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In this issue it is our pleasure to introduce articles by students and guest contributors. With the theme ‘Archaeological Futures’ we challenge our writers, and readers, to think about the future of the sector and discipline in the coming decades, centuries and millennia... anyone’s interest. Some of the articles within are challenging and provocative, aimed at interrogating the status quo to provide impetus for change, others inform on innovations which could shift horizons in theory and practice. Some explore creatively the fate of contemporary spaces in the deep future.

There are articles reflecting a wider range of interests and movements within the sector, and reports from the SSASC2020 conference and panels, Women in Heritage conference, and Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy. We also have interviews with Dr. Dan Rhodes and Prof. Ian Hodder, and guest articles by Dr. Giovanna Vitelli and others. Thanks to our Student and Guest writers we have something of a bumper issue in store this Summer.

While dwelling on our theme of ‘Archaeological Futures’, and in this summer of existential dread, it was natural briefly to dwell on the fate of this very publication. Barrow was published in 1968 for a period of two to three years, before it fell quiet, then again in 1986 it was briefly revived, falling quiet again by 1988. This cyclical revival and reinvention provides something of a clue to the future of this magazine too, once the varying priorities and resources of the society change. The last editorial of the final 1988 issue of Barrow was titled ‘Where have all the students gone?’ The current reinvention of Barrow is the second such act of revival, and it is curious to think, in 2040, 2060 and 2080, what the future may hold?

We hope you enjoy this issue, and what remains of the Summer!

The Editorial Committee

Gu_archsoc@hotmail.com
The Glasgow University Archaeology Society has seen a pretty unusual academic year, despite everything that has happened around the world, last year was another good year for Arch Soc. The society and committee welcomed an increased number of new members. Throughout the year we organised widely popular socials such as Quiz Nights, Potluck Dinners, Wine & Cheese Nights and Field Trips although sadly our semester two residential field trip had to be cancelled due to the pandemic.

Thanks to the hard work of our members and support from the wider archaeological community we successfully organised the 3rd Scottish Student Archaeology Societies Conference (#SSASC2020) on the 15th - 16th February. We successfully brought together the archaeologists of the future: students and early career researchers to hear and present the latest research in Scottish Archaeology.

In March we adapted to the quickly evolving situation and held our AGM online. We also collaborated with the Glasgow University Walking Society in their campaign to raise awareness of how much a breath of fresh air and a short walk can do for everyone’s mental health during Mental Health Awareness Week (18 -24th May). In the campaign ‘On Your Doorstep’, we asked our members to find a tiny bit of beauty and/or archaeology which is worth sharing on their daily walk.

In the last academic year, I helped the work of the Society as its Secretary and I am now looking forward to facing the challenges of being President in the new academic year. The new committee looks forward to facing the challenges of this new term to deliver some of your favourite arch soc events with innovations. Next year, you can hopefully expect some of our traditional society events as well as some exciting new events and collaborations. We are hoping as part of the socially-distanced first semester to introduce a programme of Wednesday afternoon field trips throughout the semester, allowing us to escape the city and explore heritage sites and landscapes responsibly. Despite the lack of a fieldwork season this year, we will have plenty of exciting opportunities to advertise going forward!

I would like to finish by thanking all those who attended and supported the society last year, and my fellow committee members for their hard work, without whom the society could not function. I look forward to seeing all your faces, old and new, in the new semester.

You can count on us!

Arianna Magyaricsova
President
This year the Scottish Student Archaeology Society Conference was held in Glasgow in February 2020, organised by the Glasgow University Archaeology Society. This conference, running for the third year, is organised by student archaeology societies in order to provide a forum for students across Scotland and beyond to meet and share their research in a friendly atmosphere. In past the conference has been organised by Glasow in 2018 and Edinburgh in 2019. Building on the success of the Edinburgh conference it was decided to split the conference into a day of presentations and a day of panels.

On the first day of the conference Students from across Scotland presented their research on a range of themes from the deep past to recent present - exploring everything from Mesolithic Middens to Memes. The prize for best speaker, sponsored by Antiquity, was awarded to Elizabeth Greenberg from the University of Edinburgh. In the evening a ceilidh held in the City Centre brought together many of the attendees for an evening of networking and merry-making.

The second day of the conference focused on panel discussions on the topics of ‘Careers’ and ‘diversity and equality’ in Archaeology. The panel drawn from across Scottish Archaeology comprised Giovanna Vitelli (Huterian), Cara Jones (CIfA/Arch Scot), Thomas Rees (Rathmell), Maya Hoole (HES), Kirsty Dingwall (Headland) and Ingrid Shearer (GBPT).

Cara and Giovanna gave a duo of opening talks which explored the state of the sector and posed some questions for going forward. Questions were collected via an anonymous online poll and posed by the audience - and the forum provided allowed for the airing of many of the challenges that face student archaeologists. Among the questions posed were prompts about the cost of field schools as a barrier to gaining experience, the legacy of the work of Theresa O’Mahony and the Enabled Archaeology Foundation and the need for pay transparency within the sector. From the panel discussions a number of key themes were drawn out and useful career advice was discussed.

We look forward to #SSASC2021 to be hosted at UHI next year!

All presentations and discussions were live tweeted #SSASC2020
The study of human history does not need to be stuck in the past. Progress in the position of women in the heritage sector – including academic, public, and private archaeology – appears to have advanced during the last ten years or so. Still, a lot of work is to be done, and part of this work is starting the conversation of where women in heritage are, where we’ve come from, and where we are going in this discipline.

The Women in Heritage conference held by the Archaeology Society of the University of Edinburgh in March discussed some of these broad themes, from specific problems in the industry, to archaeological gender theory, and the use of social media to give women a voice in the heritage sector. The difficulties facing women breaking into the sector as workers, facing everyday sexism on the job, and gender imbalance in positions of power were key elements of the panel discussion. It seems that even today, women in the heritage sector face many of the same issues they did ten or twenty years ago.

Lectures were given by Dr. Diane Bolger, Dr. Hannah Cobb, and Amy Talbot and Dr. Ruth Humphreys. Dr. Bolger discussed feminist and gender theory in Cypriot archaeology and the wider archaeological world. Dr. Cobb brought up modern-day statistics and examples of diversity in the workplace and how far we have to go in the heritage sector to achieve gender parity. Amy Talbot and Dr. Ruth Humphreys discussed their Facebook Group, Mentoring Women in Heritage and Archaeology, which promotes open discussions about workplace issues and creating a safe space for women in the heritage sector to connect.

The panel discussions focused on real life experiences by those in the commercial and public archaeology sectors, as well as struggles currently faced in the academic realm.

The panel featured: Dr. Joanne Rowland, Dr. Catriona Pickard, Dr. Lindsey Buster, Karina Croucher, Jessica Bryan, Emily Johnston, Rachel McMullan, Maya Hoole, and Cara Jones. Cara Jones also gave the keynote speech to open the event, which discussed personal experiences as well as relating modern problems to sexism in the industry of archaeology.

Sanitary conditions, child-care, and the importance of mentoring were major topics covered in the event. The panel consisted of women from various stages in their lives and careers, and encompassed past, present, and future problems archaeologists face.

The panel discussion tallied many problems remaining in the heritage sector and academic field, but solutions still seemed few and far between. Mentorship, allyship, and self-promotion were emphasised as ways to circumvent a still imbalanced system. Initiatives seemed not to be enough, and the gender pay gap in academia was referenced as a shocking statistic, one which hopefully shall provoke change. The panel did not necessarily present any solutions but allowed for a more open discussion about problems. Many came away with a hope that things were improving, at least in the mentality around the importance of women in archaeology.

One positive that deserves a special mention is the Seeing Red campaign, which aims to provide sanitary products on all archaeological excavations openly available to those who need it, absolutely free. This is a small but crucial step in allowing women to enter the archaeological work force with one less barrier. As workers return to the field after Covid-19, hopefully worker’s rights, sanitary conditions, and more conversations about the need for diversity in archaeology will follow.
I have been asked to write a short note particularly in light of the current global pandemic and what it might mean for you in the future. What follows are purely my own views; I am not representing an organisation or have any greater insight than you but hope my musings are of some use.

