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Abstract. Archaeology assumes itself as a discipline through a practice of boundarymaking that merges the past with the present. It is, in this practice, increasingly critiqued for being ethnocentric and separating power from the communities it claims to represent. In response, archaeology is experiencing a turn toward “community”. Examining two community archaeology case studies, we assess whether archaeology can be transformed into a discipline that productively participates in the liveliness and messy connectedness of objects, peoples, histories and cultures—in contrast to a conventionally detached practice of objectifying other peoples’ lifeways. In both cases, archaeological and descent communities play direct and central decision-making roles in this traditionally “distanced” discipline. They demonstrate means of re-figuring archaeology as a participatory practice. Community-founded archaeology is thus shown to transform methods commonly supporting institutional reproduction into a radically indigenous, emically structured, set of knowledge practices and outcomes.

Résumé. Archéologie suppose elle-même comme une discipline à travers une pratique de fabrication limite qui fusionne le passé au présent. Il est, dans cette pratique, plus en plus critiqué pour avoir été puissance ethnocentrique et séparation des communautés qu’elle prétend représenter. En réponse, archéologie connaîait un tournant vers une « communauté ». Examen de deux études de cas communautaires archéologie, nous déterminer si archéologie peut se transformer en une discipline qui productivement participe à la vivacité et la connectivité désordre des objets, des peuples, des histoires et des cultures—contrairement à une pratique conventionnelle détachée d’objectiver les modes de vie des autres peuples. En cas, archéologiques et descente communautés jouent des rôles décisionnels directes et centrales dans ce traditionnellement « distanciés » discipline. Ils montrer les moyens de retrouver l’archéologie comme une pratique participative. Archéologie communauté fondée est ainsi montré à transformer les méthodes communément soutien institutionnelle reproduction en un jeu radicalement indigène, emicalement structuré, de connaissances pratiques et les résultats.

What is at stake in the contemporary work of archaeology? As culture history, scientific method, and economic activity, archaeology continues to participate in the “settling” of people and things in time and space as objects of study (Atalay 2006; Trigger 1984). Most viscerally through excavation, though no less the case with resistivity survey, fieldwalking or desk-based assessment, archaeology transforms...
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that which it seeks from the simultaneity and messiness of material-discursive lifeworlds into archaeological record (Lucas 2012), fieldwork reports (Lucas 2002), academic conference papers, landscape characterizations, archives and objects in “glass cases” (Ames 1992; Merriman 1991). Quite simply, “archaeology is what archaeologists do” (Clarke 1973:6). That is, archaeological practice makes rather than finds archaeology; it is a discipline that does “not start with its own self-definition, but with practices that have come to be called archaeological” (Shanks 2012:41). What is at stake in the contemporary work of archaeology, then, is the continuing need to account for archaeology’s entangled enactments—of archaeologists, communities, traditions, habits, technologies, landscapes, bureaucracies, tools, materials—of the past in the present in order, ultimately, to practice archaeology better (Kintigh et al. 2014; Sassaman 2014).

In this paper, we discuss two community archaeology case studies and assess whether the discipline of archaeology can be transformed into one that productively participates in the liveliness and messy connectedness of objects, peoples, histories and cultures—in contrast to the conventionally detached, normative, empiricist practice of objectifying other peoples’ lifeways. In doing so, we do not suggest that such a practice is not empirical, rigorous or professional (Martindale and Nicholas, this volume). Rather, we argue that a more self-aware and embodied practice of co-production that acknowledges, alongside Bruno Latour (1991), that “we have never been modern”, in fact contributes to an empirical objectivity that is not reducible to scientific positivism or Western knowledge biases. We do not suggest that conventional archaeologies should be cast aside in yet another paradigm shift (Martindale and Nicholas, this volume; Schaepe 2014). Instead, we wonder whether contemporary, community-involved archaeologies productively recognize the co-production implicit in all archaeological work and thus offer a better model for inductive observation that is at the heart of archaeology. Such co-production can be rendered invisible by the apparatus of disciplinary archaeology and its often selective empiricism (Lucas 2002). Why should twentieth-century urban or Anglo-Saxon or nineteenth-century Chinese-immigrant remains be ignored due to archaeological research designs that seek to privilege medieval or Iron Age or aboriginal origins, for example? If orthodox archaeological practices create a certain kind of knowledge, does changing that practice create new ways of understanding? In advocating for embracing inductive methodologies our aim is to broaden the scope of archaeological practice, interpretation and application, while yet maintaining rigour and expertise as boundaries set by community-based epistemologies and critical standards.

We look first at Stó:lō Nation, where archaeology is conceptualized within a Halq’eméylem context as an integrated practice linked by language to health, research, resource management, cura-
ology’s complex relationships within and across localities are particularly clear in contexts where the archaeological landscape and descent communities are proximal, where that proximity may be temporal and/or spatial. That is, in cases where descent communities have lived on the land since time immemorial or where the archaeology in question provides a record of practices within living memory there are opportunities to develop better archaeological practices. We argue these archaeologies are better in as much as they require greater ethical rigour, demand collective accountability, and refuse to close down the limits of archaeological enquiry.

Archaeology is one of myriad boundary-making practices (Barad 2007) that, through processes of assembling (Harrison 2011) and dissembling, produce distinctions that create what Karen Barad refers to as “cuts” in the multiplicity of lived experience (2007), cuts that resolve into categories that slip into the alwaysbeen, beyondquestion and commonsensical. In other words, practicing archaeology is what creates and reproduces what is and is not considered archaeological at any one time; and by pulling materials together as “archaeological” archaeologists resolve the complexity of those materials into that singular category. Normative archaeological knowledges are produced by these “cuts”, by the literal slicing through soil to create sections that frame stratographies or the rendering of select subsurface features as data via ground penetrating radar or the modeling of past lifeways according to 20th century European gender roles. These norms have been critiqued as ethnocentric, colonial practices that skew and misrepresent authentic pasts and present communities (Atalay 2006; Gosden 2004; Layton 1989; Moro-Abadía 2006; Nicholas et al. 2007; Nicholas et al. 2011; Wylie 1997). In recent archaeological scholarship, however, a performative turn—drawing on the work of writers across a disciplinary spectrum, including Judith Butler (1993), Bruno Latour (1991), Nigel Thrift (2007) and Karen Barad (2007)—sees archaeology as material-discursive practice. That is, archaeology is a group of practices that always involve both matter and discourse in that matter cannot exist prior to discourse while at the same time discourse does not produce matter. They are involved in entangled and ongoing processes. Archaeologists participate in observing

...a world that is not unitary or preordained, but becomes manifest through regular intelligible patterns that emerge not through the recognition and representation of such regularities, but through repeatable circumstances of material arrangement [Brittain 2013:257].

