



INTRODUCTION

In Pursuit of a Critical Public Archaeology

V. Camille Westmont



Introduction

In the early 2000s, concerns grew about the role archaeology serves in society. Discussions centered on questions such as “is archaeology useful?” and “*should* archaeology be useful?” (Dawdy 2009: 131, emphasis in original). Others took a more personal tack, puzzling, “Can we make our voices heard? Should we make our voices heard? Do we have anything worthwhile to contribute to current debates?” (Tarlow and Stutz 2013: 3). Still others raised the stakes of this discussion by entreating readers with questions such as “Can Archaeology Save the World?” (Dawdy 2009; Stottman 2010). Although this anxiety was nearly universally answered in the affirmative, this exercise in self-doubt also brought to the fore several key observations about archaeologists’ relationships with the public. In the midst of a major reevaluation of who public archaeology should serve and in what ways, an old perspective gained renewed interest: approaches based in critical theory.

Critical theory in archaeology is, by this point, a widely accepted form of praxis. New research projects, articles, books, and even a journal dedicated to the subject—*Forum Kritische Archäologie*—attest to its versatility, longevity, and popularity. However, a review of the literature published over the last forty years indicates that how critical archaeology is conceived of and carried out continues to be debated. While these largely theoretical treatises do at times identify applied projects that have enacted one or another forms of critical theory—including Carol McDavid’s work on the Levi Jordan Plantation (2002, 2004), Mark Leone’s Archaeology in Annapolis program (Leone 2005; Leone, Potter, and Shackel 1987; Palus, Leone, and Cochran 2006; Potter and Leone 1986; Shackel, Mullins, and Warner 1998), Randy McGuire and the Ludlow Collective’s work in Colorado (Ludlow Collective 2001; Larkin and McGuire 2009;

Saitta 2007; Walker 2000; McGuire and Reckner 2003), and Paul Shackel’s Anthracite Heritage Program in northeastern Pennsylvania (Shackel 2019; Shackel and Roller 2012; Westmont 2020)—published examples of applied critical archaeology projects are still heavily outnumbered by theoretical examinations of what critical archaeological praxis could be. This volume aims to expand these conversations by bringing together a variety of projects with a diversity of perspectives in order to examine how critical theory is currently being mobilized in pursuit of emancipatory public archaeologies that confront modern-day social and economic ideologies.

The concept for this book emerged from a public archaeology session at the 2019 Society for Historical Archaeology Conference in St. Charles, Missouri. The papers and discussions inevitably diverted from discussions about archaeological findings to concerns about the modern communities taking part in this research. These concerns about communities are not new: in the last two decades, public archaeologists have increasingly pushed for archaeologists to work collaboratively with communities through power-sharing arrangements (Atalay 2012; Franklin and Lee 2020; Nassaney 2020), or even potentially through the complete transfer of control to communities, a model in which archaeologists act solely as “technicians” within community-based projects that pursue community-set research agendas (La Salle 2010: 416; Biolsi and Zimmerman 1997; McNiven and Russell 2005). What is new is the growing interest in not just sharing power and resources, but in using archaeology and archaeological findings to create social change in modern communities by exposing the ideological roots of modern inequities. I refer to this type of archaeology as critical public archaeology to clearly and forthrightly situate this work and these approaches within the tradition of critical theory. Undoubtedly, a number of public archaeology projects in the “activist” and “transformative” camps could easily be categorized as being grounded in critical theory; the goal of introducing this category to an already terminologically crowded field (see Stottman, this volume) is to explicitly communicate the liberatory aims of this type of project.

Critical theory in archaeology has enjoyed a rich tradition in many international contexts, and this book aims to capture some of the diversity of the practice. Authors were invited to contribute chapters on the critically engaged public archaeology projects taking place in their communities. This opportunity to examine how ideas on public archaeology, critical theory, and public engagement praxis come together in different cultural and legal contexts provides new opportunities for the future of the field. I believe these differences to be both a strength of their independent development and an opportunity to grow and reflect on our own individual practices.

This introduction aims to provide a brief theoretical and literature review on critical public archaeology in order to situate the chapters in the volume that follow. It begins with a background on critical theory and its previous uses within archaeology. The chapter then briefly introduces public archaeology and discusses how these two concepts—public archaeology and critical theory—can be brought together as part of a coherent archaeological praxis. Some of the challenges of implementing a critical

public archaeology are then explored, with particular attention paid to the relationship between critical public archaeology and multivocality in archaeology. Finally, I explain the organization of the book and introduce the chapters in this volume.

Critical Theory as Praxis

Critical theory differentiates itself from traditional philosophical perspectives in that it aims not to simply increase knowledge, but instead to act as a “liberating and stimulating influence” with the goal of achieving “man’s emancipation from slavery” (Horkheimer 1972: 246). Achieving this requires two acknowledgments: first, one’s own theorizing is embedded within a socio-political context; and second, ignoring the socio-political contexts of one’s work enables the reproduction of power structures of society (MacDonald 2017). Key within these considerations were the roles that social and cultural institutions played in maintaining and reproducing the dominant social structure (Gramsci 1971). Implementing a critical perspective is, therefore, not a neutral or apolitical act. A properly implemented critically informed project should aim to both dismantle the status quo and to confront the structures that create and perpetuate social inequalities.

Others have previously examined the contributions of Marx and later theorists to the formulation of critical theory (see Leone et al. 1987; Palus et al. 2006; McGuire 2008). In the interest of brevity, I will not repeat those outlines here; however, it is important to note that the constellation of scholastic influences on the topic of critical inquiry means that there can be variation in the specific intellectual tradition that underpins critical praxis (see McGuire 2008). In some instances, archaeologists took their inspiration from the writing of Marx (see Kohl 1975; Gassiot, Palomar, and Ruiz 1999; Gassiot and Palomar 2000; Vila-Mitjá et al. 2010), V. Gordon Childe (see Vargas and Sanoja 1999; Trigger 1984, 1985; Muller 1997), and/or Louis Althusser and the Frankfurt School (see Leone 1986; Leone, Potter, and Shackel 1987).

Critical theory has also been adapted outside of Marx’s traditional class-centered remit, including in feminist archaeology, Indigenous archaeology, and through the application of Critical Race Theory to archaeological contexts. These non-class-based applications of critical theory within archaeology have advanced the field in vital and creative ways. Work pursued by feminist and gender archaeologists since the 1980s has employed a gender-critical approach to highlight the androcentric biases that shape fieldwork, interpretations, and permeate the discipline as a whole (Conkey and Spector 1984; Conkey and Tringham 1995; Conkey 2003). This work has exposed the taken-for-granted assumptions, particularly those related to gendered activities, embedded within archaeological interpretations and knowledge formation processes. The introduction of critical feminist approaches has laid bare the ways modern gender biases have been normalized and maintained within the discipline of archaeology (Wylie 2007; Fryer and Raczek 2020; Heath-Stout 2020).

