

What's up with WAC? Archaeology and 'Engagement' in a Globalized World

NICK SHEPHERD

University of Cape Town, South Africa

ALEJANDRO HABER

Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina

The year 2011 marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the World Archaeological Congress (WAC). WAC marked a bold intervention in the politics of knowledge in archaeology in the context of the mid-1980s. But how has it fared in contemporary worlds of practice? In this paper, two senior WAC members take a close and critical look at the changing fortunes, meanings, and contexts of the organization. At its centre, is an account of the controversial meeting between the WAC Executive and Rio Tinto Limited, the mining multinational, in Melbourne in 2007. Other parts of the paper engage with notions of the Indigenous, and discuss the assumptions informing the WAC programme Archaeologists Without Borders. Framed as a challenge, the paper invites response and commentary, as a way of opening debate which allows us to envisage alternative futures for the discipline, beyond the banal prospect of 'Archaeology Inc.'

KEYWORDS World Archaeological Congress, Rio Tinto Limited, knowledge politics, Indigenous Archaeology, decolonial thinking, Archaeology Inc.

Barn dance

There is a photograph that serves as a kind of touchstone. It shows Jo Mangi, the dreadlocked delegate from Papua New Guinea, holding Peter Ucko's hand as they attempt to barn dance. The photograph was taken at an evening of 'Music, Drama and Dance from All Over the World' held at the Southampton Guildhall in September 1986 as part of the events around WAC_I, the first World Archaeological Congress. Both men are smiling, Ucko in a slightly self-conscious way, as they share the joke at this unlikely collaboration in this unlikely setting. As an image, it captures something of the nature of WAC in its foundation, an appealing mix of fun, edginess, iconoclasm, and commitment. A decade and more later it was something of this founding impulse that attracted each of us to the World Archaeological Congress. In different

ways we have become closely involved in the workings of the organization: as a member of the Executive Committee (Shepherd 2003–08) and as a member of Council (Shepherd 2008 to present), as editor-in-chief of the WAC journal *Archaeologies* (Shepherd 2003 to present) and of the WAC-affiliated journal *Arqueología Suramericana* (Haber 2003 to present), and as members of various subcommittees and working groups.

We began with high expectations of the organization and of ourselves. We would take the spirit of that unlikely barn dance and translate it into the terms of our own time and place. WAC means different things to different people. For archaeologists from the global south it arguably holds a special importance in that it provides (or it should provide) forms of professional networking outside of the hegemonic lines of disciplinary connection. For each of us there was an added logic to our enthusiasm which came from our respective contexts of work, post-apartheid South Africa and post-dictatorship Argentina. Not teargas and bullets, but freedom was in the air. After the isolationism and fear of the past there was a new opening out to the world, and WAC seemed like a logical forum through which to explore this in a disciplinary setting. So what went wrong? Why has our involvement with WAC been such a disappointing, even disillusioning, experience? Why do we find ourselves stepping back from our commitments? Why do we find ourselves having to explain and qualify our involvement with the organization in conversations with friends and colleagues? What's up with WAC? And what can we do about it?

This is a paper about the gap between a set of expectations — the joy of the dance — and the disappointing reality of organizational involvement. It is a serious attempt to track the changing meanings and contexts of the World Archaeological Context. More than that, it is an attempt to initiate debate in a context in which such debate has been lacking. Various attempts to have this discussion internally have been shut down. One of the characteristics of WAC in recent years has been a kind of anti-intellectualism, in which dissent is interpreted as disloyalty. We came to WAC to ask our hard questions, where else could we take them? The obvious course of action might have been quietly to withdraw as others have done, but a kind of stubbornness keeps us in play. This paper is an attempt to place a set of positions on record, and an invitation to begin an exchange, in the conviction that it is through considered discussion, debate, and disagreement, that we best address the complex issue of WAC and its possible futures.

