean that archaeologists should be allowed to impose their views on the public. In order for public archaeology to be successful, dialogues with members of the public, involving a two-way process, are essential.

Public archaeology can be defined as a movement or a social engagement by archaeologists, and the question of "which direction it should move in" needs to be constantly addressed and kept under critical examination. One of the aims of this book is to provide a forum for such open discussion, and by doing so also to reaffirm the relevance of archaeology in a global society in the twenty-first century.

References

Aitchison, K., 2009, Archaeology and the Global Financial Crisis. *Antiquity* 83(319): online. http://www.antiquity.ac.uk/projgall/aitchison319/, accessed February 1, 2010.

Archibald, R.R., 1999, *A Place to Remember: Using History to Build Community*. Altamira, Walnut Creek.

Arnold, B., 1990, The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* 64(244): 464–478.

Ascherson, N., 2000, Editorial. *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 1–4.

Ascherson, N., 2006, Archaeological Overthrows: The 1980s Seen Through the Rear Window. In *A Future for Archaeology: The Past in the Present*, edited by R. Layton, S. Shennan, and P.G. Stone, pp. 47–52. UCL Press, London.

Ascherson, N., 2010, Editorial. *Public Archaeology* 9(1): 1–3.

Barlow, T.E., editor, 1997, *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Bartu, A. 2000. Where is *Çatalhöyük*? Multiple Sites in the Construction of an Archaeological Site. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example of Çatalhöyük*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 101–109. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Oxford.

Bastin, J., and Benda, H.J., 1968, *A History of Modern Southeast Asia: Colonialism, Nationalism, and Decolonization*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Bender, B., 1998, *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Berg, Oxford and New York.

Bonacchi, C., 2009, Archeologia pubblica in Italia. Origini e prospettive di un 'nuovo' settore disciplinare. *Ricerche Storiche* 2–3: 329–350.

Calhoun, C., 1995, *Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and Challenge of Difference*. Blackwell, Cambridge MA.

Carman, J., 2002, *Archaeology and Heritage: An Introduction*. Continuum, London and New York.

Cleere, H., editor, 1984, *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage: A Comparative Study of World Cultural Resource Management Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cleere, H., editor, 1989, *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*. Routledge, London.

Derrida, J., 1982, Différance. *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by A. Bass, pp. 3–28. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Faulkner, N., 2000, Archaeology from Below. *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 21–33.

Foucault, M., 1980, Truth and Power. In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, edited by C. Gordon, pp. 109–113. Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo and Singapore.

Franklin, M., 2001, A Black Feminist-Inspired Archaeology?, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1): 108–125.

Fredrik, S., and Wahlgren, K.H., 2008, *Publik Arkeologi*, Nordic Academic Press, Lund.

Funari, P.P.A., 2001, Public Archaeology from a Latin American Perspective, *Public Archaeology* 1(4): 239–243.

Funari, P.P.A., 2004, Public Archaeology in Brazil. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by N. Merriman, pp. 202–210. Routledge, London.

Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D., editors, 1990, *The Politics of the Past*. Unwin Hyman, London.

Gazin-Schwartz, A., and Holtorf, C., 1999, 'As long as ever I've known it…': On Folklore and Archaeology. In *Archaeology and Folklore*, edited by A. Gazin-Schwartz and C. Holtorf, pp. 3–25. Routledge, London and New York.

Gero, J.M., 2006, Here Come the Aliens… Do We Dig Them???, in Program and Abstracts of WAC Osaka Inter-Congress 2006, edited by WAC Osaka Executive Committee, p. 128. WAC Osaka Executive Committee, Osaka.

Green, L.F., Green, D.R., and Neves, E.G., 2001, Indigenous Knowledge and Archaeological Science. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(3): 366–398.

Grima, R., 2009, A Reply to "What is Public Archaeology?". *Present Pasts* 1: 53–54.

Guo, L., and Wei, M., 2006, Chu lun gongzhong kaoguxue [A preliminary discussion on public archaeology]. *Dong Nan Wenwu* 2006/4:54–60.

Hamilakis, Y., 1999a, From Gramsci's Cell to 'Guerrillas' in Çatalhöyuk: A Response. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 12(1): 99–103.

Hamilakis, Y., 1999b, La trahison des archéologues? Archaeological Practice as Intellectual Activity in Postmodernity. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 12(1): 60–79.

Hodder, I., 1991, Archaeological Theory in Contemporary European Societies: The Emergence of Competing Traditions. In *Archaeological Theory in Europe: The Last Three Decades*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 1–24. Routledge, London and New York.