More recently, members of the Society for Black Archaeologists (SBA) have been spearheading a movement aimed at confronting and dismantling the everyday racism and anti-blackness that pervade archaeological thought and practice (see Flewellen et al. 2022; Franklin and Lee 2020). Through the application of Black feminist and critical race theories, this work draws on critically based praxis, including reflexivity, acknowledging the political power of one's work, and exposing the biases within our current systems, to advocate and work toward a more just and equitable future archaeology (see Battle-Baptiste 2011).

Efforts to challenge the inherent colonial and Western biases of archaeology have been a long-running focus of many Indigenous archaeology projects. Beginning in the 1960s, Indigenous activists have fought for the right to control their own cultural heritage (see Deloria 1969; Echo-Hawk and Echo-Hawk 1994). Activism aimed at decolonizing archaeology has led many archaeologists to “think critically about their right to control the material culture of the Indigenous past” and to reconceptualize their relationships with Indigenous stakeholder communities (Atalay 2006: 289; La Salle and Hutchings 2016). Instead of traditional frameworks, collaborative and community-oriented approaches have emerged as means of enabling research that is “politically aware of, sensitive to, and harmonious with, the goals of Indigenous peoples” (C. Smith and Wobst 2005: 5; Supernant and Warrick 2014; Watkins 2005; Hennessey et al. 2013). These approaches exemplify the ways critical engagement with the past can lead to new, more equitable relations in the present.

Other forms of grass-roots resistance to the status quo have also emerged, such as the punk archaeology movement, which foregrounds political actions within archaeology while embracing fictive kinship, integrity, and community (see Morgan 2014; Caraher 2014; Richardson 2017; however, some have explicitly distanced punk archaeology from Marxist approaches, see Morgan 2015).

In the context of archaeology, the application of critical theory enabled the realization that archaeology is a site of ideological struggle both in the past and in the present (Tilley 1989).¹ Critical theory posits that knowledge does not exist apart from the social context in which that knowledge was created (Rowlands 1998). Therefore, the reconstructions of the past that archaeologists create are both culturally constituted and serve a social function within the culture that created them. The social functions that non-critical archaeologies serve are based in ideologies. Under this idea, archaeology does not produce objective and universal perspectives on history; rather, our interpretations are “always guided by contemporary interest” and serve as a “mirror image of the present” that is used to conceal current-day structures of domination that are actuated through ideologies (Rowlands 1998: 26).

Although critical theory in archaeology is frequently discussed as a singular approach, in practice critical theory as it relates to archaeology has been envisaged in an assortment of ways. In general, however, a critical approach to archaeology seeks greater emancipation and less alienation (McGuire 2008). Once alienated, individuals feel disconnected from their labor, their colleagues, and even potentially aspects of

themselves. Emancipation solves the issue of alienation by revealing the ideological structures that cause alienation by challenging the dominant ideologies that otherwise obscure the social tensions.

Understanding the connections between archaeologically derived knowledge, the social context of that knowledge, and the ideologies perpetuated by that knowledge illuminates why archaeology matters, particularly to the very people subjugated by ideologies who might otherwise disregard archaeology as being irrelevant to their everyday life and lived experience (McGuire 2012). Archaeologists cannot expect those groups to seek out archaeology; rather, archaeologists need to identify methods that will enable greater collaboration and understanding, particularly within communities not already in the process of managing their heritage resources (see Two Bears 2008; Hunter 2008; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008).

Public Archaeology

Public archaeology brings together archaeological practice and archaeological scholarship to make the field relevant for a non-professional audience (Moshenska 2017; Matsuda and Okamura 2011); however, approaches to creating relevancy vary greatly. Over the past two decades, conceptions of public archaeology have become more refined as demand for archaeological experiences grows (Thomas 2017). This trend has not diminished, with multiple new volumes on the topic continuing to demonstrate public archaeology's increasingly international profile and wide-ranging methodologies (see Barton 2021; Gürsu 2019; Williams, Pudney, and Ezzeldin 2019). Nick Merriman's (2004) delineation of the "deficit" and the "multiple perspective" models represents one of the early attempts to categorize specific modes of practice within public archaeology, followed shortly by Cornelius J. Holtorf's (2007) "education," "public relations," and "democratic" models of public archaeology. Akira Matsuda (2016) expanded on Holtorf and Merriman's categories with a fourth approach: the critical category. The critical approach to public archaeology diverges from these earlier categories through its focus on upending modern inequalities based in ideologies.

Although public archaeology had made major advances, both theoretically and methodologically, since it was formalized in the late twentieth century, our understanding of its goals continues to develop. Increased activism around Black and Indigenous cultural resources in the early 1990s saw the relationships between archaeologists and descendant communities shift in fundamental and important ways. Public anger around the excavations at the African Burial Ground in New York City revealed the deep tensions and asymmetries that had arisen between those conducting the excavations and the area's African American community (La Roche and Blakey 1997). Since that time, the public archaeology of the African diaspora—including projects that promote critical engagement with the past—has steadily grown (see McDavid 2002; Minkoff, Brock, and Reeves, this volume).

Arguments over the central premise of public archaeology intensified at the turn of the century with Francis McManamon and Holtorf's debate in *Public Archaeology* (Holtorf 2000; McManamon 2000); disagreements arose yet again just a few years later, this time between Holtorf (2005) and Garrett Fagan and Kenneth Feder (2006) in *World Archaeology*, over the role public-generated interpretations labeled as alternative archaeologies should play in the field. Akira Matsuda (2016) identifies both of these arguments as stemming from disagreements in the conceptualization of the role public archaeology should serve in society; however, all of these arguments, in one way or another, connect back to questions about the roles of non-professionals should serve—considerations that are based in ideologies about the field and reflexivity (debates over the role of the public in archaeology continue today, see Thomas and Pitblado 2020; Watkins 2020; Pitblado and Thomas 2020).

Defining a Critical Approach to Public Archaeology

The fact that archaeology and archaeological interpretations of the past are political has largely been accepted (Shanks and Tilley 1987; Trigger 1984; Habu, Fawcett, and Matsunaga 2008; McGuire 2008; Borck 2019); what is more uncertain is what archaeology should do about those politics. For many, this political awareness has led to greater ethical engagement. To this end, recent trends in the field include working with descendant groups and promoting greater reflexivity (Hodder 2000; Hamilakis 2004; Meskell 2012; Silliman 2008; Simpson and Williams 2008). Others, however, are explicitly engaging with the politics of archaeology as a form of social justice activism (Zimmerman, Singleton, and Welch 2010; Shackel 2011; Shackel and Westmont 2016; Stottman 2010; Atalay et al. 2014; Barton 2021). This final form of political engagement takes many forms, including as critical archaeology praxis.