COVID-19 AND SCOTTISH ARCHAEOLOGY

2020 has, of course, been unprecedented and affected our shared heritage sector greatly. No one could have imagined the emerging worldwide pandemic and its effects on our society and economy. Everyone knows the devastating impact the pandemic has had on our sector with widespread closure of sites and buildings; the furloughing of hundreds of staff; and the cessation of many archaeological activities that we would normally take for granted (excavations, community events, university activities). Various reviews are currently taking place, the reviews not only trying to assess the immediate short-term impacts but also taking time to consider what will happen in the medium- and longer-term to our heritage sector. We await their conclusions with interest.

Thus, as I write it is still unclear of the immediate effects that will take place over the next 12 months. Funding (either direct through visitors or indirect through grants), of course, is critical for many institutions and we can only hope that said institutions get the support they desperately need. Things should become clearer over the next few months.

CONTINUING TO GET OUR VOICE HEARD

In the meantime a key thing for everyone to work hard on is making sure that everyone is considered. In our inclusive reviews and discussions we should not solely concentrate on the ‘bigger, better known’ bodies. For example local museums and the like are equally essential to our aspirations of caring and enhancing understanding across Scotland. During the pandemic we have all lived and worked more locally, taken time to enjoy again our immediate environment and appreciate our local benefits. Localism and Regionalism, I am sure, will become an enhanced focus in the short to medium term and I am sure this will impact on future agendas and hopefully funding priorities for local and regional institutions and bodies.

Equally, there are scores of critically important bodies and individuals that are central to an innovative and inclusive Scottish archaeology landscape. I am in no way saying any of the following are in difficulty (I simply don’t know I am just using them to make a point) but think of, for example the central contribution of institutions such as BAJR (a few people), Scottish CIfA (a few people), ScARF (a few people), and some of the smaller companies (smaller in terms of number but certainly not stature, importance, expertise and voice) and ‘sole traders’ (freelance illustrators, finds and environmental experts etc). Think of their critical contribution to our shared narrative and what they contribute to Scottish archaeology on a daily basis. These individuals with decades of expertise and passion have to be remembered in any of our deliberations. Imagine a changing landscape where some of their voices are diminished or, worse, lost, due to a lack of support. During our considerations of impact we have to keep everyone in mind.

WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP AND DEMONSTRATING RESILIENCE

One thing that the last few months has shown me that in times of crisis Scottish archaeology can pull together. Often, we work in disparate sectors; whilst we all get on with our daily work we rarely take the time to confer and share ideas and practices across our profession. This is not deliberate; but we are often too constrained within our normative environments to take time to consider the outputs of other
fellow practitioners and what we can learn from each other. I feel these unintentional barriers are beginning to be removed during the pandemic. We have had numerous cross-sector working groups showing the shared value of our profession; we have pulled together to get the value and successes of our profession recognised and, from what I have seen, worked together to do the best for Scottish archaeology and offer shared learning.

Further, we have shown our resilience. Although many people were on furlough and many institutions had to close their doors temporarily, a significant number of Scottish archaeologists continued to work (always in a safe environment) whether that was national or local institutions or across the UK working on various excavations.

THE FUTURE

But there is still much to do and still many unknowns. Scottish archaeology at the moment is shrouded in uncertainty but I do feel optimistic.

Many readers of Barrow will understandably be concerned about their futures – what to do when they graduate now or in the next few years. When I was at University the great majority of my peers wanted to work in a university or institutions like the Historic (Environment) Scotland or NMS. These jobs were few and far between twenty years ago but many of my peers and friends still went on to become Professors at various universities, to work in HES, local planning authorities, NTS, NMS, FCS and SAS. If my generation could do this there is no reason at all why you should not follow in their footsteps.

But there are more opportunities now than when I was at University. A major change was that the biggest employer in graduates across the UK is now applied (commercial archaeology). Many graduates now see a career in this sector.

As highlighted in a recent FAME / ALGAO publication Development-led Archaeology in Scotland and Covid-19 the sector is feeling cautiously optimistic for the future. There are many opportunities in the pipeline from an applied perspective and this is an avenue you may wish to explore.

At the start of 2020 I became the new Chair of the Scottish Strategic Archaeology Committee, following in the footsteps of your very own Professor Stephen Driscoll. SSAC, which oversees the development and implementation of Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy, was created to complement and support other strategies in the sector and articulate an ambitious agenda for the future.

My appointment as Chair was a massive compliment to me. Throughout my two decades in Scottish heritage I have always been passionate about promoting the five cornerstones of the Strategy: delivering archaeology; enhancing understanding; caring and protecting; encouraging greater engagement; and innovation and skills. And perhaps these 5 aims allow you a prism through which to view your future aspirations and career. Often our profession is broken down into the private, public and third sectors but this is the wrong way to think about things. In my view, the future of Scottish archaeology, and your career, is founded not on these silos but on the 5 aims of the Strategy, irrespective of where or who you work for. This is an important sea change from when I was at university where your aspirations were usually to be ‘an academic’, ‘a curator’ or ‘a circuit digger’ with little crossover; this should be the old language of our sector.

If you are passionate about enhancing understanding of our heritage, sharing the narrative with everyone; encouraging inclusivity for everyone, discussing important, current issues, and being innovative and risk-taking then use those passions for your future career path. Take inspiration from some of the very impressive individuals who have graduated from, or worked, at Glasgow Uni (think of Gavin MacGregor and Alan Leslie) and make archaeology more relevant. Archaeologists are often their own worst enemy; we need to start being better at promoting how we contribute to national, indeed global, issues, and far beyond the barriers of normative ‘heritage’. People need to stop being told ‘how important that stone circle is to our understanding of the Neolithic’ and explained its wider narrative to current emerging issues. Otherwise we become irrelevant, unsupported and ourselves dusty pieces of the archaeological record.

So be optimistic. Get yourself seen and be relevant. Do not constrain yourself to working in one institution, sector or mindset. Any progressive company should welcome innovative, inclusive and enthusiastic people with open arms.

That’s probably you.
For ‘Archaeological Futures’ I delve into Dr. Dan Rhodes’ journey and experiences that helped pave the way to his present role at the NTS. In this interview, we discuss Dan’s experience working in various different countries and what led to these big career decisions. We find out more about the types of research he has carried out and the responsibilities of his current job role. As we explore Dan’s journey round the world he finishes off with some good tips for students and graduates to pave their way for their own future in archaeology.

How did you get into Archaeology?

Time Team totally galvanised what I wanted to do. The very first episode of Time Team came on the television and I just saw it and I was like “it's history, outside… That's everything I like!”

Where I lived in Leeds there was a place called Kirkstall Abbey. It was a medieval abbey that had been bought in the Victorian period by the Leeds City Council as a green space. It always fascinated me. Being a five year old, learning to ride his bike around these ruins… They were always there in the back of my mind. Then, when I was at the University of Wales, Lampeter, we used to have a lecturer called Michael Shanks who was a big theoretical archaeologist. We spent, I think the first six weeks of our course, analysing a beer can and just deconstructing what this can was as an artefact and using that to interpret society. It blew my mind, absolutely blew my mind. That and the idea of physically working outside, digging and discovering things, it just absolutely ticked all the boxes for me of what I wanted to do with my days.

Could you tell us a little bit about your career?

I did my undergraduate at the University of Wales in Lampeter and then after that it was about a year and a half before I could get paid archaeology work. For about a year and half, I sent out CVs and applied to as many commercial archaeology companies as I could, that included companies in Ireland as well. Eventually I got offered a three week dig in Ireland. I went over for this three week excavation and eventually left Ireland about 10 years later. I worked there for a few years with various different companies and I then decided to do a masters learnt to scuba dive while I was away travelling for a little while and I decided that I wanted to see if I could combine scuba diving and archaeology. So, I did a masters at the University of Ulster in Maritime Archaeology. While I was there, I saw a chap come over to give a lecture from the British Institute in East Africa, a guy called Paul Lane who used to be the director of the Institute based in Nairobi. He gave a lecture one evening and he mentioned that they did an internship scheme over there. So, when I finished my masters I applied to the British Institute in East Africa. I went out and I think by that point I was the oldest they'd ever had. I was probably just short of 30 at that point and most of their interns had been newly graduates and undergraduates. But it worked really well because I had quite a lot of field experience by that point. In the end, I stayed out there for about a year and a half.
While I was there that’s when I started coming up with ideas for PhDs myself. I started doing a PhD in historical Maritime Archaeology in East Africa, looking at these harbour towns and the architecture. Looking at the interaction of European, Arabian and Indigenous architecture and how that affected the populations of these towns in terms of access and control over people. I used to pay for my PhD fieldwork in East Africa by working my summers teaching field archaeology at a place called Hella in Iceland. 