The discipline as such (Graves-Brown et al. 2013:3–5) is coming to be understood as a practice of difference and repetition (Deleuze 2004): rather than simply (mis)representing an authentic past, archaeology is active in the worlding of world (Barad 2007) in a process of objectifying its objectifying relationships (Bourdieu 1990). In short, archaeology is one of the key practices through which the world that we and other non-human entities inhabit is produced. Archaeology’s ethnocentrism is thus also part of an ongoing messy and “throwntogether” (Massey 2005) practice rather than an ideological imposition upon a stable, originary community.
The current move away from notions of fixed, a priori entities (objects, people and so on) that precede archaeological *representation*, together with a more recent focus on archaeology as a process that *disciplines* matter by transforming it into archaeological record, enable nuanced interventions into archaeology's contradictory entanglements with broader relations of capital and growth (Hamilakis 2007; Wylie 1999), law (Martin 2008), nationalism (Kohl 1998), and—via its reliance on funding through resource extraction, construction, utilities and infrastructure planning—anthropogenic climate change (Hutchings and La Salle 2012). In other words, a move away from a concern with *representation* as such (Lorimer 2005:84; Thrift 2007) does not suggest a move away from concerns with social justice, power or the ethics of archaeology. Rather, an approach that understands archaeology as a complex process of becoming pays attention to power as multiple and to the problem of how an emphasis on ethnocentric misrepresentation is part of the same repressive totalizing vision as the structures of power that such critiques purport to resist (Foucault 1977). It also opens up spaces for the crafting of difference (Grosz 2010)—for a doing otherwise—by community-involved archaeologies that question how archaeology has come to be settled through specific relations of intellectual property and *politicoeconomic* paradigms of “professional” academic or commercial modes.

How might such a shift in archaeology from the politics of representation to the power of performance be experienced? One response to the diffuse multiplicity of archaeology, a response that aims both to acknowledge the workings of power and to craft spaces of difference, has been the recent concentration of community-involved archaeologies. Commercial (La Salle and Hutchings 2012) and *developer-funded* archaeology (Cumberpatch and Blinkhorn 2001; Jones 2013:166–168) has witnessed substantial growth alongside a shrinking population of academic archaeologists. At the same time, this academic archaeological community remains characterized by a commitment to social justice issues and both recognizes its ongoing role in colonial relations and archaeology as a potentially critical and emancipatory exercise in understanding people from the ground up (Byrne 2013; González-Ruibal 2008, 2012, 2013; Graves-Brown et al. 2013:7–9). The subsequent shift to “community” within both commercial and academic archaeology is, therefore, striking. Although the history of community-involved archaeology is almost as long as the history of the discipline itself (see Atalay 2012:29–54) and is aligned with community-based participatory practices across the arts and humanities (Bishop 2012), current intensive interest in making archaeology relevant to and accessible by nonprofessionals comes at the very point at which archaeology’s main areas of economic activity lie within privately funded arenas: that is, in the transformation of archaeology in the ground as a virtual heritage commons into the private spaces of condominiums and shopping malls and the increasingly privatized spaces of higher education.

While the quality of community engagement within global CRM and its complicity in the forces of privatization are beyond the scope of this paper (but see, for example, the collected chapters in Dalglish 2013), within universities and funding councils what is clear is that...
significant resources are now being allocated to community-involved, engaged and co-produced research. In the UK, the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement was set up in Bristol in 2008, with funding from the four UK Funding Councils, Research Councils UK and the Wellcome Trust. The UK research councils launched their Connected Communities strategic funding stream in 2009 and over 300 major projects, workshops and networks are being funded, many of which have community-based participatory action research with communities at their heart. Canada’s Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) has followed suit with its Connection strategic funding strand. Academic archaeology is an active participant in this process and 2013 alone saw the launch of the international Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage, the start of NEARCH, a new 5-year, €5m European Union investigation of “New scenarios for a community-involved archaeology” and conference sessions on “Community Archaeology and the University” at Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group, Iceland, “Public Archaeology from the Ground Up” at the European Association of Archaeologists meeting, Czech Republic, and “Community-oriented Archaeology” at the Canadian Archaeological Association meeting, Whistler, B.C. Communities have been quick to recognize the opportunities and challenges that this new academic and commercial interest in participation creates. At the same time, a growing critique of tokenism and concern with the ethics of appropriating and commercializing local knowledges is being directed at university-based community-involved archaeologies, voiced across the range of international conference sessions and within community-based archaeology projects themselves (DePauli 1999; Lyons 2013; Scarre and Coningham 2013), which sit alongside important critiques of community practices beyond archaeology (see Banerjee 2000; Cooke and Kothari 2001; Joseph 2002). Moreover, the exclusivity of academic access to funding, particularly in Canada, needs to be recognized. Archaeological research funding, such as that administered through SSHRC, Canada’s leading federal funding agency, is often not directly accessible to community-based archaeologists. This limitation of access to funding forces academic collaborations, with funds often necessarily flowing through universities rather than directly accessible by communities. Although the UK context supports communities to access funding directly via such bodies as the Heritage Lottery Fund, applications are strengthened with university partnerships. There remains, therefore, an issue of diasporic power and money relations that actively shapes which archaeologies are visible or invisible.