In many ways, the connection of critical archaeology to public archaeology is a natural one: both acknowledge the socio-political importance of the past, and both are interventions in the present into that past (Tilley 1989; Dalglish 2013). A critical approach to archaeology focuses on revealing and challenging the social and political ideologies unquestioningly maintained and reproduced through archaeological interpretations and practices. It does this in part by asking simply: who today benefits from this particular interpretation of the past (Matsuda and Okamura 2011; Hodder 2002)? Through this line of inquiry, archaeologists aim to disrupt the cycles of social subjugation and marginalization of minority groups by confronting at least one method of domination: historical narratives.

As archaeology has become a more formal, professionalized undertaking, archaeologists have recognized the importance of incorporating the public into their work (see Fritz and Plog 1970) and of considering the political implications of their work on the public. Politically engaged work often means focusing on those communities that have been traditionally ignored by or excluded from archaeology. Understanding how these

groups became oppressed and marginalized by the field, however, requires self-reflection on the social and political dimensions of the field as well as on archaeologists' positionality within those dimensions (McGuire 2008). In some instances, pressure to adopt critical perspectives can also come from communities themselves. Thomas Patterson (2008: 73–74) finds that descendant and diasporic communities that suffer the injustices of hegemonic standards are often the groups to begin broader political and intellectual debates around the legitimacy of the status quo; in these instances, archaeologists have the opportunity to participate in meaningful and productive ways as they struggle alongside communities to enact change.

Challenges to a Truly Critical Public Archaeology

This discussion of the possibilities of critical public archaeology ultimately raises a new question: how can archaeology, with its purview in the past, liberate anyone from modern ideological structures? As Gavin Lucas (2001) observes, while the introduction of New Archaeology brought with it fundamental changes to the way archaeology was done, post-processualism has not similarly changed the way archaeologists carry out fieldwork. While some have identified means of integrating reflexive practice into fieldwork (see Hodder 2000, 2003), much of the critical evaluations central to a critical theory-informed practice continue to take place away from the “trowel’s edge” (Berggren and Hodder 2003). If ideologies permeate everything from the sites archaeologists choose to excavate to the field approaches employed to the interpretations made back at the lab (Hodder 1999), a truly critical archaeology will ultimately require a re-building of the discipline and its methodology from the ground up (see Atalay et al. 2014).

While addressing embedded ideologies within archaeological practice is one challenge, archaeologists' positionality poses another major challenge. As people who have subscribed to and benefited from the current system of archaeology, how can archaeologists be the ones expected to change it (Castañeda 2014)? Considering that most archaeologists are employed within some form of a neo-liberal market economy, calling for change through a critical theory approach might not just be untenable, it might be career suicide (Nakamura 2012; Durrans 1987).

These problem with implementing a fully critical approach—one that critiques the very systems that employ the archaeologists launching the critiques—are also felt within the field of public archaeology. Akira Matsuda (2016) astutely posits that it is critical theory's arguments against ideology that render it ill-suited for an increasingly neo-liberal market economy, one in which private funders increasingly have control over the products of intellectual and academic research. Cornelius Holtorf (2009) even suggests that the questions presented in the opening of this introduction—questions about the usefulness of archaeology—are themselves entangled within a Western neo-liberal mindset that determines value based on profitability and revenue.

Further complications come from working with communities. Community identity is fluid, complex, and heterogeneous (Pyburn 2011). When working with communities they are not personally part of, archaeologists risk overlooking or ignoring existing social relations in pursuit of community cohesion (Waterton 2005). Additionally, studies have indicated that for many volunteers and enthusiasts, archaeology is a leisure activity; if archaeologists intend to take up social issues through their public practice, they also need to ensure that the demographics they are working with are truly representative of the broader community and not simply reflective of those groups who have the time and resources to engage in these forms of leisure (Richardson and Almansa-Sánchez 2015).

Other challenges also confront critical public archaeology efforts. As Durrans (1987: 294) highlights, critical interpretations that focus on liberating public audiences by revealing their naturalized ideologies “are feeble [in] comparison [to] the dominant media through which ideological views of the past are promoted.” Indeed, subsequent analyses of the public archaeology tours and interpretations associated with the Archaeology in Annapolis project found that visitors often situated the liberatory narratives within their pre-existing ideological frameworks, thereby rendering archaeologists’ attempts to emancipate the public futile (Potter 1994; Leone 1995).

Additionally, implementing aspects of critical practice in limited ways might actually entrench archaeological ideologies and power dynamics. Although projects seek to incorporate power-sharing and community collaborations as part of their critically informed praxis, these actions do little to address the systemic, power-based disparities inherent in the field. Even when communities are involved in research, archaeological fieldwork still often requires governmental permits or external funding, access to which continues to be heavily dependent on positionality and disciplinary ideologies (Westmont and Clay 2021). While community collaborations are important for building relationships and trust, ultimately “these worthwhile pursuits are not tantamount to any true transformation or radical redistribution of archaeological power and capital” (Nakamura 2012: 124).

Additionally, archaeologists’ interpretations continue to shape understandings of the site in subtle or less overt ways throughout the entire archaeological process—including during field work (Hodder 1999)—which further obscures the power dynamics within collaborative projects. In short, archaeologists still act as gatekeepers with control over official narratives of the past; archaeologists allowing communities to direct research questions or participate in projects opens the gate but does not remove it. At worst, conducting collaborations under these circumstances—circumstances that appear on the surface to be equal but actually engage and perpetuate power disparities—can be seen as its own form of ideological obfuscation; in this light, power-sharing structures can be seen as the type of practice that presents a veneer of social change while it reproduces inequalities. While many have outlined processes for achieving a truly ethical, power-balanced, collaborative public archaeology practice (see Col-

well-Chanthapongh and Ferguson 2008; L. Smith 1999), actuating methods that achieve true systemic change in a widespread way continues to be a challenge.

Multivocality and Critical Archaeology

Tenets of critical theory are deeply ingrained in all sorts of public archaeology projects today. Chief among these are projects that incorporate reflexivity and critical appraisals of assumptions, ideologies, and power dynamics into their public praxis. These types of considerations often result in projects dedicated to correcting power imbalances between archaeologists and communities (Atalay 2007; Colwell-Chanthapongh and Ferguson 2008); in practice, these values manifest as multivocality, descendant collaborations, and/or community-based research, among other power-sharing models (McDavid 2002; La Salle 2010; McAnany and Rowe 2015; Flewelling et al. 2022).

