

**The Future of Archaeology: Towards a Meaningful Community-Based  
Archaeology**

Brett Wieckhoff, April 2019

**2023 Anthropology Capstone Reader**

Angèle Smith, Editor

DO NOT CITE IN ANY CONTEXT WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

## WIECKHOFF

Archaeology and archaeological theory are currently largely in the era of post-processualism<sup>1</sup>. This has been significant as it has changed the ways that archaeologists interact with communities who are stakeholders in community-based archaeological research. However, not all archaeological research has followed suit and in many countries the archaeology still practiced does not include or benefit the local communities. I argue that moving into the future, archaeology must adopt a community-based approach as a mandatory practice in all situations. Community-based archaeology is relatively new in many parts of the world and thus its meaning is still ambiguous. How can we, as archaeologists, do better for the communities we work with and create long-lasting meaningful relationships with them? Community-based archaeology can mean many things and its breadth is part of what makes it so useful, but I argue that it must include meaningful engagement with the source community which leads to a form of heritage-building and empowerment.

This essay begins by exploring the current theories widely practiced by archaeologists before I discuss the concept of heritage. I cover Laurajane Smith's discussion of (2006) intangible heritage and authorised heritage discourse and explain how heritage can be misused for nationalistic purpose using a case study from Greece. Following that, I explore what community-based archaeology is and provide an example of community-based archaeology in a case study from Belize that I argue failed by being meaningless to the community. Lastly, I examine community-based archaeology that includes heritage-building and what I argue creates meaningful research. As an example, I use a recent archaeological research project in Crete that I

---

<sup>1</sup> Post-processualism in archaeological theory emerged in the 1980s as a movement that emphasizes subjectivity and interpretation of archaeological findings. See discussion on pg. 2

believe to be an outstanding example of what all archaeology, as a means to heritage building, should look like.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY

Much like the whole of anthropology, the history of archaeology is steeped in colonial injustices and nationalism (Lewis 1973; Forbes 2014). Archaeology and anthropology have come a long way in trying to make amends for their pasts and move into the future with new, more relevant and inclusive theories. The related fields of archaeology and heritage are now both moving in the same direction into the future. The two archaeological theories of post-processualism and symmetrical archaeology provide the basis of this paper's research in examining the present and future intersection of archaeology and heritage building.

### *Post-Processualism*

Post-Processualism emerged during the 1980s as a counter response to processualism and formed along with feminist, post-colonialist, and postmodernist theories. It starts from the idea that "history (including prehistory) is written in the present and, in that sense, only exists in the present" (Flemming 2006:268). It aimed to prove that "one cannot be objective but, rather than float on a sea of relativity, one can position oneself so as to ask questions and propose interpretations that [are] deem[ed] *relevant* to contemporary concerns... we have to go beyond the evidence... [it] does not of itself deliver an understanding it is open to any number of interpretations" (Bender in Fleming 2006:268). Post-Processualism can be seen as a turning away from Processual archaeology's mission to be accepted into the sciences, towards an archaeology focusing on contemporary societies and social issues. The Post-processual approach is important to understand as it was a significant shift in archaeology which "opened up the

## WIECKHOFF

discipline to more players, more voices and has made valid new subject matters” (Meskel 1998: 6). The type of community-based archaeology which combines with heritage-building owes its existence to post-processualism discourse.

### *Symmetrical Archaeology*

Symmetrical archaeology follows a similar approach as post-processualism, and in fact could be better described as a branch of post-processualism, as it focuses on the archaeological past and its relevance in contemporary society using multiple historical narratives. This theory explores the dualisms created through the history of archaeology and reconsiders the “relationships between past and present, people and things, biology and culture, individual and culture” (Shanks 2007:590). Symmetry is also concerned with ideas of continuity with, and memory of, the past. We are not separate from the past but rather there is a cultural continuity with our ancestors which needs to be examined through collective memories which “unlock” parts of our past (Shanks 2007:593). Symmetrical archaeology shares a lot of similarities with theories of heritage, especially with respect to the idea of cultural continuity and the importance of collective memories.