I [later] got contacted by a commercial company called AOC based in Edinburgh and they offered a job. So I went over to Edinburgh to work for them and it was just as the financial crash of 2008 kicked in so I lasted about 6 months with them before a lot of us were laid off. I applied to do a placement with the National Trust for Scotland. I got that job which was again a one year training course or training bursary with the NTS, and things just rolled from there.

Earlier you were saying that you’ve worked in a number of countries outside of Britain, how did you find working in them?

Brilliant, absolutely amazing. I mean there’s always an element of culture shock. I found working in East Africa really challenging. For a start, I was researching colonial history and I was a white guy walking into the middle of East Africa going “okay, let’s talk about how terrible the white guys were” you know? So it was always an interesting dynamic when I was chatting to people. You can be working in places that have got extreme poverty as well. So how can you justify doing something like ‘research’ when people are struggling? So there was a huge amount of soul searching. And it was really quite difficult. It can be quite emotional at times. And I often got frustrated as well with other researchers over there as well who didn’t seem to be having such a difficult time with the politics of that as I was. But I mean, maybe that’s it, everybody goes through it but I just could never quite pack it away quite as well as other people. So yeah, it was really interesting. And again, some of these places can be quite dangerous. People did try and mug me quite a few times just because you just stand out and by some of the standards over there you are rich. You’re a fair target, which is totally understandable. So yeah, it can be really challenging. And then, even working somewhere like Iceland quite often it could be really quite lonely. You’re there, you’re doing your thing, you are self-reliant and self-sufficient for quite long periods of time. It can be quite challenging.

As an NTS archaeologist what does your current role entail?

I am a consultant within the structure of the National Trust for Scotland. So I’m there to support and facilitate all the archaeology things that all of our different properties around Scotland want to do. Whether that’s public events or whether it’s to do with development, if we’re building something new or interpreting, building a new interpretation centre or something as mundane as new car park, it’s my job to make sure all of those things happen without there being any detrimental impact on the archaeology, or weigh up the impact on the archaeology. So it’s about research in archaeology so that you can make informed decisions when there is potential impact but doing all of that under the umbrella of working with the public and making sure the public are getting as much out of it as they possibly can. It’s a bit like being a council archaeologist, bit of a researcher, giving talks and working with students. It’s a bit of everything all rolled into one, which is what makes it so interesting.

If you were to give any advice to current students in archaeology what would it be?

It would be, be prepared to travel. If you want to be an archaeologist and stay at home I think you are hugely limiting your chances of being able to make a career in archaeology. I always say to people “pack a bag and just go where the work is.”

Because there will be opportunities to come back again but do go and get as many experiences as you can working in different places with different people, because through it all you’re borrowing ideas. You’re learning new ideas and skills every time you go somewhere new to work and they all pile up. By the end of it you’ve got this whole store of really good experiences and really good ideas. So, do get out as much as possible.

What do you see for the world of archaeology in the future?

I think archaeology in the future will hopefully be more integrated into decision making in Scotland. So when people do decide to make changes to the historic environment, they’re not just doing it solely for the money and trying to find a way around the issues of heritage they are actually embracing heritage as part of what it is that they want out of their environment.

Hopefully everyone in Scotland will know what archaeology is and have the opportunity to engage with it. Because if everybody is able to engage with it there is going to be more justification for actually protecting the historical environment. So that’s where I would like it to be, I would like it to be everyone’s hobby.
On June 7th 2020 protestors in Bristol gathered to confront the statue of eighteenth-century slave trader Edward Colston. As an overt celebration of racial subjugation the representation was urgently dismantled. In its wake came renewed interest in the narratives and ideologies manifesting in British cityscapes; a nationwide conversation began over the social-political function of public material culture.

Contested Histories

Epitomising the plurality of voices and experiences that mark any nation, the ensuing conversation continues to be complex and conflictual. Just as many people were violated by the presence of the Colston statue, others felt alienated by its removal; and more besides experienced complete indifference to the potential impact such a bronze figure could incite. Scrutinising the impact of the Colston statue recapitulates how different and oftentimes irreconcilable the experiences, views and needs of the British public are. And, resultantly, serves as a reminder of how different each person’s relationship with history (and the material culture it is entangled with) will inevitably be. The impact of this case, and the wider concomitant statue debates, reaches deep into the core of some salient social issues: what and who is history for; what is the socio-political role of material culture; and how can history and its durable manifestations contribute to the lives of the public today?

Telling the Stories of Empire

The Home Office recently concluded in the Windrush Report that the scandal partly resulted from the lack of engagement of officials and the public with colonial history. They deemed ‘tell[ing] stories of empire’ as a necessary measure to help prevent repetition of such injustice (2020). This Government report publicly stressed the socio-political importance of making histories of British colonialism honest and accessible to all. A valuable, encouraging revelation emerging from this summer of statue debates is that there is, despite the painful conflicts, a cross-generational appetite for such histories. From those who believe many statues tell toxic or partial histories, through to those who view dismantling statues as erasure of history altogether, people from
across a spectrum of perspectives who are chiming the statues debates seemingly agree that history must be told. And, implicitly through their very contribution to the conversation, they agree that material culture has a role to play in articulating the ‘stories of empire’ - despite the disparity in perspectives and objectives.

Thus, as state-funded access to education in subjects such as Archaeology, Classics, and Art History continue to diminish; and while the pockets of even our most prestigious history and heritage institutions increasingly run dry, public interest in history’s social-political role seems to be thriving. It remains to be considered, though, which histories should be told and how can this most effectively and ethically be undertaken.

**Decolonising Material Culture**

While the value of material culture is nigh-on infinite and continually changing, its socio-political role is perhaps no more clear than in debates around ‘decolonising’ knowledge. Decolonisation proper is the complex process of economic and political withdrawal of colonisers from formerly colonised states. While, as Tuck and Yang make clear, such ‘decolonising is not a metaphor’, the term has nevertheless adopted a tandem meaning (2012). Given that the influence of colonialism penetrated knowledge itself by prioritising Eurocentric frameworks of knowledge; perpetuating racist ideologies; and suppressing the narratives of many, decolonisation also refers to redressing the epistemic violence of colonialism. This form of violence clings to minds and materials long after colonial powers have withdrawn. To decolonise, or pursue ‘decoloniality’, is therefore to rewire knowledge itself, so that the residue of toxic colonial legacies gradually ebb away. Given that material culture - from statues to museums, architecture to iconography - was essential to maintaining the reputation of the empire in the metropole, it likewise occupies a distinctive place in redressing that lasting influence.

**Museum Dependency**

Museums have long-since stood at the centre of decoloniality efforts. In the UK, many of these institutions came into being as the ‘handmaidens’ of colonialism (Harris et al. 2013). They served to demonstrate the expanse and glory of the empire. As such, British institutions, from Glasgow’s Hunterian to Oxford’s Pitt Rivers, have made it their mission to redress those foundational legacies; to ‘decolonise’. As such, the public and Government alike have grown increasingly comfortable with the idea that museums can seamlessly neutralise any unsavoury history by turning it into a productive learning opportunity. Amidst the 2020 statue debates, there have been endless calls to resituate contentious statues into museums. They are the institutions demarcated as the antidote to uncomfortable histories; seemingly the perfect safety-net for reconciling the redress of toxic legacies and the maintenance of historical preservationism in one fell swoop. While museums are valuable facets in the effort to redress colonial epistemic violence, our dependency on them is misplaced. They alone are a necessary yet insufficient instrument for negotiating Britain’s legacies of colonialism in the present.

