

This is an electronic version of an article published as: La Salle, M. & Hutchings, R. (2016). What makes us squirm – a critical assessment of community-oriented archaeology. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, 40(1), 164-180.

Canadian Journal of Archaeology is the journal of the Canadian Archaeological Association. More information can be found at: <http://www.canadianarchaeology.com/caa/publications>.

What Makes Us Squirm—A Critical Assessment of Community-Oriented Archaeology

Marina La Salle[†] and Rich Hutchings^{†‡}

ABSTRACT. We provide a critical response to Andrew Martindale and Natasha Lyons' 2014 special section on Community-Oriented Archaeology (*Canadian Journal of Archaeology* Volume 38, Issue 2), discussing the authors' definitions, interpretations, and motivations around archaeology and community. By not defining archaeology in terms of how it is most commonly practiced, we argue the collective work misses the mark, with serious consequences for descendent communities. We show how Community-Oriented Archaeology appropriates the challenge posed to archaeologists to make their discipline relevant and responsive to Indigenous communities; instead, the authors foreground archaeology itself and reaffirm the privilege of non-Indigenous archaeologists, especially academic archaeologists. By considering what is excluded and taken-for-granted, we examine the special section in terms of selection bias and revisionist history. We suggest Community-Oriented Archaeology co-opts aspects of Indigenous, critical, and radical discourses to legitimize the institution and practice, in the process forgetting what is at stake for Indigenous peoples. Rather than focusing on the needs of archaeology and archaeologists, we emphasize the interests of Indigenous communities and address uncomfortable truths about institutional racism and systemic inequality. As the editors had hoped, Community-Oriented Archaeology makes us "squirm," but not for the reasons they intended.

RÉSUMÉ. Nous offrons une réponse critique à Andrew Martindale et Natasha Lyons sur leur section spéciale de 2014 concernant

l'archéologie axée sur la communauté (*Journal canadien d'archéologie* volume 38, numéro 2) en évaluant les définitions, interprétations et motivations des auteurs à propos de l'archéologie et la notion de communauté. En évitant de définir l'archéologie par la façon dont elle est la plus souvent pratiquée, nous soutenons que le travail collectif manque la cible, non sans conséquences pour les communautés descendantes autochtones. Nous démontrons comment l'archéologie axée sur la communauté s'approprie le défi lancé aux archéologues de rendre leur discipline pertinente et sensible aux communautés autochtones; à la place, les auteurs mettent à l'avant-plan l'archéologie elle-même et réaffirme le privilège des archéologues non-autochtones, particulièrement des archéologues académiques. En considérant ce qui est exclus et pris pour acquis, nous examinons cette section spéciale sous les plans du biais en sélection et d'histoire révisionniste. Nous suggérons que l'archéologie axée sur la communauté combine des éléments de discours autochtones, critiques et radicaux pour légitimer l'institution et sa pratique, en oubliant dans le processus ce qui est en jeu pour les peuples autochtones. Plutôt que de se concentrer sur les besoins de l'archéologie et des archéologues, nous mettons l'emphase sur les communautés autochtones et adressons les inconfortables vérités sur le racisme institutionnel et l'inégalité systémique. Comme les éditeurs l'avaient espéré,

[†] Department of Anthropology
Vancouver Island University, 900 Fifth Street,
Nanaimo, B.C. V9R 5S5 [marina.lasalle@viu.ca]

[‡] [richard.hutchings@viu.ca]

l'archéologie axée sur la communauté nous met dans l'embarras, mais pas pour les raisons dont ils en avaient l'intention.

NORTH AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGISTS have been discussing the problem of ethics, experts, and the public for almost a century, “informally since Boas’s letter to the editor in 1919, and formally since 1949, when the first code of ethics was introduced by the [Society for Applied Anthropology]” (Fluehr-Lobban 2003:242). Archaeologists have been much slower to the gate, with ethics discourse coalescing in the early 1990s around passage in the United States of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, with interest peaking later that decade with the Society for American Archaeology’s new “principles of archaeological ethics” (Swidler et al. 1997). While ethics had largely fallen out of fashion by the end of the twentieth century, it is currently experiencing a revival in the form of collaborative and activist archaeologies (e.g., Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Stottman 2010, respectively).

With the publication in 2014 of their special section Community-Oriented Archaeology in the *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* (Volume 38, Issue 2, pp. 424–591), editors Andrew Martindale and Natasha Lyons, along with their fellow contributors, join the movement that is engaged archaeology (Atalay et al. 2014:12). Martindale and Lyons introduce Community-Oriented Archaeology by observing how archaeology favours the dominant cultural community¹ and is rife with privilege and ethnocentrism (2014:425). They use the term community-orientation to represent an “umbrella of alternative archaeologies that are challenging disciplinary orthodoxy” (2014:427).

The living community is marginalized in archaeology today, so we thank the authors for broaching this timely subject. Drawing from papers presented at the 2013 Canadian Archaeological Association’s Annual Meeting (CAA 2013:11–13),² the special section includes seven articles (Table 1) relating archaeologists’ experiences engaging with community, conceptually and practically.

Martindale and Lyons (2014:430) state the specific aim of this collective work is to “look inward” and “ask questions that make us squirm.” While we share much in common with many of the authors in Community-Oriented Archaeology, and our review of these works has, indeed, made us squirm, it is likely not for the reasons intended.