However, others have pointed out that while these reflexive methods reflect engagement with the concepts espoused by critical archaeology, multivocal interpretations alone do not constitute a fully critical archaeology. Akira Matsuda and Katsuyuki Okamura (2011) separate multivocal approaches from critical approaches in their characterization of different forms of public archaeology. While the two forms appear similar in many respects, Matsuda and Okamura suggest that “the divide between the critical and multivocal approaches . . . could be compared to the differences between two positions on the intellectual left: the traditional left and the postmodern liberal left” (2011: 6). A multivocal approach is ultimately grounded in a hermeneutic epistemology that acknowledges and incorporates multiple perspectives on the past as a means of exploring the diversity of perspectives on the past. Oftentimes this approach is used to achieve socio-political aims, such as to counter dominant narratives of the past (Faulkner 2000) or to achieve recognition (Bender 1998). In these instances, the diversity of perspectives is the key goal, with socio-political changes then emerging from that diversity of perspectives. In critical approaches, however, the opposite is true: the key goal from the outset is to identify the social and political ideologies upheld by archaeology by first questioning the situatedness of the project and the positionality of the stakeholders. It is only through confronting those ideologies and dismantling dominating structures that communities benefit.

While this might seem like an inconsequential difference (multivocality leading to social change versus critical inquiry and reflection leading to social change), these differences have real consequences. Central among these is the role of non-expert voices in interpretations. Multivocality in archaeology has been invaluable for decolonizing archaeological practices and continues to play a major role in restorative justice for many marginalized and oppressed communities around the globe (R. Smith 2018). However, within a critical archaeological praxis, multivocality is limited by necessity. Controlling narratives and interpretations is an essential aspect of a critical archaeol-

ogy framework—after all, it is through precisely these channels that dominating and hegemonic ideologies are supported, legitimized, and perpetuated. McGuire (2012: 79–80) writes that “archaeologists should practice their craft in the service of multiple communities,” but archaeologists must also remain cognizant that “archaeologists need to retain some authority over the production of knowledge in order to assess [how our interpretations fit the observations we can make of the world].” These precautions are required to prevent archaeological interpretations from being misappropriated in service of the very forces critical archaeology aims to critique and dismantle. Most pressingly, unchecked archaeological interpretation can be used as an entry for pernicious and malicious nationalism (Atalay et al. 2014; Holtorf 2009; McGhee 2008), to promote populism (González-Ruibal, Alonso Gaonzález, and Criado Boado 2018), or to perpetuate convenient falsehoods (McGuire 2008). Although some have dismissed concerns about nationalism by saying that it is “problematic to take this power away from *people* in locales in which it is already utilized by their governments” (Atalay et al. 2014: 12), I believe that the goal here should be an emancipatory archaeology, not shifting ideologies.

How, then, can public archaeology bridge the gap between ethical requirements to do no harm and critical requirements to maintain a degree of control over the production of knowledge? I suggest that Carolyn Nakamura (2012: 124) proposes the best—although admittedly among the most difficult to implement—answer: that critical archaeology should focus on “how we might facilitate impoverished communities affected by archaeology gaining more direct access to those structures, resources, and capacities with which they can express their voice and get results skewed towards their own welfare.” In other words, archaeologists should stop trying to act as mediators in the self-appointed role of implementing critical archaeology and focus instead on building communities’ capacities so that they themselves have the tool at their disposal to challenge the ideologies that oppress them. This shift in the disciplinary “status quo” is likely to spur new conceptions and perspectives on the past and open the field to new innovations. Archaeologists must abandon our vested interest in the field as we know it—as a field of study, a discipline, a profession, an institution, and a cultural apparatus—in order to enable new methodologies, theories, and perspectives to drive the future of the discipline (Castañeda 2014). As economic and social disparities continue to grow, critical archaeologies can offer necessary and appropriate tools for navigating the future of the field (C. Smith 2012).

Structure of Book

Critical perspectives on archaeology are not new, and neither are critical perspectives on public archaeology (see Potter 1994). So what, then, does this volume add to an already well-trodden path? First, this volume aims to specifically highlight instances where critical perspectives of the past are being integrated into public archaeology and

community engagement. While these examples engage with critical theory to varying extents, this volume provides a starting place to begin addressing concerns that critical public archaeology cannot function in our current economic and socio-political contexts (e.g., Kristiansen 2008; Matsuda 2016).

Second, the volume aims to introduce new ways of conceiving of the intersections between critical theory and public archaeology. Public tours, interpretations, and collaborative excavations have demonstrated utility, but what about other facets of public archaeology? This volume encourages archaeologists to think beyond traditional modes of engagement to examine where critical approaches can be implemented within a broader definition of public archaeology. Recognizing the full scale and diversity of public archaeological practice (see Moshenska 2017) can highlight areas for archaeologists to develop and implement critical praxis that extend outside of the traditional critical public archaeology remit.

Finally, this book hopes to encourage archaeologists to more explicitly and openly engage with the politics of their field. Although scholars have repeatedly emphasized the political nature of archaeology, many do not extend that acknowledgment to their fieldwork or their public engagement. A full acknowledgment that a project's public outreach is aware of and in reaction to its political and social circumstances would advance theoretical perspectives within public archaeology and make our political engagements clearer for professional and lay audiences. While undoubtedly some will say that using the phrase "critical archaeology" is jargon-y, and indeed others have cautioned against the pitfalls of jargon in public interactions (see C. Smith 2012), I believe that the terminology also provides a teaching opportunity for archaeologists to familiarize members of the public with a term that, in many ways, affects them, too. Ultimately, archaeologists need to be honest with members of the public about the politics of our work, and starting that process by using the correct terminology (and instructing members of the public on what those terms mean) is a step toward a more open and direct practice.

This book is organized into three sections. The opening section explores the ways an explicitly critical perspective can be used to advance work within communities. Mary Furlong Minkoff, Terry Brock, and Matthew Reeves open the section with their examination of the ways anti-racism can be pursued through public archaeology at Montpelier, a historic home in Orange, Virginia. Anti-racist praxis follows Critical Race Theory's acknowledgment that policy is where structures become racist or anti-racist, so to combat racism, institutions must create or sustain anti-racist policies. At Montpelier, the Archaeology Department has used critical self-reflections to implement anti-racist policies that address and confront racism in both representations of the past and in the present. These efforts have since become a defining force of the public archaeology practice, particularly with reference to descendant communities, internships, and public archaeology programming. These efforts outline how a critically informed praxis can be used to identify and dismantle the policies that create racial inequalities, particularly within public engagement and interpretation of archaeological sites.

The second chapter in the section explores how public engagement and public archaeology are working to change harmful and ingrained notions around racism and civil rights as it relates to the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. Jeffery Burton and Mary M. Farrell demonstrate how they have used community archaeology at Manzanar, a Japanese Relocation Center in California, to challenge damaging and untrue modern narratives about the site that seek to downplay and justify the events that took place there. In challenging these narratives, Burton and Farrell are challenging modern ideologies centered in nationalism and racism while they engage the public in a critical reflection on governmental power and the rights of citizens.