Yet, is it too easy to dismiss the collective move towards locating expertise within communities as simply a cynical exercise in “feel-good” public engagement, cost-cutting or white (green, or red) washing corporate expansion? To dismiss out-of-hand risks a different kind of paternalistic marginalization of communities as unknowledgeable, fails to account for the multiplicities of agency and sidesteps what is at stake in contemporary archaeological practices: an attempt to account for archaeological work as not representing the world “out there”, but as a key agent in world-making. In this paper, as two archaeologists working in two different parts of the world, we discuss case studies of archaeologies conducted in and by com-
communities in order to assess the extent to which archaeology’s boundaries can be productively tested and shifted by local knowledges. Can such practices open out spaces of difference that will significantly impact upon other professional archaeological practices (academic, heritage professional and developer-funded) and contribute positively to the lifeworlds of those people with whom we work?

We look first at the role and practice of archaeology at Stó:lō Nation in south-western British Columbia as it applies to addressing needs of the Stó:lō community. Archaeology is conceptualized within a Halq’eméylem context as an integrated practice linked by language to health, research, resource management, curation, repatriation and education in the context of contemporary aboriginal rights and title issues. The archaeological program at Stó:lō Nation developed as a holistic operation responding to and benefiting the community in a variety of ways—some of which, like health, are not commonly linked to the discipline. Archaeology is thus practiced as an element of a broad ranging approach to heritage operations linking the present with the past and the future, among a field of aboriginal rights and title issues. We turn then to Knowle West, a suburban community in Bristol of around 12,000 people. The housing estate was built in two phases in the 1930s and 1960s, although there is archaeological evidence of some 4,000 years of inhabitation. The community has participated in a number of local knowledge projects that focus on multi-period archaeology and heritage, as part of a long-term project supported by Knowle West Media Centre to locate expertise within what has popularly been defined as a “marginal” community. As in Stó:lō, archaeology becomes linked to a range of contemporary issues that touch on planning, education, digital inclusion, health and capacity building.

At both Stó:lō Nation and in Knowle West, archaeology is conceptualized as having both contemporary relevance and as attending to the materialities of the contemporary world. While by its definition archaeology is the study of old things, archaeology itself points to the conundrum: these old things can only be studied because they are here, now, which highlights the impossibility of separating past and present (Graves-Brown et al. 2013:1). Moreover, as Harrison argues (2011), traditional scholarship has tended to view archaeology as concerned only with that which is ruined and has ceased to function. Archaeologies of the contemporary world—in and of the present—enable both a concern with the “living” and the “dead” and potentially operate in close proximity to communities with non-Western worldviews, communities that powerfully counter a European, colonial construction of linear time. At Stó:lō Nation, archaeology is always-already contemporary, while the 20th century focus of archaeology at Knowle West aims to reflect “a broader understanding that archaeology can only ever be undertaken in the present and, as such, is necessarily the product of the present” (Graves-Brown et al. 2013:10; see also Graves-Brown 2000; Holtorf 2012; Lucas 2004; Shanks et al. 2004).

We conclude our paper by arguing that in both communities, the aim is to rethink archaeology as a participatory practice that has the potential to transform the discipline from a method of institutional reproduction into a more radically indigenous set of knowledge practices. Our critical lenses may differ
and our conceptual, practical and ethical responsibilities to the communities with which we work may be differently inflected. However, we feel that placing the work at Stó:lō and at Knowle West in conversation and keeping alive those differences contributes productively to a project for a more porous archaeology that resists reactionary disciplinary policing and supports a more expansive, inclusive approach to telling “otherwise” (Ricoeur 1999:9).

**Community Archaeology: Stó:lō**

Stó:lō (‘People of the River’) are a community of indigenous people interconnected by family ties, shared cultural practices, a common system of beliefs, principles and values, all of which are deeply rooted in collective connection to the land and resources (Carlson 2011; Carlson et al. 2001; McHalsie 2007; Schaepe 2007). The history of this community is founded in the land. The Stó:lō community is currently characterized by dynamic sets of cultural, political, and economic relations both internal and external. A material record of 10,000 years of occupation and use survives in the landscape of Sólh Témexw (Our World; Our Land), the mainland portion of what is commonly referred to by archaeologists as the Gulf of Georgia Region or the lower Fraser River Watershed (Lepofsky et al. 2009; Schaepe 2009).

Archaeological research is a factor of understanding Stó:lō history. The history of archaeology in the Gulf of Georgia Region extends back to the late 1800s, largely motivated by the Jesup North Pacific Expedition the aim of which was to populate the collection of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City (Smith 1897). For over a century, since the 1870s, archaeologists foreign to the Stó:lō impacted the historical and material record and understanding of the region following their own agendas, addressing their own needs, carrying out their work under foreign institutions and mandates. The result of this work, the knowledge created through archaeology, was not that of the indigenous people. It was not Stó:lō knowledge. While about them, it remains apart from the Stó:lō community. While archaeological practice, theory and methodology, has changed dramatically over the past century the relationship between archaeology, the practitioners of archaeology, and the people whose ancestral cultural properties are subject of this study has only much more recently been redefined.

In the mid-1990s the Stó:lō, through the Stó:lō Nation, began to understand and embrace archaeology as potentially useful in addressing their own needs and questions. Indigenous archaeology emerged from the adoption of archaeology as a tool-kit applied for, if not also by, indigenous purposes as a community-based practice (Figure 1). Over the last two decades indigenous community-based archaeology has continually matured to engage and connect indigenous paradigms with archaeological practice. This recombination of practice, principles and paradigm within a community-based framework has transformed the nature and understanding of archaeology as a discipline, expanding the scope of relationships regarding where we do it, how we do it, for whom we do it, and why? (e.g., Atalay 2012); for what purpose we practice archaeology. This community-driven transformation has had a positive impact on both the community and the discipline, as attested to by the feculence of community-based archaeology.
among the Stó:lō, and more widely among indigenous and non-indigenous communities alike throughout North America (Nicholas et al. 2010), Great Britain (Dalglish 2013), and Australia (Roberts and the Mannum Community Association Inc. 2012). This relationship continues to emerge in other parts of the world, including among the Ainu and Japanese (Hirofumi Kato, personal communication 2013).

What can archaeology do to benefit “the community”? In literal engagement of this question, two decades of community-based archaeology at Stó:lō Nation developed into a holistic, integrated and principled practice involving the integration of five disciplines: research, regulation, resource management, curation, and repatriation. In conventional western systems of education and practice, these areas are typically separated between archaeology, anthropology, museology, and cultural resource management. In adopting and applying archaeology, as a toolkit, the Stó:lō steered the development a holistic, integrated, principled practice of archaeology that serves and benefits their community.

