Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Public Archaeology, The Move Towards	
Copyright Year	2013	
Copyright Holder	Springer Science+Business Media New York	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	**Angelo**
	Particle	
	Given Name	**Dante**
	Suffix	
	Division/Department	Departmento de Antropología
	Organization/University	University of Tarapacá (UTA)
	City	Arica
	Country	Chile
	Email	dangeloz@uta.cl

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:41 Page Number: 1

Public Archaeology, The Move Towards

Dante Angelo
Departmento de Antropología, University of Tarapacá (UTA), Arica, Chile

Introduction

One of the most evident changes brought by the reflexive turn in archaeology is perhaps the move towards public archaeology. Although in its inception public archaeology was primarily related to educational concerns and efforts to attain public outreach (McGimsey 1972; Jameson 1997; Stone & Molyneaux 1994), in recent years it has become more complex to define. This slipperiness has to do with the fact that, as an umbrella term, public archaeology now encompasses a wide array of concepts and purposes (Schadla-Hall 1999; Merriman 2004a; Matsuda & Okamura 2011). This turn towards public archaeology, thus, can be better characterized by a gradual and explicit involvement of archaeology practitioners in different and intertwined levels of educational, political, governmental, and ethical issues. In this sense, it relates to and involves concepts such as development, heritage, applied archaeology, and community archaeology.

Definition and Historical Background

The term public archaeology attained recognition in the early 1970s with Charles R. McGimsey's publication with this very title (McGimsey 1972). Then, it was mainly meant to address the dangers of destruction of archaeological remains, raise broader awareness about this problem, and support legislative efforts aimed at protecting them (Schadla-Hall 1999). The increasing pressures of development, observed mainly in the United States and European countries, posed a challenge to professionals and state institutions as they were increasingly confronted with the destruction and loss of historical and archaeological heritage. The rise of independent archaeological contractors, as well as the participation of some universities in the development process, provided some means to mitigate such destruction and gave rise to Cultural Resource Management (CRM) or contract archaeology. Known also as heritage management and archaeological resource management, one of the main tenets of CRM archaeology was the preservation of past remains, conceived as a resource belonging to societies (MacManamon & Hatton 2000). The past, henceforth, came to be seen as a public right pertaining to the interests of the whole society (Carman 2002; Merriman 2004b). As observed by Smith (2004:6), although the equal accessibility and significance to all comers implied by the term "resource" was subsequently challenged, the prolific efforts to develop outreach and educational programs and prevent the

C. Smith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2,
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2013

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:41 Page Number: 2

destruction of archaeological remains also contributed to make the subject relevant to a broader audience. Additionally, scholars drawing from critical theory emphasized that a reflexive stand oriented to reinforce stakeholder communities' civic and proactive engagements with the past should be paramount to public archaeology (Leone et al. 1995; Little & Shackel 2007).

In any case, the term public archaeology began to take its current shape with the involvement of archaeology in public debates, traversing the borders of traditional academic archaeology, to respond to public interests about the past. The rationalist and political neutrality of scientific discourse, prevalent in the discipline during most of the 1960s and 1970s, was fiercely challenged in the early half of the 1980s. Theoretically, factions of the post-processual movement in archaeology, strongly influenced by feminist and Indigenous discourses, challenged the authority and ethics of representation of the "other" and echoed the cultural critique about the hegemony of the Western academy (Wylie 1982; Hodder 1986; Pels 1999); most of these critiques called for a more inclusionary archaeological interpretation, in which Indigenous peoples and different local communities and stakeholders could participate (Layton 1989; Hodder et al. 1995). Following the controversies that arose as a result of the creation of the World Archaeology Congress (WAC) in 1986, a much more politicized world emerged for archaeology (Ucko 1987; Shanks 2004).

