Received: 3 January 2023 | Accepted: 13 January 2023

DOI: 10.1111/aman.13840

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Special Section: Reckoning with Violence

Introduction

Let's reckon, then

Tiffany C. Fryer[1] | **Maia Dedrick**[2]

[1]Department of Anthropology and Museum of Anthropological Archaeology, University of Michigan, USA

[2]Department of Anthropology, Cornell University, USA

Correspondence
Tiffany C. Fryer Department of Anthropology and Museum of Anthropological Archaeology, University of Michigan, USA
Email: tcfryer@umich.edu

KEYWORDS
archaeological ethics, archaeological praxis, disciplinary history, reckoning, violence

Violent encounters move quickly. They explode and then weave their tentacles, as Veena Das (2007, 1) once put it, into the recesses of everyday life, amplifying the slower-paced systemic violences that already structure life in inequitable societies. Distinct acts of violence build over time. They become compound events that can eventually characterize major experiential aspects of entire generations. This compound, multidimensional violence characterizes the discipline of archaeology, just as it also exists within broader society. Because violence operates at so many different scales, pulses, and distributions, it can be difficult to identify it and parse its causes and consequences. What we choose to name as violence depends on *who* is doing the naming and *what* is socio-politically possible to name from the moment in which we are situated. Thus, while we deal with explicit, physical forms of violence, we also attend to the structural and epistemic violences that manifest themselves through the discipline's entanglements with imperialism and claims of epistemic superiority, as well as the ramifications of its entrenched whiteness. We ask: How might anthropologists reckon with the social and material realities of violent pasts and their enduring presence? What can archaeologists, specifically, contribute to this reckoning process?

So much has transpired since January 2020, when many of the authors featured in this special section came together to present the early seeds of these articles. Our session, titled "Reckoning with Violence," was held at the annual conference of the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), where, despite being the last programmed session, we found ourselves standing before a packed room. We realized then that we weren't the only ones longing for more-substantial ways of grappling with violence in and through archaeology. Although we thought the session timely, we certainly did not predict 2020 would bring into such stark relief the myriad forms of violence our discipline and the media had long posed as at best related but distinct, or at worst entirely disparate.

The co-occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic and a string of highly visible killings of Black people at the hands of the police and vigilantes in the United States highlighted the need to address entrenched racism and deep-seated economic inequalities here and across the globe. At the same time, there was a startling spike in anti-Asian violence, as people began to place undue blame for the pandemic on China (Coloma et al., 2021). As the pandemic wreaked havoc on the world, people seemed suddenly to have sufficient time to notice the disturbing state of racialized violence specifically (d'Alpoim Guedes, Gonzalez, and Rivera-Collazo, 2021; Buchanan, Bui, and Patel, 2020). And they reacted furiously. As the world watched, protestors toppled and transformed long-protected racist and colonialist public monuments (Fryer et al., 2021). They demanded changes to buildings and foundations named for known slavers, racists, and abusers. They called for reparations. These global uprisings were, as Jeannette Plummer Sires (2021, 957) put it, "born out of the deepest grief, rage, and desolation."

The media gave these "twin pandemics"—COVID-19 and unbridled racism—unprecedented coverage, often echoing activists' calls for "racial reckoning" (see Franklin et al., 2020, 756–58; Thiaw, 2020). Our heritage institutions, professional societies, and academic departments were not impervious to the tumult of 2020. Many have since started to process what calls for racial reckoning might really mean for them. Granted, a marginal

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.
© 2023 The Authors. *American Anthropologist* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of American Anthropological Association.

group within the discipline has been taking the field to task for decades about the need for such a reckoning (e.g., Colwell, 2007; LaRoche and Blakey, 1997). But the confluence of these "twin pandemics" seems to have made a great deal more people receptive to genuine self-reflection and substantive change for the first time. For instance, the editors of the journals and publications of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) released a statement in July 2020 publicly acknowledging representational shortcomings of the SAA's publications and noting that they "must actively take on the commitment to anti-racist and anti-colonialist structural change as individuals and as an organization" (Gamble et al., 2020). Such statements are welcome and have the potential to open the space for reckoning. But it seems a tall order to go from an organization whose membership dedicates almost no time to discussions of race and racism (Park, Wang, and Marwick, 2022; see also Curtoni and Politis, 2006; Gosden, 2006) to one prepared to raise the mantle of antiracism. We must be careful that the kinds of solutions proposed for enacting change don't simply traffic in "gestures of inclusion and parenthetical citation over the reorganization of anthropological practice" while the harm continues (Jobson, 2020, 267). If gestures are all we gain, then it's not so difficult to understand why some might be in favor of letting archaeology burn (sensu Jobson, 2020).

Still, we have been offered a rare opportunity for reinvention (Dedrick, McAnany, and Batún Alpuche, this section). As reckoning remains a topic of frequent reference, we seek to situate what it means for the field of archaeology. Opting to reckon with historical and persistent violence in archaeology is not easy. It takes enormous emotional and intellectual energy. And because the problem is too often cast as one for individuals to solve (rather than institutions), the time required can seem especially daunting. Likewise, many who desire to pursue this kind of work harbor fears of alienating colleagues in the journey to root out problematic practices and name what often goes unsaid. Each of these concerns can conflict with the demands of academia and industry alike. Yet, for reinvention to occur, we must organize to creatively grapple with the implications and intentions of our collective work (e.g., Black Trowel Collective, 2016; Carlson, 2017; Franklin et al., 2020; Fryer, this section; Saitta, 2007; Society of Black Archaeologists, 2020). Reckoning does not promise resolution. Rather, it begins the process of exposing damages and coming to terms with wrongs. How we choose to do so today may be considered misguided or unsatisfactory in a generation or two. Nonetheless, reckoning is a necessary first step to opening up possibilities for justice, repair, and well-being.

ACKNOWLEDGING OUR FAULTS AND SHIFTING OUR PRIORITIES

We've crafted this special section with the fervent conviction that archaeologists and heritage practitioners, whether academically situated or in professional industries, could be doing a lot more to support efforts at reckoning with violence as both an operative force in the past/present and in the epistemological orientations of our disciplines writ large. In this introduction, we speak at length about archaeology's shortcomings not to condemn it but rather to suggest avenues toward repair. However, we do not advocate repairing archaeology for archaeology's sake. Enough ink has been spilled over why *archaeology* matters or what makes *archaeology* relevant (see Stahl, 2020)—at times to a point of violent defensiveness (see, for example, Heath-Stout, 2019, 217–19). Our concern, though, is how archaeology and related heritage practices can be put to work effectively supporting things that matter beyond the small circles of our disciplines. We don't believe we can wholeheartedly contribute to societal reckoning projects (as many of the contributors herein do) without also grappling with the forms of violence endemic to our profession.

We humbly acknowledge, however, that the questions we ask herein (and solutions we propose) come on the coattails of several decades of scholarship consistently aimed at figuring out the socio-political role of archaeology (e.g., Gero, Lacey, and Blakey, 1983) and how it might contribute to alleviating broader societal ailments, such as inequality, racism, and injustice (e.g., Atalay et al., 2014; Barton, 2021; Battle-Baptiste, 2011;; Douglass et al., 2019; Habu, Fawcett, and Matsunaga, 2008; Hamilakis and Duke, 2007; Kiddey, 2017, 2020; Little and Shackel, 2007; Lupu, 2020; Matthews, 2020a; McGuire, 2008; Smith et al., 2019; Stottman, 2010; Supernant et al., 2020; Voss et al., 2013; Watkins, 2020; Wilkie and Bartoy, 2000). Still, if anything has become clear these last few years, it's that a lot remains to be done.

Of late, Indigenous, African diasporic, and community-centric approaches in archaeology have led the charge in attempts to right the abuses archaeologically oriented heritage practices have long perpetuated (see, for example Smith, 2006). The growing number of projects taking these approaches as their central ethos (Colwell, 2016; Wylie, 2014, 2019) is causing what might be the most significant paradigm shift in the field since the postprocessual movement (e.g., Acabado and Martin, 2020; Cipolla and Quinn, 2016; Cowie, Teeman, and LeBlanc, 2019; Diserens Morgan and Leventhal, 2020; Flewellen et al., 2022; Fryer and Raczek, 2020; Gonzalez, 2016; Lyons, 2013; McAnany and Rowe, 2015; Schmidt and Pikirayi, 2016; Sesma, 2022; Surface-Evans and Jones, 2020). There's ample overlap between those projects utilizing community collaborative methodologies and those projects whose aims center on repairing injustices and combating the epistemic violence permeating our field—a result often of our tendencies to prioritize archaeological understandings of the past while excluding other voices and perspectives (Gnecco, 2009; Schneider and Hayes, 2020). Alicia Odewale and Parker Van Valkenburgh are fashioning an exceptionally promising example of the sort of work that upends those tendencies with their Mapping Historical Trauma in Tulsa, 1921–2021 project—a community-centric exploration of the afterlife of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, which explores archaeology's potential as a tool for restorative justice (Odewale, forthcoming).