There is now a rapidly growing body of writing espousing the benefits of community-engaged practice (e.g., Atalay et al. 2014; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Smith and Wobst 2005). Yet, there remains little in the way of critical evaluation. Our response offered here is therefore explicitly critical, as we feel celebration is premature in the absence of ruthless criticism unafraid of its own conclusions or conflict with the powers that be (Marx 1978[1844]:13).

We discuss how archaeology is defined by the authors and assess their collective vision of community. We then examine the context from which these articles derive, discussing what the authors perceive as the goals of community archaeology. We conclude by considering what is at stake and provide our prediction for the outcome of this practice.

Defining “Archaeology”

Few of the authors in this collection directly address their vision of what archaeology is. As we discuss elsewhere

TABLE 1. Community-Oriented Archaeology (2014).

| | |
|---|---|
| Andrew Martindale and Natasha Lyons | Introduction: “Community-Oriented Archaeology” |
| Andrew Martindale and George P. Nicholas | Archaeology as Federated Knowledge |
| Angela Piccini and David M. Schaepe | The Messy Business of Archaeology as Participatory Local Knowledge: A Conversation Between the Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West |
| Natasha Lyons and Yvonne Marshall | Memory, Practice, Telling Community |
| Bill Angelbeck and Colin Grier | From Paradigms to Practices: Pursuing Horizontal and Long-Term Relationships with Indigenous Peoples for Archaeological Heritage Management |
| Sean P. Connaughton, Mike Leon, and James Herbert | Collaboration, Partnerships, and Relationships within a Corporate World |
| Kisha Supernant and Gary Warrick | Challenges to Critical Community-Based Archaeological Practice in Canada |

(La Salle and Hutchings 2015), we see this as a significant problem if the goal is to affect archaeology’s transformation (Martindale and Lyons 2014:426).

To discern a definition indirectly, we note that, simply by virtue of being published in the *Canadian Journal of Archaeology*, archaeology is a specialized, exclusive, and professional practice—it is a world (or silo) populated and defined by experts (Moghaddam 1997; Nicholas and Hollowell 2007; Smith 2004; West 1995). Indeed, the case studies offered in most of the seven articles that comprise Community-Oriented Archaeology detail academic projects (Piccini, Supernant, Warrick, Lyons, Marshall, Grier) and most citations are to academic literature. Jargon-laden and at times scientific language employed by some authors (particularly Martindale and Nicholas 2014) may reasonably be considered inaccessible to non-academics, and even to many academics. We therefore conclude Community-Oriented Archaeology is

defining archaeology as academic, a narrow and outdated view that ignores cultural resource management (CRM).

The clearest attempt to define archaeology is by Angela Piccini and David Schaepe (2014:467, citing Clarke 1973:6) who state “archaeology is what archaeologists do.” This is significant in light of our study of archaeological practice in British Columbia, which found 97 percent of permits granted went towards commercial archaeology and only three percent to academic research (La Salle and Hutchings 2012). If archaeology is what archaeologists do, then archaeology *is* CRM.

Acknowledging the figures above, Sean Connaughton et al. (2014:545) suggest

archaeologists working for companies have the best chance to bring about a more collaborative approach to the practice of archaeology as they are the ones in a position of privilege and power.

However, such words as “limits,” “restrictions,” and “constraints” appear throughout their paper, reinforcing their position that “the supervisory structure, permit requirements, money, and time constraints, all hinder” attempts at transformation (2014:556). In the only other paper to discuss cultural resource management, Bill Angelbeck (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:525) discusses CRM *in service of a First Nation* as an example of successful community archaeology, however this is an exception he acknowledges does not accurately reflect the wider practice (2014:521).

Ultimately, the absence of a definition enables authors to generalize about archaeology in a social, political, economic, and historical vacuum. In this light, one could conclude the aim of community archaeology is to “understand history” (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:434) rather than the present, a short-sighted and potentially dangerous approach that ignores the politics of heritage construction (Graham et al. 2000; Smith 2004; West 1995; see also Berkes et al. 2007; Orwell 1949). We return to this vital issue below.

Defining “Community”

Elizabeth Crooke (2010:16) describes how community is a

multi-layered and politically charged concept that, with a change in context, alters in meaning and consequence. According to the situation, different priorities will come to the fore and the purpose of community-heritage engagement will differ.

This dynamic, whereby the definition of community determines priorities

and purpose, is clearly discernible in Community-Oriented Archaeology.

Martindale and Lyons note their special section is directed “towards the community that is archaeology” in order to engage with self-critique (2014:427). We find it ironic and troubling that the spirit of community archaeology—to orient archaeology towards affected descendant communities—has been appropriated such that archaeologists are the descendants and archaeology the community affected. The impact of this focus is seen throughout the collection of articles, where authors repeatedly ask not what archaeologists can do for communities, but how communities “can help improve archaeological practice” (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:519) and “help us interpret artifacts and features at archaeological sites” (2014:535), a project that “benefits archaeology” (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:456), “enrich[es] the field” (Piccini and Schaepe 2014:485), in the process making archaeology more “sophisticated” (Martindale and Lyons 2014:426) while “advancing knowledge” about the past and archaeology itself (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:435)—all “in order, ultimately, to practice archaeology better” (Piccini and Schaepe 2014:467).