Academic freedom and apartheid

A starting point in our own understanding of WAC is to recognize the radicalism of its programme in the context of its founding in the mid-1980s. The history of formation of WAC has been well covered. In 1985, Ucko and his co-workers, who were part of a local organizing committee of a meeting of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (IUPPS), disinvited South African and Namibian scientists, in line with calls to sanction apartheid (Ucko, 1987). When the central committee of the IUPPS failed to support them, they split from that body to form the World Archaeological Congress. WAC held its first meeting in Southampton in 1986. While the issue at stake was the question of framing a disciplinary response to apartheid, the founding of WAC became an opportunity for iterating a very

different kind of professional organization. WAC's constitution provided for what it termed 'Indigenous' representation at all levels of the organization. It adopted a code of ethics which accorded specific rights to Indigenous groups and descendent communities in relation to the archaeological process. Broadly speaking, the elements of WAC's programme were threefold: first, a commitment to the politics of voice and representation; second, an emphasis on inclusivity and multiculturalism; third, a concern with questions of ethics and best practice. This concern with inclusivity and multiculturalism extended to practitioners from the global south, or what WAC calls 'economically disadvantaged countries'.

A feature of WAC's programme was the manner in which it both transcended and recapitulated what might be called a modernist/colonialist conception of knowledge. For example, it remained tethered to notions of expert knowledge and disciplinary authority, even as it attempted to open the discipline to a broader set of accountabilities. This mixture of transcendence and recapitulation was most clearly visible in notions of the Indigenous, conceived within WAC as rooted, embedded populations, tied to ways of life and forms of knowledge that existed as the irreducible other of archaeological knowledge. Within WAC the Indigenous was valorized as a sign of subaltern consciousness and practice, and became central to WAC's practice and thinking as a foil to hegemonic conceptions of the discipline. At the same time, the terms on which WAC's Indigenous representatives were included in the organization were never made clear. Were they fully present, as producers of knowledge in their own right? Or was their presence a more qualified one, overseen and overruled, as it were, by the sign of the Indigenous.

But such critiques lie in the future. Part and parcel of WAC's radicalism in the context of the mid-1980s was the manner in which it anticipated the current phase of globalization, which gathered pace from the early-1990s, and the growth of social movements. It also anticipated the multiculturalist turn, a key word of the coming decade. Within the discipline, it both anticipated and catalysed a set of discussions around the terms of archaeological engagement, which have since found expression in legislation and in the codes of ethics of numerous professional bodies. More generally, it anticipated the growth of postcolonial studies and the postcolonial turn in the academy. In part, this was in response to theory and developments in Britain. In 1982 the first post-processual critiques opened a space for challenging the scientism and positivism of mainstream archaeology. In the same year, the war over the Malvinas Islands, a set of events played out in the twilight of imperial nostalgia, brought home the actuality of (neo)colonialism to publics in Britain, as much as in Argentina. Later, the Southampton organizers were to pay special attention to sponsoring Argentinean delegates, a small but pleasing symmetry to chalk alongside the disinviting of the South Africans.

A measure of the radicalism of the events around WAC1 was their unpopularity within the discipline at large. Although there were a significant number of attendees at WAC1, it remained strictly a fringe development. The reaction of noted South African archaeologist and palaeontologist Philip Tobias was not untypical of the discipline as a whole. He returned to South Africa from a meeting of the Permanent Council of the IUPPS with the news that South Africans would be included in the eleventh congress of the IUPPS scheduled for Mainz and Frankfurt in 1987 (Deacon,

1986). This was hailed, unironically, as a victory for ‘academic freedom’, in a local context in which a state of martial law remained in effect, and in which local political activists were dead, in exile, in prison, or in hiding.

Archaeology in the postcolonial postmodern

So much for WAC in the context of its founding: a second essential point to register in relation to the organization, is that this programme has remained largely unchanged, through the subsequent twenty-five years of activity and meetings. There have been some additions — new accords, new funding initiatives, some tinkering with the constitution — but the core of the programme, its sense of mission, key definitions, the terms on which it understands the relation between archaeology and society, has remained largely as stated in its first iteration. Over the years there have been some notable interventions (Hall, 2002; Kitchen, 1998). These include a set of papers commissioned for the journal *Archaeologies*, under the heading of ‘WAC: Twenty years on’. However, few, if any, of these critiques and suggestions have penetrated to the level of policy. The biggest change has come about in the years following WAC5 (Washington DC, 2003), when a central element of WAC’s programme was dropped. At the same time, key organizational principles were shifted in the service of a particular interpretation of WAC’s purpose and mission. This took place in largely undiscussed ways, as a result of a particular stance on the part of the WAC leadership, notably WAC President Claire Smith. In our experience, a kind of pragmatism has gripped the organization in the years following WAC5 (2003). We were to get on with the job, even when it was not at all clear what the job was: why? For whom? And on what terms?