The final chapter in the section on archaeologists working with communities profiles a different way public archaeology can highlight ideologies of inequality. M. Jay Stottman's work at Portland Wharf in Louisville, Kentucky, uses public archaeology not just as a means of confronting misconceptions about communities and their history, but as a form of activism in itself. Stottman investigates the possibilities of using archaeological performance to reinvest in Portland Wharf Park and, by extension, the people who live there. Portland Wharf, once a thriving independent community, was progressively annexed by the city of Louisville during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries until eventually the physical remains of the community itself vanished. Now an economically depressed area, archaeologists are using public archaeology programming methods to raise the profile of the former community and draw attention back to the area's working-class heritage. Exit surveys from the project indicate that archaeology itself is a political action—one that connotes worth, value, and investment. Stottman's findings suggest that rather than relying on interpretations, archaeologists can also illuminate ideologies around whose history is remembered and whose is not by using the public popularity of the discipline to draw attention to forgotten communities.

While communities will always remain at the heart of critically engaged work, deeper investigations into the means by which critically engaged work is carried out can point to new directions for innovation and collaboration. The second section of the volume explores how critical perspectives can advance other areas of archaeology, including museums, websites, narratives, and performances. The section begins with Monika Stobiecka's investigations into the possibility of a critical archaeological museum. Following the work of Piotr Piotrowski, Stobiecka examines how museums can be spaces for social critique, where anachronistic displays of the past are re-interpreted as venues for addressing modern-day social questions, as a response to recent calls for museums to reconsider their public role. Specifically, Stobiecka identifies three requirements from a critical archaeology museum: that it must feature strong bonds to other institutions such as universities; that it must focus on "big picture" problems or problems of global importance; and that it must engage visitors in ways that promote archaeological imagination and encourage them to personally reflect on the various meanings of the past. Stobiecka's observations on the roles museums have to play in promoting greater critical evaluations of archaeology thoughtfully demon-

strate the important roles that archaeological institutions can play in confronting social challenges.

While Stobiecka introduces readers to the opportunities for critical engagement that exist within museum contexts, Kerry Massheder-Rigby demonstrates that public archaeology can still be carried out in places where the past's physical presence has been largely erased. The *Our Humble Abodes* project explores the viability of a joint archaeology and oral history approach to public archaeology and ultimately finds that oral history can be a powerful tool for combating essentialized mainstream narratives. Ultimately, the project succeeded in complicating narratives about working-class life in Liverpool's court houses and captured a range of emotions—from attachment to happy childhoods to nostalgia—that are often not included in official remembrances of working-class life. Massheder-Rigby suggests that incorporating oral history more thoroughly into archaeological investigations not only provides a fuller and richer perspective on the past, but it also enables members of the public to make meaningful contributions to archaeological research. These new perspectives can help to combat negative stereotypes about marginalized communities while empowering those communities to take more active roles in the interpretation of their history.

The applicability of new methods of critical public archaeology continues with Camille Westmont's chapter on the potential for narratives to ground critical reevaluations of the past and connect past injustices to modern circumstances. Westmont inserts narratives derived from archival documents into her archaeological site tours of the Lone Rock Stockade, a private prison used to house forced laborers in nineteenth-century Tennessee. Over the course of the tour, Westmont transitions from narratives about historical prison labor abuses to narratives based on modern prison labor abuses. Through these stories, Westmont attempts to build empathy for prisoners that can then be translated into political action in the present. Westmont points out that while narratives are not a new strategy within archaeology or within public archaeology, their potential as a form of critical scholarship is currently underdeveloped within the field of public archaeology.

Moving away from traditional approaches to public engagement, Adam Fracchia turns to digital means of reaching broader audiences. Fracchia provides an update on one of the United States' early critical public archaeology projects—Archaeology in Annapolis. Forty years into the project, however, Fracchia highlights a major absence: the inclusion of diverse and non-expert perspectives in the project's production of knowledge. Fracchia acknowledges that while that omission cannot be corrected, a critical approach to Archaeology in Annapolis's forthcoming digital humanities aims to move in a new direction—one that pursues the democratization of knowledge and the inclusion of non-expert voices. To achieve this, Archaeology in Annapolis explores the possibilities of new data frameworks, expanded access, and online collaborations. While the application of digital humanities concepts to archaeology is not new, Fracchia's aims to seek an explicitly critical digital archaeology that offers new directions for the field.

While the first two sections of the book explore how critical approaches to public archaeology are currently deployed, chapters by Torgrim Sneve Guttormsen and Chiara Zuanni offer important critiques and identify areas of further evaluation for a critical public archaeology praxis. Guttormsen uses the Norwegian Museum of Technology as a foil for examining the way public historiography can be used to explain the relationship between archaeology and the public. Using Bakhtin's concepts of dialogism and chronotopes, Guttormsen explains how museums can become real-life chronotopes where spatial and temporal aspects of history are fused according to popular conceptions of the past. The chapter suggests that archaeology itself can end up being negotiated by publics, and that the relationship between archaeology and the public can only truly be understood retrospectively as the findings of archaeologists become discursively linked with those created by society. Guttormsen advocates a nuanced understanding of the interconnections between various stakeholders' perspectives on the past, and calls for critical reflexivity in understanding these relational aspects of public archaeological interpretation.

The second chapter in this section explores similar concerns about the efficacy of critical interpretations, although this time from the visitors' perspective rather than from the museum's. Zuanni recounts the role that museums play in shaping visitors' experiences and understandings of the past, and analyzes those sentiments in light of visitors' preconceived ideas, interests, and beliefs about the past. Zuanni finds that museums continue to be viewed as a source of authoritative knowledge, with recent efforts to promote participatory practices potentially being overlooked by the public. These observations are crucial for critical public archaeologies because they echo warnings outlined in the 1990s: the balancing of archaeologists' interpretations with the publics' own embedded understandings of history was a major obstacle identified by Parker Potter (1992) in the Archaeology in Annapolis public tours in the 1980s, demonstrating that the interplay between old and new knowledge can potentially continue to create obstacles for critically engaged projects.

The book closes with a thoughtful consideration on public archaeology in the context of critical theory. Suzie Thomas presents the historical origins and current trajectories of public archaeology, particularly in a rapidly changing post-COVID world. Thomas connects each chapter in turn to the broader public archaeology movement and demonstrates the opportunities that critical approaches hold for the future of the practice and the future of archaeologically engaged communities.

Conclusion

This volume provides a view to the intersections between critical theory and public archaeology in American and European contexts. The diversity of communities involved, approaches used, definitions, and conceptualizations of critical approaches to archaeol-

ogy demonstrates the current growth and future potential for these forms of outreach and inquiry.

In particular the range of practitioners and situations in which critical public archaeology is being applied is promising. From small, socially disadvantaged communities in the Midwestern United States to museum goers in Poland, the range of groups to which critical approaches can be applied is extraordinary. Given the various legal and regulatory restrictions on public involvement in archaeological research across different countries, the fact that critical approaches can be implemented to a plethora of types of public archaeology lends the approach even more value. The wide application and high adaptability of critical approaches shine through in the range of circumstances presented in these chapters.