Scholars working in heritage contexts steeped in violence also seem to be challenging the discipline writ large to take stock of its affective dimensions (e.g., Bondura, 2020; Lydon, 2019; Rizvi, 2019) and recommit to reflexivity in research design and implementation (Fryer, 2020). That reflexivity reveals, among other things, archaeology's deeply relational practices. It can elicit a wide range of emotions from practitioners, commu-

nity partners, and interested publics. Unfortunately, we've often denied those emotions their due space, relegating them to whisper networks and late-career memoirs. Collections such as *Archaeologies of the Heart* (Supernant et al., 2020) demonstrate how allowing space for emotional entanglements with and ethical reflections on the research process and its results can strengthen archaeology and begin to repair the disconnect between the discipline and the communities it is poised to serve. It's exceedingly important that we disrupt our tendencies to produce detached and unfeeling accounts of violence (Byrne, 2009)—a narrative disposition that impedes our capacity to reckon by denying us a human response to the forms of violence we encounter (whether in the material record, the ways research is conducted, or the ways it is presented to and received by our audiences).

What might be considered the most visible seeds of a reckoning ethos in archaeology are the hard-won changes to how archaeologists view and handle ancestral remains, as well as the ways spaces such as cemeteries are approached. There is abundant literature now on the fight for, consequences of, and remaining challenges to the repatriation legislation in the United States that would become the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA; Daehnke and Lonetree, 2011; Fine-Dare, 2002; Kakaliouras, 2017; Marek-Martinez, 2008; Mihesuah, 2000; Thomas, 2002). As it happens, 2020 marked the 30th anniversary of NAGPRA's passing. "It was a law that directly confronted the colonial histories of museums and the ethical blinders of archaeology" (Nash and Colwell, 2020, 226) without being "retributive (punishing museums for past actions) or distributive (redistributing cultural objects in an equitable way) . . . rather [it] was geared towards a kind of restorative justice in which the history of disrespect would be replaced by respectful repatriations" (Colwell, 2019, 92). As the only law of its kind, NAGPRA has also had global influence, helping to chart new directions for Indigenous-settler relations (Fforde, McKeown, and Keeler, 2020; Meloche, Spake, and Nichols, 2020) and for other groups whose graves have long been the subject of anthropological study.

On the other hand, NAGPRA caused (and continues to cause) some archaeologists and physical anthropologists to double down on their commitments to "the science," defending their unfettered access to human/ancestral remains (see discussion in Nash and Colwell, 2020). Others claim the underlying implications of the legislation have no real bearing on *their* particular brand of anthropology, even as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples demonstrates otherwise (see Claw et al., 2017; Hudson et al., 2020). While some archaeologists have conversely been among the key advocates for the protection of cemeteries, encouraging the conservation of burial markers and the upkeep of grounds, there has been a clear imbalance in the kinds of cemeteries positioned as priorities for preservation (Beisaw et al., 2021; Nichols, 2020; Seidemann and Halling, 2019). Implementing this legislation has been challenging, and the journey to repatriation for Indigenous peoples in the United States is far from complete (Atalay, 2018; Bondura, 2020; Colwell, 2017). Moreover, it is becoming increasingly clear that other racialized communities have suffered similar postmortem violence as Indigenous peoples in the United States and elsewhere (Atalay et al., 2020; Balanzátegui Moreno, 2018; de la Cova, 2019; De León, 2015; Dunnavant, Justinvil, and Colwell, 2021; Gust, Glover, and Houck, 2007; Lans, 2020; Lemke, 2020; Pierson, 2006; Watkins, 2022). Justice via repatriation necessitates immense amounts of time and emotional energy. Sonya Atalay (2018, 544) put it well: "Bearing witness in repatriation requires carrying many . . . moments of quiet violence."

Sometimes the buildup around that violence can't be contained. Bursting into the public eye, it forces us to reflect on what has been permissible as a result of our entrenched practices and epistemological commitments. For instance, 2021 surfaced tense politics surrounding the continued display of the Samuel Morton cranial collection at the Penn Museum, which, it was recently revealed to the public, includes the grave-robbed skulls of Black Philadelphians (Keheller, 2021). At the same time, it came to light that the partial skeletal remains of two children killed in the police bombing of the MOVE organization compound in Philadelphia in May 1985 were still in the possession of two anthropology faculty members who had been asked to aid the coroner's office in identifying them. Though their investigations were ultimately inconclusive, it's likely the remains belonged to Katricia (Tree) and Delicia Africa. Rather than returning the bones in a timely manner so they could be laid to rest with their kin, the professors kept them stored in the Penn Museum and then in a personal collection, unbeknownst to the families of the bombing's victims. In the decades that followed, those professors apparently used the bones as case studies in their classes, without regard for the ethical implications. One of those classes, Real Bones: Adventures in Forensic Anthropology, was held on the online platform Coursera and reached thousands of people (Muhammad, 2022; Thomas, 2021). The blatant misuse and mistreatment of human remains in anthropology and archaeology is not simply a thing of our colonial past.

Whatever temporal distance we may have told ourselves exists between our practices today and those of our past collapses when we witness the violence—like the illicit holding of bombed body parts of two Black girls in a world-renowned public institution—that our discipline continues to make possible. Our collection practices are one of the areas complicating reckoning with violence. As Susan Pollock (this section) discusses, because collecting has an "extended temporality," collections are often poised to accumulate violence. "Collecting and collections—and the knowledge built upon them," she tells us, "have been historically situated at the nerve center of archaeology." The acquisition, classification, and storage of research collections results from both the aims of individual researchers and the permissions (or nonimpediments) they receive from their institutions. Pollock describes the afterlife of a collection of human bones and casts made and later haphazardly discarded by members of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology (KWIA), a eugenicist research institution with deep ties to the Nazi regime in Germany. It's not just the disreputable association of this collection with Nazi Germany that should prompt a reckoning. It's the fact that the institute's acquisition practices resemble an all-too-familiar practice of scientific opportunism that comes at the expense of already disenfranchised people—both in life and in death. Instead, Pollock notes, the "KWIA profited from a general climate as well as specific government-driven policies of racism, abuse, and genocide." Moreover, it's not only violence against humans but the violence against myriad animals that many of these collections (whether rediscovered in trash pits below the ground's surface or in the bowels of a museum) are imbricated. Pollock highlights the importance of considering the accumulated forms

of violence involved not only in acquisition but in the deaccession and circulation of collections containing human remains: "can they *no longer be needed* in the same way that archival documents or collections of objects may be judged to be superfluous?" There are compelling ethical, moral, and political reasons suggesting the answer ought to be "no."

Decisions about stewardship of sensitive collections made unilaterally by museum specialists, as by archaeologists, can become antithetical to the goals of communities seeking avenues of repair by engaging the materialities of past violence (see Lau-Ozawa, this section). In this case, and in those presented by Montgomery (this section) and Fryer (this section), collaborative processes of caring for collections can open the space for healing. On the other hand, displaced and violence-ridden belongings, ancestors, and landscapes can continually harm communities, all too often without recourse (Pollock, this section; Reilly, Banton, and Stevens, this section). Will we continue to participate in these wrongdoings?