Authors such as Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1992) and Mark Leone and colleagues (Leone et al. 1987, 1995), for example, emphasized the need for a critical appraisal of the interrelationship between archaeology and politics and to understand the power relations established discursively through historical and archaeological knowledge (see also McGuire 2008). Advocating for an inclusion of the different emerging voices, then, these contributions set an interpretive movement that came to call into question the prevalent authority over the past held by the discipline. With the advent of politics of identity and recognition, the past became a realm of contestation in which a variety of contemporary interests became interweaved. Thus, steering public archaeology in new directions, the reflexive turn established by an overt critique to objectivity, rationalism, and scientific archaeology coalesced with the politics of cultural recognition and provided the basis for a more inclusive debate, raising issues and categories such as identity, ethnicity, and so forth.

Key Issues/Current Debates

The move towards public archaeology has brought a new array of themes and topics to the discussion about archaeological practice and theoretical consideration. Prominent in the current debate related to this recent turn in the archaeological inquiry are the discussions about transnationalism, tourism, sustainable development, commodification of cultural resources, and global–local relationships (Smith 2006). The impact that this reflexive trend had on archaeological practice can be scrutinized at least in two interrelated aspects: collaboration and heritage. On the one hand, emanating from various angles, critiques to academic authority pushed archaeologists to reconsider their position as the only stewards of the past and prompted them to engage in collaborative programs with a wide array of Indigenous and local communities (Faulkner 2000; Colwell-Chanthaphonh & Ferguson 2010; Gnecco & Ayala 2011). Thus, a more nuanced perspective about public archaeology, although still involving educational and legislative aspects, now incorporates ethical concerns and acknowledges that the practice of "scientific archaeology" can no longer be the only authoritative voice about the past. Moreover, in investigating the past, archaeologists need to be aware about social, "racial," political, and other tensions emerging from dissonant interpretations of the past; the practice of public archaeology, therefore, also incorporates components of ethics and sociopolitical accountability.

On the other hand, although still concerned about protecting the past, public archaeology now actively engages in issues related to the management of sites through a nuanced

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:41 Page Number: 3

understanding of cultural and archaeological heritage. Heritage, as a concept, has recently made its way to the core of archaeological theory. Closely related to the politics of recognition mentioned above, the concept of heritage has recently opened a new and vigorous debate, expanding the considerations of what constitutes the public and, therefore, what public archaeology or archaeological practice should entail. The involvement of different communities of stakeholders that stepped forward to express interests or concerns about archaeological sites and archaeological discourse constituted a new challenge for the discipline (Russell 2006; Smith 2006). Barbara Bender's (1998) seminal work about the emblematic archaeological site of Stonehenge provides an exemplary approach to the analysis of the historically dynamic contexts that stakeholders (including archaeologists) can become involved in. Eluding the essentialist thought that commonly portrays Indigenous peoples and descendant communities as the only "other voices" that come forward to question archaeology, Bender's work also reflects on the formation of new groups of stakeholders and the politics that surround them. By the same token, critical awareness about the decisions, interpretation, and management of cultural and archaeological heritage acquired global connotations through the increasing myriad of stakeholders as well as a burgeoning tourist industry related to the consumption of the past.

This global trend of cultural consumption closely relates to a process of shrinking of distances which – fueled by a burgeoning and constant flux of peoples, goods, information, and capital – consolidated globalization as a phenomenon with a wide array of economic, cultural, and political implications worldwide. For many, globalization meant the standardization of culture as well as economics, with the consequent establishment of a single dominant and global cultural order; however, contradicting the fears of homogenization predicted as part of the effects of globalization, the blooming of cultural diversity set under the auspices of multiculturalism amounted to define tourism as one of the key themes in archaeological theory (Merriman 2002; Meskell 2005). Consequently, archaeologists have started to turn their attention to the relationship of the discipline with the heritage and tourism industries. Related to this current trend, tourism and cultural recreation have become central to archaeologists as the public increasingly demands the articulation of new narratives about the past (Holtorf 2005).