Hodder, I., 1997, "Always Momentary, Fluid and Flexible": Towards a Reflexive Excavation Methodology. *Antiquity* 71: 691–700.

Hodder, I., 1998a, The Past as Passion and Play: Çatalhöyük as a Site of Conflict in the Construction of Multiple Pasts. In *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, edited by L. Meskell, pp. 124–139. Routledge, London and New York.

Hodder, I., 1998b, Whose Rationality? A Response to Fekri Hassan. *Antiquity* 72: 213–217.

Hodder, I., 1999, *Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Blackwell, Oxford and Malden.

Hodder, I., 2002, Archaeological Theory. In *Archaeology: The Widening Debate*, edited by B. Cunliffe, W. Davies, and C. Renfrew, pp. 77–90. British Academy, Oxford and New York.

Holtorf, C.J., 2005a, Beyond Crusades: How (Not) to Engage with Alternative Archaeologies. *World Archaeology* 37(4): 544–551.

Holtorf, C.J., 2005b, *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas: Archaeology as Popular Culture*. Altamira, Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York, Toronto and Oxford.

Holtorf, C.J. 2007. *Archaeology is a Brand: The Meaning of Archaeology in Contemporary Popular Culture*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Horkheimer, M., 1995 [1937], Traditional and Critical Theory. In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays,* pp. 188–243. Continuum, New York.

Jameson, J.H. Jr, 2004, Public Archaeology in the United States. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by N. Merriman, pp. 21–58. Routledge, London.

Kohl, P.L., and Fawcett, C., editors, 1995, *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by P.L. Kohl and C. Fawcett. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kohl, P., Kozelsky, M., and Ben-Yehuda, N., editors, 2007, *Selective Remembrance: Archaeology in the Construction, Commemoration, and Consecration of National Pasts*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.

Kuper, A., 2003, The Return of the Native, *Current Anthropology*, 44(3): 389–402.

Lal, B.B., 2001, A Note on the Excavations at Ayodhya with Reference to the Mandir-Masjid Issue. In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by R. Layton, P.G. Stone and J. Thomas, pp. 117–126. Routledge, London and New York.

Lampeter Archaeology Workshop. 1997, Relativism, Objectivity and the Politics of the Past. *Archaeological Dialogues* 4: 164–198.

Layton, R., editor, 1994, *Who Needs the Past? Indigenous Values and Archaeology*. Routledge, London.

Leone, M.P., Potter, P.B. Jr., and Shackel, P.A., 1987, Toward a Critical Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28: 283–292.

Little, B.J., editor, 2002, *Public Benefits of Archaeology*, University of Florida Press, Gainsville.

Marshall, Y., 2002, What is community archaeology?, *World Archaeology* 34(2): 211–229.

Matsuda, A., 2004, The Concept of 'the Public' in Public Archaeology and the Aims of Public Archaeology. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 15: 66–76.

Matsuda, A., 2005, Public Archaeology at Archaeological Sites: Case Studies in Britain and Applicability in Japan (in Japanese). *Journal of the Japanese Society for Cultural Heritage (Isekigaku Kenkyû)* 2: 90–101.

Matsuda, A., 2010a, Public Archaeology in Somma Vesuviana (in Japanese). In *Festschrift for Tsuboi Kiyotari on the Occasion of His 90th Birthday*, pp. 515–524. Meishinsha, Nara.

Matsuda, A., 2010b, When a Local Legend Is (Mis)Appropriated in the Interpretation of an Archaeological Site. *Archaeologies* 6(3): 447–467.

McDavid, C., 2004, From "Traditional" Archaeology to Public Archaeology to Community Action: The Levi Jordan Plantation Project. In *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Archaeology*, edited by P.A. Shackel and E.J. Chambers, pp. 35–56. Routledge, New York and London.

McDavid, C., and McGhee, F., 2010, Commentary: Cultural Resource Management, Public Archaeology, and Advocacy. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, edited by J. Lydon and U.Z. Rizvi, pp. 481–494. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

McGimsey, C.R., 1972, *Public Archeology*. Seminar Press, New York.

McManamon, F.P., 2000, The Protection of Archaeological Resources in the United States: Reconciling Preservation with Contemporary Society. In *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society: Perspectives on Managing and Preserving the Past*, edited by F.P. McManamon and A. Hatton, pp. 40–54. Routledge, London and New York.

McManamon, F.P., and Hatton, A., editors, 2000, *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society*. Routledge, London and New York.

Merriman, N., 2002, Archaeology, Heritage and Interpretation. In *Archaeology: The Widening Debate*, edited by B. Cunliffe, W. Davies, and C. Renfrew, pp. 541–566. British Academy, Oxford and New York.