WHITENESS, IMPERIALISM, AND EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

What does reckoning mean for archaeologists and other heritage professionals? Several scholars have now illuminated the historical relationship between archaeology, imperialism, and colonialism (e.g., Hall, 2000; Lydon and Rizvi, 2010; McNiven and Russell, 2005; Meskell, 1998; Silliman, 2020; Trigger, 1984). Archaeology remains embedded in imperialist endeavors through its extensive use of technology developed as part of the "military-industrial-academic complex" for espionage and war (Meskell, 2020, 2022; Pollock, 2016), through its continued exploitative labor practices (Mickel, 2021), through its enabling of colonialist development projects (Hutchings and La Salle, 2015), and through archaeologists' continued feelings of entitlement to undertake field research wherever they please in the name of stewardship (historically, see Langford, 1983). These imperialist archaeologies, whether explicit or implicit, are now widely recognized as a primary context within which archaeology has been operationalized violently, directly or indirectly (Díaz-Andreu, 2018; González-Ruibal, 2018; Meskell, 2020). In her recent treatise against imperialism, Ariella Azoulay (2019, 148) contends, "imperial violence is our commons." In its institutionalized forms, she writes, violence "has become omnipresent, the ultimate resource held in common." "Unlike land, water, or air," though, "violence should not be preserved or taken care of, but rather acknowledged as that which is truly in common and also everybody's problem, to be curbed, allayed, and reversed." The antiracist, anticolonialist uprisings of the last few years were a collective recognition of that commons.

While acknowledging our imperialist roots and tendencies is key, reckoning with violence in archaeology also means explicitly facing the fact that archaeology—wittingly or unwittingly—participates in the social violence that is the maintenance of whiteness as capital and white supremacy as power (see Beliso-De Jesús and Pierre, 2020). Recent studies show that in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom (major centers of archaeological scholarly activity), the production of archaeological knowledge remains an overwhelmingly white, cis-gender endeavor (Heath-Stout, 2020, 417–20; Overholtzer and Jalbert, 2021; White and Draycott, 2020). This means the majority of the stories told by archaeologists about human history are told from the perspective of white people.

Taking stock of this reality, Matthew Reilly (2022), who also contributed to this special section, flips Maria Franklin's (2001) influential provocation, "Why are there so few Black archaeologists?" to ask: Why are there so many white ones? Reilly argues that in order to contend with issues like imbalances of power, legitimacy, voice, and knowledge production in the discipline, these majority white archaeologists need to be asking more reflexive questions about what their whiteness as practitioners means for the field (see also Carlson, 2017; McDavid, 2007). Taking his cue from Meg Gorsline (2015), who argues for increased accountability measures in archaeology, Reilly (2022, 6) suggests that confronting whiteness and white privilege in our field "challenges us to rethink the archaeological principles and practitioners that we hold dear, encouraging all archaeologists, but especially those in training, to perhaps depart from our traditional methods in favour of more emancipatory frameworks." Ayana Flewellen et al. (2021) and Elizabeth Carlson (2017) provide additional suggestions for detailed measures that might be taken to establish intentionally antiracist and anticolonial research praxes as a step to holding our institutions—and the discipline writ large—accountable (see also Smith, 2012).

If anthropology is a project centered on defining the normative limits of humanity (Welcome and Thomas, 2021), then archaeologists within anthropology, in concert with physical anthropologists, have disproportionately influenced how the field understands the corporeality of the human body and its skeletal remains and genetic materials (Blakey, 2020; Colwell, 2017). Put otherwise, we've contributed to synonymizing normative humanity with white(male)ness (Conkey, 1991; Gero and Conkey, 1991; Wynter, 2003) while simultaneously exploiting the bodies of nonwhite persons for our scientific gains. It's no surprise, then, that archaeology has been produced and maintained as a white space (Poser, 2021; White and Draycott, 2020). For example, Lee Panich (2022) shows that over a century of archaeological work at the Mission Santa Clara de Asís has been used to erase the lives and experiences of thousands of Indigenous Californians while contributing to a "fantasy heritage" that embeds and naturalizes whiteness in the landscape.

Unfortunately, as Nedra Lee (2020) argues, archaeologists' lack of perspective on how white privilege operates across the discipline means that little attention has been given to the consequences for how humanity and its past have been characterized. As she puts it,

> Archaeologists continue to struggle with . . . exactly what the field's obligation should be to people marginalized by racism and economic exploitation. [This is magnified by] the artificial division between prehistory and history which can muddy the ability of archaeologists studying the distant past to understand how the results of their research can be used in the present or have sociopo-

> litical implications for the daily lives of the contemporary communities who may have ancestral ties to the past peoples they study. This is further exacerbated by disciplinary or theoretical commitments to objectivity, empiricism or processualism, which make some scholars either hostile to or uncomprehending of the ways in which interpretations or artefacts of the past can be used to marginalize non-white and poor people. (22)

We raise the issue of whiteness precisely because we think that archaeology (and its related fields) can be mobilized toward decolonial (Atalay, 2006; Nelson, 2021) and antiracist (Flewellen et al., 2021; Fong et al., 2022; González-Tennant, forthcoming) ends. Calls for decolonizing the field have steadily increased since the 1990s, and decolonization remains a looming, unfinished project. As Akhil Gupta argued in his 2021 presidential address to the American Anthropological Association, anthropologists and anthropology do not function simply as handmaidens to colonialism, but when we do not acknowledge that race and location matter to the work that we do and that our very presence in a community can be a reminder (or an enactment) of colonialism, we stifle what anthropology *could* be (Gupta and Stoolman, 2021, 16–17; see also Fryer, 2020). A shared esteem for the archaeological record will never be enough to chart a productive way forward when whiteness continues to create barriers to effective research (see Hart, 2020). And, as Chardé Reid (2022) demonstrates, even when we have worked to reverse the effects of racist archaeological research, public perception of the places we have come to steward may take generations to shift.

A real break with past models will require that we first be diligent about the unacknowledged ways that violence permeates the discipline. Maia Dedrick, Patricia McAnany, and Iván Batún Alpuche (this section) demonstrate this very problem when they interrogate the works of Sylvanus Morley, the renowned Mayanist who, while laying the foundations of what would become one of the most influential subdisciplines of archaeology, was also organizing espionage networks and reinforcing colonialist agendas. Although his questionable actions certainly warrant some reckoning in their own right, Dedrick, McAnany, and Batún Alpuche show that it's the implicit biases of his archaeological analyses and interpretations that have made a truly lasting impression on the field. Morley drew from Spanish colonial accounts as well as the statistics and calculations of physical anthropologist Morris Steggerda to make faulty claims about agricultural labor in Yucatan. His apologist stance toward colonialism and imperialism aided in alienating Indigenous Maya communities from their lands and labor, perpetuated the view of Maya farmers as lazy and agentless, and misguided archaeological and anthropological studies of Colonial-period and earlier Maya foodways for decades. Yet, his research is still considered a vital entry point to the field.

These colonialist agendas do not exist solely in the abstract: they work to produce or uphold real food insecurities, exploitation, displacement, and denigrating representations. Amanda Logan (2016) discusses a similar phenomenon in a provocative article—"Why Can't People Feed Themselves?"—in which she shows how food insecurities in Ghana are a direct result of colonialism and that not recognizing them as such severely skews our interpretation of the archaeological record concerning foodways and climate. Archaeologists have engaged in forms of epistemic violence by skewing "evidence" toward the validation of already-distorted interpretations reliant on categories that are themselves derived from colonial pursuits (see also Fricker, 2011; Haber, 2015; Hartemann, 2021; Jofré Luna, 2015; Panich and Schneider, 2019). The intentionality of these moves to skew only matters so much when the outcome is our continued implication in regimes of injustice and inequity.

The difficulty is that much of the racism accompanying global archaeological practice is produced through ignorance (e.g., archaeologists who study Black or Indigenous pasts without ever engaging Black or Indigenous studies) or good intentions (e.g., scholars who desire to solve contemporary issues related to inequality through research that simultaneously reinscribes it). Ignorance should be easy to overcome: if we are good at anything as students, scholars, and professionals, it should be taking the necessary steps to educate ourselves. Yet racism (and its attendant violence) emerges and persists, a phenomenon Lee Baker (2021) names "racist antiracism." Why? The late philosopher Charles Mills (2007) asserts that ignorance too is racialized. That is, *white* ignorance (defined not simply as a contingent nonknowing but rather as a nonknowing embedded in white racial domination and its ramifications) is insidious because it emerges through both direct racist action and socio-structural conditions that make it possible for the "non-racist cognizer [to] form mistaken beliefs (e.g., that after the abolition of slavery in the United States, blacks generally had opportunities equal to whites) because of the social suppression of the pertinent knowledge" (Mills, 2007, 21). Because of the power relations and patterns of ideological hegemony involved in societies characterized by white racial domination, Mills tells us, white ignorance may not be a phenomenon confined only to white people. Though moments like 2020 or movements like Black Lives Matter can be galvanizing, they are not equipped to usher in substantive change overnight in the face of an ignorance cultivated to exclude, deny, and oppress. That kind of change requires we reckon with our disciplinary biases while making space for nonwhite epistemologies *and* nonwhite scholars with a diversity of intellectual and political agendas. It requires we dedicate time to carefully evaluating the potential biases of our methodological and theoretical frameworks and regularly engaging in disciplinary self-analysis without the inclination toward defensiveness.