As heritage or cultural tourism consolidates as one of the most important global industries (Urry 2002), the interest in archaeological heritage has gradually increased over the last few decades. With a burgeoning demand of cultural consumption fostered by an exponentially increasing flux of capital and peoples, tourism promoted archaeological heritage to new dimensions. Additionally, the gradual involvement of different stakeholders and local communities in heritage issues brought up several concerns regarding property and propriety of heritage. Archaeologists, in this sense, have been pushed to explore ever more complex and intertwined relationships involving individuals, communities, states, and global agencies at different scales. Local understandings of heritage values, however, as demonstrated by different scholars, can differ significantly from those parameters conceived as universal. The past, once aptly depicted as a "foreign country" (Lowenthal 2003), became the arena in which active – and sometimes dissonant – social constructions continuously take place through heritage and tourism and, therefore, have opened new lines of debate regarding its ownership and stewardship (Smith 2006).

International Perspectives

Arguably, then, heritage tourism has become one of the most profitable industries of recent decades and a global force that increasingly extends its branches throughout the world (Hoffman et al. 2002; Higueras 2008). As part of this global trend in which archaeological heritage is now involved, the heritage industry included in the core of developmental policies of global organizations such as the World Bank has been endowed a reputation of being a determinant factor for

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:42 Page Number: 4

economic growth, especially for developing countries (Meskell 2005; Lafrenz 2008). Whereas it is often argued that heritage can play a significant role in overcoming economic adversities, less is said about its detrimental effects on local communities. While some argue for the necessity of making useable pasts, as something that can be assessed to provide economic profitability, others question the beneficiaries of these profits (Lafrenz 2009). As the expectations of tourism and heritage industries have risen, the attempts to attain the inscription of sites in the prestigious World Heritage Site list by different country parties have also escalated. A large percentage of recent nominations, related to the aforementioned search for economic growth, have to do with the fact that the attempt to gain such a reputable designation will help to promote heritage sites as marketable tourist sites.

In this sense, with an exponential number of new local sites and museums that now compete to attain some recognition while others focus on maintaining their high profiles and well-preserved statuses, the values and principles for such recognitions and other tenets heralded by global organizations are being called into question. Questioning the set of values that have commonly been used to define cultural and archaeological heritage, some archaeologists now actively work to emphasize local views and values regarding the past (Faulker 2000). Challenging previous top-down perspectives that were mainly concerned with a rather monumental and conservationist view of archaeological heritage, the intervention of new stakeholders established the need for archaeologists to understand the emergence of new relationships between local interests and global demands (Hodder 2003). Whereas international agencies and organizations such as UNESCO, ICOMOS, and WHC had advanced important contributions to deal with issues deeply affecting cultural heritage, such as looting and trafficking of archaeological remains, a new approach to heritage also emphasizes ethical concerns pertaining to cultural property and human rights (Brodie et al. 2000; Brodie & Walker 2002; Silverman & Fairchild Ruggles 2007).

In this scenario, as heritage has become the axis where these contemporary social understandings and active constructions of the past come together, public archaeology confronts a wide array of challenges in its efforts to engage with different communities and stakeholders. Related to this, by drawing away from conservative approaches to heritage, public archaeology has also highlighted the importance of including different criteria and considerations, other than those defined by the World Heritage Convention in the definition of valuable heritage sites (Cleere 1996; Lafrenz 2008). As a result, heritage organizations and state agencies have been compelled to take into consideration a more dynamic and diversified understanding in which cultural and heritage value could be also related to political restitution or economic leverage and well-being. Nonetheless, although different countries have adopted the globally sponsored efforts towards the recognition of their Indigenous peoples, for many of these populations, to attain such recognition implies a compliance with guidelines of authenticity in order for them to prove cultural and genealogical continuity so that they may be conferred with the rights to cultural ancestry (Clifford 1988; Hale 1999).