**Beyond Durability**

Cityscapes, where statues reside in the first instance, are the most public of spaces in which such narratives and ideologies of Empire are absorbed. It therefore follows that statues offer a unique and valuable opportunity to engage with decoloniality beyond museums; whether by toppling, erecting or otherwise manipulating the durable aspects of cityscapes. Nevertheless, while we should doubtlessly feel comfortable to make decisions within our communities to remove toxic aspects of our durable environment, we cannot see this as the only means for pursuing decoloniality either. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to the historical injustices of colonialism, and their extant durable legacies. There is, rather, a multitude of valuable roles for material culture to play in pursuit of decoloniality which operate in response to whatever changes the community makes to the built environment. And crucially this can include practices that use an existing statue or an empty plinth long after that statue has gone. By way of inspiration we can turn to organisations pursuing decoloniality in the built environment in creative, accessible, and inherently adaptable ways like Oxford’s Uncomfortable Oxford. In the midst of these global statue debates, perhaps it is time to cultivate bespoke local methods - both durable and transient in nature - for engaging local communities in the pasts that shape the present.

**References**


Illustration inspired by photography at - https://www.brh.org.uk/site/2020/06/kick-over-the-statues-colston-is-going-going-gone/
Exploring the Value of Creative Archaeologies

By Dr Gavin MacGregor
Director of Northlight Heritage

What is archaeological practice? One answer is that archaeological practices, the ways in which people have been trying to understand and make sense of the material remains of the past they find, have changed over the centuries. We can conjure caricatures of: prehistoric artefacts treated as talismans or charms in the Medieval period; through Antiquarian fetishisms for collection and display; to scientific methodologies of strict discipline in the 20th century that aspired to 'read the past'; together which reveal something of changes in practices. And now, in the early part of the third millennium AD, we find most archaeological practice (and opportunities for employment) being delivered in the context of developer funded works, providing mitigation services ensuring preservation through record.

Why do we practice archaeologies? In part due to the human fascination with 'pastness' and in part through recognition that there is a tangible resource which represents a common good. In short, the nature of the archaeological has changed and our rationale for why we undertake it has changed too.

So what might happen, if we reconsider the purpose and nature of archaeological practices in the future?

What could happen if, rather than describing archaeology somewhat apologetically as relating to destructive processes, we embrace the fact it is a fundamentally creative field of expression?

What will happen if we consider what we do, not as recording the past or knowledge production, but as archaeological activation? Rather, as the collective bringing to life and sharing of remains which were dormant or dead?

Some of these questions are, at least implicit, in a long tradition of practice and research around art and archaeology. More recently we can see areas of experimentation and innovation around archaeological activation through a number of ‘sub-fields’, including digital heritage, art | archaeology and creative archaeologies.

Creative archaeologies could be described as practice led research with and through intersections between art and archaeology. For me the 2015 EAA Glasgow session on Creative Archaeologies was the opportunity to begin a project We Are But A Moment In the Flow of Time which is still ongoing. As part of a short performance, I extended an invitation for attendees to take a box within which was a waste flake from Neolithic axe productions. If people took one of the 30 boxes they had to respond creatively to its contents. Five years later, this slow archaeology work still continues.

And then there is the practice led research promoted by Professor Doug Bailey that actively explores the space between Art | Archaeology. In a recent work by Doug and sculptor Sara Navarro Ineligible, objects from excavations in San Francisco were sent across the world to be incorporated in creative responses, with the key dimension of the brief being ‘not to think of the material as archaeological, as artefactual, or as historic’. My piece involved smashing a range of 19th objects and incorporating them into snow globes as part of And So We Turn Our Backs in Dysfunctional Globes.
Both these works have, in part been designed, to explore the inter-relationships between temporal and material conditions we inhabit, which is a fundamental concern of the archaeological.

This short piece is intended to provoke some thinking among readers but it is through practice and collaboration which we so often learn best.

In the spirit of the piece, I would invite anybody who is interested in the idea of Creative Archaeologies to contact me about participating in a possible Creative Archaeology event in 2021.

gavin.macgregor@northlightheritage.org
@gmacg_1

References:
https://www.artarchaeologies.com/
https://www.artarchaeologies.com/featuredwork_illegible
https://heritagelandscapecreativity.wordpress.com/2015/09/20/flow-of-time/

Thomas, A, Lee, D Frederick, U & White, C 2018 Beyond Art/Archaeology: Research and Practice after the ‘Creative Turn’. Journal of Contemporary Archaeology 4, 121-129.

I would suggest the fertile arena of creative archaeologies could be of interest in developing our range of ‘archaeological’ practices. Not least as forms of creative practice (relating to engagement, learning, interpretation etc) are going to be fundamental for future archaeological practitioners, not only as ways to explore more ethical codesign and coproduction of archaeological projects and outputs, but also as ways to add value to a sector which could be transformative to many more people and communities who the outcomes of archaeological activation should be focused on.
The following is a personal reflection on the formidable task ahead of any museum as it seeks to change deeply embedded practices and ways of thinking.

Most readers are aware that the decolonisation movement has been in existence for some time, and extends across many sectors, not just heritage. In 2012, an article by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang was published as a reminder that the process of decolonisation is inherently unsettling and fraught with potential misunderstandings between the coloniser and the colonised. As the authors assert, a decolonising discourse (i.e., words) has been used as a means to alleviate guilt and mask inaction. The term becomes a metaphor and more of a virtue signal, rather than a real commitment to change.

I find this assertion particularly relevant to museums, as a number of museum activists have insisted that the hard work of decolonising is in fact the responsibility of museum staff and not of the people who have been affected by the injustices of the process. Layered onto this is the urgent need for museums to look inwards and to recognise that diversity and inclusion are fundamental to all experiences of the museum, for staff, visitors, researchers and educators.

What is increasingly clear, especially in the wake of the Black Lives Matter resurgence this summer, is that in the public eye, and indeed among prominent public historians such as David Olusoga, museums are often perceived as spaces outside of – marginal to – important debates on power and structural injustice. In the case of recently toppled statues, museums are being called upon to take in these contested objects, as sites “where they belong”. In other words, by being placed in a museum, they are removed from their potentially toxic and inflammatory location in the public arena and (presumably by association with the museum) are neutralised to become objects of research and reflection. To some extent this has shifted public gaze on to museums and their function in society. If, as some public figures have said, contested statues “belong in museums”, do we take it to mean that museums really are repositories for discredited objects, in a sort of equivalent of an attic clean-out? What have museums done to create the perception that there is a connecting thread running between a rejected civic statue and their storeroom? Has all the good work on outreach, community engagement and activists’ socially engaged practice been for nothing?

Museums face this explicit challenge on a number of different but interrelated fronts, not just on their relevance and importance to public discourse, because we most emphatically are not neutral. Are we dismantling our imperial and colonial formation, our inherently racialised structures? Are we prioritising openness, transparency and willingness to be scrutinised? Underpinning all of these challenges is perhaps the most critical need: nurturing mutual respect, an obligation of care, and essential humanity in how the museum goes about its business – in other words, bringing the lessons from recent international events of injustice and ignorance into the museum, and
making these a natural extension of the hard work being undertaken outside its doors. Seen through the eyes of many white museum staff, these challenges are unsettling and at times perplexing. How does a museum engage with these challenges in a way that produces change and ensures it is visible? And is deep, durable change possible, or are we caught in the paradox that Audre Lorde famously pointed out in her essay “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House”? Can the dominant model of the museum professional be revised – and who should be doing the revising?

So ultimately it is about people. Working against the grain of entrenched attitudes in museums requires a willingness to let go control of the narrative, which has at times been created at the expense of the experiences and creativity of people of very different epistemological backgrounds. Museums cannot easily ‘become’ diverse and inclusive in the short term; nor in many cases can they successfully foster a mentality that encourages inclusivity and sensitivity, without changing the composition of the workforce.

How does that work? Some museums have brought in temporary, guest curators and project staff to assist with ‘decolonising’ projects and exhibitions, not always successfully. Some have proactively begun hiring programmes for fulltime entry level staff with invisible as well as visible diversity. Some have deliberately sought out minority Ethnic or Indigenous specialists to link collections to source communities. Being challenged and unsettled by new staff is not always welcomed, but as it becomes increasingly evident that museums are not neutral spaces, the discomfort of being challenged is being understood in some quarters as a necessary catalyst for change.

