# Foreword

*Margaret Purser*

The beginning ideas for this volume grew from some far-reaching conversations between its editors, Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George, in early 2020. Mulling over the increasing use of archaeology as a platform for advocacy and social action, they began counting the various case studies they could name, just among shared friends and colleagues in American historical archaeology. In the process, they observed how many of these projects were taking place in the densely urban contexts of major metropolitan areas across the United States and elsewhere. By the first months of 2020, they had extended some initial invitations, drawn up the requisite book proposal, and found a publisher. The basic goal was to produce a volume of focused case studies in advocacy-oriented archaeology in urban spaces. The discussion would update and perhaps reframe a conversation in our field about the links between archaeological practice and social action that was at least two decades old by that point. We all began drafting chapters.

Not even the most prescient among us in those early conversations could have imagined the events that would unfold over the subsequent months of 2020 and 2021. A global pandemic shut down the routines of daily life nearly overnight, and created entirely new ones shaped by quarantine: masks, social distancing, and seemingly random shortages of basic commodities. The resulting infection and death rates exposed the brutal inequities of health care systems, wealth distribution, and living conditions across the globe. An explosive summer of mass protests for social justice triggered by the horrific murders of Black men and women by police officers began as highly localized events and grew within days to national and global scales. Monuments to Confederate generals and British slave traders became sites of transformative reinterpretation of both urban landscapes and collective memory. In the United States, these

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

events played out amid the roiling tempest of a national election year and culminated with a mob of domestic terrorists breaching the United States Capitol Building bent on reversing the outcome of the election and ending more than two centuries of peaceful transfers of political power in the country. As the authors have revised and refined the chapters over this momentous period, it has been impossible not to take these events into account. Collectively, they have created an inescapable rupture in time, cleaving it into palpable "before" and "after" times for those who lived through the experience.

In many ways, these same events make the work the chapters of this volume explore more salient and important than ever. So much of what has happened during this consequential period has unfolded as radical encounters in the present with unresolved or unacknowledged pasts. So many moments have demonstrated the continually transformative relationships among people and place and time, especially in urban contexts.

Incorporating what we have learned since our earlier discussions brings a sharper focus to some of the emphases in our work. To begin with, many of us have designed our archaeological projects to expose and address the erasure of particular groups of people, periods of time, frames of mind, or inhabited places from present-day consciousness. The events over the past two years tell us that there really is no such thing as complete erasure: that the perceived absences or invisibility we are exploring are always only partial. Somewhere in the affected population, that lingering memory or knowledge is still palpable. And so it is really still present, in its very absence from the broader public sphere, like a negatively charged space.

In moments of encounter with radically different remembrances of these pasts or places, past acts of attempted erasure or denial themselves have become today's flashpoints: the commemorative statue, the desecrated burial ground, the demolished building, street, or neighborhood. "The Past" may appear to roll out behind us as an inexorably enumerated timeline, but the process of defining "pastness" is punctuated with radical moments of identity creation and transformation that occur in the present. Our archaeological practice is increasingly bound up in these punctuated moments, both as participants and at least occasionally as their creators, in collaboration with the community members with whom we often now work.

Another critical heightening of our archaeological focus brought on by the events of the past year centers on materiality, and the ways in which materiality, broadly construed, is integral to human action, both individual and collective. Noticing that stuff matters, and that human social life quite literally "takes place," is hardly a radical turn for archaeology in the early twenty-first century. Indeed, those notions inform a set of basic

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

tenets for the field that we share with a wide array of disciplinary neighbors and cousins working across both past and present, from historians to geographers to folklorists, and so on. They form the core of a wide array of twenty-first century heritage practices (heritage being used in this chapter in its broader sense to encompass the fields of archaeology, historic preservation, conservation, and interpretation). But the sheer scale and drama of the role played by objects, places, and material practices over the past two years has us all searching for new vocabulary, and wider frames of reference.

In particular, look at the ways that objects and places became highly charged, multilayered symbols in an unflinchingly intentional theater of contest in nearly every public venue imaginable. Masks—and mask-wearing—reframed notions of personhood that played out in an explicitly public arena. Social distancing protocols scattered polka dot maps across the floors of public places, from post offices to grocery stores to the VIP section of inaugural seating on the steps of the US Capitol. Material targets of contestation—Civil War monuments, Black Lives Matter murals, and public streets, parks, plazas, and administrative buildings across this country (as well as similar sites in many others)—became the location/locale/locus of intensely reiterative placemaking, as each new layer of paint, each rally, each occupation, and each march drew its meaning from the explicit juxtaposition with all those that had come before. Once again, the contexts for this highly visible set of material practices were not only very performatively public, but also most often urban.