This appropriation of a community-orientation to instead “look inward” at archaeology is intentional, as the editors state (Martindale and Lyons 2014:430). The question is, why? While it can be argued that doing archaeology in pursuit of “self-consciousness and thought about thought” (Clarke 1973:85) is part of critical reflexivity, to end there, with how a community-orientation affects archaeology, is to miss the point entirely. All authors describe their experiences doing archaeology with/in communities, but few describe how their project affected people in the communities

where they worked (Supernant and Warrick 2014 are a notable exception here). The question is, could the authors have written about this instead? As this would likely have necessitated the inclusion of those with whom they collaborated, would such co-authorship and collaboration-in-publication have posed a problem? Would the product (the special section) have had a different focus? A different message? Would it even have made it into publication?

Instead, Community-Oriented Archaeology brings archaeology and archaeologists back to the centre. This is a familiar problem in race discourse where, because the conversation is dominated by ethnically and economically privileged groups, “the path of least resistance is to focus attention on them[selves]—who they are, what they do and say, and how they do it” (Johnson 2006:100). Re-centring archaeology and archaeologists represents no break with past practices; indeed, it is the most common response when privilege is questioned. Yet this is a step backwards if the goal is to “move non-Indigenous archaeologists from a safe space of unassailable privilege” (Martindale and Lyons 2014:427).

We are dismayed that frank discussions of racism do not appear in Community-Oriented Archaeology, especially given its Canadian context (Alfred 2009; Gordon 2006; Mascarenhas 2012; Woolford et al. 2014). Redressing inequality and power are central motivations for community archaeology, as discussed below, and the dynamic of non-Indigenous archaeologists studying Indigenous heritage, prevalent in colonized contexts such as Canada, is acknowledged throughout the articles. Yet, the authors quickly move past such matters to discuss solutions (Angelbeck

and Grier 2014; Connaughton et al. 2014; Lyons and Marshall 2014), even reframing the dynamic as not about race but about “philosophical concurrence” (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:440). This redefinition by Andrew Martindale and George Nicholas makes community archaeology an intellectual project rather than a moral or political one. Here, the realities of systemic inequality are sidestepped to promote a “mosaic” approach (2014:450) based on equality. The authors justify continued access to Indigenous history by non-Indigenous archaeologists on *philosophical* rather than cultural grounds (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:444–445). In this way, the future of archaeology is secured.

Redirecting the conversation away from descendant communities and back onto archaeology avoids the discomfort associated with directly confronting inequality, particularly around entitlement, white privilege, and institutional racism. Indeed, despite suggesting self-critique as a goal, the editors go on to state that Community-Oriented Archaeology presents “not so much a critique of orthodoxy but rather a mapping of its capacity by defining its current boundaries” (Martindale and Lyons 2014:428). Rather than transformative, such an approach runs the very real risk of being hegemonic (Byrne 2005). These issues loom large in archaeology, community-oriented or not, and avoidance guarantees status quo.

Selection Bias and Revisionist History

Andrew Martindale and Natasha Lyons note most of the papers that make up Community-Oriented Archaeology emerged from their session at the 2013 meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA). They do not, however, discuss the other papers from that

session *not* invited for inclusion in their special section. The rationale provided for their selection was their specific focus on what happens to archaeology when non-Indigenous archaeologists work with descendent communities (Martindale and Lyons 2014:427). Arguably, all 18 papers presented at the 2013 conference addressed this issue. Thus, we ask what other reasons may exist for the editors' choices.

One possibility is that some of the papers presented dissonant views (Kahan et al. 2011). In his presentation in the session (published elsewhere as Martindale 2014), Martindale argued "archaeological knowledge is increasingly invoked in legal battles defining Aboriginal Rights, including Title Rights" (Martindale and Lyons 2014:431). However, Kristina Hannis, presenting on behalf of the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, argued exactly the opposite, suggesting "archaeological evidence currently contributes minimally to the resolution of specific claims," a result of archaeology's limited ability to establish spatial, temporal, and *cultural* continuity of use and occupation (Hannis, personal communication 2015). In her experience, it is ethnographic, not archaeological, data that are of the most use. We suggest the insistence that archaeology is important for Indigenous legal cases is an attempt to validate archaeology as not just socially relevant (Wurst and Mrozowski 2014:210) but also ethical and, indeed, in the interests of Indigenous peoples. While a common refrain in British Columbia archaeology today, we have seen little evidence to support such a claim.

Similarly, in her paper presented at the 2013 session, Marina La Salle framed collaborative archaeology as co-optation,

offered disingenuously by archaeologists as "something different than before, as a solution to Indigenous demands. It placates the protesters, meanwhile the project continues" (La Salle 2014). Her paper addressed institutional inequality, ethics and decolonization, racism, capitalism, and colonialism; indeed, most of the critiques discussed in our response here draw on points she raised in her CAA presentation. However, her critiques are not mentioned in *Community-Oriented Archaeology*.