A third, and obvious, point is that the world of 2011 is a very different place from that of the mid-1980s. It is, arguably, both more complex and more sharply divided. At first glance this seems surprising. Surely a world that is free of the Cold War, apartheid, dictatorship in Argentina, and the baleful effects of Thatcher/ Reagan is an unambiguously better place? And yet so much of what might be described as the world of the postcolonial postmodern has been marked by irony, paradox, and disappointment (the ironic return of life-threatening pandemics, the paradoxical rise of ethnic nationalisms and genocide, the disappointment of a generation of postcolonial leaders co-opted by the interests of global capital and local elites). The simple, reassuring (and fictive) binaries of the Cold War have given way to a far more complex conceptualization of the relation between power, knowledge, capital, the role of the state, and the interests of local and transnational elites.

It becomes important for our argument that we begin to itemize and conceptualize these transformations. Such a list would need to include the end of the Cold War, and the accelerated effects of the current phase of globalization. It would note the generative role of transnational corporations, and accelerated capital fluidity and crisis. One effect of these developments has been the increasing polarization of income distributions (both intra-nationally and internationally), and the spectacular rise of both wealth and poverty. Following the work of Manuel Castells, we would note the rise of the information society, and the paradoxical advent of informational ‘black holes’ (Castells, 1998). In different ways, Stuart Hall, Arjun Appadurai, and

Homi Bhabha have commented on both the cultural effects of globalization — migration, hybridity, cultural homogenization — and the growth of global mediascapes and image-scapes (Appadurai, 1996; Bhabha, 1994; Hall & du Gay, 1996; Hall et al., 1992). The last two decades have seen rapid geographical shifts in production, and simultaneous processes of deindustrialization (in historical manufacturing centres) and industrialization (in emerging economies in China, Brazil, India, and elsewhere). The last decade has been marked by the acknowledgement of global environmental crisis, and the advent of ‘green’ imaginaries in public life and popular culture (Giddens, 2009). Politically speaking, this period has seen the further erosion of the power of the state, the growing consolidation and influence of transnational corporations and globalized capital, and the rise of ethnically based identity politics (Castells, 2010; Comaroff & Comaroff, 2009). It has also seen a sharpened set of inter-state political and economic differences, and the rise of new imperial formations, as well as new resistant practices and social movements (Escobar, 2008; Hardt & Negri, 2000, 2004, 2009).

This is an incomplete sketch of an impossibly broad terrain. The point is that this list begins to delineate a very different kind of world to that envisaged by the founders of WAC. Within this broadly delineated terrain, the world of the postcolonial postmodern, the place of archaeology and cultural heritage has itself been transformed. Developments in this regard include the growth of heritage tourism, archaeological theme parks, and the experiential economy (Hall & Bombardella, 2005). They also include the accelerated commodification of knowledge, the influence of managerialism in universities and museums, and the advent of the corporate university. Perhaps the most significant transformation in the years since WAC’s founding has been the rapid, global growth of cultural resource management, and the direct involvement of increasing numbers of archaeologists in development projects, including construction projects, infrastructure development, and mining and extractive industries. The period post-1990 has been marked by military/ political conflicts and forms of transnational warfare that engulf territories rich in archaeological resources, and in which archaeologists become directly involved, on behalf of occupying forces, or more rarely on behalf of occupied populations (Hamilakis, 2003).