Thus, some of the questions still to be addressed regarding the intersection of public archaeology and tourism are related to the new power relationships and cultural dynamics provoked by the commodification of cultural heritage. For instance, the demand for authentic experiences related to this global trend of cultural consumption has commonly driven heritage managers, cultural planners, and tourism-related policy makers to resort to the use of archaeological discourse to recast "authentic" – or rather essentialist – views of culture (Castañeda 1996; Benavides 2004; Hamilakis 2008). This is particularly the case for Indigenous peoples and other historically marginalized communities that, related to their cultural and political struggle, opt or are compelled to resort to heritage and cultural tourism as strategies to boost their economies (Meskell 2005; Lafrenz 2008); in this sense, Indigenous peoples remain commonly represented as passively reproducing a colonial

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:42 Page Number: 5

imaginary in the realm of heritage. Furthermore, it has been generally the case that most of the countries whose archaeological heritage is administrated by state and centralized agencies not only tend to emphasize its economic importance for local development, as part of their policies, but also – and primarily – to reify it as the legitimate roots of nationhood (Rowan & Baram 2004; Hamilakis 2008). Therefore, despite the fact that these strategies have prompted a successful public recognition of multiple ethnic groups, which is one of the reasons why they became widely adopted as part of different state policies, they also exert powerful constrains and fixities determined by the very demands posed by consumption.

Different collaborative projects between local communities and archaeologists have, therefore, been caught up in a series of paradoxes. On the one hand, collaborative projects struggle to protect archaeological sites and to confront the destructive threats of development and sometimes, ironically, even harmful effects of tourism; as it was noted, "cultural tourism can pose a significant challenge to the management of heritage sites, as visitors can have positive and negative impacts, and increased visitation means increased responsibility, especially in terms of on-site safety" (Smith & Burke 2007:239). On the other hand, public archaeology projects that involve working with economically disadvantaged communities often involve efforts relating to political empowerment and identity issues as well as attempting to orient their efforts to promote heritage tourism opportunities as part of these communities' social and economic sustainability. In that sense, the move towards public archaeology needs to be understood as an ongoing process in which the practice of archaeology itself becomes reconfigured. It comes as no surprise that public archaeology, as part of its response to these new challenges, has adopted and stressed the importance of a rather involved take on the politics surrounding the conceptualization of the audiences towards whom our work is directed, which – at its turn – implies a strong reflexive slant towards ethics.

Future Directions

The objectives of public archaeology largely remain framed within the original goals, namely, committed to reaching broader and more diverse audience whose needs and demands regarding the past can be advanced and supported by the work of archaeologists. As part of this, public archaeology is still concerned with the protection and preservation of archaeological heritage and seeks to provide adequate management plans to respond to tourism global needs, for instance, while keeping the balance between tourism expectations and the carrying capacity of archaeological sites. Nonetheless, public archaeology is also becoming increasingly involved in collaborative efforts to yield more inclusive considerations of local perceptions of the past, as part of the categorization of archaeological sites as global tourist destinations. Practitioners involved in public archaeology are also aware that such categorization cannot be fulfilled by any standardized set of practices nor unique codes or universal paradigms. Arguably, the present times are characterized by highly politicized contexts in which claims to heritage and identity, however controversial, are part of a struggle for power and still rely very heavily on discourses about the past. Regardless of the aforementioned paradoxes, or perhaps precisely because of them, public archaeology is gradually moving to include developers and tourist operators, as well as state agencies, educational partners, and legislators as part of the equation (Hoffman et al. 2002:31). Therefore, it can be said that what public archaeology now faces is an urgent need to reconsider previous notions of what has been understood by "the public," in order to achieve even wider conceptualizations.

In this sense, if one contends that public archaeology is mainly meant to take care of the public interest in the past, then it will also be necessary to acknowledge the impossibility of considering a general, single, and homogeneous public (McGuire 2008:86–7). It follows from here that archaeologists need to keep considering who this public is – or rather, who the different audiences we are addressing and responding to

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:42 Page Number: 6

are – and the ways in which it/they become constituted, as well as to recognize the effects, influences, and contentions fostered by a burgeoning process of globalization upon the public's interests in the past. It is crucial, therefore, to take into account the power relationships displayed between micro and macro levels (stakeholder communities, state agencies, and global organizations or corporations) and the way national or global entities' decisions and actions equally impact archaeological resources and upon the different audiences' criteria of value and importance of the past. In order to advance its goals and attain a fully fledged engagement of archaeology with the different stakeholders and constituencies interested in the past, it will be necessary to weave all those parameters into some of the common themes that have, thus far, characterized public archaeology. Then, any education outreach projects oriented to the valuing of the past (and its preservation), as well as any attempt to use archaeology as an effective way to overcome economic imbalances or prompt political action by lobbying for recognition of previously disenfranchised communities, will need to make sense of the conditions and differences in which these activities are going to be carried out as part of this engagement.