One feature shared by special section authors who had participated in the CAA session is their credentials: all authors hold a Doctoral degree and all but one also hold a regular faculty position at an academic institution. Conversely, nearly all session participants not invited to publish lack this Ph.D. credential and are not professors. This reaffirms the academic orientation of *Community-Oriented Archaeology*, which represents the views and experiences of an elite and exclusive few.

We also question Martindale and Lyons' decision to invite only one of the seven Indigenous presenters in the session to publish their work in this collection. We suspect this is because these Indigenous presenters shared a focus on communities over archaeology—precisely the opposite of what Martindale and Lyons chose to emphasize.

Indeed, Martindale and Lyons (2014:428) acknowledge the "lack of representation of Indigenous voices" in their special section. We agree—but go further to also note a lack of Indigenous voices in most of the papers' citations. This, despite Martindale and Lyons' assertion that Indigenous perspectives have continually been voiced and authors in this collection are "listening" (2014:431). In our analysis, at least 85

percent of citations in Community-Oriented Archaeology are by non-Indigenous authors; Indigenous authors included are nearly all from the global north and the same few archaeologists (e.g., Atalay, Watkins) are repeatedly cited. We suggest this is because either (1) there are few Indigenous archaeologists who are publishing in academic venues, (2) there is a perception that there are few Indigenous archaeologists publishing in academic venues and so researchers do not actively seek out their works, and/or (3) archaeologists tend not to cite outside of their discipline (i.e., archaeology's silo) and so do not cite Indigenous authors who are not archaeologists. We wonder whether the authors of Community-Oriented Archaeology could have made strides towards rectifying this inequality had they elected to co-publish with their collaborating communities.

The papers chosen for publication share a generally-positive view of archaeology—that is, they are “for” it. Few authors really challenge the premise that archaeology is inherently “good” (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a, 2015b), and citations chosen reflect this, with serious critiques left unexamined (e.g., Alfred 2009; Deloria 1969, 1995; Forbes 2008; King 2009; Smith 2004). Most authors relied on British Columbia examples (e.g., Lyons cited in Supernant and Warrick; Angelbeck cited in Angelbeck and Grier and in Connaughton et al., etc.) to show how community archaeology is successful; yet other local examples critiquing the practice (e.g., Merchant 2010; West 1995) were not included. Using local examples to characterize community archaeology writ large illustrates a selection bias where archaeology's positive outcomes are celebrated and uncomfortable critiques downplayed or

forgotten entirely. Thus, the interest is to “move the industry forward” rather than “engage in this dialogue” (Connaughton et al. 2014:545).

Collectively, these observations demonstrate how the articles in Community-Oriented Archaeology have been written by archaeologists, for archaeologists, about archaeology. This is a significant deviation from the vision of Indigenous archaeology commonly espoused as by, with, and for Indigenous peoples (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Yellownhorn 2002).

“Lofty Goals”

Several authors describe how Community-Oriented Archaeology is a product of the discipline's colonial history, framing it as a “moral motivation” (Martindale and Nicholas 2014:436) and a “commitment to social justice issues” (Piccini and Schaepe 2014:496). This dedication to “lofty goals” (Connaughton et al. 2014:545) is both laudable and problematic.

A community-orientation is construed as a means to pursue equality and/or equity between archaeologists and descendent communities (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:522; Connaughton et al. 2014:551, 556; Martindale and Nicholas 2014:436; Supernant and Warrick 2014:566). Some authors acknowledge “structural asymmetries of funding and law” available to archaeologists and communities (Martindale and Lyons 2014:429; Piccini and Schaepe 2014:470), while others feel equality is achievable “[d]espite the overarching hierarchies and institutionalized inequalities of modern nation states” (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:520). Equality and/or equity within a social and economic system predicated on inequality and exploitation is a concept we personally find elusive.

Regardless, we suggest the goal of equality between archaeologists and Indigenous communities is insufficient and even insulting in light of the objectives of self-determination, self-governance, and sovereignty espoused by the Assembly of First Nations (2003) and the United Nations (2008). Equality here means a nation-to-nation relationship between First Nations and Canada, not between First Nations and archaeologists. After all, being an archaeologist is just a job. Being Indigenous is not. Should Indigenous people really be considered as merely equal to archaeologists when it comes to their heritage?

This ideology of democracy promotes equality in lieu of justice; indeed, few authors in Community-Oriented Archaeology explicitly advocate for absolute community control over their heritage, despite this control being recognized as integral to the cultural survival of Indigenous peoples (United Nations 2008). We do not find this surprising, given the community to which this collection is oriented and how “our understanding of history is mediated by the orientation to our own community” (Martindale and Lyons 2014:430). The right of archaeologists to do archaeology is thereby unsalable, so equality is what is offered.

Community archaeology is also linked to decolonization (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:520; Supernant and Warrick 2014:566), although the term is never defined. A common definition comes from Frantz Fanon (1963:37), who describes decolonization as putting into practice the sentiment that “the last shall be first and the first last.” In this view, decolonization is literal, not metaphorical (Tuck and Yang 2012), and is about overthrow, not collaboration (La Salle 2010). For archaeology, this would mean the end of outsider research and man-

agement, and perhaps the end of archaeology altogether (Smith and Waterton 2009); however, these are clearly not the desired outcomes for most authors. We return to this below.