More generally, the last two decades have seen accelerated global interconnectivity, networking and reach at all levels, including among scholars and practitioners, and between practitioners and field locations. Led by capital in its unceasing search for untapped resources and new investment opportunities, followed by an army of tourists, field practitioners, and international agencies, the global gaze now penetrates to the furthest reaches of territories, ways of life, and bodies of material culture, knowledge, and memory (Escobar, 2008). Partly in response to these developments, the same period has seen the growth of the Indigenous Movement, and more generally of social movements who organize and mobilize around archaeological sites and cultural heritage, as a route to protecting territory and gaining access to resources, rights, representation, and restitution (Haber, 2009b; Shepherd, 2008a, 2010). Such movements often take the form of subaltern social movements, struggling against (variously) the postcolonial state, Transnational Corporations, local elites, international agencies, and, occasionally, professional heritage managers and archaeologists. Framed in primordialist terms, they involve forms of contemporary ethnogenesis and

the (re)invention of tradition. At the same time, they form part of a broader phenomenon in the postcolonial postmodern, which Jean and John Comaroff have called 'the politics of ID-ology', that is, forms of identity politics used as a resource in framing contemporary claims to citizenship and rights (Comaroff & Comaroff, 2009). Examples of such struggles are as various as contemporary San/ Bushman ethnogenesis in southern Africa, Maya Movements activists contesting development in Guatemala City, the contested exhumation and reburial of remains from the African Burial Ground in New York, and the contested exhumation of an early colonial burial site in post-apartheid Cape Town (Shepherd, 2006, 2007, 2008b).

These are some of the contexts of contemporary archaeological practice, and they form a formidably complex as well as a formidably changed list from the world envisaged by WAC1, with its politics based on voice, multiculturalism, and outreach. As an interim set of observations, we note the following. First, archaeologists are increasingly situated at the sharp edge of a series of struggles around cultural heritage, archaeological sites, and human remains, whose deeper scripting involves struggles around territory, citizenship, and rights. Such struggles involve complex plays of ethnogenesis and the invention of tradition, and are an aspect of the present. In fact, a defining feature is their backward- and forward-looking nature: situated in the present, drawing on the materials of the past, to contest possible futures. Second, archaeologists find themselves differently situated in relation to these struggles, depending on whether they identify with the interests of capital, the postcolonial state, and local elites, or with the interests of subaltern social movements, resistant formations, and what have been called 'altermodernities' (Hardt & Negri, 2009). Such identifications have little or nothing to do with national differences (as in WAC's vision of a world archaeology composed of many nations), nor are they covered by questions of norms, professional ethics, or best practice. Rather, they are political, economic and ideological in nature, and require a complex positioning on the part of individual archaeologists, as they make sense of their own practice in the context of their own time and place. Third, such developments call into question a position in which archaeological intervention is always, or necessarily, a good thing (as in a modernist/colonialist conception of knowledge). Many struggles are aimed at ameliorating, or suspending, the archaeological gaze: what they want is not more archaeology, but less, or at least a different kind of archaeology. The question remains as to how WAC has situated itself in relation to these various contexts, and how a programme articulated in the mid-1980s, and radical in its day, looks from the perspective of the contemporary moment.

A room full of lawyers

So how has WAC navigated the world of the postcolonial postmodern? Our closest involvement with the organization has been in the years following WAC5 in Washington DC (2003), and it is this period that forms the basis for the comments that follow. But first, a proposition. It is this: in the absence of informed, open, and critical debate and movement, even a radical-seeming programme like WAC's becomes functional to new dominant interests and powers. A refinement of this proposition might be that in the absence of informed, open, and critical debate and

movement, a programme like WAC's falls prey to prevailing discourses and received ideas, where these discourses and ideas are themselves functional to new dominant interests and powers.

Members of the WAC Executive Committee communicate via a closed LISTSERV. In the period following WAC5, two issues dominated these exchanges. The first was the question of a venue for WAC6. There was a strong feeling coming out of WAC5 that the host country should be from the global south. At that stage, two countries were in the running: Colombia and Jamaica. A minority of the Executive Committee favoured the Colombian bid, but this was rejected early in the process over fears about safety and security. A clinching argument for the Executive Committee was a US State Department report warning against travel to Colombia. Jamaica began preparations, but these were derailed after the local organizing committee fell out with senior members of the WAC Executive. The details of this falling-out are murky, even to those of us who tried to follow the thread of events. We were told that the local organizers lacked the capacity to host a full-scale congress. It was a relief to the Executive Committee when Ireland stepped in with a late bid. We were told that the location was convenient for travel from Europe and North America, and that a strong subscription base would allow substantial funding for attendees from economically disadvantaged countries. It was clear that WAC congresses had become a juggernaut, financially risky and of uncertain benefit to the host country. However, it was not clear what WAC hoped to gain from its engagement with each of these host locations, outside of the conventional conference experience. The Jamaican bid was framed in terms of a tourist discourse of sun, sand, and cricket, rather than local issues and debates. This was despite the obvious significance of the bicentenary of the abolition of the slave trade in the Atlantic. In the same year as the scheduled WAC congress, the University of the West Indies at Mona, Jamaica, held a major symposium on questions of slavery and freedom.