## HERITAGE

Heritage can be defined as our array of inherited culture, our traditions, objects, monuments, and memories. As well, heritage does not exist within a vacuum and is not strictly our past: heritage is how our past affects our present. The past is constantly renegotiated to make it correspond with the present as we choose what parts of our cultural past to preserve and pass on to future generations (Smith 2006, Littler 2014, Holtorf 2012). Heritage can also be defined as

a practice, that has protocols followed by heritage managers, archaeologists, museum curators, and community members. Heritage can be turned into profit through tourism, but most importantly, it is the social and culture practice of meaning and identity making (Smith 2006:13). Heritage is a vast subject which will be examined in terms of its relationship with archaeology and identity building. Heritage can be used both negatively and is regularly used to perpetuate hegemonic<sup>2</sup> power and nationalism. However, it also has been used to rebuild collective identities and empower marginalized communities.

### *Intangible Heritage & Memory*

According to Smith, heritage tends to focus on the aesthetically pleasing things which can be placed inside a museum and admired (Smith 2006:29). These tangible parts of heritage, ones which exist physically in our world, are of importance to our heritage and collective identity, but there is another aspect of heritage which is more subtle but even stronger than cultural objects. Intangible heritage has a “focus on practices and expressions that do not leave extensive material traces... such as storytelling, craftsmanship, rituals, dramas and festivals” (Littler 2014:95). Intangible heritage is the experiential parts of culture that define our sense of belonging, and the idea that we are who we are because we have been practising and experiencing this for generations. This type of heritage is created through collective memories of the past, distinct from history, as acts of remembering and forgetting which create the heritage we practice and preserve today.

Intangible heritage and memory are intimately related to the “present through the personal and collective actions of remembering... [and] is an important constitutive element of

---

<sup>2</sup> Simply put, hegemonic power is that of the ruling or dominant class in a political or social context.

## WIECKHOFF

identity formation” (Smith 2006:60). Being created from the past does not mean that heritage is necessarily “history” which seeks to clearly define and analyze the truths of the past; rather, heritage does not have to follow the strict narratives of historical continuity. Memories that are shared often have been widely accepted as something which should be remembered, and this sharing becomes social glue which creates feelings of belonging and security within communities which further creates cultural continuity (Smith 2006:63). However, not all collective memories and historical narratives are thought to be equal; heritage discourse has often focused only on dominant ideologies and has been misused for nationalistic purposes.

### *Authorized Heritage Discourse and Nationalism*

As previously discussed, heritage discourse tends to focus on our material heritage, the physical aspects which are admired for their aesthetic. While our monuments and our masterworks are important parts of our cultural identity, it is only one aspect of heritage. Laurajane Smith (2006:29) has termed this the “authorized heritage discourse” (AHD) which focuses on “aesthetically pleasing material objects, places and/or landscapes that current generations ‘must’ care for, protect and revere so that they may be passed to nebulous future generations for their ‘education’”. However, our heritage extends far beyond the “aesthetically pleasing” material objects only and thus authorized heritage discourse is often problematic and exclusionary. Similarly to archaeology, “heritage arose during the nineteenth century as a way to consolidate national identity and served as a foundational component of nationalism, with archaeological evidence frequently being used to support these heritage narratives” (Westmont and Antelid 2018:238). Heritage is a powerful force in creating collective and national identities and thus can be used in a way that is harmful towards minority groups. It can prevent the

participation of minorities “in the selection and creation of historical sites and narratives” (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:242). There is power within authorized heritage discourse and that power establishes who can speak for the past, by creating a single historical narrative and national identity that gives power to those who fit that identity and takes power from those who do not. However, heritage is “also a process that continually creates and recreates a range of social relations, values and meanings about both the past and present... it legitimizes and defines the identities of a range of social actors” (Smith 2006:42). While authorized heritage discourse has the power to create space for other heritage narratives, it is largely used for nationalistic purposes to solidify dominant ideologies and silence minority voices. Authorized heritage discourse can use archaeology to give power to these dominant ideologies by not allowing space for dissonant voices. The power within authorized heritage discourse is illustrated perfectly in a Greek context where the government has spent many decades pushing a single idea of what it means to be Greek.