Cross-References

- ▶ Archaeology Museums and the Public
- ▶ Community Archaeology
- ▶ Heritage Tourism and the Marketplace
- ▶ Heritage Values and Education
- ▶ Heritage, Public Perceptions of
- ▶ Local Communities and Archaeology
- ▶ Public and Archaeology
- ▶ Public Humanities and Cultural Heritage
- ▶ World Archaeological Congress (WAC)
- ▶ World Archaeological Congress (WAC) and Cultural Heritage Management
- ▶ World Heritage and Human Rights

References

Benavides, H. 2004. *Making Ecuadorian histories: four centuries of defining power*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bender, B. 1998. *Stonehenge. Making space*. Oxford, New York: Berg.

Brodie, N., J. Doole & P. Watson. 2000. Stealing History. The Illicit Trade of Cultural Material Cambridge, MacDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Brodie, N. & K. Walker. (ed.) 2002. Illicit Antiquities. *The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology* London: Routledge.

Carman, J. 2002. *Archaeology and heritage: an introduction*. London: Continuum.

Castañeda, Q. 1996. *In the museum of Maya culture. Touring Chichén Itzá*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cleere, H. 1996. The concept of 'outstanding universal value' in the World Heritage Convention. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 1:227–233.

Clifford, J. 1988. *The predicament of culture: twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, C. & T.J. Ferguson. (ed.) 2010. *Collaboration in archaeological practice*. Lanham (MD): Altamira Press.

Faulkner, N. 2000. Archaeology from below. *Public Archaeology* 1(1):21–33.

Gnecco, C. & P. Ayala. (ed.) 2011. *Archaeology and Indigenous peoples in Latin America*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Hale, C. 1999. Travel warning. Elite appropriations of hibridity, mestizaje, antiracism, equality, and other progressive sounding discourses. *The Journal of American Folklore* 112(445):297–315.

Hamilakis, Y. 2008. *The nation and its ruins. Antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Higueras, A. 2008. Cultural heritage management in Peru. Current and future challenges, in H. Silverman & B. Isbell (ed.) *Handbook of South American archaeology*: 1073–1088. New York: Springer.

Hodder, I. 1986. The politics and ideology in the World Archaeological Congress 1986. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 5:113–118.

- 2003. Archaeological reflexivity and the "local" voice. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76(1):55–69.

Hodder, I., M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last & G. Lucas. (ed.) 1995. *Interpreting archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*. London: Routledge.

Hoffman, T., M. Kwas & H. Silverman. 2002. Heritage tourism and public archaeology. *SAA Archaeological Record* 2(2):30–32,44.

Holtorf, C. 2005. *From Stonehenge to Las Vegas*. Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira.

Uncorrected Proof

Comp. by: KVijayakumar Stage: Proof Chapter No.: 1015 Title Name: EGA
Date:11/5/13 Time:07:17:43 Page Number: 7

JAMESON, J. 1997. *Presenting archaeology to the public: digging for truths*. Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira Press.

LAFRENZ, K. 2008. Value and significance in archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues* 15(1):71–97.

- 2009. Trajectories of development. International heritage management of archaeology in the Middle East and North Africa. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeology Congress* 5(1):68–91.

LAYTON, R. 1989. *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*. London: Unwin Hyman.

LEONE, M. P., M. CREVELING, L. HURST, B. JACKSON-NASH, H. JONES, H. JOPLING, KAISER, G. LOGAN & M. WARNER. 1995. Can an African-American historical archaeology be an alternative voice?, in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, V. Buchli, J. Carman, J. Last & G. Lucas (ed.) *Interpreting archaeology. Finding meaning in the past*: 110–124. London: Routledge.