The most significant issue of this period, and a defining moment in our own relationship with WAC, was its attempted partnership with the mining multinational Rio Tinto Limited. In late 2007 we were told that there was funding for an Executive Committee meeting in Melbourne, Australia. This would be preceded by a short symposium (on 'Ethical Globalization'), and a set of meetings with Rio Tinto (RioTinto, 2007f).¹ We were told by the WAC leadership that there was the prospect of significant funding from Rio Tinto, but no detail as to what was involved. We arrived at the meeting with Rio Tinto to be confronted by a roomful of lawyers, and a slick corporate presentation. A mix-up at our hotel meant that none of us had seen the documentation. There was a scramble as we tried to assimilate what was being proposed. Rio Tinto works through what it calls 'trusted brokers' in civil society (RioTinto, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d, 2007e).² Typically they would be involved in matters of the environment or education, but increasingly Rio Tinto finds itself having to access mineral resources on territories under Indigenous control, or where there are clear heritage interests. WAC members and office holders were being asked to act as brokers and intermediaries in facilitating the relationship between Rio Tinto and these local groups and interests. Rio Tinto lacks credible local networks in many parts of the world. WAC would make its networks available to Rio Tinto, along with the symbolic capital of its track record and reputation as an advocate on

behalf of Indigenous causes. In return, Rio Tinto would provide a range of funding, including funds for a full-time salaried secretariat for WAC. WAC would become an archaeological/scientific organization whose salaried office holders were paid by Rio Tinto, and whose members were on call to facilitate Rio Tinto in its relation with local interests and heritage managers.

It was clear that preliminary meetings had been held between senior WAC office holders and representatives of Rio Tinto, and that these same office holders were strongly in favour of this set of arrangements.³ We were told by the WAC leadership that mining was a 'fact of life' and a 'reality' of archaeological practice. Rather than retreat from this reality, we needed to 'engage' with it, in the first instance through a partnership with Rio Tinto. Rio Tinto funding would 'professionalize' WAC, and make it 'sustainable'. Our impression was that from the perspective of the WAC leadership, this was a done deal. We had been gathered as a large group, with a mandate to make far-reaching decisions. We had only to signal our assent for these riches to drop into the lap of the organization.

Picture the scene: the seminar room with its tiered rows of seats, the ranks of Rio Tinto lawyers and community relations professionals, and the WAC members, less a delegation than a group of individuals with little to guide us in the way of organizational policy or developed positions. It should have been a defining moment for WAC, and perhaps it was. A minority of us in the WAC group spoke up against the proposed partnership. Being in partnership with Rio Tinto, having them fund aspects of our core operation, would render impossible precisely the kind of even-handed 'engagements' that were being alluded to. What credibility would we have in disputes around archaeology and cultural heritage with rival mining houses? Some of us are involved in anti-mining activities on behalf of local communities. A partnership with Rio Tinto would make our position untenable. We were being asked to sacrifice our organizational independence for the sake of opportunistic funding. Nor was Rio Tinto just another potential funder. Rio Tinto's track record in relation to Indigenous rights and the environment has been the subject of considerable critical commentary, litigation, and protest (Anon., 2007; Moody, 1992; Perlez & Bonner, 2005; West, 1972).⁴ That WAC should enter into a preferential arrangement with such an organization was a contravention of basic principles of organizational independence and impartial critique.

Over the course of two days, we managed to hammer out a frail compromise between our own position, a pro-partnership position in WAC, and the Rio Tinto delegation. This provided for a cautious set of engagements over the coming year, and a full and open discussion among WAC members at the coming congress in Dublin. There would be no partnership, and no Rio Tinto funding of core WAC operations. Crucially, it provided for two test cases in which there would be some engagement between locally situated WAC members and Rio Tinto operatives. We proposed that these test cases be in Cameroon (where Rio Tinto was opening up operations) and Argentina. Future developments would depend on the outcomes of these test cases. A joint working committee was established to oversee these activities.