*Case Study: Greece’s Misuse of Heritage*

Using Greece as an example, I would like to illustrate the ways in which heritage can be misused and ways that archaeology without community involvement can create dangerous identity politics. Greece has spent decades forging itself into a nation-state based on a collective identity based on Hellenism, Greece’s ancient past (323 BC – 31 BC). Since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century to today, archaeology in Greece has been used by its government to “legitimize the identity of the nation. The claim was that a direct cultural link existed between ancient Classical Greeks and the people living in the same region” (Sakellariadi 2010:516). Modern Greece has

## WIECKHOFF

had its connections to the classical past solidified since the War of Independence (1821-1829) from the Ottoman Empire.

The connection to Greece's classical past was born during Ottoman occupation (from the mid-15<sup>th</sup> century to 1821). Under this Turkish Ottoman rule, high-status Greeks sought to claim their unique difference from their oppressors by emphasizing that they had an unbroken connection to the ancient Hellenic spirit and culture. Yet, this "unbroken connection" was an invention, as a continuous connection with this past had not existed (Forbes 2014:83). After independence, the Hellenistic obsession only continued and was further reinvigorated with Greece's membership to the European Union in 1981 (Gotsi in Forbes 2014:83). In an attempt to prevent European homogeneity, Greece used its classical past to differentiate itself from the rest of the European Union. Greece "compromised its modern identity so as to prove itself worthy of this legacy at the expense of a far richer past than the one that suited the national narrative" (Sakellariadi 2010:516). The creation of a single national narrative had led to the denial, and even prosecution, of alternative heritages. Greek citizens have been arrested and charged with crimes, usually with disrupting public peace, if they publicly recognize minorities. One such case in 2001, saw a citizen jailed for 15 months for "disseminating false information which could provoke public anxiety and give the impression that there are minority problems in Greece... the court ruled that claiming that any minority language groups existed in Greece was a lie" (Forbes 2014:79). However, minority groups do exist, and the misuse of archaeology and heritage has created a sense of disconnect and unbelonging for minority groups within Greece.

Arvanites, an ethnic minority of Albanian origins living in southeastern Greece, have experienced discrimination due to their non-Hellenistic past despite their permanent residence in the region since the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Arvanites even faced modern ethnic cleansing, not in the



extreme sense of genocide, but still a deliberate attempt to erase Arvanitic identity. One way in which the Greek government did this was to remove all indigenous Arvanitic place names with Greek names in order to claim the land as historically Greek (Forbes 2014:87). The Arvanite population also faced increasingly xenophobic attacks because they were erroneously associated with Albanian refugees in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The belief that “of all the migrant groups in Greece... ethnic Albanians were the most visible, most reviled and most particularly associated with criminality in Greek social consciousness” led the native Arvanitic population to be attacked (Forbes 2014:90). Arvanites were faced with assimilating into the hegemonic Greek identity and differentiating themselves from Albanian refugees.

Constant discrimination and lack of representation has severely affected the Arvanite’s heritage and sense of belonging in Greece. Arvanites are very proud of their “distinctive language, culture and origins, directly challenging the dominant national discourse on ‘true’ Greek identity” (Forbes 2014:89). Having an unwanted heritage, a heritage deemed uninteresting at least, and dangerous at worst by Greek researchers led Arvanites to create their own discourse on heritage. With the creation of Arvanitic associations, Arvanites entered the battle of who was “more Greek”. These associations focused on the “primeval origins of Arvanite’s civilisation... [and] that the original ancestors of Albanians and Greece’s Arvanites were the Pelasgians, a mythical race that the ancient Greeks believed inhabited Greece before they arrived” (Forbes 2014:90). This narrative thus placed the Arvanites in Greece before the Greeks themselves, making Arvanitic heritage as important as, if not more than, the dominant Greek heritage.