Another pattern across the chapters is the diversity of definitions archaeologists use when discussing their approaches to critical theory. Some projects seek a critical perspective that incorporates those voices that have been marginalized historically by making space for those voices to play leading roles in current and future research; other projects define critical approaches as those that raise awareness about pressing social issues by connecting the past and the present into a single continuous narrative; still others see critical approaches as means to restore historical voices and correct misinformation through direct conversation with descendant groups and interested interlocutors. The core tenets of critical theory—reflexivity, liberatory aims, and positionality—all come through to various degrees in these chapters.

While far from comprehensive, the chapters in this book provide a starting point from which I hope future critically engaged public archaeology projects will emerge. The range of approaches, methodologies, communities, and perspectives captured by the chapters in this volume offer potential directions for future innovations in the field. As the world continues to struggle with constant and growing social, economic, environmental, and political conundrums, these chapters demonstrate that the past can still be a resource for creating change for the future.

V. Camille Westmont is the Andrew Mellon Foundation Postdoctoral Fellow in Historical Archaeology at the University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee. She received her PhD in anthropology from the University of Maryland. Her work focuses on labor archaeology, industrial cultural heritage, landscape analyses, and public engagement. She currently serves as the co-chair of the Public Archaeology Community in the European Association of Archaeologists.

Notes

1. Ideology has long been a subject of study within archaeology (see Kristiansen 1984; Paynter 1985; Handsman 1980, 1981, 1982). In this context, ideology refers to the aspects of cultural systems that prevent social conflict by obscuring or masking contradictions in society (Barnett and Silverman 1979; Leone 1986).

References

- Atalay, Sonya. 2006. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3/4): 280–310.
- . 2007. "Global Application of Indigenous Archaeology: Community Based Participatory Research in Turkey." *Archaeologies* 3: 249–70.
- . 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Atalay, Sonya, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, eds. 2014. *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*. London: Routledge.
- Barnett, Steve, and Martin G. Silverman. 1979. *Ideology and Everyday Life*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Barton, Christopher P., ed. 2021. *Trowels in the Trenches: Archaeology as Social Activism*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Battle-Baptiste, Whitney. 2011. *Black Feminist Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Bender, Barbara. 1998. *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Oxford: Berg.
- Berggren, Åsa, and Ian Hodder. 2003. "Social Practice, Method, and Some Problems of Field Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 68(3): 421–34.
- Biolsi, Thomas, and Larry J. Zimmerman, ed. 1997. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Borck, Lewis. 2019. "Constructing the Future History: Prefiguration as Historical Epistemology and the Chronopolitics of Archaeology." *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 5(2): 229–38.
- Caraher, William. 2014. "Introduction." In *Punk Archaeology*, ed. William Caraher, Kostis Kourelis, and Andrew Reinhard, 9–13. Grand Forks, ND: Digital Press.
- Castañeda, Quetzil E. 2014. "Situating Activism in Archaeology: The Mission of Science the Activist Affect, and the Archaeological Record." In *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, ed. Sonya Atalay, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, 61–90. London: Routledge.
- Chikikure, Shadreck, and Gilbert Pwiti. 2008. "Community Involvement in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management: An Assessment from Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere." *Current Anthropology* 49(3): 467–85.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T.J. Ferguson, eds. 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Conkey, Margaret W. 2003. "Has Feminism Changed Archaeology?" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28(3): 867–79.
- Conkey, Margaret, and Janet Spector. 1984. "Archaeology and the Study of Gender." *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, 11 vols., ed. Michael B. Schiffer, 5: 1–38. New York: Academic Press.
- Conkey, Margaret, and Ruth Tringham. 1995. "Archaeology and the Goddess: Exploring the Contours of Feminist Archaeology." In *Feminisms in the Academy*, ed. Domna Stanton and Abigail Stewart, 199–247. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Dalglish, Chris, ed. 2013. *Archaeology, the Public, and the Recent Past*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Dawdy, Shannon Lee. 2009. "Millennial Archaeology: Locating the Discipline in the Age of Insecurity." *Archaeological Dialogues* 16(2): 131–42.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. London: Macmillan.
- Durrans, Brian. 1987. "Response to: Toward a Critical Archaeology." *Current Anthropology* 28(3): 293–94.
- Echo-Hawk, Roger C., and Walter R. Echo-Hawk. 1994. *Battlefields and Burial Grounds: The Indian Struggle to Protect Ancestral Graves in the United States*. Minneapolis, MN: Lerner.

- Fagan, Garrett G., and Kenneth L. Feder. 2006. "Crusading against Straw Men: An Alternative View of Alternative Archaeologies: Response to Holtorf (2005)." *World Archaeology* 38(4): 718–29.
- Faulkner, Neil. 2000. "Archaeology from Below." *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 21–33.
- Flewellen, Ayana, Alicia Odewale, Justin Dunnivant, Alexandra Jones, and William White III. (2022). "Creating Community and Engaging Community: The Foundations of the Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project in St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26: 147–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-021-00600-z>.
- Franklin, Maria, and Nedra Lee. 2020. "African American Descendants, Community Outreach, and the Ransom and Sarah Williams Farmstead Project." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 7(2): 135–48.
- Fritz, John, and Fred Plog. 1970. "The Nature of Archaeological Explanation." *American Antiquity* 35(4): 405–12. <https://doi.org/10.2307/278113>.
- Fryer, Tiffany C., and Teresa P. Raczek. 2020. "Introduction: Toward an Engaged Feminist Heritage Praxis." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 31(1): 7–25.
- Gassiot, Ermengol, and Beatriz Palomar. 2000. "Arqueología de la Praxis: Información Histórica de la Acción Social." *Complutum* 11: 87–99.
- Gassiot, Ermengol, Beatriz Palomar, and Gustavo Ruiz. 1999. "Brief Outline of the Marxist Archeology in the Spanish State." *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(3): 234–36.
- González-Ruibal, Alfredo, Pablo Alonso González, and Felipe Criado Boado. 2018. "Against Reactionary Populism: Towards a New Public Archaeology." *Antiquity* 92(362): 507–15.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Gürsu, Isilay, ed. 2019. *Public Archaeology: Theoretical Approaches and Current Practices*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Habu, Junko, Clare Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, eds. 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer.
- Hamilakis, Yannis. 2004. "Archaeology and the Politics of Pedagogy." *World Archaeology* 36(2): 287–309.
- Handsman, Russell G. 1980. "The Domains of Kinship and Settlement in Historic Goshen: Signs of a Past Cultural Order." *Artifacts* 9(1): 2–7.
- . 1981. "Early Capitalism and the Center Village of Canaan, Connecticut: A Study of Transformations and Separations." *Artifacts* 9(3): 1–21.
- . 1982. "The Hot and Cold of Goshen's History." *Artifacts* 10(3): 10–20.
- Heath-Stout, Laura E. 2020. "Who Write about Archaeology? An Intersection Study of Authorship in Archaeological Journals." *American Antiquity* 85(3): 407–26.
- Hennessey, Kate, Natasha Lyons, Stephen Loring, Charles Arnold, Mervin Joe, Albert Elias, and James Pokiak. 2013. "The Inuvialuit Living History Project: Digital Return as the Forging of Relationships Between Institutions, People, and Data." *Museum Anthropology* 7(1/2): 44–73.
- Hodder, Ian. 1999. *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2000. "Developing a Reflexive Method in Archaeology." In *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example of Çatalhöyük*, ed. Ian Hodder, 3–15. British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara Monograph No. 28. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- . 2002. "Archaeological Theory." In *Archaeology: The Widening Debate*, ed. Barry Cunliffe, Wendy Davies, and Colin Renfrew, 77–90. Oxford: British Academy.
- . 2003. "Archaeological Reflexivity and the 'Local' Voice." *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1): 55–69.
- Holtorf, Cornelius J. 2000. "Engaging with Multiple Pasts: Reply to Francis McManamon." *Public Archaeology* 1(3): 214–15.
- . 2005. "Beyond Crusades: How (Not) to Engage with Alternative Archaeologies." *World Archaeology* 37(4): 544–51.