Meanwhile, the suddenly cloistered life of quarantine brought a new consciousness of the intimate surroundings of interior spaces, and of the newly familiar localized places defined by nearby streets, blocks, and neighborhoods. Archaeologists make their living parsing the material culture of the past into coherent narratives. But for those of us who do so while working in and with present-day communities to document their lives, heritage, and voices, being immersed in this year-long theater of performative materiality at a very localized, intimate scale has revealed nuances about the relationships between people, places, and things that we are only beginning to process.

Where does all this leave a group of historical archaeologists contributing to a volume called "Archaeology and Advocacy"? We are reflecting on our original work, finding a host of new questions, and if anything, renewing our commitment to this kind of archaeology conducted with communities in the present and for the future. What follows is a brief introduction to the volume's contents and some of the key concepts and questions that thread through the rest of these chapters.

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

## Archaeology and Advocacy

What does it mean to talk about "archaeology" and "advocacy" in the same sentence? As the volume's editors discuss in the preface, advocacy approaches in historical archaeology cover an increasingly broad range of projects, partnerships, goals, and strategies. The chapters in this volume explore this diversity as a developmental trajectory over the course of the discipline's history. Moreover, this trajectory is one we share with all the historical and social sciences that seek to define the relevance of the past in the present. How historical archaeology's work connects with and contributes to that larger discourse is a key theme running through many of the volume's chapters.

The earliest approaches to advocacy in historical archaeology might be described as "advocacy for the resource." This form is embedded in the very origin story of the field and still forms a core value for its practitioners. It is also obviously one we share with all other heritage- and preservation-related practices. There are several specific disciplinary legacies that feed into our approach to the work. In the early days of historical archaeology's emergence as a field, the larger preservation world sharply privileged both the surviving documentary record and the elite architecture of the built environment over the archaeological record of the past. Archaeological data were not seen as contributing information of the same value or integrity as that of the written record in particular, so working to counter this perception became a central rationale for historical archaeologists' early research efforts. By the mid-1970s, this argument had become more nuanced: the idea that archaeological resources and research could be used to revise and expand a written record that was itself biased and incomplete became integral to the field. It is this justification, which emphasizes the power of archaeology to expose and correct historical erasures and silences, that still drives much of the historical archaeology in the United States and elsewhere.

What is new in more recent iterations of this kind of advocacy-based work, including research discussed in several chapters in this volume, is the assertion that the ultimate value of these archaeological resources and their analysis and interpretation is their ability to alter present-day society's assumptions and perceptions about the past, and thus to affect social and political change in the present. This moves the power of the objects and sites themselves from a remedial role of revising or augmenting some essentialized record of the past, to actively invoking "new" pasts as rationales for present-day change to create better—or at least alternate—futures.

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

Beginning as early as the 1990s, a second set of modalities linking archaeology and advocacy began to emerge. These new modalities shifted the focus of advocacy from the artifacts, sites, and archaeological resources to present-day people, and in particular, to communities that held specific connections to those archaeological resources. These new approaches grew directly out of earlier work with local communities and organizations. Over time, archaeology happening *in* communities became archaeological explorations *of* those communities, and finally, fully collaborative work *with* communities designed to achieve much more present- and future-driven goals. Examples of this latter kind of work are now innumerable, and community-based archaeology and its cousins in related disciplines have entire journals and programs devoted to it, such as the *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*, *Heritage and Society,* and *Public Archaeology*, to name a few. There are formal organizations with ongoing programming such as the "Archaeology in the Community" organization, and many others (Jones and Pickens 2020).

In these projects, the archaeology itself may be as focused on the process of designing and doing the work as on the ultimate product of the project as a singular piece of research or final report. This is archaeology as praxis, where it is not (just) the data that matter, so much as the processes of exploration, documentation, and above all, narration. These projects are often long-term, multifaceted, and embedded in extensive ongoing partnerships with numerous community organizations, governmental agencies, or educational institutions. Perhaps more importantly, project goals can explicitly target community-driven needs and issues, such as combating gentrification, preventing crime, reducing conflict, or revitalizing economically blighted districts or neighborhoods. The urban contexts of many of these projects can also mean that "community" is construed much more broadly across scales, from a local neighborhood to the city as a whole and beyond. The issues being addressed may begin as very local ones, but almost inevitably invoke much more comprehensive issues, such as structural racism, environmental justice, or national ideological narratives of identity and origin.