How does this apply to archaeology? If we reflect on the histories of British collecting in the 19th and early 20th centuries, for example, we regularly will confront colonialist manipulation and eradication of cultures and peoples from across the world, whether of living or past societies. Many university degree courses now adopt a more postcolonial perspective, and the extent to which an archaeology student can learn the tools of self-critique and be committed to re-making not only themselves but their institution, they will be equipped to understand and support change agendas in museum settings. White archaeologists – as much as white museum professionals – are being told bluntly by Minority Ethnic people that the “emotional labour” of change is not their responsibility; that they will not save us from ourselves.

As future professionals, students need to ask the institutions around them, what are you doing to confront and rectify the injustice of the past and present? And, in turn, what can students contribute to (re)making us more open, transparent, equitable, respectful?
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A project with mixed outcomes is the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery 2017 exhibition on Birmingham and the British Empire, with invited co-curator of BAME background. See Rachael Minott (2019), The Past is Now: Confronting Museums’ Complicity in Imperial Celebration. In Third Text 33:4-5, pp 559-574. Link: https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2019.1654206

Building strong, dynamic and reciprocal international connections will be vital for Scotland’s Archaeological futures, which is why envisioning and shaping ‘archaeological futures’ is at the core of the motivation behind constructing Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy (http://archaeologystrategy.scot/). Since the Strategy was unveiled at the European Association of Archaeologists’ Annual Meeting in Glasgow in 2015, the entire archaeology sector has worked to use the Strategy as a tool to improve archaeological practice across the range of contexts in which archaeologists work. Some of the planned improvements, for instance in the procedures and criteria used in the allocation of government grants, are aligned with the Strategy and have clearly changed for the better. More ambitious goals, such as improving the funding mechanisms behind Scottish archaeology, have met with resistance and have not progressed.

Enhancing Scotland’s international profile is embedded within Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy’s aspiration to ‘make archaeology matter’ and has contributed towards improvement. Behind the ‘make archaeology matter’ slogan lies a collective commitment, which has been accepted across the archaeology sector, to deliver an accessible and socially-engaged archaeology. The delivery of particular strategic aims ultimately depends upon the efforts of the specific groups and individuals working within their particular spheres, and academia is one of those spheres, one which is well placed to develop our international profile.

While recognising that it is not possible, or desirable, for Scotland to be distanced from its intrinsic Britishness, it is nevertheless apparent that the Scotland of the coming generation will benefit from exploring wider geographic influences and pursuing more substantial
International collaborations. Perhaps the most coherent international initiative inspired by the Strategy has been the reimagination of European medieval archaeology in collaboration with the Medieval European Research Community (MERC), a group affiliated with the European Association of Archaeologists. This project has generated a Manifesto based upon principles articulated in Scotland’s Strategy, which are intended to widen access and improve social engagement. In the account below, I describe how the principles of Scotland’s Strategy were repurposed for European geographical and political contexts, and how the engagement across the European profession has enhanced awareness of Scotland’s achievement’s in medieval archaeology.

Who is MERC and what is the Manifesto?

MERC is a large, organic, confederation of medievalists (and post-medievalists) which emerged following a series of major congresses in York organised by Martin Carver in 1992 and then in Brugge organised by Frans Verhaeghe in 1997. Subsequent events were less well-attended or successful and MERC went into hibernation until it was reawakened at the European Association of Archaeologists 2013 annual meeting in Helsinki. Since then it has become the largest self-aware group with the EAA. In reflecting on MERC’s first 25 years at the 2017 meeting, the members spontaneously decided to articulate a vision for a more equitable, just, socially-engaged kind of medieval archaeology. The drivers behind the values reflected in the Manifesto varied across Europe from dissatisfaction with increases in social inequality driven by neoliberal political agendas to the existential threats posed by the appropriation and misuse of the heritage by political extremists. The Manifesto arose from a dissatisfaction with the status quo, a status quo that will no longer exist after the Covid-19 pandemic. The core values of the Manifesto seem even more urgent now.

The key message in our Manifesto is that a concern for the preservation, presentation and presentation of medieval archaeology is not a niche concern, but that Medieval Pasts are core business for everyone. We Europeans inhabit worlds largely made in the middle ages, so the better we as a society know this and appreciate it, the better use can make of our fundamental cultural resources. Much of the groundwork constructing the Manifesto was driven by Glasgow University medievalists, past and present, using a grant from the Royal Society of Edinburgh which allowed us to bring members of MERC to Scotland. The many people who have contributed are named in the Manifesto website. We use the term Manifesto to signal that our call for change was both serious and revolutionary. This conscious use reveals an aspiration to achieve some of the longevity of previous other manifestos with which we are familiar:

- A spectre is haunting Europe…’ - Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto (1848)
- ‘The feminist movement as at present instituted is Inadequate.’ - Mina Loy, Feminist Manifesto (1914)
- ‘Alienation and oppression in this society cannot be distributed amongst a range of variants, but only rejected en block with this very society.’ - Guy Debord, Situationist Manifesto (1960)
- ‘I am for an art that embroils itself in everyday crap & still comes out on top.’ - Claus Oldenburg, I Am for an Art (1961)

Manifestos are of course most familiar from politics (where characteristically they are empty and ephemeral) and from the art world (where they are characteristically ambitious and ephemeral); nothing makes the importance and volatility more forcefully than Julian Rosefeldt’s Manifesto (2015) a multi-screen film featuring Cate Blanchette (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manifesto_(2015_film).

The MERC Manifesto reflects a powerful desire for change within the community of European Medieval Archaeologists, and we sincerely hope that it will be neither empty nor ephemeral. From the outside, our concern for Medieval Pasts looks like a tiny niche of the greater socio-political ecosphere, but for those of us who work in the medieval field, this is our world, it is a logical starting place, and it seems quite big enough. In any case, medieval Europe is what we know and where we must focus our efforts.

In drafting the Manifesto we did not start with a blank sheet of paper; we drew upon the Scotland’s Archaeology Strategy for inspiration and for the structuring principles evident in the Manifesto. The guiding principles are conceived of as a virtuous circle, a ‘heritage wheel’. Here, the Manifesto’s debt to the Strategy is plain, as are the influences of international heritage conventions such as the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (1979), commonly known as the Burra Charter. One of the most profound impacts on academic life by the COVID pandemic was the sudden cancellation of conferences and meetings. This meant that the final public facing-event in the Manifesto workshop sponsored by the Royal Society of Edinburgh had to be replaced by a digital alternative. Arguably the different format, extended timescale, and perhaps the reflective mood of the pandemic contents, improved the final stages of the Manifesto development.
The purpose of these two events is to introduce the MERC Manifesto to heritage professionals, in Scotland and beyond, not all of whom are medievalists or archaeologists.

For our public facing we decided to link the presentation of the manifesto to a reflexive discussion about the Scottish Burgh Survey. This webinar was recorded and is available on YouTube (https://youtu.be/5EDWDj531dQ).

This was intended to both provide a handle for Scottish heritage professionals to engage with MERRC and the Manifesto, but also to draw international attention to the pioneering efforts of the Burgh Survey (Owen in Antiquity). It is hoped that the event rekindled interest in the Burgh Survey and will lead to a more sustained intellectual reflection. In outline, the Burgh Survey was prompted by the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland report of 1972, and the first series were undertaken by a team based in Glasgow University including Ann Turner (Simpson) and Robert Gourlay, under the oversight of Professor Leslie Alcock. The first series were quick productions, flexible and creative responses to increasing development pressure. They were distinguished by their cut and paste graphics; they were the antithesis of long gestation and polish of the RCAHMS Argyll Inventories. The purpose of the survey was to help local communities and decision-makers to care for their own historic towns.