Lastly, even though this is not the focus of any of the articles herein, we think it's important to also address the fact that the "cowboy culture" of archaeology (Wade, 2020), steeped as it is in its relationship to whiteness and male dominance, has supported not only racism but also a sociality based on alcohol overconsumption and widespread harassment that continues to push people out of the field (d'Alpoim Guedes, Gonzalez, and Rivera-Collazo, 2021, 902–5; Hodgetts and Supernant, 2020; Leighton, 2020; Voss, 2021a, 2021b). These internal violences have been left unaddressed for too long. If an underwritten allegiance to whiteness—and the kind of disciplinary culture it cultivates—continues to ail archaeology, it is not because we do not possess the tools to expose and eradicate it. Surely we could apply "stratigraphic methods themselves [to] help unearth and dismantle whiteness' seeming immutability" (Brand, 2022, 277) if we saw it as a disciplinary priority.

TAKING VIOLENCE TO TASK

Archaeologists have proven themselves plenty capable of documenting and describing the material, spatial, and temporal elements of past violence. The discipline has a long history of interest in conventionally violent events (wars, interpersonal conflicts) or potentially violent places (forts, battlefields, prisons), and the subdiscipline of conflict archaeology continues to grow exponentially.

However, the contributors herein are more interested in interrogating "violence as itself a structuring social force in modernizing and modern society" (Matthews, 2020b, 229) and considering what avenues there might be for alleviating it. Naming *violence* as the analytic is a relatively new direction for archaeologists (Bernbeck, 2008; Matthews and Phillippi, 2020). In an effort to hone the slipperiness (Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois, 2004) of violence, we sometimes need to appeal to other concepts, like racism, power, inequality, or white supremacy, but we think there is value in reminding ourselves that those phenomena are *violent*. Thus, we warn against divorcing those adjacent terms from the notion of violence, which warrants more sustained attention in its own right.

Readers of this special section will notice immediately that the contributors all fall within the subdisciplinary realm of "historical" or "contemporary" archaeology. This reflects the fact that it is enormously difficult for archaeologists of more recent times to ignore or deny personal testimonies of violence that accompany studied material evidence (though many certainly have, either through their ignorance or through an incessant willfulness fueled by a commitment to a detached and apolitical scientism, as discussed above). Violence, however, is an issue reaching far enough that archaeologists of the deeper past would be mistaken to think the work of reckoning does not apply to them (Athreya and Rogers Ackermann, 2020). Most archaeologists who study violence (wherever they are situated within the discipline writ large) have had the privilege of doing so without being made, or even encouraged, to reckon with it. When archaeologists do discuss violence, we tend to do so in a detached or vicarious way, even glorifying acts of violence (ritual sacrifice, cannibalism, etc.) as indicative characteristics of entire societies. These interpretative and representational tendencies risk resubjecting the subjects of that violence to unrelenting cycles of suffering (Pollock, 2016).

What archaeologies of violence should not be are detached and lacking in "the passion and rage that a concept like violence engenders" (Wurst, 2020, 208–9). The authors of this special section have each been personally impacted by the stories recounted to us and their physical residues, testifying to the lingering effects of past violence (see also Atalay, 2018; Bondura, 2020, 150–51). In their own ways, the contributors show that to confront violence in the past and present is to contend not only with the acts that constitute it but with the materials and affects that accompany it. The effectiveness of those archaeologies—whether they be excavations of past societies or excavations of our past as a discipline—relies on more practitioners acting as accomplices in dismantling the structures of violence "that operate at all levels of the discipline: pedagogy, field training, site interpretations, publishing, collections management, funding streams, job placement and advancement, and our professional organizations" (Flewellen et al., 2021, 234).

As participants in this special section, we see reckoning as the first order of business when it comes to taking the violence in and of archaeology to task. By "reckoning," we mean owning up to our shortcomings, wrongdoings, complicities, and silences as well as bringing to light the violence suffered and endured by the communities and publics we serve. To us, reckoning indexes a desire for accountability and therefore entails first naming and sitting with the multifaceted, intersectional (González-Tennant, 2018), and fragmentary violences (Reilly, Banton, and Stevens, this section) we wish to remedy. Our contributors also demonstrate how important it is to distinguish between societal, institutional, or professional reckonings with violence and the moves individuals or communities make to cope with and confront violence. Reckoning requires that the people and institutions that continue to be complicit in violent wrongdoing (whether intentionally or not) recognize their roles in that wrongdoing and seek ways to atone for it. Though reckoning is not an individual project, it takes individuals to see reckoning through. For archaeologists, this means asking, "How am I implicated in this history of interwoven forms of violence?" (Pollock, this section).

BEYOND RECKONING: ON THE ROAD TO REPAIR

We see reckoning as a "potential pathway to repair" (Welcome and Thomas, 2021, 13), which, if taken, might enable us to pursue other avenues of inquiry—such as archaeologies of freedom-making (LaRoche, 2014; Reilly, Banton, and Steves, this section; Weik, 2012) or archaeologies of survivance (Montgomery, this section)—without replicating the violence we've become beholden to. Stated otherwise, we envision a day when we might find joy in the practice of an emancipatory archaeology because reckonings have charted the field anew, rather than in spite of the violence our discipline continues to permit. While it is important to bring the violence into the light, we also don't want to produce "damage-centered narratives" (Tuck, 2009; see also Montgomery, this section) that cast a community's relationship to the violence it has suffered as determinant of its identity, cultural practices, or potential. Instead, we can reckon in ways that shift attention to the desires and complex personhood of communities, past and present, while refusing practices that asymmetrically assign the burden of reckoning to those wronged.

But decolonizing the field and working toward repair can be especially challenging in the face of the archaeological apparatus. Reckoning requires bringing wrongdoing into the light, especially among people who have the power to interrupt it or atone for it. This frequently involves working across different types of institutions, such as museums, universities, local governments, and nongovernmental organizations. In her contribution to

this special section, Tiffany C. Fryer challenges that apparatus, advocating for a framework of archaeological heritage practice she terms *heritage as liberation*. The proposed framework unsettles purely descriptive heritage studies that often unwittingly perpetuate harm. To work against societal inequities, and to address the field's underlying biases, she implores archaeologists to take up substantive theorizing in tandem with collective visioning and action. Fryer makes a demand of the reader, asking: Why is it that we have amazing technologies at our disposal and yet have not frequently put them to use in projects of reckoning close to home and significant to achieving justice? To elaborate, she considers the successes of the Equal Justice Initiative's (EJI) Community Remembrance Project, which was designed to help community members and local institutions confront the legacies of racial terror in the US South. One of the reasons reckoning may be so difficult is that people are not often called to witness the violence that abounds in the materialities of our daily lives. EJI's heritage work asks participants and visitors to do just that, closing the physical and temporal gaps between themselves and those who suffered and still suffer from the terrors of racialized violence.

Indeed, witnessing—not of the legal testimonial sort but rather the deeply personal scrutinizing of violence and its attendant artifacts (social and material)—and reckoning are complementary. Witnessing, as Deborah Thomas (2019) articulates it, involves a daily practice in which we wrestle with our personal complicities in systems of oppression and structures that maintain violence, while allowing ourselves to affectively engage with and acknowledge instances of violence, past and present. Witnessing, then, helps to clarify the position of individuals in the structural processes of reckoning, repair, redress, and reconciliation. In an *American Anthropologist* Vital Topics Forum in 2018 (which included two contributors to this section, Koji Lau-Ozawa and Susan Pollock), Mark W. Hauser (2018, 535) proposed that bearing witness makes for "a valuable way to scrutinize violent encounters, traumatic events, dislocations, and structural inequalities."