Any and all of these kinds of advocacy-oriented archaeological projects can and do happen everywhere. So why focus on urban contexts, and why now in particular? If that question was relevant in early 2020, it has become even more so following the events of the rest of that fateful year. Setting those recent events aside for the moment, urban contexts have long been a focus of special research emphasis in historical archaeology in the United States and internationally, with at least two dedicated volumes in the field's flagship American journal *Historical Archaeology* (1987, 2008) and innumerable books and articles published globally. More importantly

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

here, urban archaeology has evolved in very parallel ways to advocacy-based archaeology. It has grown from archaeological projects conducted *in* cities to increasingly complex and critical archaeologies *of* cities, city people, and city life (Mullins and Warner 2008, 1).

As a result, urban archaeology and community-based collaborative archaeology have grown up together. So, for the authors of this volume, the sheer density and ever-changing texture of urban placemaking, the dynamism and complexity of urban social life, and the frequently contested nature of urban places as sites of varying scales of both community identity and social power all help to focus and problematize key aspects of archaeology as advocacy. Cities as material places are constantly being built, demolished, and rebuilt by repeated decisions about what to keep, what to change, and what to remove. These transformations are never politically, socially, or economically neutral, and repeatedly impact the lives of generations of smaller, more marginalized neighborhoods, enclaves, and districts: erasing some places altogether, moving sectors of the population from one area to another, and shifting people's access to land, housing, and other infrastructure. The archaeological record of this fractured landscape transformation has proven to be a powerful platform for revealing those impacts, raising questions about processes of erasure and dispossession, and challenging the city's official narratives, which normalize today's distributions of power and authority (Matthews 2020, 4–9).

The different sections of this volume both reflect and amplify this longer-term intellectual history and evolutionary trajectory linking archaeology and advocacy. The first section, "Preservation of Cultural Resources," explores the earlier, foundational concept of advocacy as protection of places and resources: identifying and protecting physical sites from destruction or erasure and protecting and sharing the information generated from archaeological research as something useful and valuable in the present. The first chapter grounds the volume in the origins of the field with Joan Geismar's historical review of New York's Professional Archaeologists of New York City (PANYC). PANYC formed forty years ago when archaeologists across the city banded together to coordinate advocacy for both the preservation of places and public access to information recovered from development-driven excavation projects. Elizabeth Meade and Douglas Mooney's chapter extends this discussion of advocacy for places in the urban fabric with a focus on a particular type of urban place: burial grounds. They explore burial grounds as a category of urban site particularly vulnerable to the material consequences of being forgotten, which is the inherent characteristic of urban change over time. More importantly, they detail how destroying these places constitutes a form of loss from a

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

city's collective memory that repeatedly impacts present-day communities already marginalized in urban contexts.

Across the chapters of this introductory section, the identities of those engaged in the advocacy efforts in question shift from exclusively professional archaeologists to include an ever-broader range of community members and organizations, which leads easily into the second major section of the book, "Raising Public, Descendant, and Community Voices." Here, the chapters focus on the developing role of archaeology as praxis: as an inclusive and collaborative platform for encouraging dialogue in the present about the past and its meaning. Ana Edwards and Matthew Laird unravel the complex interplay among place, memory, and social action that unfolded in Richmond, Virginia, when archaeological work in the city sequentially revealed a set of powerful African American sites: a slave-trading complex, a burial ground, and ultimately a set of discarded human remains at a medical college. Their chapter explores the power of both the places themselves, and the archaeological exposure of the places, to validate social memory and provide a launching point for social commentary and action in the Richmond community. Meredith B. Linn, Nan A. Rothschild, and Diana diZerega Wall use the twenty-year history of the Seneca Village Project in New York's Central Park to reflect on the realities of crafting genuinely collaborative interpretations of places and pasts that are charged with powerful but complex and diverse meanings for many different communities in the present day. Their work also explores both the challenge and the potential of digital media for extending this collaboration into new social dimensions. Britt's chapter closes out the section by circling back to advocacy as the protection of community-valued places but employs this traditional disciplinary strategy in new ways. Her work with Brooklyn's United Order of the Tents leverages the heritage values of the organization's headquarters building to empower the local neighborhood in its struggle to own and use everyday community places in today's ongoing contests over who controls urban spaces.