At their best, the Survey served both as a heritage management tool and as a vehicle for advocacy, outreach and education about the heritage. This is however with the later volumes of the survey, mostly compiled under the leadership of Pat Dennison, who from 1986 contributed to more than two dozen surveys. This final series of volumes, published by the CBA, were attractive and accessible, distinguished by the use of full colour and useful broadsheet maps. One of the most relevant insights of these critical reflections on the achievements and shortcomings of the Scottish Burgh Survey Project was an appreciation of the resonances between the Scottish heritage management experience and the Manifesto’s aspiration to promote greater engagement with medieval archaeology as a social priority. In some important respects the Burgh Survey foreshadowed the MERC Manifesto. Two points emerged from the webinar discussions that are worth further consideration. Firstly, the surveys were conceived of exclusively management tools, with no community participation in their creation involvement and with no thought given to a public audience. As time went on, it was recognised that there was a significant public interest in the surveys and their creation. The most recent examples not only were designed to appeal to the general public, but also included investment in training members of the public so that they could actively contribute to the work of the survey. Secondly, it was pointed out that while the survey was good at identifying and protecting nationally significant sites and monuments, the surveys were not very effective at creating value, particularly with respect to more fluid concepts such as place-making. These are particularly important because these are key challenges for us as we seek to use the Manifesto. It is worth consulting Olwyn Owen’s more detailed history ‘A Sound Foundation for the Future: archaeology in Scotland’s towns and cities and the role of the Scottish Burgh Survey’, Antiquity 76 (2002), 802-7.

It is impossible to say how effective the MERC Manifesto will be in the long run, but so far it has captured the attention of archaeologists from across Europe and beyond. The key thing about building up an international reputation is to be noticed; the Manifesto has already done that and in so doing has elevated Scotland’s archaeological reputation.

*By Stephen Driscoll, edited by Megan Kasten*
PAST - FUTURE INTERFACES

by Tristan Boyle,
Archaeology Podcast Network

Archaeology as a discipline concerns itself very much with the interplay between past, present and future. Its very preservation is uniting the past with the future through the present; in this way archaeologists are forever reinventing the relations of time and the way in which society reacts to it.

“The past is a foreign country; they do things differently there” is a quote by LP Hartlet in his book The Go-Between, in which the story’s protagonist finds a diary from their past and relives suppressed memories. In a similar way, history is a modern day therapy for societies who find themselves amongst a global tangle of economic ties. However the effectiveness of searching for “the answer” in the past is itself doomed to failure because it does not recognise the power of the present in its ability to shape the future. Perhaps there is a better way to communicate the way in which the past exists, in a fragmented, constantly changing form, predicated on our ability to understand the archaeological record, other than a catalogue of serial events; in fact it may be better if we, as archaeologists in our outreach, find ways to hand the past over to the public and ask them to reflect on their own ideas on it.

This form of crowdsourcing, almost an appeal to democracy, can seem genuine and simple but it raises difficult questions down the line like: do we want a democratic past? (Fleming 2008) Are there some things that shouldn’t be voted out of existence? And does this not still create a top-down method of archaeology (Richardson 2014) that is something we would like to change? However, it is difficult to see where we, as professionals, can move the public away from viewing the past as a linear progression leading to the present and seeing the past as window dressing, there to clothe the spirit of the nation and hold people together. In this manner, to reflect on the atrocities of the past or to think of the reasons why certain choices were made is only to demonise the ‘nation’ and belittle its people. And here is where we begin to uncover the unspoken power of the past and its ability to grip people, to charm them and change their perspective, or to reinforce it. It may not surprise people that online hate groups, particularly those who idolise Nazism are constantly looking at their own histories, getting DNA tests to check that they are ‘white enough’; history is very important to them.

So then, how is it that we can remove this power of history from people who would use it to justify violent acts or to continue to reinforce systems of oppression? Rhetorically, we are ill-equipped to easily separate our own use of the past from these racist groups, the very premise of race being something ingrained in the common knowledge. In every argument, no matter how untrue, there is time taken to at first tear down the multitude of falsehoods and then to put a point forward. I am not sure if archaeology can survive solely on the back foot. In order to tackle and take down the worst forms of these online hate groups, researchers need to be ready to make statements about their work, clarifying their own positions and in some cases, directly calling out the twisting of conclusions to fit a narrative.

In this climate, it is furthermore disheartening and not surprising that the institutions, upon which archaeology draws its own history, museums and research bodies, are failing to accept their own history and culpability in maintaining the aforementioned history that props up and reinforces the ‘nation’. Each
and every item, claimed through war, colony or bartered for food, that museums nowadays keep in their collections against the wishes of the communities to whom these items hold value, is a stumbling block for the heritage industry and a constant reminder that no matter how far things have come, the power relations between countries is maintained by those who hold history. These items, if returned, would signal that a misdeed had been rectified, that justice had been served and some transgression had been committed; keeping the items in place secures a fragile innocence for those institutions and the society which keeps them locked away.

If on a fundamental level, these institutions do not reform and reorganise, how can we expect things to change? And in the spirit of trying to bring together the past, present and future, how will archaeologists, years from now, see the attempts that are being made in the present? We are not doomed to repeat history, we are doomed to make it constantly and the choices that we make, especially the most difficult ones will remain the most important ones. We cannot change years of hubris overnight, but we can change the relations that are set up between institutions, peoples, communities and countries in a way that ultimately rights a wrong. It will most definitely be an uphill struggle and we will all find it difficult to rectify our own issues, but if we do not change, we have no chance of a future archaeology being better than past archaeology.
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An Interview with Prof. Ian Hodder

Eddie Stewart

As part of this issue I interviewed Professor Ian Hodder of Stanford University. In this interview we discussed Prof. Hodder’s career, and his visions for where archaeological theory might go now. We end with Hodder’s advice to Students and ECR about starting a career in Archaeology today.

How did you get into Archaeology?

I decided to be an archaeologist in my early teens and started going on digs around Oxford where I lived while I was still at school. It was partly social - I went to an all boys school! But mainly it was because I liked working out of doors and I just found the whole process of puzzling out what went on in the past through a few ambiguous clues utterly fascinating and absorbing - and maybe there is a romanticism to that.

Can you tell us a little about your career?

I got my degree in the Institute of Archaeology in London and then did my PhD at Cambridge with David Clarke. I then taught for 3 years at Leeds before returning to teach at Cambridge for over 20 years and then moved to Stanford where I have also been for over 20 years now. In terms of digging, I dug in loads of places in the UK and the Mediterranean but the main large-scale projects that I worked on were at Haddenham in the Fens near Cambridge and at Catalhoyuk in Turkey.

What was it like to be a student/ECR during such a time of theoretical change in Archaeology?

I was a graduate student in Cambridge at the height of processual and ecological archaeologies, but the main excitement for me was when I came back to Cambridge in the heyday of post-processual archaeology. That was an incredibly lively time - amazing students and a real sense of change, with a strong political energy and optimism.

Where do you see the future of Archaeological Theory as we go forward?

In some ways I see today some of the excitement of the early post-processual years. I am thinking particularly of the moves to decolonize archaeology in the wake of the BLM and BIPOC movements.

I see there again the same sort of excitement and energy to change the world of archaeology for the better. There are of course important new scientific developments in archaeology, such as aDNA, but often these tend to push in a reactionary direction, back to culture history, origins and self. In the decolonizing movement on the other hand there is a real sense of radical change and rethinking. It is an exciting time.

What do you believe to be the relevance of archaeology to modern society?

People produce the presents and futures they want by making reference to the past, re-imagining the past in positive or negative ways to suit their interests. In my view it is the task of archaeology to counter those narratives that people conjure up, especially when it comes to the long term. For example, many people today believe that we live in increasingly unequal societies, but is that true and what leads to inequality? Many people argue that climate change is a new challenge, but how did people in the past deal with such crises? Why do we amass so much stuff as modern consumers? - but haven’t we always amassed stuff and got entangled up in it? There are lots of ways in which archaeologists can dig for answers to contemporary issues.

What advice would you give to Archaeology Students and recent graduates today?

It is an extremely tough time for young archaeologists as they start their careers. The challenges are almost overwhelming. It is a very different scene from when my generation set out. But I still think it is important to do an archaeology that motivates you and that you feel passionate about, that engages with the world and seeks to change it for the better. It is a fascinating multi-stranded discipline: it is necessary to know about and be proficient in the natural sciences, as well as in the social sciences and humanities. Use this diversity and breadth to provide a balance against the tendency in many walks of life to be narrow and hyper-specialized and thus unable to take a broad and balanced view. Be motivated to address and redress the issues of our time.
Artefact Report: Toilet Roll Holder

Ceramic

A modern ceramic wall-mounted toilet roll holder, found in the river Clyde south of Daldowie Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). This is one of two such mounts which would hold a roll of toilet paper.