Using heritage for nationalistic purposes is dangerous, it pushes minorities further into the margins and creates conflict about who truly belongs to the state. Community-based archaeology would assist in breaking this hegemonic heritage discourse in Greece by

## WIECKHOFF

highlighting dissonant historic narratives and bringing minorities into the national view. In order to normalize other Greek identities and create more diverse heritage, Greek archaeology needs to expand beyond the authorized heritage discourse. Doing so will add value to the heritage, create more diverse tourism, and economically benefit smaller, local diverse communities (Sakellariadi 2010:523). Community-based archaeology provides an opportunity for minority voices to be heard and allow researchers to explore histories beyond of the authorized heritage discourse.

### COMMUNITY-BASED ARCHAEOLOGY

Community-based archaeology (CBA) is a relatively new concept within archaeology. Although CBC is already deeply rooted in archaeology that deals with Indigenous peoples, especially in North America, it is still in its infancy in many parts of the world. Very simply, CBA is defined as any outreach aspect of an archaeological project (Thomas 2017:16). However, that allows archaeologists to label their research as community-based without any meaningful engagement of locals. What CBA is and how it looks in practice will vary between communities (see Atalay 2012:16-17), but I argue that to truly be considered CBA, researchers must include locals in meaningful engagement. Types of meaningful engagement can include public outreach by disseminating information to source communities, involvement in excavations, site management, and conservation (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008:469). It is also important to note what, or who, is the community. A clear definition of community, or even the community you are specifically working with, is inherently difficult to arrive at. Community is not only the people who reside where you do research, there are many other kinds of community, including those based on interest and referred to as stakeholders, which can be anything from descent

communities (which do not always reside on lands of their heritage anymore), to politicians (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008:468). The communities that can be involved in research are pluralistic and complex, which can both serve to enrich the process and/or add struggles.

History too is pluralistic; there is no single truth in the re-creation of the past, yet only the most dominant narrative is widely spread. As we saw in the above case study in Greece, there is clearly a dominant version of history that is promoted which leaves no space for other versions of history. Community-based archaeology, by working with and listening to the voices of minority communities, recognizes that there is no single past and that the “meaning of the past and its remains cannot be revealed objectively, but are always created in a given contemporary social and cultural context” (Holtorf 2012:7). Every historical narrative is up for negotiation, and community-based archaeology allows for dissonant voices to be heard and for a more pluralistic version of history to be offered. Community-based archaeology in the capacity it exists today in many places, is easily abused due to its multiple and sometimes ambiguous definitions. With one definition, a researcher only has to use local knowledge for their research to be considered “community-based”. It is easy to have community involvement in research and it is even easier to benefit from that involvement. However, creating meaningful engagement can be difficult and does not always directly benefit research, but it should be a requirement to be recognized as truly “community-based” and to receive any type of research funding.

### *Case Study: Almost There: Research in Belize*

While community-based archaeology is unarguably a step in the right direction, it can be far too loosely defined which is seen in Mayfield and Simmons’ (2018) research in Belize. Their

## WIECKHOFF

idea of community-based archaeology is what I describe as the bare minimum. The following will be an evaluation of the work Mayfield and Simmons did in Belize and why I believe they should not call their research community-based archaeology. Their research involves the community of San Pedro, but it still lacks meaningful engagement that serves to further the community after the researchers' departure. The community is also loosely defined; they are not working with a specific community but instead just allowed locals in a city to interact with the research. It is clear that their intentions were not to exploit the source community for their knowledge, as they speak about how positive and enlightening experience it was to work with locals. However, by only focusing on what the community could offer their research they effectively leached the local knowledge and fled back to America with their results.