Coupling indigenous knowledge with that gained through the application of archaeology as a unique toolkit works toward establishing a relationship that crosses paradigms and has the potential to achieve alternative ways of knowing (Stone T’xwelátse et al. 2012; Figure 2). To most archaeologists, a too-often unrecognized indigenous knowledge underlies and cradles the “archaeological” sites and features of S’ólh Téméxw. Halq’eméylem place-names, such as those associated with some of the settlements studied in the Fraser Valley.
Project (Lepofsky et al. 2009; Schaepe 2009), bring out indigenous knowledge and perspectives accounting for fundamental elements of S’ólh Téméxw describing the relationship between people, geography, and things. From a Stó:lō community-based understanding, sqwelqwel (personal histories) and sxwóxwiyám (a time of the distant past when the world was not quite right; narratives of the distant past, including the transformations of Xexá:ls the Transformers) that ground the archaeological explorations of the Fraser Valley Project within a cultural landscape of indigenous Stó:lō knowledge and interconnected sense of place (McHalsie and Schaepe 2010).

Stó:lō community-based archaeology integrates and “blankets” western-originating practices with Stó:lō principles to help ensure the prevalence of xwelmexwqel (our way). Examples of this relationship are outlined below, with italicized Stó:lō principles providing the classificatory roots to various fields of practice: Take Care of What Belongs to Us—heritage management, regulation (policy/permitting/planning/assessment requirements), curation, repatriation; Know your History—research; and Share and Remember the Future Generations—education, exhibition, interpretation, and tourism. Thus establishing the Stó:lō in the pole position within power relations, archaeology can manifest as a restorative practice that melds with the overt indigenous worldview, principles, and knowledge embedded in the cultural landscape and

Figure 2. Stone T’xwelátse, a Stó:lō ancestor transformed into a living stone form and the central figure of the exhibition Man Turned to Stone: T’xwelátse (pictured above), challenges archaeological understandings and interpretations of objects, relationships between past, present and future, and the depth of meaning connecting people, places and things (Photo: David Campion).
mindscape of S’ólh Téméxw (McHalsie 2007; Schaepe 2007).

Weaving archaeology together with the Halq’eméylem language and principles of inter-connectedness helps mitigate the disintegrating and disruptive forces of archaeology as a foreign practice. An important point of intersection between western discipline and indigenous philosophy is with the Halq’eméylem term tómiyeqw. This word means both great-great-great-great-great grandparent and great-great-great-great-great grandchild. The principle drawn from the word is the active interconnection of time linking ancestors seven generations past and future with those living today. Through tómiyeqw, Stó:lō community-based archaeology establishes a paradigm for interpreting and situating material remains of the past as meaningful elements of today, affecting the future. Derived from the language, this principle challenges western views of linear time and passivity of the past. A Stó:lō view, alternately, understands the existence of intangible knowledge attached by the maker and user of an object in the past as always present and active. History, then, is powerful and influences peoples’ behavior and decision-making today, informing the future. Time is cyclical and connected, not linear and detached.

Local Stó:lō spiritual practices commonly incorporated as integral parts of archaeological protocol since the mid-1990s include the use of témélh and also what are known as “burning” ceremonies. Both cultural practices serve to recognize and demonstrate respect for ancestral connections to place and objects affected by the disturbances of conventional archaeological methods, physical and otherwise. The following descriptions are necessarily brief, given the constraints of this paper. Témélh a red ochre-based substance applied to various parts of the body prior entering and working on a site. Burning ceremonies, led by a Stó:lō spiritual worker and conducted as an opening and more generally concluding element of excavation, serving to feed the associated ancestral community through the offering plates of food burned in an ceremonial fire. All fieldworkers are required to participate in both aspects of these cultural practices as factors of engaging in a holistic form of archaeology. Such practices lay a groundwork that accommodates the conventional toolkit of archaeological methods while providing a context and opening for the intersection with and integration of local knowledge and meaning (Figure 3). Participation in community-based protocols and practices provides an applied education beyond the classroom of conventional instruction.

Community-based archaeology can be practiced as an effective tool kit and means of action supporting and promoting: self-governance, self-determination and self-sufficiency; recognition and respect of cultural heritage; and healing / healthy and sustainable community(ies). The transformation of archaeological practice in community hands, then, has the potential to achieve results more commonly linked with the goals of direct actions, such as protests and demonstrations, or social work. These goals differ from and expand on those commonly defined in more traditionally western archaeological practice, generally aiming to understand past human behavior.

Stan Greene once told me he asked one of his elders—“Where
is our culture and history?” His elder replied—“Our culture and history is all around us. You are just too weak to take it all back all at once. You can only take a little bit back at a time, but each time you take a little bit back it makes you stronger so that you can take more back” [Naxaxalhts’i (Albert ‘Sonny’ McHalsie), personal communication YEAR].

As told by Stó:lō artist Stan Greene, above, reconnecting to the past is a factor of gathering strength in the present. It is in this realm of outcomes that community-based archaeology enhances and supplements conventional archeology, as a conscious objective of practice. Artifacts are treasures of knowledge. They belong to the people who made them. Those people still affect the living. Archaeology is therefore alive and meaningful.

Returning Strength to Community: Insights from a Stó:lō Perspective

Three fundamental elements supporting the development of community-based archaeology then are local knowledge, local meaning, and local practice. At a grass-roots level, these three elements are connective forces. The production of local knowledge derived from direct interaction with the material remains of their past connects people within a continuum of time and place. It links the past with the present. It stimulates deep, collective memory, serving to reinforce identity and societal context.

The production of meaning resulting from community-based archaeology emerges as an outcome complementary
to the outcomes of conventional archaeology, beyond yet not exclusive from the realm of fact or the application of scientific methods. The direct connection between tangible heritage and an ancestral community is personal in nature. Objects experienced in this context have the potential to be more fully recognized for their intangible qualities—resulting in knowledge leading to meaning. Local practice provides a context that provides recognition of local knowledge and meaning as a performative element of archaeology.