Instead, the emphasis is on how to bring “Indigenous archaeology into the archaeological orthodoxy” (Martindale and Lyons 2014:426, citing Nicholas 2010), and on “engaging Indigenous peoples in archaeological work and the production of knowledge about the past” (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:520). Given the opposition to archaeology voiced by many Indigenous people (Deloria 1969, 1997; McNiven and Russell 2005; Watkins 2005), this hegemonic project is fundamentally one of co-optation (La Salle 2014); indeed, in his book *Negotiation Basics for Cultural Resource Managers*, Nicholas Dorochoff (2007:49–50) argues that “‘co-opting’ your counterpart’s goals” is an “important first step” towards achieving success in collaboration. As Connaughton and colleagues discuss (2014:555), such “inclusive archaeology” in CRM is beneficial to their clients, economically and socially, by improving the “public perception of their project.” More community outreach by transnational resource management corporations and state institutions does not make archaeology more ethical, nor does it decolonize; it simply ensures profit (Bakan 2004:32, 34, 50; compare with Gnecco and Dias 2015).

The equation of community archaeology with social equality, social justice, and decolonization is fundamentally problematic and wholly uncritical. Taiaiake Alfred (2009:10) calls these associations a “postcolonial promise” that

ensures continued access to Indigenous lands and resources by

insidiously promoting a form of neo-colonial self-government in our communities and forcing our integration into the legal mainstream. Real control remains in the hands of white society because it is still its rules that define our life ... And it is still white society's needs that are met.

While many authors in this collection discuss colonialism, few explicitly address archaeology's context of capitalism or the relationship between money, power, and race (Gnecco and Dias 2015; Hamilakis and Duke 2007; McNiven and Russell 2005), an erasure we find shocking but ultimately not surprising (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a, 2015b; see also Arnold 2014; Logan 2014). In the absence of such critical examination, change is at best superficial, at worst a lie:

the evidence is that research and universities are still sites of colonial dominance ... spaces where colonial ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies are reproduced as "best practices" and where the priorities of colonial states and capitalist social relations ... motivate research and teaching [Coburn et al. 2013:339].

The lesson here is captured nicely by Marie Battiste (2005), who posits that "you can't be the colonial doctor if you're the colonial disease."

"What is at Stake?"

The question of what is at stake is raised by Angela Piccini and David Schaepe (2014:466). Interestingly, Piccini is the only author whose work focuses on archaeology in Europe. The differences

between her context and archaeology in Canada are evident from her descriptions of the extensive bureaucratic and financial support given to communities to be involved in the management of their heritage. This is because their past is viewed as part of the nation's heritage—as British, or English. In colonial Canada, settler history is celebrated as national heritage (Logan 2014) while Indigenous places are designated archaeological sites. Piccini's work offers a glimpse of what things could be like should Canada value Indigenous culture.

Working for the Stó:lō Nation, David Schaepe (Piccini and Schaepe 2014:467) describes how heritage is conceptualized 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.

He suggests Stó:lō Nation sees archaeology as "potentially useful" (2014:472) and an "effective toolkit" (2014:475) to pursue "self-governance, self-determination and self-sufficiency; recognition and respect of cultural heritage; and healing/healthy and sustainable community(ies)." He emphasizes the following guiding principles: Taking Care of What Belongs to Us, Know Your History, Share, and Remember the Future Generations (2014:474).

These observations highlight a key difference between how community archaeology is portrayed in the special section versus how it is conceived of by Indigenous communities. While archaeologists express concern with development impacts to "sites" or the

“archaeological record” (Angelbeck and Grier 2014:524), a community-oriented approach as described by Schaepe prioritizes how these activities impact *living people* (Supernant and Warrick 2014:583). Indeed, as Natasha Lyons and Yvonne Marshall (2014:498) explain, “narratives and objects hold content in common, especially memory... both are central to the sense of belonging that creates and perpetuates community.” Archaeology thus has the potential to interfere in these cultural connections between place, memory, and identity—the building blocks of heritage (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a).

This is significant because archaeology/CRM may be viewed as statecraft, government technology designed to clear Indigenous heritage from the landscape in advance of economic development (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a).³ In this process, cultural connections to place are fragmented, producing dislocation and solastalgia (Albrecht et al. 2007; Alexander 2008). So long as academic archaeologists ignore CRM, they are not taking responsibility for what archaeology is (Gnecco and Dias 2015) or how it impacts living communities (Sutton et al. 2013). As such, archaeology has “potential to do harm to Indigenous rights and self-determination” and there are many reasons why it should not be done at all (Supernant and Warrick 2014:583; see Smith and Waterton 2009 for discussion of “taking archaeology out of heritage”).

Ultimately, what is at stake in Community-Oriented Archaeology is the community itself. It is therefore disheartening that the editors chose to focus this collection instead on archaeology. Below, we discuss why this choice may have been made.

Planned Obsolescence: “Do It Slow”

Recently, we contacted our local museum to volunteer our expertise to assist them in identifying, describing, and exhibiting their collections. The museum staff were grateful we reached out and glad to hear we were available; however, they informed us that the museum directly consults and works with the local First Nations regarding collections and exhibits. They said they would keep our information on file.