- . 2007. *Archaeology is a Brand!: The Meaning of Archaeology in Contemporary Popular Culture*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2009. "Archaeology: From Usefulness to Value." *Archaeological Dialogues* 16(2): 182–86.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1972. *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell et al. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Hunter, Andrea A. 2008. "A Critical Change in Pedagogy: Indigenous Cultural Resource Management." In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, ed. Stephen Silliman, 165–87. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Kohl, Phil. 1975. "The Archaeology of Trade." *Dialectical Anthropology* 1(1): 43–50.
- Kristiansen, Kristian. 1984. "Ideology and Material Culture: An Archaeological Perspective." In *Marxist Perspectives in Archaeology*, ed. Matthew Spriggs, 72–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2008. "Should Archaeology Be in the Service of 'Popular Culture'? A Theoretical and Political Critique of Cornelius Holtorf's Vision of Archaeology." *Antiquity* 82(316): 488–90.
- Larkin, Karin, and Randall McGuire, eds. 2009. *The Archaeology of ClassWar: The Colorado Coalfield Strike of 1913–1914*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- La Roche, Cheryl J., and Michael L. Blakey. 1997. "Seizing Intellectual Power: The Dialogue at the New York African Burial Ground." *Historical Archaeology* 31(3): 84–106.
- La Salle, Marina. 2010. "Community Collaboration and Other Good Intentions." *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 6(3): 401–22.
- La Salle, Marina, and Rich Hutchings. 2016. "What Makes Us Squirm—A Critical Assessment of Community-Oriented Archaeology." *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 40: 164–80.
- Leone, Mark P. 1986. "Symbolic, Structural, and Critical Archaeology." In *American Archaeology Past, Present, and Future*, ed. David Meltzer, Donald Fowler, and Jeremy Sabloff, 415–38. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- . 1995. "A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism." *American Anthropologist* 97(2): 251–68.
- . 2005. *The Archaeology of Liberty in an American Capital: Excavations in Annapolis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter, Jr., and Paul A. Shackel. 1987. "Toward a Critical Archaeology." *Current Anthropology* 28(3): 283–92.
- Lucas, Gavin. 2001. *Critical Approaches to Fieldwork*. London: Routledge.
- Ludlow Collective. 2001. "Archaeology of the Colorado Coal Field War 1913–1914." In *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*, eds. Victor Buchli, Gavin Lucas, and Margaret Cox, 94–107. London: Routledge.
- MacDonald, Bradley J. 2017. "Traditional and Critical Theory Today: Toward a Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 39(4): 511–22.
- Matsuda, Akira. 2016. "A Consideration of Public Archaeology Theories." *Public Archaeology* 15(1): 40–49.
- Matsuda, Akira, and Katsuyuki Okamura. 2011. "Introduction: New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology." In *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*, ed. Katsuyuki Okamura and Akira Matsuda, 1–18. New York: Springer.
- McAnany, Patricia A., and Sarah M. Rowe. 2015. "Re-visiting the Field: Collaborative Archaeology as Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 40(5): 499–507.
- McDavid, Carol. 2002. "Archaeologies that Hurt; Descendants that Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology." *World Archaeology* 34(2): 303–14.
- . 2004. "From 'Traditional' Archaeology to Public Archaeology to Community Action." In *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*, ed. Paul A. Shackel and Erve J. Chambers, 35–56. New York: Routledge.
- McGhee, Robert. 2008. "Aboriginalism and the Problems of Indigenous Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 73(4): 579–97.

- McGuire, Randall H. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2012. “Critical Archaeology and Praxis.” *Forum Kritische Archäologie* 1: 77–89.
- McGuire, Randall, and Paul Reckner. 2003. “Building a Working-Class Archaeology: The Colorado Coal Field War Project.” *Industrial Archaeology Review* 25(2): 83–95.
- McManamon, Francis P. 2000. “Archaeological Messages and Messengers.” *Public Archaeology* 1(1): 5–20.
- McNiven, Ian, and Lynette Russell. 2005. *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Merriman, Nick. 2004. “Introduction.” In *Public Archaeology*, ed. Nick Merriman, 1–18. London: Routledge.
- Meskel, Lynn. 2012. “The Social Life of Heritage.” In *Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd edn, ed. Ian Hodder, 229–50. Cambridge: Polity.
- Morgan, Colleen. 2014. “The Young Lions of Archaeology.” In *Punk Archaeology*, ed. William Caraher, Kostis Kourelis, and Andrew Reinhard, 63–70. Grand Forks, ND: Digital Press.
- . 2015. “Punk, DIY, and Anarchy in Archaeological Thought and Practice.” *AP: Online Journal in Public Archaeology* 5: 123–46.
- Moshenska, Gabriel. 2017. “Introduction: Public Archaeology as Practice and Scholarship Where Archaeology Meets the World.” In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, ed. Gabriel Moshenska, 1–13. London: UCL Press.
- Muller, Jon. 1997. *Mississippian Political Economy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Nakamura, Carolyn. 2012. “Archaeology and the Capacity to Aspire.” *Forum Kritische Archäologie* 1: 123–33.
- Nassaney, Michael S. 2020. “Archaeology, Heritage, and Public Participation: Fulfilling the Promise of Authentic Collaboration.” *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 9(2): 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.40>.
- Palus, Matthew M., Mark P. Leone, and Matthew D. Cochran. 2006. “Critical Archaeology: Politics Past and Present.” In *Historical Archaeology*, ed. Martin Hall and Stephen W. Silliman, 84–104. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Patterson, Thomas, C. 2008. “Social Archaeology and Marxist Social Thought.” In *Companion to Social Archaeology*, ed. Lynn Meskel and Robert W. Preucel, 66–81. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Paynter, R. 1985. “Surplus Flow between Frontiers and Homelands.” In *The Archeology of Frontiers and Boundaries*, Stanton W. Green and Stephen Perlman, 163–211. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Pitblado, Bonne L., and Suzie Thomas. 2020. “Unravelling the Spectra of Stewards and Collectors.” *Antiquity* 94(376): 1077–79.
- Potter, Parker B., Jr. 1992. “Critical Archaeology: In the Ground and on the Street.” *Historical Archaeology* 26(3): 117–29.
- . 1994. *Public Archaeology in Annapolis: A Critical Approach to History in Maryland's Ancient City*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Potter, Parker B., Jr., and Mark P. Leone. 1986. “Liberation not Replication: ‘Archaeology in Annapolis’ Analyzed.” *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 76(2): 97–105.
- Pyburn, K. Anne. 2011. “Engaged Archaeology: Whose Community? Which Public?” In *Global Public Archaeology*, ed. Akira Matsuda and Katsu Okamura, 29–41. New York: Springer.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane. 2017. “I’ll Give You ‘Punk Archaeology’, Sunshine.” *World Archaeology* 49(3): 306–17.
- Richardson, Lorna-Jane, and Jaime Almansa-Sánchez. 2015. “Do You Even Know What Public Archaeology Is? Trends, Theory, Practice, Ethics.” *World Archaeology* 47(2): 194–211.
- Rowlands, Michael. 1998. “Objectivity and Subjectivity in Archaeology.” In *Social Transformations in Archaeology: Global and Local Perspectives*, ed. Kristian Kristiansen and Michael Rowlands, 26–35. London: Routledge.
- Saitta, Dean J. 2007. *The Archaeology of Collective Action*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