Mayfield and Simmons' research took place on the property of a hostel in San Pedro Town in northern Belize. They set out with the goals to work in clear view of the community and invite the public to ask questions and engage in the research and were successful with immediate public responses on the first day. Four people approached the researchers and each of them "had seen artifacts similar to those ... excavated on their property... [they] got leads on previously unidentified sites and were informed of community members who might be able to answer some ... questions" (Mayfield and Simmons 2018:30). The team clearly benefited greatly from including source communities, but the lack of meaningful engagement sets a low bar for future community-based projects. Chirikure and Pwiti (2008:468) outline the need for meaningful engagement which benefits source communities socially and economically as an important facet of community-based archaeology. I believe that Mayfield and Simmons missed the mark with their research and only took advantage of the benefits archaeologists can receive from community-based objectives without thinking about how they could give back to the community.

This might be at best considered to be public archaeology, but it is not truly “community-based” archaeology.

### **THE FUTURE OF ARCHAEOLOGY: A CLEARER COMMUNITY-BASED APPROACH**

Community-based archaeology has come to dominate the field of archaeology in many places across the world, especially in places dealing with indigenous archaeology, but has been slow to pick up in other areas (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008:467). Its multiple and ambiguous definitions have also led to misinterpretations of what correctly is community-based archaeology and in some cases has only benefited the archaeologists, as shown in Mayfield and Simmons’ (2018) archaeological project. I argue that to truly be considered community-based, archaeology must include meaningful engagement with the source communities, and one such way to ensure this is through heritage-building. Archaeology must also make itself relevant to minority communities and cannot exist within a vacuum, just as with heritage, archaeology reflects and is embedded in present-day society (Holtorf 2012:6). Community engagement can be understood in many ways, and these understandings can range from having limited or a great deal of engagement.

As discussed, the past is pluralistic and filled with many narratives which come from both dominant and marginalized communities. This means that archaeologists must become advocates for communities if it is going to be community-based. Post-Processualism presented archaeologists with the need to give source communities a say in the research and allow them to present their needs to researchers. Research that does not do this, such as in the above-mentioned case study in Greece, explicitly goes against anti-colonial research standards which were

## WIECKHOFF

commonly practiced since the 1980s. In North America, research that does not follow the criteria of CBA would not even be able to find research funding. This type of archaeology, however, is less common in Europe, the Middle East, and elsewhere. Community-based archaeology is a powerful tool against nationalistic movements which strive to create a single identity, but because the “heritages that underlie these nationalistic claims to power are entirely dependent on constructed versions of the past, versions that oftentimes require as much forgetting as they do remembering, their authenticity can be challenged” (Westmont and Antelid 2018:238).

Community-based archaeology challenges hegemonic history by hearing the voices of marginalized communities and providing the physical means to help strengthen their claims to their own heritage. Interacting with communities is an important aspect of community-based archaeology and an excellent way to gather information which benefits both the archaeologist and the community is through ethnographic archaeology.

### *Ethnographic Archaeology*

Ethnographic archaeology is an important tool that links archaeology with heritage-building and should be an integral part of any archaeological research. Ethnographic research involving source communities provides valuable information, not just for archaeological research, but it also provides insight into what is important to these communities and the ways that archaeological research may help them. This kind of research involves “short interviews, or more in-depth ethnographic research... [and] merges accountability with public education and truly practices an archaeology beneficial to diverse stakeholders” (McGill 2010:476). Engaging in such a way with the community provides insight for the archaeologist but it is also a tool for encouraging stewardship of the past through education. Ethnographic research does this by highlighting material remains and the “embodied and narrative performances in which locals

relate to them” (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:250). Ethnographic archaeology becomes an important aspect when paired with a symmetrical archaeology approach. Symmetrical archaeology aims to discover the multiplicity of history and how these multiple narratives relate to contemporary communities, and thus requires the method of ethnographic research. Creating links between contemporary populations and the material past breeds an interest in the past which leads to increased stewardship and a renewed sense of heritage.