We believe this anecdote neatly encapsulates the fear archaeologists are harbouring today. To support descendant-community control over heritage is to render archaeologists-as-experts obsolete (FitzMaurice 2010:351). In a sense, this is a *planned* obsolescence: if social justice is the goal, archaeologists should be working to facilitate community autonomy, supporting Indigenous self-determination, self-representation, and sovereignty. The structured outcome of this goal is that non-Indigenous archaeologists work themselves out of a job. However, when it comes down to either supporting lofty ideals of decolonization or sustaining a well-above-average income in a profession for which one has specifically trained over many years... well, we know of few who have yet given up their careers in archaeology for their ideals.

As a compromise, community archaeology ensures those most closely affected by archaeology become partners in it, minimizing resistance and securing a livelihood for archaeologists (La Salle 2014). Indeed, by working closely with descendant communities, researchers use those communities to validate their own work and shield the practice from critique (Dabulkis-Hunter 2002:176). Further, “significant resources are now being allocated to community-involved,

engaged, and co-produced research” (Piccini and Schaepe 2014:470). In short, there is money to be made and social capital to be gained in cooperation.

In not defining archaeology, Community-Oriented Archaeology misrepresents who archaeologists are (state-sanctioned experts) and what archaeology does (manage Indigenous identity in the present). By excluding existing critiques of the practice, the authors collectively reproduce the culture of silence around archaeology’s pivotal role in the ongoing disempowerment of Indigenous peoples, their heritage, and their land. These omissions are significant because it is in the acts of forgetting and erasure that archaeologists do the most harm to living communities (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a, 2015b). Ultimately, psychosocial and spiritual dislocation is what is at stake, with serious consequences for all (Cohen 1953).

Our review of Community-Oriented Archaeology highlights similarities with race discourse in terms of how archaeologists respond to demands made by Indigenous communities about control over heritage. This dynamic is neatly encapsulated in Nina Simone’s 1964 song “Mississippi Goddamn” about responses to institutional racism in the United States:

Don’t tell me, I tell you
 Me and my people just about due
 I’ve been there so I know
 They keep on saying “Go slow!”
 [...]
 But that’s just the trouble—“do it slow”
 Desegregation—“do it slow”
 Mass participation—“do it slow”
 Reunification—“do it slow”
 Do things gradually—“do it slow”

But bring more tragedy—“do it slow”

As Piccini and Schaepe point out (2014:472), archaeology’s history is that of archaeologists “following their own agendas, addressing their own needs, carrying out their work under foreign institutions and mandates.” It is one of going slow, resulting in more tragedy. We see little evidence from this suite of articles to suggest community archaeology represents anything but disciplinary status quo (see Hutchings and La Salle 2014:37–38, 49–55).

Indeed, most authors in this collection accept as a foregone conclusion that archaeology is both good and necessary, and that community archaeology is both desirable and possible—here, archaeologists are archaeology’s greatest proponents. This is business as usual for archaeology, not alternative practice or archaeology transformed, nor is it radical (for comparison, see FitzMaurice 2010; Forbes 2008; Gordon 2006; Logan 2014; Mascarenhas 2012; Smith and Waterton 2009; The Council of the Red Nation 2015). Indeed, some view collaboration as already an “orthodoxy within the social sciences” (Menzies 2015:5).

In his review of the Community-Oriented Archaeology conference session, discussant George Nicholas (2013) confessed to being disappointed:

the session doesn’t move the discussion forward as much as I had hoped. After 25-plus years of archaeology’s engagement with “community,” I have to ask what’s really new here?

We feel our response maps onto his, which called for authors to *critically* evaluate community archaeology,

including the nature of the community, archaeologists' responsibilities, potential consequences, and whether or not such an approach is meaningful.

We applaud the authors of Community-Oriented Archaeology who grappled with these issues in pursuit of self-critique and humility. This is a necessary step towards any community work, and the process can and should be unsettling. However, we suggest Community-Oriented Archaeology is still far too comfortable, for it does not seriously engage with the institution's foundational and systemic problems, notably modernity, capitalism, neoliberalism, elitism, racism, resourcism, and, above all, ecocide, ethnocide, and genocide. *These* are words that make archaeologists squirm, and until they are confronted openly and honestly, archaeology cannot and will not change.

Acknowledgments. We thank Gary Coupland and the ten members of the *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* Editorial Advisory Board for their reviews and comments. We also thank Alex Bérubé-Robert for his assistance in translating our abstract.

NOTES

1. In North America, the majority of archaeology is undertaken in relation to Indigenous heritage, while most archaeologists are non-Indigenous. As such, our focus here is on that context, recognizing, of course, that there are other descendant communities and some archaeologists are Indigenous.
2. Most of the works included in Community-Oriented Archaeology drew from papers presented in Martindale and Lyons' session at the 2013 Canadian Archaeology Association conference (CAA 2013:11–12). One additional contribution (Connaughten et al. 2014) was based on a paper presented in a separate but concurrent session at the 2013 meeting titled "Evenflow: Managing the Perspectives of Development, Communities, and Archaeology" (CAA 2013:13).
3. Indeed, at the plenary session of the 2013 Canadian Archaeological Association meeting (CAA 2013:1), the panel of Indigenous speakers related their collective fear, anger, and urgent concern regarding state-sanctioned heritage destruction (Hutchings and La Salle 2015a:706).