- Shackel, Paul A. 2011. "Pursuing Heritage, Engaging Communities." *Historical Archaeology* 45(1): 1–9.
- . 2019. *An Archaeology of Unchecked Capitalism: From the American Rust Belt to the Developing World*. New York: Berghahn.
- Shackel, Paul A., Paul R. Mullins, and Mark S. Warner, eds. 1998. *Annapolis Past: Historical Archaeology in Annapolis*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Shackel, Paul, and Michael Roller. 2012. "The Gilded Age Wasn't So Gilded in the Anthracite Region of Pennsylvania." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 16(4): 761–75.
- Shackel, Paul A., and V. Camille Westmont. 2016. "When the Mines Closed: Heritage Building in Northeastern Pennsylvania." *General Anthropology* 23(1): 1–10.
- Shanks, Michael, and Christopher Tilley. 1987. *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Silliman, Stephen, ed. 2008. *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Simpson, Faye, and Howard Williams. 2008. "Evaluating Community Archaeology in the UK." *Public Archaeology* 7(2): 69–90.
- Smith, Claire. 2012. "The Benefits and Risks of Critical Archaeology." *Forum Kritische Archäologie* 1: 90–99.
- Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst. 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Smith, Linda T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Smith, Rhianedd. 2018. "Plurality and Multivocality." In *The Encyclopedia of Archaeological Sciences*, ed. Sandra L. Lopéz Varela. Retrieved 4 April 2021 from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781119188230.sases0466>.
- Stottman, M. Jay, ed. 2010. *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeology Save the World?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Supernant, Kisha, and Gary Warrick. 2014. "Challenges to Critical Community-Based Archaeological Practice in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38(2): 563–91.
- Tarlow, Sarah, and Liv Nilsson Stutz. 2013. "Can an Archaeologist Be a Public Intellectual?" *Archaeological Dialogues* 20(1): 1–5.
- Thomas, Suzie. 2017. "Community Archaeology." In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, ed. Gabriel Moshenska, 14–30. London: UCL Press.
- Thomas, Suzie, and Bonnie L. Pitblado. 2020. "The Dangers of Conflating Responsible and Responsive Artefact Stewardship with Illicit and Illegal Collecting." *Antiquity* 94(376): 1060–67.
- Tilley, Christopher. 1989. "Archaeology as Socio-Political Action in the Present." In *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology*, ed. Valery Pinsky and Alison Wylie, 104–16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trigger, Bruce. 1984. "Marxism and Archaeology." In *On Marxian Perspectives in Anthropology: Essays in Honor of Harry Hoijer*, ed. Sidney Mintz, M. Godelier, and Bruce Trigger, 59–99. Malibu, CA: Undena Publications.
- . 1985. "Marxism in Archaeology: Real or Spurious." *Reviews in Anthropology* 12: 114–23.
- Two Bears, Davina R. 2008. "Ihoosh'aah, Learning by Doing: The Navajo Nation Archaeology Department Student Training Program." In *Collaborating at the Trowel's Edge: Teaching and Learning in Indigenous Archaeology*, ed. Stephen Silliman, 188–209. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Vargas, Irada, and Mario Sanoja. 1999. "Archaeology as Social Science: Its Expression in Latin America." In *Archaeology in Latin America*, ed. Gustavo G. Politis and Benjamin Alberti, 59–75. London: Routledge.
- Vila-Mitjá, Assumpció, Jordi Estévez, Daniel Villatoro, and Jordi Sabater-Mir. 2010. "Archaeological Materiality of Social Inequality among Hunter-Gatherer Societies." In *Archaeological Invisibility and Forgotten Knowledge*, ed. Karen Hardy, 200–10. Oxford: BAR International Series.

- Walker, Mark. 2000. "Labor History at the Ground Level: Colorado Coalfield War Archaeology Project." *Labor's Heritage* 11(1): 58–75.
- Waterton, Emma. 2005. "Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11(4): 309–25.
- Watkins, Joe. 2005. "Through Wary Eyes: Indigenous Perspectives on Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 429–49.
- . 2020. "Not with the Same Brush." *Antiquity* 94(376): 1071–73.
- Westmont, V. Camille. 2022. "Working-class Intangible Heritage from the Pennsylvania Coal Fields." *Forum Journal* 32(4): 54–63.
- Westmont, V. Camille, and Elizabeth Clay. 2021. "Introduction: Current Directions in the Community Archaeology of the African Diaspora." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26(1): 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-021-00631-6>.
- Williams, Howard, Carolina Pudney, and Afnan Ezzeldin, eds. 2019. *Public Archaeology: Arts of Engagement*. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishing.
- Wylie, Alison. 2007. "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist: An Introduction." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 14(3): 209–16.
- Zimmerman, Larry, Courtney Singleton, and Jessica Welch. 2010. "Activism and Creating a Translational Archaeology of Homelessness." *World Archaeology* 42(3): 443–54.