In their contribution to this section, Matt Reilly, Craig Stevens, and Caree Banton demonstrate Hauser's point skillfully. They introduce us to Gran, who is witness to the inherited violences of both colonialism and Liberia's civil war. Collectively engaging with object-elicited memories that Gran offers, the authors found themselves standing witness to the intermingled detritus of the daily lives of nineteenth-century Black Barbadian settlers, on the one hand, and the dozens of AK-47 shell casings bringing Liberia's civil war into stark relief, on the other. Their piece encourages consideration of the messy spatiotemporal copresence of these remains, putting forth a framework they call *fragmentary violence* to acknowledge the corporeal experience of being in this space as understood through their engagement with literal fragments that evidence violence "at the intersection of colonialism and armed conflict." They juxtapose artifacts of violence with those of privilege, such as grandiose houses ("aspirational architecture") and ceramic assemblages that demonstrate a desire for respectability and modernity. Through attention to oral histories elicited from photos and artifacts, the authors bear witness to Liberian pasts and contemporary life, while current residents reckon with violence and seek to patch that which they have inherited. The authors seek to move their project forward with collaborators through productive dialogue about heritage that acknowledges this fragmentary violence and seeks fruitful foundations for repair.

Lindsay Montgomery's contribution similarly demonstrates the possibilities of object-guided remembrance in spaces where people are still facing, attempting to cope with, and considering avenues for reckoning with inherited violence. She approaches repair through a project that involved object-based oral histories presented within a desire-oriented framework. The objects Montgomery centered in her interviews—artifacts collected by Jesse H. Bratley from the Port Gamble S'Klallam community while he worked at the federally run Port Gamble day school, then held in the Denver Museum of Nature and Science—were not generally meant to elicit stories about violence. Yet, she found structural and interpersonal violence latent in the stories about their educational experiences that community members brought to light. The objects Montgomery reintroduced to the community through photographs were "ethnographic objects acquired as part of America's assimilationist mission," having been physically removed from their place of origin and subjected to an anthropological gaze in a context that suppressed settler-colonial violence from their interpretation. Montgomery sought to reckon with violence as a museum practitioner and begin the labor of repair, engaging Port Gamble's Indigenous community members in "storywork" (Archibald, 2008)—an Indigenous methodology of recovery "rooted in the ethical principles of reciprocity, responsibility, respect, and reverence." Through their stories, members of the Port Gamble S'Klallam community demonstrate their resistance, resiliency, and critical social perspectives in the face of structural violence.

As mentioned, reckoning requires a recognition and call to account on the part of those people and institutions who have sourced and reinforced violence. Often, though, the directionality of violence—perpetrator and victim—is not so clear-cut and shifts depending on the vantage point. Koji Lau-Ozawa's essay in this collection considers three such vantage points with respect to the histories of violence at Gila River incarceration camp in Arizona, which confined thousands of Japanese Americans during World War II. The first follows objects created in the incarceration camps and sent to auction, subjecting them to a new violence: that of capitalist commodification. The second considers the role of garden ponds and discarded objects in enabling and mitigating the violences of settler colonialism as they are experienced both by the descendants of the camp's incarcerees and by the tribal members of Gila River on whose lands the camp was forcefully built. The final vantage point turns to the paper cranes and other new materialities created by former incarcerees and their descendants in protest of the use of another incarceration camp, Fort Sill, as a detention facility for undocumented migrants entering the United States. Humble objects produced or used during difficult times, such as those originating within Japanese American incarceration camps, can facilitate descendants' emotional connections to violent pasts, including processes of witnessing and healing. The availability of these items within intimate and unguarded personal spaces can inspire processes of coming to terms with past wrongs in ways institutional contexts may not. On the other hand, when made available to the wider public, "the physicality of archaeological materials . . . constrains the production of alternative narratives," offering concrete connections to the experiences of underacknowledged or untaught state violence and providing opportunities for reckoning (Lau-Ozawa, 2018, 539).

But the articles herein only scratch the surface of what reckoning in and through archaeology might mean. They offer important insights that we hope will encourage more sustained attention to how archaeology might contribute to much-needed reparative endeavors, but, as we have already impressed, they are a starting place, not an endgame. This is a particularly poignant moment to be reengaging this conversation and recommitting to eradicating both expressive and structural forms of violence in our societies. Archaeologists obviously can't do it all. We may not even be the best poised to do this work. But we should do what we can. As Evelynn Hammonds (2021, 14) recently put it, the events of the past few years, are "showing us where we have failed; [they] cannot show us how to build a better future." That is work for all of us. It is true that archaeology remains trapped by the violence it has perpetrated, sanctioned, or knowingly turned away from. But we believe that it's possible to salvage archaeology from itself and chart a new direction for future work.

A CONCLUDING INVITATION

During his original SHA presentation in 2020, Lau-Ozawa paused his talk to pass out origami paper. He invited each attendee to fold a crane for Tsuru for Solidarity—the organization folding cranes in protest of the incarceration of migrant children at the US-Mexico border. As he details in his contribution to this section, the paper cranes are multivalent in their signification but importantly always "signify the care and effort of their creators." We take our cue from him then when we invite you to fold a crane (or many) as you ponder how the work of reckoning with violence might intersect with and be addressed by your own research, scholarship, and even activism (to fold your own crane, see Lau-Ozawa Figures 5 and 6 with a printable template and instructions for folding).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We'd like to thank *AA*'s editors, Elizabeth Chin, Uzma Rizvi, and Kisha Supernant for their dedication to this volume and their developmental prowess. We also thank Ed González-Tennant for graciously serving as the discussant for the original SHA session and Alicia Odewale for engaging our work so thoughtfully in its aftermath. Thanks also to Ian Beggen and Daniel Fryer for their comments on this introduction, as well as to the anonymous reviewers for their generosity in strengthening not only this introduction but the section in its entirety.

ORCID

Tiffany C. Fryer https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7877-9021

REFERENCES CITED

Acabado, Stephen, and Marlon Martin. 2020. "Decolonizing the Past, Empowering the Future: Community-Led Heritage Conservation in Ifugao, Philippines." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 7(3): 171–86.

Archibald, Jo-Ann. 2008. *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Atalay, Sonya. 2006. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3/4): 280–310.

Atalay, Sonya. 2018. "Repatriation and Bearing Witness." *American Anthropologist* 120(3): 544–45.

Atalay, Sonya, Michael Blakey, Dorothy Lippert, Shannon Martin, and Rachel Watkins. 2020. "Reclaiming the Ancestors: Indigenous and Black Perspectives on Repatriation, Human Rights, and Justice." Sapiens webinar, September 2. https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/reclaiming-the-ancestors/

Atalay, Sonya, Lee Rains Clauss, Randall H. McGuire, and John R. Welch, eds. 2014. *Transforming Archaeology: Activist Practices and Prospects*. London: Routledge.

Athreya, Sheela, and Rebecca Rogers Ackermann. 2020. "Colonialism and Narratives of Human Origins in Asia and Africa." In *Interrogating Human Origins: Decolonisation and the Deep Human Past*, edited by Martin Porr and Jacqueline M. Matthews, 72–95. London: Routledge.

Azoulay, Ariella Aïsha. 2019. *Potential History: Unlearning Imperialism*. London: Verso.

Baker, Lee D. 2021. "The Racist Anti-Racism of American Anthropology." *Transforming Anthropology* 29(2): 127–42.

Balanzátegui Moreno, Daniela Catalina. 2018. "Collaborative Archaeology to Revitalize an Afro-Ecuadorian Cemetery." *Journal of African Diaspora Archaeology and Heritage* 7(1): 42–46.

Barton, Christopher P., ed. 2021. *Trowels in the Trenches: Archaeology as Social Activism*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Battle-Baptiste, Whitney. 2011. *Black Feminist Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Beisaw, April M., William P. Tatum, Virginia "Ginny" Buechele, and Brian G. McAdoo. 2022. "Mapping a Poorhouse and Pauper Cemetery as Community Engaged Memory Work." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26(3): 599–622.

Beliso-De Jesús, Aisha M., and Jemima Pierre. 2020. "Special Section: Anthropology of White Supremacy." *American Anthropologist* 122(1): 65–75.

Bernbeck, Reinhard. 2008. "Structural Violence in Archaeology." *Archaeologies* 4(3): 390–413.

Black Trowel Collective. 2016. "Foundations of an Anarchist Archaeology: A Community Manifesto." Savage Minds blog, October 31. https://savageminds.org/2016/10/31/foundations-of-an-anarchist-archaeology-a-community-manifesto.

Blakey, Michael L. 2020. "Archaeology under the Blinding Light of Race." *Current Anthropology* 61(S22): S183–97.

Bondura, Valerie. 2020. "Fear, Contradiction, and Coloniality in Settler Archaeology." *Anthropology Now* 12(3): 146–55.

Brand, Anna Livia. 2022. "The Sedimentation of Whiteness as Landscape." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 40(2): 276–91.