The narratives being constructed in and through these projects are not just about restoring lost or misrepresented voices from the past, but about articulating how those past voices inform and challenge today's issues and experiences. Even more powerfully, the discourses unfolding in these projects specifically unpack how today's dominant perceptions of the past are used to justify and rationalize continuing exclusion, erasure, and disenfranchisement. The authors do so by recognizing and privileging the voices of descendants and community members living today.

The book's final section, "Knowledge and Power," contextualizes these efforts in ways that extend well beyond the material immediacy of specific urban places and communities to the scope and scale of national identity

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

construction. The essays are unified in seeing archaeological research and thought as an enduring challenge to any singular, essentialized historical narrative of a single national identity. Elizabeth Martin discusses the power of an archaeological approach to teaching about the past to dismantle the singular and inevitable narratives embedded in kindergarten (K) through grade 12 social sciences curriculum covering American history. In particular, she leverages archaeological thinking to give both a historical place and an intellectual voice to high school students who are not "inculcated into white-middle-class American culture at a young age, with no interruptions in their education and a home that is not food-insecure," and so find themselves written out of the historical narrative in even the most progressive textbooks or curriculum standards. María Fernanda Ugalde and O. Hugo Benevides reflect on their exhibit in the National Museum of Ecuador, which documented gender plurality in that country's Precolumbian history as an intentionally designed encounter with the constructed nature of Ecuadorian national identity. Weaving their own personal lived experience into the exhibit's design, they explain how the exhibition, as experienced by viewers, challenged the carefully constructed nationalist narrative by exposing the colonialist violence that links today's homophobia and transphobia with the rise of the key religious and political institutions of that modern nation-state. George continues this theme with a discussion of the transformative work that can be accomplished when archaeological documentation of the commercially produced material symbolism of early post-Revolutionary America's "imagined community" is juxtaposed with the nostalgic invocation of that very same symbolism and iconography by today's nativist political groups. The constructed myth embodied in "Washington's Apotheosis" British transfer prints provides a deeply ironic challenge to the claims to a "true" American identity made by wearers of red MAGA hats manufactured in China.

Perhaps even most importantly in the culminating chapters of this volume, these authors emphasize archaeological perspective as much as methodology. They define the archaeological habits of mind that empower archaeology as advocacy. Their language ranges from Martin's charge to "think like a historical archaeologist," to Ugalde and Benevides' efforts "to look again and look differently," to George's belief in the potential of archaeologically informed "knowledge and education" to challenge today's increasingly dark nationalist and nativist political trends. And likewise, these articles clearly reframe what is meant by advocacy itself, moving well beyond the preservation of artifacts and sites to conceptualize archaeological praxis as a tool for social change. Taken together, these chapters give us an idea of where advocacy-based archaeology will go from here. They charge the practitioners of this approach with reconfiguring the na-

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

ture of knowledge construction itself—materially, socially, and politically. That new process of knowledge construction is inherently multivocal, experiential, and collaborative.

## Concepts Explored

While they are organized into separate sections, the chapters of this volume are best seen as a conversation among the different authors, being elaborated upon across these categories. In fact, many of the papers could have fit easily into more than one section. Three key concepts emerge from the authors' discussion, which could be labeled authority, mobility, and plurality. These are concepts archaeologists have been discussing for decades, in all manner of historical and cultural contexts. But shifting the focus to advocacy for specific communities in the present means that these familiar ideas take on new meanings.

By 2022, it is already something of a truism in archaeology and a wide array of other heritage-related fields that professional experts are not and should not be the only people to wield the power of deciding which objects, buildings, or places are important and to whom. In practice, however, in any given urban context, this authority is shared across myriad official government agencies and political bodies, defined by a range of policy frameworks from federal to municipal, and negotiated between and among a wide variety of community organizations: historical societies, advisory boards, commercial organizations, neighborhood associations, and so on. These entities all debate how to define attributes like authenticity, accuracy, singularity, beauty, condition, value, and significance. They negotiate how these attributes will inform decisions about what will happen to some part of the urban fabric and why.