References Cited

- Albrecht, Glenn, Gina-Maree Sartore, Linda Connor, Nick Higginbotham, Sonia Freeman, Brian Kelly, Helen Stain, Anne Tonna, and Georgia Pollard
2007 Solastalgia: The Distress Caused by Environmental Change. *Australian Psychiatry* 15:S95.
- Alexander, Bruce K.
2008 *The Globalization of Addiction: A Study in Poverty of the Spirit*. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.
- Alfred, Taiaiake (Gerald)
2009 *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. 2nd Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Angelbeck, Bill, and Colin Grier
2014 From Paradigms to Practices: Pursuing Horizontal and Long-Term Relationships with Indigenous Peoples for Archaeological Heritage Management. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:519–540.
- Arnold, Bettina
2014 Erasure of the Past. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by

- C. Smith, pp. 2441–2448. Springer, New York.
- Assembly of First Nations
2003 Charter of the Assembly of First Nations. Electronic document, <http://www.afn.ca/en/about-afn/charter-of-the-assembly-of-first-nations>, accessed December 13, 2015.
- Atalay, Sonya, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch
2014 Transforming Archaeology. In *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, edited by S. Atalay, L. R. Clauss, R. H. McGuire, and J. R. Welch, pp. 7–28. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Bakan, Joel
2004 *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*. Viking Canada, Toronto, Ontario.
- Battiste, Marie
2005 You Can't Be the Global Doctor if You're the Colonial Disease. In *Teaching as Activism: Equity Meets Environmentalism*, edited by P. Tripp and L. Muzzin, pp. 120–133. McGill-Queen's Press, Montreal, Quebec.
- Berkes, Fikret, Derek Armitage, and Nancy Doubleday
2007 Synthesis: Adapting, Innovating, Evolving. In *Adaptive Co-Management: Collaboration, Learning, and Multi-Governance*, edited by D. Armitage, F. Berkes, and N. Doubleday. UBC Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Byrne, Denis
2005 Western Hegemony in Archaeological Heritage Management. In *The Heritage Reader*, edited by G. Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John Schofield, and John H. Jameson Jr., pp. 229–234. Routledge, London and New York.
- Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA)
2013 CAA/ACA Whistler 2013—Schedule of Presenters. Electronic document, <http://canadianarchaeology.com/caa/sites/default/files/page/Whistler2013Programme-may-3.pdf>, accessed December 6, 2013.
- Clarke, David L.
1973 Archaeology: The Loss of Innocence. *Antiquity* 47:6–18.
- Coburn, Elaine, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, George Sefa Dei, and Makere Stewart-Harawira
2013 Unspeakable Things: Indigenous Research and Social Justice. *Socio* 2:331–347.
- Cohen, Felix S.
1953 The Erosion of Indian Rights, 1950–53: A Case Study in Bureaucracy. *Yale Law Journal* 62:348–390.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T. J. Ferguson
2008 *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice: Engaging Descendant Communities*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, T. J. Ferguson, Dorothy Lippert, Randall H. McGuire, George P. Nicholas, Joe E. Watkins, and Larry J. Zimmerman
2010 The Premise and Promise of Indigenous Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 75:228–238.
- Connaughton, Sean P., Mike Leon, and James Herbert
2014 Collaboration, Partnerships, and Relationships within a Corporate World. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:541–562.
- Crooke, Elizabeth
2010 The Politics of Community

- Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16:16–29.
- Dabulkis-Hunter, Susanne
2002 *Outsider Research: How White Writers Explore Native Issues, Knowledge and Experiences*. Academic Press, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1969 *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Macmillan, New York.
1995 *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact*. Scribner, New York.
- Dorochoff, Nicholas
2007 *Negotiation Basics for Cultural Resource Managers*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Fanon, Frantz
1963 *The Wretched of the Earth: The Handbook for the Black Revolution that is Changing the Shape of the World*. Grove Press, New York.
- FitzMaurice, Kevin
2010 Are White People Obsolete? Indigenous Knowledge and the Colonizing Ally in Canada. In *Re/envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, edited by L. Davis, pp. 351–367. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.
- Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn
2003 Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice. In *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice*, edited by C. Fluehr-Lobban, pp. 225–246. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Forbes, Jack D.
2008 *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism, and Terrorism*. Revised Edition. Seven Stories Press, New York.
- Gnecco, Cristóbal, and Adriana Schmidt Dias
2015 On Contract Archaeology. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19:687–698.
- Gordon, Todd
2006 Canada, Empire and Indigenous People in the Americas. *Socialist Studies* 2:47–75.
- Graham, Brian, G.J. Ashworth, and J.E. Tunbridge
2000 *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. Hodder Arnold, London and New York.
- Hamilakis, Yannis, and Phillip Duke (editors)
2007 *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Hutchings, Rich, and Marina La Salle
2014 Teaching Anti-Colonial Archaeology. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 10:27–69.
2015a Archaeology as Disaster Capitalism. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19:699–720.
2015b Why Archaeologists Misrepresent Their Practice—A North American Perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 2:S11–S17.
- Johnson, Allan G.
2006 *Privilege, Power, and Difference*. Second Edition. McGraw Hill, New York and London.
- Kahan, Dan M., Hank Jenkins-Smith, and Donald Braman
2011 Cultural Cognition of Scientific Consensus. *Journal of Risk Research* 14:147–174.
- King, Thomas F.
2009 *Whitewashing the Destruction of Our Natural and Cultural Heritage*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