Buchanan, Larry, Quoctrung Bui, and Jugal K Patel. 2020. "Black Lives Matter May Be the Largest Movement in US History." *New York Times*, July 3. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/03/us/george-floyd-protests-crowd-size.html.

Byrne, Denis R. 2009. "A Critique of Unfeeling Heritage." In *Intangible Heritage*, edited by Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, 229–52. London: Routledge.

Carlson, Elizabeth. 2017. "Anti-Colonial Methodologies and Practices for Settler Colonial Studies." *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(4): 496–517.
Cipolla, Craig N., and James Quinn. 2016. "Field School Archaeology the Mohegan Way: Reflections on Twenty Years of Community-Based Research and Teaching." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 3(2): 118–34.
Claw, Katrina G., Dorothy Lippert, Jessica Bardill, Anna Cordova, Keolu Fox, Joseph M. Yracheta, Alyssa C. Bader, et al. 2017. "Chaco Canyon Dig Unearths Ethical Concerns." *Human Biology* 89(3): 177.
Coloma, Roland Sintos, Betina Hsieh, OiYan Poon, Stephanie Chang, Sung Yeon Choimorrow, Manjusha P. Kulkarni, Grace Meng, Leigh Patel, and Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales. 2021. "Reckoning with Anti-Asian Violence: Racial Grief, Visionary Organizing, and Educational Responsibility." *Educational Studies* 57(4): 378–94.
Colwell, Chip. 2007. "History, Justice, and Reconciliation." In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul A. Shackel, 23–46. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Colwell, Chip. 2016. "Collaborative Archaeologies and Descendant Communities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45:113–27.
Colwell, Chip. 2017. *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits: Inside the Fight to Reclaim Native America's Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Colwell, Chip. 2019. "Can Repatriation Heal the Wounds of History?" *The Public Historian* 41(1): 90–110.
Conkey, Margaret W. 1991. "Original Narratives: The Political Economy of Gender in Archaeology." In *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Post-Modern Era*, edited by Micaela di Leonardo, 102–39. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Cowie, Sarah E., Diane L. Teeman, and Christopher C. LeBlanc. 2019. *Collaborative Archaeology at Stewart Indian School*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
Curtoni, Rafael P., and Gustavo G. Politis. 2006. "Race and Racism in South American Archaeology." *World Archaeology* 38(1): 93–108.
d'Alpoim Guedes, Jade, Sara Gonzalez, and Isabel Rivera-Collazo. 2021. "Resistance and Care in the Time of COVID-19: Archaeology in 2020." *American Anthropologist* 123(4): 898–915.
Daehnke, Jon, and Amy Lonetree. 2011. "Repatriation in the United States: The Current State of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35(1): 87–97.
Das, Veena. 2007. *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
de la Cova, Carlina. 2019. "Marginalized Bodies and the Construction of the Robert J. Terry Anatomical Skeletal Collection: A Promised Land Lost." In *Bioarchaeology of Marginalized People*, edited by Madeleine L. Mant and Alyson Jaagumägi Holland, 133–55. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.
De León, Jason. 2015. *The Land of Open Graves: Living and Dying on the Migrant Trail*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 2018. "Archaeology and Imperialism: From Nineteenth Century New Imperialism to Twentieth Century Decolonization." In *Unmasking Ideology in Imperial and Colonial Archaeology: Vocabulary, Symbols, and Legacy*, edited by Bonnie Effros and Guolong Lai. Los Angeles, CA: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.
Diserens Morgan, Kasey, and Richard M. Leventhal. 2020. "Maya of the Past, Present, and Future: Heritage, Anthropological Archaeology, and the Study of the Caste War of Yucatan." *Heritage* 3(2): 511–27.
Douglass, Kristina, Eréndira Quintana Morales, George Manahira, Felicia Fenomanana, Roger Samba, Francois Lahiniriko, Zafy Maharesy Chrisostome, et al. 2019. "Toward a Just and Inclusive Environmental Archaeology of Southwest Madagascar." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 19(3): 307–32.
Dunnavant, Justin, Delande Justinvil, and Chip Colwell. 2021. "Craft an African American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act." *Nature* 593:337–40.
Fine-Dare, Kathleen Sue. 2002. *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Flewellen, Ayana Omilade, Justin P. Dunnavant, Alicia Odewale, Alexandra Jones, Tsione Wolde-Michael, Zoë Crossland, and Maria Franklin. 2021. "'The Future of Archaeology Is Antiracist': Archaeology in the Time of Black Lives Matter." *American Antiquity* 86(2): 224–43.
Flewellen, Ayana Omilade, Alicia Odewale, Justin Dunnavant, Alexandra Jones, and William White. 2022. "Creating Community and Engaging Community: The Foundations of the Estate Little Princess Archaeology Project in St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26(1): 147–76.
Fforde, Cressida, C. Timothy McKeown, and Honor Keeler, eds. 2020. *The Routledge Companion to Indigenous Repatriation: Return, Reconcile, Renew*. London: Routledge.
Fong, Kelly N., Laura W. Ng, Jocelyn Lee, Veronica L. Peterson, and Barbara L. Voss. 2022. "Race and Racism in Archaeologies of Chinese American Communities." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 51:233–50.
Franklin, Maria. 2001. "A Black Feminist-Inspired Archaeology?" *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1): 108–25.
Franklin, Maria, Justin P. Dunnavant, Ayana Omilade Flewellen, and Alicia Odewale. 2020. "The Future Is Now: Archaeology and the Eradication of Anti-Blackness." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 24:753–66.
Fricker, Miranda. 2011. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fryer, Tiffany C. 2020. "Reflecting on Positionality: Archaeological Heritage Praxis in Quintana Roo, Mexico." *AP3A* 31:26–40.
Fryer, Tiffany C., and Teresa P. Raczek. 2020. "Special Issue: Engendering Heritage: Contemporary Feminist Approaches to Archaeological Heritage Practice." *AP3A* 31:1–162.
Fryer, Tiffany C., Vaughn La Belle, Nicholas Galanin, Dell Upton, and Tsione Wolde-Michael. 2021. "As the Statues Fall: An (Abridged) Conversation about Monuments and the Power of Memory." *Current Anthropology* 62(3): 373–84.
Gamble, Lynn, Debra Martin, Julia Hendon, Calogero Santoro, Sarah Herr, Christina Rieth, Sjoerd van der Linde, Christopher Rodning, Michelle Hegmon, and Jennifer Birch. 2020. "Statement and Commitments from SAA Editors to Change the Underrepresentation of Black, Indigenous, and Other Scholars from Diverse Backgrounds in Our Publications." SAA News, July 1. https://www.saa.org/quick-nav/saa-media-room/saa-news/2020/07/01/statement-and-commitments-from-saa-editors-to-change-underrepresentation.
Gero, Joan M., David M. Lacey, and Michael L. Blakey, eds. 1983. *The Socio-Politics of Archaeology*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
Gero, Joan M., and Margaret W. Conkey. 1991. *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Gnecco, Cristóbal. 2009. "Caminos De La Arqueología: De La Violencia Epistémica a La Relacionalidad." *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas* 4(1): 15–26.
Gonzalez, Sara L. 2016. "Indigenous Values and Methods in Archaeological Practice: Low-Impact Archaeology through the Kashaya Pomo Interpretive Trail Project." *American Antiquity* 81(3): 533–49.
González-Ruibal, Alfredo. 2018. "Ethics of Archaeology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 47:345–60.
González-Tennant, Edward. 2018. *The Rosewood Massacre: An Archaeology and History of Intersectional Violence*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