Community-based archaeology, particularly as it becomes more deeply embedded in and directly practiced by communities themselves, has the potential to express a fuller range, breadth and depth of archaeology as a social science than does conventional archaeology. With community-based archaeology comes the possibility of increased relevance of the practice. Such relevance, however, relies on a holism that might be threatening to “traditionalist” or “conventionalist” archaeologists and archaeologies. While perhaps challenging to the epistemologies of conventional archaeology it is not inherently threatening to the practice in that such holistic archaeologies maintain accepted standards or inquiry. In effect, community-based archaeological practice moves the borders of the archaeological discipline by revealing the cultural content in archaeological orthodoxy and accepting its indigenous manifestation in the local context.

Embracing this holistic, community-based perspective expands the potential scope of application and field of archaeology in respect of its engagement and relevant to both science and the humanities. Holism in this context links the past, present and future as a factor of creating meaning. It challenges the concept of fact as a static, universal and univocal certainty. It opens the door to a realm of possible, coexistent perspectives, interpretations, voices and agencies. Tangible heritage is the physical structure of intangible properties that are derived as connective rather than divisive forces, in the holistic context of community-based archaeology. To archaeology and archaeologists of a purely western tradition, the individual, personal experiences and multiplicity inherent in community-based archaeology is enriching and yet can be simultaneously challenging or threatening to practitioners locked into the universality of “Newtonian” science and fact.

Community Archaeology: Knowle West
On the other side of the world, situated above the River Malago, a tributary of the Avon that eventually empties into the Severn Estuary to mix with the waters of the Irish Sea, is the 12,000-strong community of Knowle West. It is a suburb in south Bristol, England’s seventh largest city with a population of around 430,000 people (Bristol City Council 2013). In Knowle West, the power of archaeology in the hands of the community is not so very different from what we see at Stó:lō Nation. Archaeological evidence includes the remains of Iron Age, Roman and medieval settlement; it is argued that Bristol and York were the two most significant medieval towns in England (Liddy 2005:12–13; Palliser 2014:259). Archaeological evidence also includes the contemporary built environment of the mid-twentieth century housing estate and the mixed assemblage of its more recent features and artifacts.

The Knowle West estate was designed, planned and built as part of the great British interwar slum clearances. In
the 1930s, families were uprooted from Bristol’s inner city and relocated to the bright, modern houses in the new “garden city” of Knowle West. There they joined a small, rural descent community. A second wave of building and relocation of families happened in the 1960s, in response to the devastation of central Bristol in the Second World War (see, for example Bristol City Council 2009). Knowle West is, therefore, both a recently settled place and a community comprising families with very long histories of labouring in the city and links to, both aspirational and historical, to medieval, Roman and prehistoric West Country populations (Insole and Piccini 2013).

The Knowle West community has been marginalized as a “problem place” since the estate’s expansion in the 1960s (Brent 2009:13). It experiences high levels of deprivation and is ranked within the worst 10 percent in Britain in terms of crime, education, training and skills deprivation and the City of Bristol’s Quality of Life indicators point to a wide range of poor health, education and social outcomes (Bristol City Council 2012). Such metrics tell only one story, of course, as there is also a long history of community activism and action (Community Foundation Network 2007; Lewis 1976). Archaeology as both subject and endeavour features in that activism, as it constitutes active engagement in place-making. Sites at which local archaeological knowledges, meanings, and practices circulate include Knowle West Media Centre which works in partnership with university researchers, Bristol’s Senior Archaeological Officer, Pete Insole, and with technology and industry; the Filwood Chase History Society, which undertakes community archaeology projects in partnership with other societies across the city and with Bristol City Council; and through debates about the future of the Grade II listed fifteenth-century house at Inns Court, which is on English Heritage’s Heritage at Risk register (2008).

Archaeological practice in Knowle West takes many forms. Garden excavations, watching briefs (in the UK, these are formal programmes of archaeological observation and investigation conducted during any planning or development operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons) and local talks currently form the bulk of practice, while the past five years have seen the emergence of community-involved projects that engage with archaeologies of the contemporary landscape of Knowle West. That is, community projects have a keen interest in the archaeology of the twentieth century. While community archaeology in Knowle West may not have engaged with the full range of analytical tools and methods available for archaeological investigation, in the UK more broadly community archaeology projects access a wide range of techniques and equipment through collaborations with universities and, even more importantly, via the structures of local archaeological officers based in county, city and town councils and through the national Council for British Archaeology. Community archaeology groups are encouraged to borrow survey equipment and will be trained to operate it in order to add to the knowledge base, which ultimately supports the UK’s comprehensive planning processes.

Where conventional archaeological survey and excavation methods are widely encouraged and supported, community archaeology projects are also taking up some of the more experimental visual methods that UK academics
have been developing over the past 25 years. Specifically, these community-involved projects are marked by the important role of media practices and have responded to the rapid growth of community media and archaeology projects across the UK. This growth has, arguably, been inspired by early adoption of live web streaming from archaeological excavations conducted by a wide range of public and commercial archaeology projects, including the National Museum Wales (2001), Wessex Archaeology and the British Channel 4 television series *Time Team’s 2003 Big Dig* live experiment, which involved around 1,000 people engaging in garden excavations. Beyond excavation-focused media practice, video’s role in community archaeology and heritage projects is well-established and informed the development in 2001 of the MA in Archaeology for Screen Media at University of Bristol and the early adoption of video within social media contexts for projects such as 2008’s Thames Discovery Project (Thames Discovery Project 2008).

Examples of video production within and across the full range of UK archaeological practices (public sector, developer-funded and academic) highlight the fluidity of archaeology as a discipline within the British context. Where archaeology in the North American academy is part of four-field anthropology, in Britain archaeology may sit within departments of geography, earth sciences, classics, heritage studies, ancient history, history, and, much more rarely, anthropology. As such, a wide range of practices are accepted as archaeological in the UK that would ordinarily be described as anthropological in a Canadian context. Knowle West Media Centre’s “Second Chances: Remixing your City for Good” (2014) is a prime example of urban historical archaeology. The project focused on Bristol’s Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone, which has been framed as a blank canvas by the City, a space without history. The “Second Chances” project aimed to mix the rich industrial heritage of the area with people’s stories in order to engage with both the archaeological record and future potential of the area as a peopled place.