Advocacy-oriented archaeology projects are often designed to create platforms that enable community members or groups who do not have direct access to this kind of decision-making authority to assert an alternative authority based on the documented results of the project. These results tend to highlight local knowledge and local narratives of value and significance, with conventional archaeological data and research woven into other works such as oral history, folklore, and ethnography. In many cases, the existence of the archaeological project itself leverages broader community participation in the decision-making process.

In other, nonurban contexts, these kinds of community-based projects can often assume an explicit connection between the past occupants of a place, represented by their remaining archaeological record, and contemporary occupants living in the area or nearby. Modern urban contexts can

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

make this assumption extremely problematic. Today's urban populations are highly mobile, physically as well as economically and socially. People's connections to both past and place are nonlinear and fractal in complexity: associations with cultural institutions such as churches, schools, or cemeteries can map out widely across a given city's neighborhoods, as generations shift and relocate over time. Conversely, the physical neighborhoods traditionally identified with immigrant populations can retain that identity over decades, but the specific immigrant groups living in those neighborhoods can change radically over the same period. Last but by no means least, urban contexts have always seen significantly higher proportions of their populations who rent rather than own their residences. Even more broadly, the urban fabric itself creates an enduring material framework that shapes where and how successive generations live and work in its built environment. As a result, most urban residents inhabit places created and controlled by someone else. And while each generation modifies and remakes these places, they do so in a continuously reiterative interaction with the inherited palimpsest of that evolving framework.

How then do advocacy-oriented archaeology projects identify either the people or the places relevant to their work? What other forms of community affinity, identity, and place attachment need to be identified and documented as critical parts of these projects? And finally, what is the value of places that, through archaeological project work, become essentially new or renewed sites of collective memory: places where the assumed past connections between some specific "place" and "community" yield to a more future-oriented, collaborative designation of a documented place as a site for ongoing interpretation, reflection, or pilgrimage?

Identifying such places and documenting the people who have lived there throughout any given city's past means encountering a diverse array of past occupants, land uses, and histories. That is the fundamental nature of cities as forms of human settlement anywhere in the world and at any time. In any North American context, as well as in many other colonialist contexts around the world, that settlement history begins well before the arrival of European urban settlement systems. Much of historical archaeology's disciplinary story has been about opening up a more inclusive narrative of place to encompass these complex histories.

In the advocacy-oriented cases in this volume, this pluralist approach is extended in several ways. These projects both document and facilitate the connection of diverse groups to their sites and places. The interpretive programs described here focus on including multiple voices and the collaborative development of diverse and complex narratives. But beyond this, these projects create both places and processes that encourage the telling of more than one story, which is not just a way to generate new

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

or different facts for richer narrative content. These projects aspire to be inclusive, transdisciplinary, and open-ended as a form of practice. They do not just document multiple stories but teach plurality as a mode of knowledge construction.

## Questions Raised

What happens when archaeology is practiced as advocacy? What is gained, or accomplished, and for whom? How does it change the archaeology? How does it change the situation of the moment? How does it change people's perceptions of past and present, going forward? The authors in this volume are participants in a much broader dialogue exploring the meaning and relevancy of our field in the twenty-first century. Their work here opens up at least two distinct paths for continuing that dialogue.

The first would be to delve into what might be called archaeological habits of mind. Many of these projects—and others like them—do not necessarily involve large-scale excavations and analysis of those recovered materials. Even when they do, this work is only one component of a much larger collaborative project. Perhaps even more importantly, these projects are often designed to continue long after any excavation has been completed, particularly in terms of fostering collaborative engagement among different community members and organizations. This model is not a particularly new part of our larger discipline. It is standard practice in projects conducted under the domain of contemporary archaeology, where archaeological methods and conceptual frameworks provide powerful new insights into present-day issues such as homelessness (Zimmerman et al. 2010) or migration (De Leon 2013). In fact, the distinction between "contemporary" and "historical" archaeology is increasingly blurred, as practitioners of the latter undertake more projects that explore the very recent past, such as the impact of 1960s freeway construction and urban renewal (Matthews 2020; Mullins 2006).

But still, a certain intellectual vertigo can come with trying to explain the ways in which one is an archaeologist without reference to our discipline's hallmark methodology. Yet we still think like archaeologists, and like historical archaeologists for that matter, as the chapters in the final section here so cogently reveal. So what does that mean, exactly? And how does it matter? The projects discussed in these chapters suggest that the answer goes beyond any contribution of our scholarly experience with either materiality or constructs of pastness, although these important elements underlie and inform the rest. Instead, this work suggests that what may be the most powerful contribution that archaeologists make in these

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

deeply collaborative projects is perspective. Our role is less as authorities in either methodology or content, and more as people trained to analyze how and why current narratives of the past read the way they do, and how all the disparate sources of new information produced by these new kinds of projects amplify, challenge, expand, or change those narratives.