- La Salle, Marina
2010 Community Collaboration and Other Good Intentions. *Archaeologies* 6:401–422.
2014 The Trouble with ‘Co-.’ *Institute for Critical Heritage Studies Bulletin* 2014-1:1–11.
- La Salle, Marina, and Rich Hutchings
2012 Commercial Archaeology in British Columbia. *The Midden* 44:8–16.
2015 Review of *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*, edited by Sonya Atalay, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 39:359–362.
- Logan, Tricia E.
2014 Memory, Erasure, and National Myth. In *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America*, edited by A. Woolford, J. Benvenuto, and A.L. Hinton, pp. 149–165. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.
- Lyons, Natasha, and Yvonne Marshall
2014 Memory, Practice, Telling Community. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:496–518.
- McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell
2005 *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Maryland.
- Martindale, Andrew
2014 Archaeology Taken to Court: Unravelling the Epistemology of Cultural Tradition in the Context of Aboriginal Title Cases. In *Rethinking Colonial Pasts through Archaeology*, edited by N. Ferris, R. Harrison, and M.V. Wilcox, pp. 397–422. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Martindale, Andrew, and Natasha Lyons
2014 Introduction: “Community-Oriented Archaeology.” *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:425–433.
- Martindale, Andrew, and George P. Nicholas
2014 Archaeology as Federated Knowledge. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:434–465.
- Marx, Karl
1978 [1844] For a Ruthless Criticism of Everything Existing. In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Second Edition, edited by R. C. Tucker, pp. 12–15. W.W. Norton, New York.
- Mascarenhas, Michael
2012 *Where the Waters Divide: Neoliberalism, White Privilege, and Environmental Racism in Canada*. Lexington, Lanham, Maryland.
- Menzies, Charles R.
2015 Oil, Energy, and Anthropological Collaboration on the Northwest Coast of Canada. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 71:5–21.
- Merchant, Peter
2010 Reinflicting the Past: Reflections on Personal Experiences in Collaboration. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 26:45–57.
- Moghaddam, Fathali M.
1997 *The Specialized Society: The Plight of the Individual in an Age of Individualism*. Praeger, Westport, Connecticut.
- Nicholas, George
2013 “Community-Based Archaeology”: A Discussion in Eight Questions. Discussant paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Canadian Archaeological Association, Whistler, British Columbia.
- Nicholas, George (editor)
2010 *Being and Becoming Indigenous Archaeologists*. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

- Nicholas, George, and Julie Hollowell
2007 Ethical Challenges to a Post-colonial Archaeology: The Legacy of Scientific Colonialism. In *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, edited by Y. Hamilakis and P. Duke, pp. 59–82. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Orwell, George
1949 *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Secker and Warburg, London.
- Piccini, Angela, and David M. Schaepe
2014 The Messy Business of Archaeology as Participatory Local Knowledge: A Conversation Between the Stó:lō Nation and Knowle West. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:466–495.
- Simone, Nina
1964 “Mississippi Goddam.” Nina Simone in Concert. Philips, Amsterdam.
- Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst (editors)
2005 *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonization Theory and Practice*. Routledge, London.
- Smith, Laurajane
2004 *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton
2009 Introduction: Heritage and Archaeology. In *Taking Archaeology Out of Heritage*, edited by E. Waterton and L. Smith, pp. 1–9. Cambridge Scholars, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom.
- Stottman, Jay M. (editor)
2010 *Archaeologists as Activists*. University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Supernant, Kisha, and Gary Warrick
2014 Challenges to Critical Community-Based Archaeological Practice in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 38:563–591.
- Sutton, Mary-Jean, Jillian Huntley, and Barry Anderson
2013 “All Our Sites are of High Significance”: Reflections from Recent Work in the Hunter Valley—Archaeological and Indigenous Perspective. *Journal of the Australian Association of Consulting Archaeologists* 1:1–14.
- Swidler, Nina, Kurt E. Dongoske, Roger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer (editors)
1997 *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- The Council of the Red Nation
2015 Native Liberation Struggles in North America: The Red Nation 10-Point Program. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 26:1–7.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang
2012 Decolonization is Not a Metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1:1–40.
- United Nations
2008 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Electronic document, http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf, accessed September 14, 2015.
- Watkins, Joe
2005 Through Wary Eyes: Indigenous Perspectives on Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:429–449.
- West, Robert Gerard
1995 Saving and Naming the Garbage: Charles E. Borden and the Making of B.C. Prehistory. Unpublished Master’s thesis, Department of History, University of British

Columbia. Vancouver, British Columbia.

Woolford, Andrew, Jeff Benvenuto, and Alexander Laban Hinton (editors)

2014 *Colonial Genocide in Indigenous North America*. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.

Wurst, LouAnn, and Stephen A. Mrozowski

2014 Toward an Archaeology of the Future. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 18:210–223.

Yellowhorn, Eldon

2002 *Awakening Internalist Archaeology in the Aboriginal World*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

Manuscript received December 1, 2015.

Final revisions March 31, 2016.