Merriman, N., 2004a, Introduction: Diversity and Dissonance in Public Archaeology. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by N. Merriman, pp. 1–17. Routledge, London.

Merriman, N., editor, 2004b, *Public Archaeology*. Routledge, London.

Messenger, P.M., and Smith, G.S., editors, 2010, *Cultural Heritage Management: A Global Perspective*, University Press of Florida, Gainsville.

Mizoguchi, K., 2010, The Colonial Experience of the Uncolonized and Colonized: The Case of East Asia as Mainly Seen from Japan. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, edited by J. Lydon and U.Z. Rizvi, pp. 81–92. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Moser, S., Glazier, D., Phillips, J.E., el Nemr, L.N., Mousa, M.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.

Moshenska, G., 2009, What is Public Archaeology? *Present Pasts* 1: 46–48.

Pai, H-I., 2010, Resurrecting the Ruins of Japan's Mythical Homelands: Colonial Archaeological Surveys in the Korean Peninsula and Heritage Tourism. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*, edited by J. Lydon and U.Z. Rizvi, pp. 93–112. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.

Preucel, R.W., 1995, The Post-processual Condition. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 3(2), 147–175.

Public Archaeology (journal), 1(1) 2000.

Rao, N., and Reddy, C.R., 2001, The Ayodhya Issue. In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by R. Layton, P.G. Stone and J. Thomas, pp. 139–156. Routledge, London and New York.

Schadla-Hall, T., 1999, Editorial: Public Archaeology. *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(2): 147–158.

Schadla-Hall, T., 2004, The Comforts of Unreason: The Importance and Relevance of Alternative Archaeology. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by N. Merriman, pp. 255–271. Routldege, London and New York.

Schadla-Hall, T., 2006, Public Archaeology in the Twenty-First Century. In *A Future for Archaeology: The Past in the Present*, edited by R. Layton, S. Shennan, and P.G. Stone, pp. 75–82. UCL Press, London.

Schlanger, N., and Aitchison, K., editors, 2010, *Archaeology and the Global Economic Crisis: Multiple Impacts and Possible Solutions*. Culture Lab Editions, Tervuren.

Shackel, P.A., 2004, Working with Communities: Heritage Development and Applied Archaeology. In *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Archaeology*. edited by P.A. Shackel and E.J. and Chambers, pp. 1–16. Routledge, New York and London.

Shackel, P.A., and Chambers, E.J., editors, 2004, *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Archaeology*. Routledge, New York and London.

Shankland, D., 1996, Çatalhöyük: The Anthropology of an Archaeological Presence. In *On the Surface: Çatalhöyük 1993–95*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 349–358. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Oxford.

Shankland, D., 2000, Villagers and the Distant Past: Three Seasons' Work at Küçükköy, Çatalhöyük. In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example of Çatalhöyük*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 167–176. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Oxford.

Shanks, M., and Tilley, C., 1987, *Re-Constructing Archaeology*. Routledge, London and New York.

Sharma, R.S., 2001, The Ayodhya Issue. In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by R. Layton, P.G. Stone and J. Thomas, pp. 127–138. Routledge, London and New York.

Shoocongdej, R., 2006, Can We Be Equal? Working Relationships between Southeast Asian and Foreign Archaeologists, in *Program and Abstracts of WAC Osaka Inter-Congress 2006*, edited by WAC Osaka Executive Committee, p. 107. WAC Osaka Executive Committee, Osaka.

Shepherd, N., 2005, From "One World Archaeology" to One World, Many Archaeologies. *Archaeologies* 1(1): 1–6.

Smith, C., and Wobst, H.M., editors, 2005, *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London.

Stone, P.G., and Molyneaux, B.L., editors, 1994, *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums and Education*. Routledge, London and New York.

Stone, P.G., and Planel, G, editors, 1999, *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education and the Public*. Routledge, London and New York.

Tarlow, S., 2001, Decoding Ethics. *Public Archaeology* 1(4): 245–259.

Ucko, P.J., 1990, Foreword. In *The Politics of the Past*, edited by P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal, pp. ix-xxi. Unwin Hyman, London.

Ucko, P.J., 1995, Archaeological Interpretation in a World Context. In *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, edited by P.J. Ucko, pp. 1–27. Routledge, London and New York.

White, N.M., Weisman, B.R., Tykot, R.H., Wells, E.C., Davis-Salazar, K.L., Arthur, J.W., and Weedman, K., 2004, Academic Archaeology is Public Archaeology. *The SAA Archaeological Record* 4(2): 26–29.