The WwTW at Daldowie services the populations of Greater Glasgow and North Lanarkshire, drawing on a brown water catchment from Shettleston and Parkhead to Airdrie and Motherwell, and an equivalent of 292,000 peoples waste is processed daily.

The filters on this site remove all those objects accidentally flushed away are recovered in the hooked screens and at intervals throughout the day and cleared, the collected deposits being ejected into skips along conveyors known as ‘nodding donkeys’. Among this waste everything from false teeth to whole sheep carcasses are recovered. The site staff have noticed a trend that on Saturday and Sunday mornings, after the festivities of the night before, it is common for plastic £5 and £10 notes to float through the inlets into the filters where they are gleefully recovered and cleaned by the site staff for return into circulation later. These notes, dropped by intoxicated hands in a variety of houses and bars across the city are just one of many acts of transfers that occur in this landscape.

Extract from Mount Vernon and Daldowie Landscape Gallery – [click here to visit]
When the Siege of Sarajevo began in 1992, I was 11 years old. An age at which you start watching the news and begin understanding the world around you. The following year, my mother bought me a book, Zlata’s Diary, written by a young girl, approximately my age, who was living through the siege. Being a similar age, her experience became very relatable for me, and accordingly this conflict has loomed large in my mind ever since.

In 2018, on my way from Australia to Glasgow to study archaeology at UoG, I was able to finally visit Sarajevo. While I visited many sites from the war and the siege during my visit, the one that really stood out and affected me the most was the War Childhood Museum. This museum is composed of childhood objects that people have donated, along with their memory of that object during the war. The majority of objects come from Sarajevo, however there were also some from more recent conflicts such as Syria.

The project began as a book, collating short, 160-word memories from people who were children during the war in Sarajevo. Some are mundane, some funny, some fearful and some angry. Examples can be seen on the website https://warchildhood.org/book/. The museum contains similar memories, but this time accompanied by objects. Objects such as a Barbie doll that a girl recalls wanting so badly that her mother traded her waterproof boots for it. There are also pieces of clothing, drawings, musical instruments, and even a bicycle, all with a story about what it meant to that child during the war. The one that made the strongest impression on me was a soft toy, which is the only toy of a young girl’s which wasn’t burnt for heating.

I had a lot of toys as a child. When the war started, many of them were sacrificed for heating. One “unidentifiable” toy was notably spared. To this day I haven’t exactly figured out what it is: a bunny, teddy bear, cat, or something else? That didn’t matter much to me; all that mattered was that it was mine. My sanctuary and my companion during shelling, my friend at bedtime, my conversant and hug. My “unidentifiable” toy is still here. May it spread its message of peace and love! Elma, 1989

What I really liked about this museum was the way in which simple, commonplace childhood objects that we all grew up with were made into really powerful pieces of material culture when accompanied by children’s memories of war. I grew up with Barbie dolls as well, however my experience was so different, and being able to relate so strongly to the object, made the girl’s story that much more affecting. We were so similar in so many ways, however her experience of life was so different to mine.

When I came to study conflict archaeology at the University of Glasgow, this museum was also fresh in my mind and gave me a different perspective on what could be considered an artefact or material culture. It doesn’t have to be centuries old or dug out of the ground. These are objects from just three decades ago, but they are still valuable objects for telling the story of a conflict from a perspective that does not normally appear in the history books.

Follow the link to find out more about this museum: https://warchildhood.org/
In the Future, We Will Create a Typology for Thrift Store* Tags

By Alex Fitzpatrick
Student, University of Bradford

*Translation Note: For my UK friends, a “thrift store” is the American equivalent to your “charity shop”.

Imagine, if you will...

In the year 3020 P.C.C. (the post-climate change era, of course), both humanoid and non-humanoid archaeologists alike have begun a major intergalactic excavation project located in key areas around the Planet Earth. Using 21st century texts, the researchers have identified spaces referred to as ‘thrift shops’, a type of economic space in which specially curated artefacts from the past are sold in exchange for the local currency. Despite textual evidence of their existence, archaeologists have remained baffled at the intended purpose of these sites. “Early excavations that occurred in the late 2990’s recovered a diverse assemblage of artefactual evidence from these so-called thrifting spaces, including votive figures, pottery, iron work, and even traces of cloth. However, it is unclear of what purpose they may have held, and what their value was. Based on preliminary analysis, it appears that these objects may vary wildly with regards to their regional and temporal provinces. Frankly, without textual evidence, I would have assumed that this site was a landfill. Perhaps what we consider rubbish was much more valuable in the past?” said project director Dr. Xylem Zexel. This project intends to further investigate the possible socio-economic importance behind these spaces by developing a typological approach to identifying and analysing the various artefacts found in thrift stores across the planet.

As an archaeologist in the year 2020, I can only imagine the grief that is felt over the contextually mess that would be the thrift store for my future colleagues. Intermingling of contexts is already a frustrating problem for current day archaeologists – but imagine the horror that would face you within a thrift store? It is perhaps the only place in the world where kitschy bowling shirts from the 1960’s are sold alongside t-shirts from a church fundraising event from 2010, or where antique brass candelabras can be on sale for the same price as a homemade picture frame made of glue and glitter. Thrift stores are museums of contradictions, exhibiting the well-loved and the never-opened, the secular and the somewhat holy, the utilitarian and the otherwise decorative – it is the nightmare of an archaeologist looking to develop neat, succinct categories of artefacts.

And maybe that is exactly why there has yet to be any substantial archaeological work on the thrift store as artefactual accumulation; this is a shame, of course, as the thrift store could be a fruitful space for theorising new approaches towards archaeological investigation and excavation. As Dawid Kobialka (2013) wrote shortly after the music video premiere of Macklemore’s hit song “Thrift Shop”, “thrift shops are, as it were, cultural heritage sites in which are staged and saved artefacts from the past, usually from the ’80s and ’90s. They will soon certainly become of interest for archaeologists too. They are places in which the past meets the present. They are about inclusive heritage where most of us can afford to buy something from the past.”
Thrift stores are not only places of contradictions, but as Kobialka has described, they are also places of liminality. Past and present collide, not only through the literal age of objects, but also in accumulation of objects as well; artefactual deposits become a new type of material culture. And yet, we cannot say that these are reused objects either, not until they are sold. This is where the liminality of the space comes in, representing the potential that these artefacts have for reuse and reincorporation into the living assemblage through what Michael Schiffer (2010, p. 38) has referred to as the “reclamation process”.

With the proper tools and methodological approaches, I could imagine that thrift stores may become a wealth of information for future archaeologists. YouTuber and thrift store aficionado Clint Basinger (2019) has remarked in a previous episode of his YouTube series LGR Thrifts how these stores most likely received an increase in donated goods in January 2019 – not only because it is the post-holiday season, but also because of the release of the Netflix series Tidying Up with Marie Kondo. Thrift stores can reflect broader trends of the general public, from what’s in fashion to technological progresses (see: the amount of VHS tapes, DVDs, vinyl records, and CDs that are constantly on sale). And yet, there is also something very intimate reflected in the thrift store assemblage as well – a wayward family photo in an unwanted frame, someone’s high school art project that was accidentally donated to the local shop.

In many ways, the thrift store reflects the greater goals of archaeology as a discipline, in which we develop the bigger picture of the past, but also take time to examine the smaller threads of everyday lives.

I’m not entirely sure how our future colleagues will tackle the interwoven narratives of the thrift store archaeological site, but I’ll admit that I envy them, as there is so much to be extrapolated from a thorough analysis of such a mixed assemblage. That said, to those future archaeologists, here’s a tip – those tags found on the artefacts? They’re often colour-coded to indicate price. I think it’s 50% off blue tag items on Tuesdays!
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The Crystal World

By Dr Kenny Brophy, University of Glasgow

This is a partial and probably unreliable account of an archaeological exploration into a partially ruinous grass mound 10 km east of Innsbruck, Austria. A hole became evident in the side of the mound after an electrical storm and heavy rainfall.

A small team from the University of B under the leadership of Prof. C entered this structure via this hole on the 14th of March 2043. Some of the party left this ‘tomb’ some three weeks later. Prof C was not amongst the those who left and is missing presumed dead. One of the survivors was able to provide a rambling account of the fieldtrip and discoveries made, excerpts from the transcript of interview sessions reproduced here for the first time. Her disjointed narrative was produced after the administration of several experimental drugs.