LEONE, M., P. POTTER & P. SHACKEL.1987. Toward a critical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28(3):283–302.

LITTLE, B. & P. SHACKEL. 2007. *Archaeology as a tool of civic engagement*. Lanham (MD): Altamira Press.

LOWENTHAL, D. 2003[1985]. The past is a foreign country. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MACMANAMON, F. & A. HATTON. (ed.) 2000. *Cultural resource management in contemporary society. Perspectives on managing and presenting the past*. London: Routledge.

MATSUDA, A. & K. OKAMURA. 2011. Introduction: new perspectives in global public archaeology, in K. Okamura & A. Matsuda (ed.) *New perspectives in global public archaeology*: 1–18. New York: Springer.

MCGIMSEY, R.C. III. 1972. *Public archaeology*. New York and London: SPCK Publishing.

MCGUIRE, R. 2008. *Archaeology as political action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

MERRIMAN, N. 2002. Archaeology, heritage and interpretation, in B. Cunliffe, W. Davis & C. Renfrew(ed.) *Archaeology. The widening debate*: 541–566. Oxford: The British Academy.

- 2004a. Introduction. Diversity and dissonance in public archaeology, in N. Merriman (ed.) *Public archaeology*: 1–17. London: Routledge.

- (ed.) 2004b. *Public archaeology*. London: Routledge.

MESKELL, L. 2005. Sites of violence: terrorism, tourism, and heritage in the archaeological present, in L. Meskell & P. Pels (ed.) *Embedding ethics*: 123–146. Oxford: Berg.

PELS, P. 1999. Professions of duplexity. *Current Anthropology* 40(2):101–136.

ROWAN, Y. & U. BARAM. (ed.) 2004. *Marketing heritage: archaeology and the consumption of the past*. Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira Press.

RUSSELL, I. (ed.) 2006. *Images, representations and heritage: moving beyond modern approaches to archaeology*. New York: Springer.

SCHADLA-HALL, T. 1999. Editorial: public archaeology. *European Journal of Archaeology* 2(2):147–158.

SHANKS, M. 2004. Archaeology/politics, in J.L. Bintliff (ed.) *The Blackwell companion to archaeology*: 490–508. Oxford: Blackwell.

SHANKS, M. & C. TILLEY. 1992. *Re-constructing archaeology. Theory and practice*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

SILVERMAN, H. & D. FAIRCHILD RUGGLES. (ed.) 2007. *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*, New York: Springer.

SMITH, C. & H. BURKE. 2007. *Digging it up down under. A practical guide to doing archaeology in Australia*. New York: Springer.

SMITH, L. 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*, London: Routledge.

SMITH, L. 2006. *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.

STONE, P. & B. MOLYNEAUX. (ed.) 1994. *The presented past. Heritage, museums, and education*. London: Routledge - English Heritage.

UCKO, P.J. 1987. *Academic freedom and apartheid: the story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.

URRY, J. 2002. *The tourist gaze*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.

WYLIE, A. 1982. The interpretive dilemma, in I. Hodder (ed.) *Symbolic and structural archaeology*: 18–27. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Further Reading

BARAM, U. & Y. ROWAN. 2004. Archaeology after nationalism: globalization and the consumption of the past, in Y. Rowan & U. Baram (ed.) *Marketing heritage: archaeology and the consumption of the past*: 3–24. Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira Press.

MACMANAMON, F., A. STOUT & J. BARNES. (ed.) 2008. *Managing archaeological resources: global context, national programs, local actions*. Walnut Creek (CA): Left Coast Press.

OKAMURA, K. & A. MATSUDA. (ed.) 2011. *New perspectives in global public archaeology*. New York: Springer.

SCHADLA-HALL, T. 2006. Public archaeology in the twenty-first century, in R. Layton, S. Shennan & P. Stone (ed.) *A future for archaeology: the past in the present*: 75–82. London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.

STOTTMAN, M.J. (ed.) 2010. *Archaeologists as activists: can archaeology change the world*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Uncorrected Proof