González-Tennant, Edward. Forthcoming. "Reckoning with Violence in a Rural White Community: Anti-Racist Archaeologies as Future-Making." Working Paper.
Gorsline, Meg. 2015. "An Archaeology of Accountability: Recovering and Interrogating the 'Invisible' Race." In *The Archaeology of Race in the Northeast*, edited by Christopher N. Matthews and Allison Manfra McGovern, 291–310. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
Gosden, Chris. 2006. "Race and Racism in Archaeology: Introduction." *World Archaeology* 38:1–7.
Gupta, Akhil, and Jessie Stoolman. 2021. "Decolonizing U.S. Anthropology." Presidential Address, American Anthropological Association annual meeting, Baltimore, MD.
Gust, Sherri, Amy Glover, and Kelly Houck. 2007. *The Historic Los Angeles Cemetery (CA-LAN-3553), Los Angeles Metro Gold Line Project, East Portal Area, Los Angeles, CA. Final Summary Report*. Santa Ana: Cogstone Res. Manag. http://libraryarchives.metro.net/DPGTL/studies/2006-historic-los-angeles-cemetery-ca-lan-3553-summary-report.pdf.
Haber, Alejandro. 2015. "Archaeology after Archaeology." In *After Ethics: Ancestral Voices and Post-Disciplinary Worlds in Archaeology*, edited by Alejandro Haber and Nick Shepherd, 127–38. New York: Springer.
Habu, Junko, Clare P. Fawcett, and John M. Matsunaga, eds. 2008. *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies*. New York: Springer.
Hall, Martin. 2000. *Archaeology and the Modern World: Colonial Transcripts in South Africa and the Chesapeake*. London: Routledge.
Hamilakis, Yannis, and Philip Duke, eds. 2007. *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Hammonds, Evelynn M. 2021. "A Moment or a Movement? The Pandemic, Political Upheaval, and Racial Reckoning." *Signs* 47(1): 11–14.
Hart, Siobhan M. 2020. "Gender, Masculinity, and Professional-Avocational Heritage Collaborations." *Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 31: 54–65.
Hartemann, Gabby Omoni. 2021. "Unearthing Colonial Violence: Griotic Archaeology and Community-Engagement in Guiana." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26:79–117.
Hauser, Mark W. 2018. "Introduction." *American Anthropologist* 120(3): 535–36.
Heath-Stout, Laura E. 2019. "Diversity, Identity, and Oppression in the Production of Archaeological Knowledge." PhD dissertation, Boston University.
Heath-Stout, Laura E. 2020. "Who Writes about Archaeology? An Intersectional Study of Authorship in Archaeological Journals." *American Antiquity* 85(3): 407–26
Hodgetts, Lisa, and Kisha Supernant. 2020. "Broadening #MeToo: Tracking Dynamics in Canadian Archaeology through a Survey on Experiences within the Discipline." *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 44(1): 20–47.
Hudson, Maui, Nanibaa' A. Garrison, Rogena Sterling, Nadine R. Caron, Keolu Fox, Joseph Yracheta, Jane Anderson, et al. 2020. "Rights, Interests and Expectations: Indigenous Perspectives on Unrestricted Access to Genomic Data." *Nature Reviews Genetics* 21(6): 377–84.
Hutchings, Rich, and Marina La Salle. 2015. "Archaeology as Disaster Capitalism." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19(4): 699–720.
Jobson, Ryan Cecil. 2020. "The Case for Letting Anthropology Burn: Sociocultural Anthropology in 2019." *American Anthropologist* 122(2): 259–71.
Jofré Luna, Ivana Carina. 2015. "The Mark of the Indian Still Inhabits Our Body: On Ethics and Disciplining in South American Archaeology." In *After Ethics: Ancestral Voices and Post-Disciplinary Worlds in Archaeology*, edited by Alejandro Haber and Nick Shepherd, 55–78. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
Kakaliouras, Ann M. 2017. "NAGPRA and Repatriation in the Twenty-First Century: Shifting the Discourse from Benefits to Responsibilities." *Bioarchaeology International* 1(3–4): 183–90.
Kelleher, Suzanne Rowan. 2021. "How a Museum's Human Skull Collection Sparked a Racial Reckoning." *Forbes Magazine*, April 16. https://www.forbes.com/sites/suzannerowankelleher/2021/04/16/penn-museum-samuel-morton-human-skull-collection-black-slaves-repatriation/?sh=4165beaf7d4c.
Kiddey, Rachael. 2017. *Homeless Heritage: Collaborative Social Archaeology as Therapeutic Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kiddey, Rachael. 2020. "I'll Tell You What I Want, What I Really, Really Want! Open Archaeology That Is Collaborative, Participatory, Public, and Feminist." *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 53(1): 23–40.
Langford, Rosalind F. 1983. "Our Heritage, Your Playground." *Australian Archaeology* 16:1–6.
Lans, Aja M. 2020. "Embodied Discrimination and 'Mutilated Historicity': Archiving Black Women's Bodies in the Huntington Collection." In *The Bioarchaeology of Structural Violence*, edited by Lori A. Tremblay and Sarah Reedy, 31–52. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
LaRoche, Cheryl J. 2014. *Free Black Communities and the Underground Railroad: The Geography of Resistance*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
LaRoche, Cheryl J., and Michael L. Blakey. 1997. "Seizing Intellectual Power: The Dialogue at the New York African Burial Ground." *Historical Archaeology* 31(3): 84–106.
Lau-Ozawa, Koji. 2018. "Bearing Witness to the Injustices of Mass Incarceration." *American Anthropologist* 120(3): 537–39.
Lee, Nedra. 2020. "Here We Go Again. The Need to Contest and Refute Biological Determinism in Archaeology." *Archaeological Dialogues* 27(1): 20–22.
Leighton, Mary. 2020. "Myths of Meritocracy, Friendship, and Fun Work: Class and Gender in North American Academic Communities." *American Anthropologist* 122(3): 444–58.
Lemke, Ashley. 2020. "'Missing Cemeteries' and Structural Racism: Historical Maps and Endangered African/African American and Hispanic Mortuary Customs in Texas." *Historical Archaeology* 54(3): 605–23.
Little, Barbara J., and Paul A. Shackel, eds. 2007. *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Logan, Amanda L. 2016. "'Why Can't People Feed Themselves?': Archaeology as Alternative Archive of Food Security in Banda, Ghana." *American Anthropologist* 118(3): 508–24.
Lupu, Jennifer A. 2020. "Sex Workers as Stakeholders: Incorporating Harm Reduction into Archaeological Praxis." *AP3A* 31:66–79.
Lydon, Jane. 2019. "Feeling for the Deep Past: Archaeological Analogy and Historical Empathy." *Australian Archaeology* 85(1): 2–14.
Lydon, Jane, and Uzma Z. Rizvi, eds. 2010. *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
Lyons, Natasha. 2013. *Where the Wind Blows Us: Practicing Critical Community Archaeology in the Canadian North*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Marek-Martinez, Ora. 2008. "NAGPRA's Achilles Heel: The Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Remains." *Heritage Management* 1(2): 243–60.
Matthews, Christopher N. 2020a. *A Struggle for Heritage: Archaeology and Civil Rights in a Long Island Community*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
Matthews, Christopher N. 2020b. "Forum." In *Archaeologies of Violence and Privilege*, edited by Christopher N. Matthews and Bradley D. Phillippi, 228–30. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Matthews, Christopher N., and Bradley D. Phillippi, eds. 2020. *Archaeologies of Violence and Privilege*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