Diverse uses of video also speak to archaeology as a visualizing practice. As Clack and Brittain (2007), Graves-Brown et al. (2013), Moser (2009), Perry (2013), Shanks and Pearson (2001) and Shanks and Tilley (1992), have argued, visualization, whether via photography, drawing, computer modeling or video, constitutes rather than merely supplements archaeological practice. Two recent projects in Knowle West conceptualize and activate video as an emergent archaeological record and as an important mode through which archaeological knowledges are assembled and enacted. Conventional media approaches that adopt an expository mode enact archaeology’s epistemological significance as a rigorous and sober process of knowing the world, in keeping with the conventions of documentary television. At the same time the material relations of video’s production, postproduction, circulation and exhibition all invite an archaeological attention. That is, as much as media practices aim to convey an archaeological narrative, these practices themselves enter into the archaeological record through their material relations and residues (Piccini 2014). It is to these projects that we now turn.

*University of Local Knowledge*

Local knowledges such as hunting rabbits with dogs, inter-generational caring,
music production, boxing, caring for horses and hunting and preparing wild fowl are traditionally practiced across the historic landscape of Knowle West and have become the focus for the University of Local Knowledge (ULK) project. ULK is a long-term, collaborative project based out of Knowle West Media Centre and consists of different phases, funded through a range of sources (arts council, arts research, engineering research, individual commitment), involving multiple partners and resulting in a range of outputs, from communal meals to seminars to installations and websites. It operates within and across different institutional economies, with co-investigators from multiple disciplines, working within and outside of academia, and involves activities ranging from participatory artwork to a computer science research project.

In line with recent scholarship of archaeologies of the contemporary world (Graves-Brown et al. 2013), our interest lay in an archaeological assembling of the disparate practices across the project phases in addition to identifying more conventionally defined archaeological elements. If “archaeology is what archaeologists do” (Clarke 1973), which through processes of measurement and analysis produces distinct categories of “human”, “landscape” and “material culture”, then working with the community through archaeological practices to co-produce understandings of the past through the material remains of digitized video opens out the disciplinary field, such that archaeology emerges from entangled emergent practices rather being located within the discrete bodies of people institutionalized as archaeologists. That is, archaeology is always a provisional way of knowing produced by people as they work through ideas about, and practices of, their and others’ pasts.

In 2009, KWMC began collaborating with US social practice artist Suzanne Lacy, University of Bristol, BBC, Arnolfini Gallery and the University of the West of England to develop a large-scale participatory artwork involving the expert knowledges held and shared in the community. ULK emerged out of KWMC directors’ Penny Evans and Carolyn Hassan, commitment to facilitating and celebrating existing local skills, ways of knowing, and cultural traditions as a driver of socio-economic transformation. Suzanne Lacy—perhaps best known for The Crystal Quilt (1987) and, in a Canadian context, for The Turning Point/Under Construction (1997–1998)—works through large-scale, durational participation (Irish 2010). She responded to Evans’ and Hassan’s invitation to make work in Knowle West with a plan to create 1,000 videos, or “pieces of knowledge” that would feature local expertise.

Lacy’s process adopts community-development methods of long-term relationship-building and looks in many ways like the practices that archaeologists use as they work towards involving communities in projects. Out of focus group meetings emerged a complex network of local experts and knowledges pertaining to archaeological heritage and to a wide range of other topics, including design and visual arts, business, social policy, engineering, food and nutrition, health and social care, communication, sports, veterinary science and education. These became the focus for expert video interviews that aimed to manifest and enact this local knowledge as embedded in the everyday life of the community and as fundamentally participatory.

Intersecting with KWMC’s and Lacy’s artwork was a collaborative research project between University of Bristol and KWMC, with the aim of developing digi-
tal technologies and techniques to scale up and study the community skills and practices circulating through the videos. KWMC deliberately designed their video interviews to correspond formally to traditional broadcast documentary. “Talking head” expert interviews monumentalize local knowledge and ascribe value via established media aesthetics. In short, by adopting a broadcast documentary aesthetic, those videos concerning heritage and archaeology sit alongside recognizable televisual archaeologies. The research project aimed to question this documentary convention by working with the community to design an emergent networked structure (www.ulk.org.uk) that would allow users to edit, augment and use the video within a community-designed teaching and learning context. Rather than the website “delivering” information about archaeology and heritage, the project aimed to co-produce a flexible tool that the community could own and use to design multiple curricula and curate locally specific programmes of study to confront asymmetries of knowledge and authority in order to expand notions of “legitimate” knowledge (Figure 4). In short, the project aimed to break with a realist approach to the cinematic image as an straightforward impression of reality (Bazin 1967) in order to animate the provisionality and performativity of video as it produces archaeological knowledge and to create a space in which members of the community could work together to craft new spaces in which to contest hierarchies of institutional ways of knowing. By deliberately adopting the university metaphor to provoke debate about institutionalized knowledge and power, the website invites people to disrupt the

Figure 4. The history of Eagle House Youth Centre is framed by mix of interviews and archival footage showing demolition of the seventeenth-century remains of Hengrove House (www.ulk.org.uk).
university structure and to generate new “courses” that value experiential forms of learning.

**Know Your Bristol**

Know Your Bristol, another project based in Knowle West, enacts a different kind of archaeology. It is based on the Know Your Place web-based planning tool (Bristol City Council 2011), launched in March 2011 by the City of Bristol and which presents place-based data via a browser-based tool. The web service is a GIS-based resource that layers historic maps of Bristol and modern Ordnance Survey Mastermap digital mapping as a planning tool for developers and planners during the pre-planning application processes. Historic maps include nineteenth-century plans by George Ashmead, nineteenth-century parish tithe maps and 1881–3 and 1902–3 Ordnance Survey maps. Added to this are images from Bristol City’s Museums and Archives, including images from the Braikenridge Collection, which show the city and its buildings in the 1820s. The web service is further augmented by data from the Bristol Historic Environment Record (HER). Know Your Place also enables users to contribute written commentary, photographs and a range of digital files to a unique “community layer” (Figure 5). Personal and informal archival materials are thus incorporated into a formal planning process and, at a statutory level, inform decisions taken by the City, community and developers.