From this point on, the story is one of unravelling. Almost immediately, the terms of the agreement began to shift. Rio Tinto rejected the test case in Argentina. More

damagingly, pro-partnership elements of WAC's leadership acted to manage the subsequent discussion within the organization. In the weeks following the Melbourne meeting, a lively discussion took place among the members of the WAC delegation, using a WAC LISTSERV. Alejandro Haber entered these exchanges as an outspoken critic of the Rio Tinto adventure, drawing on his experience of the devastation and human suffering wrought by mining activities in the southern Andes. In late 2007 he was excluded from the LISTSERV. Haber had been seconded onto the WAC delegation as a member of WAC's Ethics Committee. It was explained that the LISTSERV was for the use of the Executive Committee. Acting in his capacity as editor of the WAC journal, *Archaeologies*, Nick Shepherd commissioned a set of position papers on WAC and Rio Tinto, in preparation for the session scheduled for WAC6 in Dublin the following year. Papers were invited from pro- and anti-partnership positions within WAC, as well as from Rio Tinto personnel. The text sent to authors was one that had been approved by the Executive Committee as a session brief for the Dublin Congress, under the heading of 'WAC and Rio Tinto: Strategic engagement, or sleeping with the enemy?'. When Rio Tinto complained about the wording of this brief, the WAC leadership acted to cancel this discussion in the pages of *Archaeologies*. We were told that such a discussion violated corporate codes of confidentiality and non-disclosure, and that since WAC was in a relationship with Rio Tinto we were now bound by these codes.⁵ The editors were instructed that all future journal content needed to be vetted by the Executive Committee.⁶ The session brief for the Dublin Congress was withdrawn. The discussion on WAC and Rio Tinto scheduled for WAC6 in Dublin was changed into a general discussion on policy-guiding agreements between WAC and 'third party organizations'. Debate about WAC and Rio Tinto had become a no-go, even as the organization acted to accept further funding from the mining house.

Rio Tinto was an uncomfortable experience, possibly for all concerned, but it was not without its uses. It forced into the open a set of ideas, principles, and positions which had become internalized in WAC, in largely undiscussed ways. For us, the months that followed were months of discussion, reflection, the canvassing of colleagues, and forms of organization outside of the ambit of WAC. It is a long way from the Southampton Guild Hall to the board rooms of Rio Tinto, but somehow the organization had made the journey.

Archaeologists and borders

Go to the home page of the World Archaeological Congress.⁷ Click on 'About WAC'. We read: 'The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) is a non-governmental, not-for-profit organization, and is the only representative world-wide body of practising archaeologists.' We read that WAC promotes 'the exchange of results from archaeological research; professional training and public education for disadvantaged nations, groups and communities; the empowerment and support of Indigenous groups and First Nations peoples; and the conservation of archaeological sites'. We are told that WAC has two major programmes, 'Archaeologists Without Borders' and the 'Global Libraries Programme'. Click on 'Archaeologists Without Borders'.

We read: 'Archaeologists Without Borders is a unique endeavour aimed at supporting archaeological education and training in economically disadvantaged countries.' We are told that: 'Through a network of training programmes, WAC members in different parts of the world travel to the host institutions of other WAC members to provide educational opportunities.' This is part of the WAC mission 'to foster international academic interaction, and to redress economic barriers to education about archaeology'.

What the text does not state in as many words, but what gradually becomes clear, is that the WAC members doing the travelling come from one kind of location — from 'the First World' — while the WAC members doing the hosting come from somewhere else, from 'economically disadvantaged countries'. The text goes on to explain that: 'The host university is expected to provide accommodation, food and ground transportation to the guest lecturer, and the guest lecturer is expected to provide their expertise in a voluntary capacity', which is clear enough. This programme was trialled in 2009 in Nigeria and Colombia, with Nigerian and Colombian institutions playing host. One of these trials took the form of a workshop on 'Current Archaeological Theory'. The Global Libraries Programme follows the same logic. This is 'a WAC project developing the archaeological literary collections of libraries in economically disadvantaged countries'. There are currently 'over 50 libraries receiving donations from around the world'. We are told that 'This is important work, as it contributes to resources for ongoing education and research in environments where archaeological and cultural heritage is under threat.'