A less conventional but potentially more important part of what we bring to these urban situations of advocacy and activism can be found in the ways that doing this kind of work has transformed our own professional practice and the meaning of "doing archaeology." This is particularly true for the growth of a more collaborative, inclusive archaeological praxis referred to earlier and its role in reframing notions of authority and knowledge construction. In ways that we are just beginning to understand, the performative, iterative nature of this new kind of praxis, and the shift of focus from the products of archaeology as research to the processes of archaeology as a practice, has become what we bring to the moment.

The second path winding through these chapters follows the ways in which the particular advocacies of which these projects are a part are taking place within a larger reconfiguring of the nexus among people, places, and the past. We study this as archaeologists, but we are also living it in our everyday lives. Part of this reconfiguring is driven by the increasingly complex patterns of human mobility in the early twenty-first century, as discussed earlier. Climate change, economic and political destabilization, and human conflict drive ever-greater waves of migrants and refugees. Tens of millions of people globally are currently displaced from their homes, on the move across international boundaries or temporarily sheltered in refugee camps. Millions more have settled somewhat more permanently in new locations far from former homes and communities.

For these people, past connections to both place and heritage have been severed, and new ones are being built. Once again, this global reality is intensified in urban contexts, where higher population densities and a more mobile resident population combine with historical identities as destination sites for migrants, both internal and external. How will the older pasts of a city become meaningful to these new residents, if at all? How will those same cities recognize and make room for the kinds of placemaking that new residents will need to engage in to create their own connections to their new communities? It is in this context that advocacy-based archaeological practice becomes a platform for dialogue around these kinds of issues. Sites interpreted in these projects tell the complex stories of a city's places in ways that invite more stories to be told. They also elevate the visibility of the city's layered and continually evolving landscape, contextualizing today's placemaking in what has come before.

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

At the same time, some urban places have become localized sites of transformative reckoning with unacknowledged and unresolved elements of much larger national and global pasts. Almost by definition, many of these sites were originally created as intentionally public, official statements of what, or who, deserved remembering and commemorating. Today, these places act as living theaters of contested narratives, not just about the past, but about the meaning of the past in the present. They act as material manifestations both of today's unbalanced power relations, and of how these are connected to enduring legacies of colonialism, racism, and inequality. In the terms discussed here, they also make visible what places and stories have been erased or ignored from the authoritative, official narrative. Pulling down a monument or layering it with spray-painted messages that assert a very different memory and commemoration transforms the way people see and use that place. What was once an unchallenged display of authoritative statements meant to instruct a passive public becomes a multivocal and ongoing public forum of engagement and debate.

This shift creates an environment in which people go to such places not only to learn about or remember the past but also to actively evaluate the meaning of that past in the present. And they do so not just once, but repeatedly, in the context of the ongoing flow of current events. In such an environment, advocacy-based archaeological projects like the ones discussed in this volume are increasingly engaged in helping to create and recreate such places and using them to foster this ongoing dialogue. Advocacy-based archaeology further complicates and reframes the commemorative landscape by undertaking this work at sites that are often not on any official list of landmarks. It documents and interprets "missing" places that can speak to the very erased or forgotten pasts whose absence is now the defining feature of that official list. This kind of work also makes more visible the connections that such local places and events have to similar sites in other places. In the process, notions of whose pasts are relevant and what communities are being defined by these histories begin to expand in scale, from local to regional, national, and beyond.

## Final Thoughts

In 2007, Lonnie Bunch, then director of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, wrote of a concept he called "usable pasts" and its value in conceptualizing the role of historical museums in contemporary society (2007, 46). He explained that history in general, but particularly those histories that people do not want to remember or seek

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

to erase, can provide "useful tools and lessons that help one navigate contemporary life" (Bunch 2007, 46). The power and value of these tools in the present make the argument that those histories must be remembered and those erasures restored. But they also suggest that the way people in the future may need to use these tools, to navigate the present of their own time, may not be the same as today. This notion of the past, or at least knowledge of the past, as a dynamic, adaptive set of resources for navigating futures to come resonates powerfully in a world freshly aware of both the uncertainty of the future and the inevitability of change.