*Know Your Bristol (2012)* and *Know Your Bristol on the Move (2013–2015)* are Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK)-funded Connected Communities projects in which University of Bristol and local communities work together to digitize and make accessible more personal archive material via the Know Your Place website. The Know Your Bristol (Bickers et al. 2012; Insole and Piccini 2013) workshops visited seven different parts of the city where attendees contributed oral histories (which were added as audio files to the community layer) and were able to have their family photographs scanned and objects digitally photographed and, where appropriate, added to Know Your Place. Ownership of digitized images and film remains with individuals, with permissions and release agreements for the deposit of materials in the Bristol Record Office the responsibility of Bristol City Council. One strand of the project sought specifically to explore the potential for people’s home movies and videos to enter into the HER, and this centred on a day workshop in Knowle West.

**Figure 5.** Left: Screen shot of Know Your Place, showing “Spyglass” tool overlaying historical mapping information on top of contemporary data. Right: Community layer contribution form (Reproduced with permission from Bristol City Council).
West, involving the Filwood Chase Historical Society, Brislington Community Archaeology Project and the archaeology subgroup of Greater Bedminster Neighbourhood Partnership. As an emerging feature of the archaeological record, people’s family photographs, home movies and oral histories complicate formal histories and can become important elements of the archaeological understandings of place-making and lifeworlds through time.

The two Know Your Bristol projects work with members of the Knowle West community to explore how moving image archives enact multiple historical and archaeological narratives and provide new information about specific everyday spatial and material practices. Scholarship on family photographs and home movies has tended to focus on the home mode as documenting the everyday, as materializing the impact of camera technologies on domestic life, as expressing cultural norms, and as documents of the ongoing social reproduction of ideology (Chalfen 1987; Hirsch 1981; Zimmerman 1995). The constructed image has been understood as recording kinship, material culture and aesthetic preference and this has been seen to be essential to the home movie mode rather than technologically contingent (Chalfen 1987; Moran 2002:35). That is, home movies, as such, have been understood as signifying underlying socio-cultural norms and their photographic representation is argued to directly index how the subjects featured in these films see themselves. In other words, home movie images are seen, ultimately, to be constrained by historically specific ideologies that determine what can be represented and shown.

Yet, the archaeologist knows that film, video and photography cannot be treated as “innocent” artifacts that give access to either the pro-filmic space seen within the frame of the image or to an off-screen space. In other words, these materials have much more complex, multiple dynamics that cannot be summed up with reference to representation and social structure. Rather, from an archaeological point of view, the phenomenon of domestic image-making mixes cameras, places, people, memories, boxes of old reels, dust, families and so on—a rich archaeological assemblage. Certainly, home mode media are central players in how we come to differentiate the social and the material, the holiday and the everyday, the family and the landscape. What should not be lost sight of, however, is the materiality of these formations. How we make sense of those materializing relationships is complex and benefits from an archaeological attention to scale and to the uniqueness of event.

Some fifty people attended the Knowle West workshop in June 2012. We set up a Super 8 projector, slide projector, VHS players and monitors and digital projection from laptops. One computer was used to play video, the other for participants to use and contribute to the Know your Place website. Display boards were set up for people’s photographs and we used a light box for slides and for any film stock that came in that we could not project. Elder Ken Jones brought his unique collection of Standard 8 films and 35 mm colour slides and others brought DVDs of local heritage projects. The local archaeology groups set up displays of material, maps and photographs. Two of the project research assistants audio-recorded conversations with participants about the changing built environment of Knowle West, which were added to the Know
Your Place website. Locating family archives in a publicly accessible setting and linking the local archaeology groups with the University enabled conversations to begin about the role of personal artifacts in history-making. Moreover, the presence of photographs, slides and film stimulated conversations about change and the fluidity of neighbourhood and community. Camera-based images invite engagement precisely because of their “reality effect” (Bazin 1967) and then provide a starting point to discussions about orientations to place and the emerging role of these materials as archaeological evidence for settlement and landscape characterization. Echoing the work at Stó:lō Nation, the specific claims to archaeological practice made through community-involved events invite consideration of the legitimacy of those practices alongside academic knowledge production. When oriented to and produced by descent communities, such archaeologies speak in proximity to the indigenous archaeologies at Stó:lō Nation and present important ethical and epistemological challenges to academic desires to police disciplinary boundaries. Work with photographic images and with the City Archaeologist propels new understandings of the ways in which archaeology is not solely the ruined materials in the ground that have outlived their usefulness; instead, any engagement with ideas of “pastness” relies on the contemporaneity of materials, their stubborn persistence in the present and their projection into the future through the gesture of archaeological inquiry. Beyond disciplinary boundaries, however, are key questions about responding to community interpretations when they may be at odds with archaeological understanding of the evidence. How might archaeologists and communities collectively and reflexively critique new standpoints and interpretations of the past that potentially create their own biases? Where openness matters, of course, so too do boundaries. Yet, as scientists such as Karen Barad have outlined, objectivity is both performed and real. It is not the product of science; rather science emerges out of ongoing material-discursive intra-actions. Knowledge is not fixed somewhere in the ground, awaiting discovery. It is made, but made in ways that are limited by the repetitions of experiment, observation and behaviour. This is as true for archaeologists as it is for communities.

In both Stó:lō and Knowle West, some of the most urgent and exciting questions that archaeology raises come together through community projects. In both communities, archaeology operates as a present day mobilization of history. However, further questions remain
as to the proper role of archaeology in these projects. Might these community-involved archaeologies reproduce the same monolithic approach to representation that they purportedly critique? That is, do we replace one limited archaeology with another due to undoubted exclusions, silences and lacu-
nae? Who participates in these participatory practices and who does not and how can archaeology interven in and even mitigate such exclusions? Conversely, what are the potential risks to these communities in making cultural heritage accessible, especially when the terms of that access come to be framed through research partnerships with academic institutions and local government?