McAnany, Patricia A., and Sarah M. Rowe. 2015. "Re-Visiting the Field: Collaborative Archaeology as Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 40(5): 499–507.
McDavid, Carol. 2007. "Beyond Strategy and Good Intentions: Archaeology, Race, and White Privilege." In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul A. Shackel, 67–88. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
McGuire, Randall H. 2008. *Archaeology as Political Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
McNiven, Ian J., and Lynette Russell. 2005. *Appropriated Pasts: Indigenous Peoples and the Colonial Culture of Archaeology*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Meloche, Chelsea H., Laure Spake, Katherine L. Nichols, eds. 2020. *Working with and for Ancestors: Collaboration in the Care and Study of Ancestral Remains*. London: Routledge.
Meskell, Lynn, ed. 1998. *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics, and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge.
Meskell, Lynn. 2020. "Imperialism, Internationalism, and Archaeology in the Un/Making of the Middle East." *American Anthropologist* 122(3): 554–67.
Meskell, Lynn. 2022. "Atomic Archaeology: Italian Innovation and American Adventurism." *American Anthropologist* 124(4): 655–69.
Mickel, Allison. 2021. *Why Those Who Shovel Are Silent: A History of Local Archaeological Knowledge and Labor*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
Mihesuah, Devon A. 2000. *Repatriation Reader: Who Owns American Indian Remains?* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Mills, Charles. 2007. "White Ignorance." In *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, edited by Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana, 11–38. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Muhammad, Abdul-Aliy A. 2022. "Decades after Philadelphia's MOVE bombing, Penn Museum Still Keeps Secrets on the Remains of 12-Year-Old Girl." Hyperallergic, April 20. https://hyperallergic.com/725976/philadelphia-move-bombing-penn-museum-still-keeps-secrets-on-the-remains/.
Nash, Stephen E., and Chip Colwell. 2020. "NAGPRA at 30: The Effects of Repatriation." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 49:225–39.
Nelson, Peter. 2021. "Where Have All the Anthros Gone? The Shift in California Indian Studies from Research 'on' to Research 'with, for, and by' Indigenous Peoples." *American Anthropologist* 123(3): 468–73.
Nichols, Katherine L. 2020. "The Brandon Indian Residential School Cemetery Project: Working towards Reconciliation using Forensic Anthropology and Archaeology." In *Working with and for Ancestors: Collaboration in the Care and Study of Ancestral Remains*, edited by Chelsea H. Meloche, Laure Spake, and Katherine L. Nichols, 43–55. London: Routledge.
Odewale, Alicia. Forthcoming. "Restorative Justice Archaeology: Unearthing the Aftermath of the Tulsa Race Massacre." Working Paper.
Overholtzer, Lisa, and Catherine L. Jalbert. 2021. "A 'Leaky' Pipeline and Chilly Climate in Archaeology in Canada." *American Antiquity* 86(2): 261–82.
Panich, Lee M. 2022. "Archaeology, Indigenous Erasure, and the Creation of White Public Space at the California Missions." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 22(2): 149–71.
Panich, Lee M., and Tsim D. Schneider. 2019. "Categorical Denial: Evaluating Post-1492 Indigenous Erasure in the Paper Trail of American Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 84(4): 651–68.
Park, Gayoung, Li-Ying Wang, and Ben Marwick. 2022. "How Do Archaeologists Write about Racism? Computational Text Analysis of 41 years of Society for American Archaeology Annual Meeting Abstracts." *Antiquity* 96(387): 696–709.
Pierson, David. 2006. "Reminders of Bigotry Unearthed; Remains Found at an MTA Excavation Site Shed Light on a Time Rife with Anti-Chinese Bias." *Los Angeles Times*, March 15.
Plummer Sires, Jeannette. 2021. "Black Lives Matter and Museums in 2020: A Personal and Professional Perspective." *American Anthropologist* 123(4): 957–59.
Pollock, Susan. 2016. "The Subject of Suffering." *American Anthropologist* 118(4): 726–41.
Poser, Rachel. 2021. "He Wants to Save Classics from Whiteness. Can the Field Survive?" *New York Times Magazine*, April 25. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/02/magazine/classics-greece-rome-whiteness.html.
Reid, L. Chardé. 2022. "'It's Not About Us': Exploring White-Public Heritage Space, Community, and Commemoration on Jamestown Island, Virginia." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 26(1): 22–52.
Reilly, Matthew C. 2022. "Archaeologies of Whiteness." *Archaeological Dialogues* 29(1): 51–66.
Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2019. "Archaeological Encounters: The Role of the Speculative in Decolonial Archaeology." *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 6(1): 154–67.
Saitta, Dean J. 2007. "Ethics, Objectivity and Emancipatory Archaeology." In *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*, edited by Yannis Hamilakis and P. G. Duke, 267–80. Walnut Creek, CA. Left Coast Press.
Scheper-Hughes, Nancy, and Philippe Bourgois. 2004. "Introduction: Making Sense of Violence." In *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, edited by Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Philippe Bourgois, 1–31. Oxford: Blackwell.
Schmidt, Peter R., and Innocence Pikirayi, eds. 2016. *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. London: Routledge.
Schneider, Tsim D., and Katherine Howlett Hayes. 2020. "Epistemic Colonialism: Is It Possible to Decolonize Archaeology?" *American Indian Quarterly* 44(2): 127–48.
Seidemann, Ryan M., and Christine L. Halling. 2019. "Landscape Structural Violence: A View from New Orleans's Cemeteries." *American Antiquity* 84(4): 669–83.
Sesma, Elena. 2022. "Materializing Memory and Building Community: Contemporary Landscape Archaeology of a Nineteenth-Century Bahamian Plantation." *Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association* 33(1): 24–41.
Silliman, Stephen W. 2020. "Colonialism in Historical Archaeology: A Review of Issues and Perspectives." *The Routledge Handbook of Global Historical Archaeology*, edited by Charles Orser et al., 41–60. London: Routledge.
Smith, Claire, Heather Burke, J. Ralph, K. Pollard, A. Gorman, C. Wilson, S. Hemming, et al. 2019. "Pursuing Social Justice through Collaborative Archaeologies in Aboriginal Australia." *Archaeologies* 15(3): 536–69.
Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Second edition. London: Zed Books.
Society of Black Archaeologists. 2020. "About." https://www.societyofblackarchaeologists.com/about.
Stahl, Ann B. 2020. "Assembling 'Effective Archaeologies' for Equitable Futures." *American Anthropologist* 122(1): 37–50.
Stottman, M. Jay, ed. 2010. *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
Supernant, Kisha, Jane E. Baxter, Natasha Lyons, and Sonya Atalay, eds. 2020. *Archaeologies of the Heart*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
Surface-Evans, Sarah L., and Sarah J. Jones. 2020. "Discourses of the Haunted: An Intersubjective Approach to Archaeology at the Mount Pleasant Indian Industrial Boarding School." *AP3A* 31(1): 110–21.

Thiaw, Ibrahima. 2020. "Archaeology of Two Pandemics and Teranga Aesthetic." *African Archaeological Review* 37(3): 475–79.
Thomas, David Hurst. 2002. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*. New York: Basic Books.
Thomas, Deborah A. 2019. *Political Life in the Wake of the Plantation: Sovereignty, Witnessing, Repair*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Thomas, Deborah A. 2021. "Enclosures and Extraction: MOVE and the Penn Museum." *History of Anthropology Review* 45:n.p. https://histanthro.org/news/observations/enclosures-and-extraction/.
Trigger, Bruce G. 1984. "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist." *Man* 19(3): 355–70.
Tuck, Eve. 2009. "Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities." *Harvard Educational Review* 79(3): 409–28.
Voss, Barbara L. 2021a. "Disrupting Cultures of Harassment in Archaeology: Social-Environmental and Trauma-Informed Approaches to Disciplinary Transformation." *American Antiquity* 86(3): 447–64.
Voss, Barbara L. 2021b. "Documenting Cultures of Harassment in Archaeology: A Review and Analysis of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Studies." *American Antiquity* 86(2): 244–60.
Voss, Barbara L., Anita Wong Kwock, Connie Young Yu, Lillian Gong-Guy, Alida Bray, Megan S. Kane, and Rebecca Allen. 2013. "Market Street Chinatown Archaeology Project: Ten Years of Community-Based, Collaborative Research on San Jose's Historic Chinese Community." *Chinese America: History and Perspectives* (2013):63–74, 85–86.
Wade, Lizzie. 2020. "Fed-Up Archaeologists Aim to Fix Field Schools' Party Culture." *Science* 369(6505): 757–58.
Watkins, Rachel J. 2020. "An Alter(Ed)Native Perspective on Historical Bioarchaeology." *Historical Archaeology* 54(1): 17–33.
Watkins, Rachel. 2022. "Repatriation Is Our Future." Sapiens podcast, April 13. https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/repatriation-african-american-remains/.
Weik, Terrance M. 2012. *The Archaeology of Antislavery Resistance: The American Experience in Archaeological Perspective*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
Welcome, Leniqueca A., and Deborah A. Thomas. 2021. "Abstraction, Witnessing, and Repair: or, How Multimodal Research Can Destabilize the Coloniality of the Gaze." *Multimodality & Society* 1(3): 391–406.
White, William, and Catherine Draycott. 2020. "Why the Whiteness of Archaeology Is a Problem." Sapiens, July 7. https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/archaeology-diversity/.
Wilkie, Laurie A., and Kevin M. Bartoy. 2000. "A Critical Archaeology Revisited." *Current Anthropology* 41(5): 747–77.
Wurst, LouAnn. 2020. "Commentary: The Violence of Violence?" In *Archaeologies of Violence and Privilege*, edited by Christopher N. Matthews and Bradley D. Phillippi, 201–11. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Wylie, Alison. 2014. "Community-Based Collaborative Archaeology." In *Philosophy of Social Science: A New Introduction*, edited by Nancy Cartwright and Eleonora Montuschi, 68–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wylie, Alison. 2019. "Crossing a Threshold: Collaborative Archaeology in Global Dialogue." *Archaeologies* 15(3): 570–87.
Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3): 257–337.

How to cite this article: Fryer, Tiffany C., and Maia Dedrick. 2023. "Introduction." *American Anthropologist* 125: 334–345.
https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13840