Advocacy-driven archaeology creates usable pasts intended to take this notion one step further, to affect some kind of change in the present that will in turn impact those futures. As such, it joins a growing body of work in the larger field of archaeology as well as several neighboring disciplines that is exploring such "future-oriented" pasts (Rosenzweig 2020, 287). Preserving the past for the future is hardly a new idea, of course: it is the often-implicit assumption that lies at the heart of all heritage legislation and organizational development of the past century, all over the world. But in recent years, practitioners working across numerous heritage-related fields have increasingly challenged us to articulate these assumptions. They reject the older version of this logic, which envisioned the preserved past as a set of material and cultural monuments that spoke to future generations as an authorized and inherently didactic narrative, giving evidence for and bearing witness to a largely fixed and static story of what happened. Instead, many are now exploring how to recast the active selecting, remembering, and preserving work all people do in defining their heritage through time as "a series of activities that are intimately concerned with assembling, building and designing future worlds" (Harrison et al. 2020. 4). Moreover, these activities are ongoing, dynamic, contested, and multivocal, making heritage "a processual and discursive, as well as material, legacy" (Harrison et al. 2020, 5). Echoing Bunch's discussion of how museums can help make the broadest and most inclusive range of "usable pasts" accessible, the role of those working in heritage fields is to develop processes that make such public discourse accessible, especially to those usually marginalized or disenfranchised from it. The authors in this volume use their own work to lay out a range of possibilities for what that kind of archaeology might look like, going forward.

**Margaret Purser** is a historical archaeologist who received her doctorate in anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley in 1987. She taught courses in archaeology, material culture studies, and cultural landscape studies at Sonoma State University from 1989 to 2020. She has worked on community-based cultural landscape projects on Nevada

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale

ranching, Sierra Nevada goldmining, maritime landscapes in California's Sacramento River Delta and the Sonoma County coast, and sugar plantations in Pacific coastal Guatemala since the mid-1980s. From 2000 to 2010, she conducted a community mapping project in the historical Pacific port town of Levuka, Fiji, as part of its nomination to the UNESCO World Heritage List. Her current project is the Santa Rosa Neighborhood Heritage Mapping Project, which documents that small California city's many diverse and vibrant neighborhoods in the context of today's rapid social, economic, and environmental transformations.

## References

Bunch, Lonnie. 2007. "Embracing Ambiguity: The Challenge of Interpreting African American History in Museums." *Museums and Social Issues* 2 (1), 45–56.

De Leon, Jason. 2013. "Undocumented Migration, Use Wear, and the Materiality of Habitual Suffering in the Sonoran Desert." *Journal of Material Culture* 18 (2), 321–45.

Harrison, Rodney, Caitlin DeSilvey, Cornelius Holtorf, and Sharon Macdonald. 2020. "'For Ever, for Everyone . . .'" In Rodney Harrison, Caitlin DeSilvey, Cornelius Holtorf, Sharon Macdonald, Nadia Bartolini, Esther Breithoff, Harald Fredheim, Antony Lyons, Sarah May, Jennie Morgan and Sefryn Penrose (eds.), *Heritage Futures: Comparative Approaches to Natural and Cultural Heritage Practices*, 3–19. London: University College London Press.

Jones, Alexandra, and Sydney Pickens. 2020. "The Power of Community Archaeologists in Uncertain Times." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 7 (3), 155–57.

Matthews, Christopher. 2020. "Urban Erasures: Historical and Contemporary Archaeologies." *Journal for the Anthropology of North America* 23 (1), 4–11.

Mullins, Paul. 2006. "Racializing the Commonplace Landscape: An Archaeology of Urban Renewal along the Color Line." *World Archaeology* 8 (1), 60–71.

Mullins, Paul, and Mark Warner. 2008. "Revisiting Living in Cities." *Historical Archaeology* 42 (1), 1–4.

Rosenzweig, Melissa. 2020. "Confronting the Present: Archaeology in 2019." *American Anthropologist* 122 (2), 284–305.

Zimmerman, Larry J., Courtney Singleton, and Jessica Welch. 2010. "Activism and Creating a Translational Archaeology of Homelessness." *World Archaeology* 42 (3), 443–54.

Advocacy and Archaeology
Urban Intersections
Edited by Kelly M. Britt and Diane F. George
https://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/BrittAdvocacy
Not for resale