In the cases of Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West we worked with communities to find ways to acknowledge and better value informal and tacit knowl-
edges and to find ways to support communities to control and circulate their own intellectual property in the form of heritage. A significant aspect of this work involves accounting for the pervasiveness of archaeology in everyday life, a perva-
siveness that may stretch conventional, academic definitions of archaeology. Disciplinary boundaries work to enact disciplines rather than existing sepa-
rately as a signifier of the innate special character of academic practices (Bal 2002; Becher 1989). It seems clear from the work in which we have taken part that community-involved, participatory archaeologies demand an intellectual, ethical and practical rigour that gener-
ates knowledges that are relevant to and urgent for all involved. These archae-
ologies remain contingent and are problematically emancipatory. However, their participatory focus means that criti-
tique itself is located with descent com-
unities. In keeping with the themes that Lyons and Marshall discuss in their paper in this volume, there is real potential for participating communities to generate locally specific critical-theo-
retical approaches to archaeology, which can only enrich the field (and see Lyons 2013). The challenge remains to find ways to translate that academic value into systems that contribute meaningfully to those descent communities. That is, the challenge is to find ways to ensure that community-involved archaeologies contribute substantively to the produc-
tion of new knowledges and new ways of doing archaeology within the academy and to ensure that there are effective mechanisms in place that allow those newer academic practices to contribute to communities. This can only be a dia-
logic and iterative process, a process that potentially occupies the contested spaces of the academy and responds to ongoing debates about power in contemporary society and institutionalized and institu-
tionalizing boundaries of knowledge production. Fundamentally, community-
involved archaeologies question the authorities of academic, commercial and public sector archaeological practices and enter in to emerging discourses of coproduction across disciplines (see, for example Beebeejaun et al. 2014; Brig-

Did we, as archaeologists and the authors of this article, succeed in our community-based archaeological efforts? How did we contribute to the communities with which we work? Moreover, how might benefit be identified and measured? In the case of Stó:lō Nation, answers to these questions are contin-
gent upon the quotient of community connectivity and a correlating disintegra-
tion of certainty in the rootedness of this work in conventional western archaeo-
logical identity, paradigm and practice. In Knowle West, an approach focused on the archaeology of the contemporary world has the potential to activate archaeology as an everyday and accessible practice that contributes to more collective understandings of the everyday. However, one of the key struggles in any community-involved practice is the set of assumptions about archaeological practice that people themselves bring to the project. If archaeology is understood as a safe and cosy heritage—of “us” and not “them”—then a community-involved archaeology can slip all too easily into the politically reactionary. In the University of Local Knowledge project, the key artist and partners had pre-existing senses of archaeology as precisely this kind of practice. For them, archaeology became a way for older people in the community to generate and circulate knowledge about the place in which they live. The kinds of politically engaged and critical practices that academics associate with archaeology are, outside of the academy, associated with architecture, urban planning or geography. Archaeology clearly continues to have a significant project ahead to unpick its popular associations in order to bring its critical voice into the public sphere to enact contingencies and challenge power structures (see Martindale and Nicholas, this volume).

We suggest that it is as much in method as it is in the “fact” of community involvement that we may locate the benefits of archaeological practices. In Know Your Bristol and Know Your Bristol on the Move, critical participatory mapping, digitization of home mode media and connecting oral testimony with material culture and the archaeological record potentially enables communities to look at specific material relations that evidence the changing uses and transformations of the built environment. As family photographs and home movies both show archaeological landscapes and are part of the archaeological record, this doubled identity can be used to open out the multivocality of material culture. Moreover, the narratives and aesthetics of these media are shaped by habit and by the manuals and magazines that instruct the image-maker on appropriate subject matter and framing (Zimmerman 1995) while the films are shaped by their technologies of production and exhibition. For example, a 3-minute roll of Super 8 film situates the filmmaker differently than does an hour of videotape or the endless record-delete-store-download of born digital images (see Orgeron and Orgeron 2007). Participatory research with communities can help to identify the gaps between performed memory and the practices within the photographic frame and on screen, which contributes to an archaeological understanding of the built environment as emergent.

Ultimately, there is an important force in simply articulating what we do as archaeology. “Today we are all archaeologists” (Holtorf, 2005:160). Yet, how do we inhabit that disposition without further colonizing indigenous ways of knowing? How can Holtorf’s assertion be a positive performative utterance that creates space for radical indigenous knowledge production and not simply western institutional reproduction? Is it possible to create meaningfully different archaeologies through working with such “tools of the master” as participatory mapping (Bryan 2011)? As geographer Doreen Massey (2005) suggests, place-making is a material entanglement, a “thrown-togetherness”, of people and the mate-
rial environment. Community-involved archaeologies aim to attend to this, to contribute to manifesting the agency that communities always-already have—to make it sensible and visible to the wider public, policy-makers, corporate interests. It is an effort to acknowledge the messiness of culture and its pasts to both explore the archaeological subject and expand its disciplinary boundaries. But there are consequences to this. We know that neither our disciplines nor the presentational practices that perform them are transparent. We treat visualization as “mere” illustration at our peril. These are often the traces that remain of our community-involvement and those circulating artifacts are unpredictable and can be dangerous. Visibility is never neutral. The ongoing challenge is to work with communities in such a way as to call attention to situatedness, to try to align this work as archaeological praxis. Archaeology and heritage remain colonizing practices; academic, CRM and developer-funded archaeology have been and remain global industries. Paying attention to the forms that these take through a reflexive criticality within community-oriented projects is not a panacea but it may be one of the few ethical positions we can take in our implicated gestures of working with, on, for, alongside the labour of communities. Boundaries collide as part of the messiness of multi-federated frameworks of archaeological practice and theory (Martindale and Nicholas, this volume). Community-founded practice is an emerging cause of intra-disciplinary collision. The spaces within collision zones challenge us to open and expand our epistemological silos to absorb those impacts; or alternately to react in rejection of those challenges and the entrenchment of conventional, ethnocentric, empirical standards, practices and boundaries. Professional standards and rigour, as a bounding mechanism, is likewise experienced, understood and maintained from within as a critical element of a participatory practice or judged, conventionally, from beyond and voiced from within an isolated silo. Our work at Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West, by virtue of insisting that practices not normally embraced as archaeological are situated as such, call attention to the contingency of all knowledge making and, we hope, warmly invites the broader archaeological community to become more involved in the collective process of world-making that community-involved archaeologies offer.
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