Behold the pleasuredome

field survey of a crystal factory in the shadows of mountains documenting the architecture of mineral accumulation giant with a green passage grave head whose mouth vomits water sample the crystalline pond beneath the nasal protuberance while being watched by dead eyes that glisten in the light before the thunderstorm translucent portals to another world entrance affected via a tunnel with square profile and golden walls touch don’t look duck and walk towards the dull crystal light

The capitalist’s tomb

within the chamber of the tomb marvellous things were documented laser scans that fractured through a million crystals with central focus a horse rearing and transparent gems scattered at its hoofs was this once the lab of a taxidermist equine embalming for the pleasure of puzzled visitors the documentation of the angular space inside a gemstone pencils cannot work here and so we can only rely on mobile phones a last resort in documentation an apple-framed world for androids the walls shimmer like waterfalls but are dry to the touch a side door suggests itself hanging from rusty hinges
The crystal maze

stairs past black smooth walls stooped doorway crawling inside a crystal replicating each one of us countless times infinite versions of each moment of documentation our faces distorted in mirrors triangular hexagonal limits on our expressions contorted physiognomies an excess of light wooden weeds breaking through the floor growing in the unnatural reflected light leaving this optical maze words written on the wall ahead TRANSPARENT OPACITY following words along passages stairs leaking neon gas picked up by detectors radon xenon highs flashing lights that should not still be working CHANDELIER OF GRIEF a place with a half-life isotopic overdose

The vermillion sun

open doors collapsed roofs giant gems littering the floors treasures of another culture another time compelling us to fill pockets bags crystal boxes with small glass stone finds a treasure addiction bejewelled lingerie material couture the form of glass skulls then a final room dominated by a huge vermillion sun formed by crystalline structures a glowing latticework frame from which light sound vibrations at low frequency began to emerge an impossible sphere composed of all fourteen three-dimensional lattices through which electrons disgorged charging our bodies breaking our recording machines collapsing into the star...

Notes

The Crystal World (Kristallwelten) is the showcase of the Swarovski crystal company who are best know for manufacturing jewellery and figurines from crystals. It is located in Wattens, near Innsbruck. Entrance to the Kristallwelten is through the mouth of a Gant, and the experience unfolds via a series of Chambers of Wonder, the work of artist André Heller. This complex space hosts a series of permanent exhibitions (such as Into Lattice Sun and Mechanical Theatre), and temporary installations, by guest artists with light and crystal themes. When I visited in 2019, one of these was a huge crystal chandelier by artist Lee Bul, which flashed on and off, dictating the JG Ballard 1966 novel The Crystal World in morse code. Ballard’s apocalyptic novel tells of a future earth where everything living turns to crystal. When I visited this capitalist dystopia, all I could think of was what archaeologists of the future would make of this place when it became a crystal ruin.
The term, liminal, is derived from the Latin word for threshold, limina. It can signify something on the periphery of everyday society or denote the space amidst different strata of reality. Liminality can be considered within human as well as architectural contexts. By descending into a trance like condition, shamans enter into a liminal state. Passage graves and caves, permeable places; places where the living were in close contact with the past, the present, and, perhaps, the future, are considered liminal places. I believe that modern underpasses can also be deemed liminal places.

Edmonds (1995, 70) proposes that rites of passage involve three distinct stages, separation, liminality, and reincorporation. Separation from the world of everyday associations and the creation of liminal conditions suspends usual conventions and helps contain potential threats. The final stage, that of reincorporation, reconfirms familiar frameworks of order, both social and natural. By descending into the underpass am I heading into the underworld? Will I experience separation, liminality, and reincorporation?

Underpasses are Liminal Places
by Rebecca Lambert, Student, UHI
We approach underpasses with trepidation, but we know we must walk their path in order to reach the 'other side'. Upon entering, I am physically removed from the world above, the world of natural light, the world of the living. I am underground, but I am not. I am moving through and within different spheres. Upon exiting the underpass and returning to the light will I be the same person? Would I have undergone a rite of passage, however small?

The artist, Mark Leckey, upon observing vibrations within concrete environments, has discussed the Stone Tape theory (Leckey, in Wallis & Coustou 2019, 16). where certain buildings, underpasses included, are receptive to the energy produced by traumatic and emotional events. Energies which can be experienced and recorded.

“I had a sense of being propelled into the future while at the same time reversed into the prehistoric past. A past which held an animistic idea of the world, in which rocks and trees could speak” (Leckey, in Wallis & Coustou 2019,16).

Underpasses, elevated walkways, ‘in-between’ concrete places, became congregational points, sub- economies (Penrose 2007, 56). Underpasses bear witness to ritual behaviour; drinking, drugtaking, communal gatherings, initiating feelings of euphoria with the hope of achieving altered states of consciousness, of reality.

Leckey describes how, for him, repetition, or loops, generate energy, power and altered states,

“you enter into a loop that has the potential to take you out of your body into this state of ecstasy but then you yourself are on repeat, you’re stuck. In folklore, the fairies would entrance people into a never-ending dance. A wild delirium that wouldn’t stop until eventually they’d just crumble” (Leckey, in Wallis & Coustou 2019, 15).

Pearson proposed that performance tends towards liminality, challenging and transgressing the relationships, rites, and rituals of everyday life. It is a place where identities may be created, shaped, contested and changed. Where new agendas are set. Whatever passes the boundary and enters the theatrical space is declared significant (Pearson & Shanks 2001, 27-8).

I believe that both Leckey’s and Pearson’s ideas apply equally to underpasses. Once within the space the everyday is challenged.

The underpass is a place where new identities and agendas can be forged. Where all acts are significant, but also where interactions with forces, both benevolent, and potentially, malevolent, take place. The underpass can be seen as a suspension of disbelief. It is a link between the routine everyday, and the more than human world. One must approach these spaces with caution.

Even as cities are increasingly dominated by functional underground spaces, these zones continue to exert a powerful hold on the imagination. Walking through and within underpasses is, in itself, a process of transition - walking through different spheres to reach the ‘other side’. For Leckey, in returning to the bridge of his youth, he sees that the time he spent there was a “period of transition” (Wallis & Coustou 2019, 35).

We accept that underpasses are an essential element for traversing the landscape, especially within cityscapes, but we do not enjoy moving within them. We do not stroll leisurely through an underpass; they are not the realm of the flâneur. We navigate them as quickly as possible, “they are still replete with our fears and anxieties about venturing below the surface” (Dobraszczyk 2019, E-Book, Chapter 5).

Underground spaces are full of dark and invisible recesses, they also harbour the potential for subversion. Within underpasses it is dark and often poorly lit. A restricted space, it can often feel claustrophobic, scary, unnerving, but can this also be considered slower, calmer, safer? Can “the very invisibility of underground spaces, their disconnectedness from the world above, lend them an aura of impregnability and security?” (Dobraszczyk 2019, E-Book, Chapter 5). Can the inclusion of art, curvaceous curves, and deviant temptations distract us sufficiently to forget our fears?

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
And that was the last time the shell was handled with any care. When the smoothest nacre-covered sections were removed, the shell was considered used up and discarded as an ostensibly worthless byproduct.

The Lippincott Button Factory in Philadelphia remained at the Jayne Building until the mid-20th century, producing buttons through two world wars, the Roaring Twenties, and the Depression that followed. Soon after WWII, it moved south to Milton, Delaware but couldn’t survive the preference for easy-care plastic fasteners.

The Jayne Building was demolished in 1958, to great acclaim at the time but vast horror from historians and architects in the years to come. It made way for the original Independence National Historic Park Visitor’s Center. During the excavation, thousands of shell remnants were found and discarded. Four decades later, expanded excavation in the area for the Museum of the American Revolution discovered even more abandoned shells, which were gathered up this time and can be found on desks and shelves throughout the museum’s offices.

One of them was given to a visiting reporter as an interesting souvenir, after catching her eye and stump ing her when asked to guess what it was. The reporter gave it to her daughter: me. My desk is in a sunny area. When the light hits the shell in the right way, the mother-of-pearl gleams.
thanks for reading!