The material past becomes important in the present because people are then able to attach memories and emotions to objects. McGill (2010:468) argues that “through discussion with local stakeholders, I believe all archaeologists have better opportunities to link the professional ethics of accountability, public education, and stewardship in their research.” This can be as simple as asking the community what is important about the place they live in. Erin Gibson (2018), during her research in a rural town in Cyprus, asked this question of the villagers and provided cameras for them to photograph these places. The villagers then “decided they wanted to videotape practices because heritage isn’t always about places, it’s about things that happen at those places, it’s about certain traditions” (Gibson 2018). Gibson’s research is now being continued by the villagers as they continue to film and record their heritage. Ethnographic research and archaeology should be inseparable and benefits archaeologists by forming relationships between contemporary communities and the ancient past they study. In cases where there are no direct descendent groups, such as in Egypt, the community that lives on the archaeological site still has a great depth of knowledge of the ancient past (Lorenzon and Zermani 2016). However, I have argued that archaeologists cannot just use the community’s knowledge without giving back and providing meaningful opportunities which empower the community.

*Empowering Communities*

Any archaeological research project should strive to leave the source community with tools to create a better situation. Far too often archaeologists have extracted knowledge from a community and fled with the findings. Empowerment can come in many forms, not just economically, it can relate to the physical wellbeing of a community. Archaeological projects involving veterans to combat war trauma has proven that “involvement and interaction with heritage... [has been] shown to have positive ‘wellbeing’ outcomes” (Thomas 2017:24) which can be measured medically. The simplest way a community can be empowered through community-based archaeology is by providing a platform for those whose voices are often not heard. Our research as archaeologists should serve to educate about marginalized populations and provide the resources for these groups to continue and benefit from this education also. This type of archaeology should always seek to challenge metanarratives “which seek to formulate people as *one* and move away from the singularities of class, sex, geopolitical locale, [and] sexual orientation” (Meskel 1998:4).

Archaeologists must counter nationalistic discourse which uses archaeology as evidence, especially in areas which are politically volatile. The representation of different heritages of both dominant and marginalized communities can often be problematic and cause increased tensions between these communities, but it can also foster greater respect for each other’s identities and opens our society to different ways of expressing identity (Golden 2004:195). Instead of feeding into nationalistic motives, archaeologists should instead work “toward producing archaeological narratives that challenge the dominant ideologies and national myths rather than support them” (Golden 2004:199). Empowering communities should be an integral part of community-based archaeology. The archaeological project of the “Three Peak Sanctuaries of Central Crete” is a



prime example of community-based archaeology that empowers local communities through meaningful engagement which includes heritage-building.

*Case Study: Community-Based Archaeology Done Right: An Example from Central Crete*

The “Three Peak Sanctuaries of Central Crete” project investigated materials from previous salvage excavations in three Minoan peak sanctuaries<sup>3</sup>: Philioremos-Gonies, Keria-Gonies, and Pyrgos-Tylissos. What makes this project unique is its use of ethnography and the ways in which it builds upon heritage, specifically of women whose voices are often left out of these types of research. The project's goal was to practice “a pragmatic, context-specific, ethnographically informed archaeology that retains its critical distance from official versions of heritage, but seeks to intervene in existing local disputes and participate in the planning and execution of heritage management... and advocate for positions that are underprivileged in the AHD [authorized heritage discourse]” (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:243). Previous archaeological research in Crete has left the community feeling robbed of their heritage. In one example from 1954, local Cretan heritage was literally taken from them when a local man discovered a suit of armour while digging a cellar in his basement. The artifact was promptly taken by the Heraklion Museum curator and neither the man nor his descendants have been allowed to see the armour as the museum is unwilling to find it within their stores (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:249). While the communities on Crete recognize that archaeology can bring tourism and revenue, they have not had positive experiences with archaeologists.

---

<sup>3</sup> These sites, found high in the mountains on the island of Crete in Greece, are thought to have been used for religious rites in the Minoan culture, which was part of the Bronze Age Aegean civilization from about 3500 BCE to 1100 BCE.

## WIECKHOFF

Ethnographic research is a way to break down the boundaries of distrust and through building rapport, archaeologists can better work with the community and learn what they want from archaeological research.

Ethnographic research was a key aspect of the Three Peaks Sanctuaries project. The purpose of the ethnographic research was to identify people most willing to partake in heritage management and to establish the aims of the community which most importantly was community regeneration (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:246). Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos learned that the community's interests were in economic development and that the local community members had no personal interest or investment in the Minoan ruins beyond economic opportunity. As a result of this finding, the project had to turn its attention to modern heritage as well to build an interest in, or stewardship of these heritage sites while also building upon the community's interest in their more recent past (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:244). This turn in the research direction is extremely important for community-based archaeology because it recognizes the needs of the community as equal to the archaeological interests. While there was little attachment to the ancient heritage of the sites, local community members did connect to these places because of more recent and personal memories and heritage. When asked "What is Philioremos to you?" one elderly man answered "it is everything; when we cut class we hid there, when the Nazis came to sack the village we flew there, when our mothers wanted to give us a beating we hid there, when the Ottomans were here, we organized up there, Philioremos is our freedom, it is every we have" (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:255). The past is multilayered: the ancient past of these Minoan ruins clearly is not the only past, nor even the most important past to the local community members. The past can also be interpreted differently by different village communities as was evident in the conflicting histories

of surrounding villages, as each tried to claim they had more rights to the Minoan heritage than did the others. Using archaeological evidence, Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos (2016) were able to disprove other villages' claims to the heritage. This is also why the ethnographic research is important as it brings forth the experiential connection different communities have with a place of antiquity. These ancient sites have meaning both about the ancient pasts and as part of the everyday lives of people.

The Three Peaks project had a clear goal to give back to the community. It was made explicit from the beginning "that this research project would be small-scale and would not funnel funds for local development. However [the project's] ethical commitment to give back to the community led [the researchers] to consider ways of reimbursing the community for its resources, its hospitality, and its time" (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:246) They did so in small ways, such as providing small sums of money to the village cultural association and to their hosts, and assisting the community in ways to attract tourism and revenue themselves (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:248).

The research project did this in a few specific ways that were both personal and geared towards creating a tourism industry within the village. First, the project used people's personal memories to increase stewardship by re-creating clay dolls from the ruins that the elderly residents used to play with as children. The workshop 'evoked bodily memories of interaction with the [dolls]... and also highlighted their importance as archaeological knowledge, and... embodied affective notions of stewardship based on a communally perceived memory of place" (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:250). Second, the project assisted in setting up tourist signposts. Third, and most importantly, this project sought to create space so that the voices of the village women could be heard in the heritage and tourism narratives. Traditionally, women

## WIECKHOFF

have been left out of most decisions in the village, but the women held deep knowledge of the heritage. In the case of Crete, these women had knowledge of herbal medicine and had used tools like those found in the ruins in their domestic labour. To highlight this, the research project created a heritage map that focused on gendered areas of domestic work. When the village men protested that this was not “heritage”, the project fostered an environment where the women felt comfortable in defending themselves. The project researchers emphasized that “what is called heritage in the village is in great part associated with female labour and domestic chores” (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2016:258). This was illustrated by the utensils and implements that are today zealously preserved as family heirlooms held by the women of the village. The Three Peaks project is a perfect example of what community-based archaeology should look like because of its range of meaningful engagements with the local community and its strict commitment to ethics.

## CONCLUSION

In order to move into the future, archaeology needs to become more relevant to contemporary populations. With the advent of post-processualism in the 1980s, archaeology moved further beyond the realm of sciences and further into cultural anthropology. However, this shift in approach is not enough. It is not enough to just consider the ways in which the past interacts with the present and the cultural aspects of material remains, archaeology needs to join the rest of anthropology in becoming socially engaged. Heritage studies are following a similar approach as archaeology; however, heritage can still be misused for nationalistic purposes of the dominant community. Community-based archaeology has the tools that can counter nationalistic heritage movements by providing evidence supporting the existence of marginalized

## Community-Based Archaeology

communities and their heritages. The Three Peaks projects in Crete is a good example of when community-based archaeology and heritage intersect and how they counter each other's weaknesses. All types of archaeology across the world need to adopt a community-based archaeology which involves meaningful engagement that empowers the communities we work with. Today, archaeologists who adopt these methods are seen as going above and beyond, but I believe this type of research should be the standard as we continue into the future.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Angèle Smith for her guidance in both this research paper and unending kindness as a teacher, mentor, and friend. I would also like to thank my capstone classmates Rhiannon Gammon, Rowan Paulson, Laura Pyke, and Christa Flowers for giving their time in editing and providing feedback on all of our projects.

**REFERENCES CITED**

Atalay, Sonya

2012 *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Chirikure, Shadreck and Gilbert Pwiti

2008 Community Involvement in archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management: An Assessment from Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere. *Current Anthropology* 49(3):467-485.

Flemming, Andrew

2006 Post-processual Landscape Archaeology: A Critique. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 16(3):267-280.

Forbes, Hamish

2014 Archaeology and the Making of Improper Citizens in Modern Greece. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 27(1):79-100.

Gibson, Erin

2018 Pathways to Heritage: Community-Based Research in a Rural Cypriot Village.

Electronic document, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hFAVSc34OBE>, accessed April 1, 2019.

Golden, Jonathon

2004 Targeting Heritage: The Abuse of Symbolic Sites in Modern Conflict. In *Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*, edited by Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram, pp. 183-204. Rowman and Littlefield, California.

WIECKHOFF

Holtorf, Cornelius

2012 *Search for the Past – Find the Present: Qualities of Archaeology and Heritage in Contemporary Society*. Archaeopress, Oxford.

Kyriakidis, Evangelos and Aris Anagnostopoulos

2016 Archaeological Ethnography, Heritage Management, and Community Archaeology: A Pragmatic Approach from Crete. *Public Archaeology* 14(4): 240-262.

Lewis, Diane

1973 Anthropology and Colonialism. *Current Anthropology* 14(5):581-602.

Little, Jo

2014 Intangible Roles: Theory, Policy, Practice and Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Ethnologies* 36(1-2):93-106.

Lorenzon, Marta and Isabel Zermani

2016 Common Ground: Community Archaeology in Egypt, Interaction Between Populations and Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 3(3):183-199.

Mayfield, Tracie and Scott E. Simmons

2018 Why the Present Matters: The Important of Community Outreach and Public Engagement in Archaeology. *Anthropology Now* 10(1):25-39.

Meskel, Lynn

1998 Introduction: Archaeology Matters. In *Archaeology under fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. Edited by Lynn Meskel, pp.1-12. Routledge, London.



McGill, Dru

2010 The Public's Archaeology: Utilizing Ethnographic Methods to Link Public Education with Accountability in Archaeological Practice. *Archaeologies* 6(3):468-484.

Sakellariadi, Anastasia

2010 Community Archaeology: A Threat or an Opportunity for Greek Archaeology? *Archaeologies* 6(3):514-527.

Smith, Laurajane

2006 *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge, London.

Shanks, Michael

2007 Symmetrical archaeology. *World Archaeology* 39(4):589-596.

Thomas, Suzie

2017 Community Archaeology. In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, edited by Gabriel Moshenska, pp. 14-30. UCL Press, London.

Westmont, Camille and Andreas Antelid

2018 The place to be: Community archaeology as a tool for cultural integration. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 5(4):237-249.