As so often happens, as archaeologists from the wrong side of the border we must admit to a kind of bemusement in the face of these programmes. They are obviously well meant, but there is something sublimely improbable about an archaeological programme modelled on *Médecins Sans Frontières* (we imagine a WAC member rushing to the aid of a fellow member with an infusion of theory, a bit of emergency instruction in some technique or other, or the latest One World volume). Can they be serious? What sort of global imaginary is at work here? Our own contexts of work are defined not by a shortage of expertise, but by a shortage of jobs, research funds, and publication opportunities. Every year we produce excellent Masters and PhD students, who find themselves having to turn to other lines of work. Our struggle is not in getting hold of books and materials, but in getting our own books published and distributed in the disciplinary metropolises, against the tide of a publishing industry centred in the global north, and a politics of language which privileges English-language publications. Our biggest struggle is with a colonial knowledge politics that casts the disciplinary metropolises as centres of up-to-dateness, new knowledge, expertise, and innovation. New ideas and forms of practice are bursting out all over, often not in the traditional centre of the discipline, often not under the heading of a post-processual archaeology, and often not in the academy. The real story here is not one about emergency drops of second-hand textbooks, it is a story about a form of globalism which uncritically reproduces a colonial knowledge politics in which the direction of exchange is always from north to south, and in which the global south is either dependent outpost or field location.

Perhaps another kind of Archaeologists Without Borders might be envisaged, a form of counter-practice, in which archaeologists from Uruguay, Botswana, and

Bangladesh travel to centres in Europe and North America to talk about recent developments in practice and theory? Except, of course, that it is not that simple, for we are archaeologists *with* borders. To travel anywhere, especially anywhere in the global north, involves a lengthy, expensive, and demoralizing process of acquiring visas, hostile border checks, and a myriad other inconveniences. We encounter the phenomenon of archaeologists with and without borders, a defining feature of archaeological practice in the postcolonial postmodern (as it has, arguably, always been a feature of the discipline). Nor are such requirements relaxed as we become global, ‘one world’; every year they become more stringent, more punishing in their requirements. Instead of assuming a common purpose, and the myth of the discipline as unitary, free of context, and reproducible across time and space, should we not ask, rather: what does it mean to face one another as archaeologists from different sides of the border? How much do we assume in advance? What possibilities exist for naming the position of archaeologists from the global south outside of the lens of dependency and ‘disadvantage’?

States of abjection and the place of aid

We are now in a position to move to some conclusions. WAC exists currently as an organization of a particular kind. It is multinational, in the sense that it has global reach, and remains committed to the idea of the nation as an organizing principle. It is developmentalist, in the sense in which it approaches the global south and its phenomena as a set of problems to be fixed, and in the way in which it accepts a particular version of history, modernity, and the disciplinary process. It styles itself as an aid organization, which delivers assistance to, and intervenes on behalf of, groups variously designated as ‘Indigenous groups’, ‘First Nations peoples’, and (persons from) ‘economically disadvantaged countries’. In fact, in the years since WAC5, the imaginaries and forms of practice of ‘international aid’ have come to the fore in the organization (Haber, 2009a).

All of this is a significant departure for WAC, which began as an organization committed to forms of disciplinary self-examination. WAC1 was, above all, an intervention in the politics of knowledge in archaeology, challenging received ideas about the relationship between power, knowledge, disciplinary practice, and social and political context. Notions of Indigenous benefit and, more powerfully, Indigenous rights, were part of this project in that they followed logically from a reconceptualized knowledge politics. WAC’s founding project caused intense debate among archaeologists. It literally split the world body of practitioners in two. We both joined WAC because of the nature of the epistemic challenge that it posed to archaeologists themselves, as a way of turning the gaze back on the discipline, thinking deeply and seriously about a set of received ideas and taken-for-granted practices.

All of this has now fallen away, leaving, as it were, the residual impulse ‘to do good’ on behalf of ‘Indigenous groups’, ‘First Nations peoples’, and ‘economically disadvantaged countries’ and colleagues. It is not that WAC, in its current iteration, does not have a politics of knowledge. Through its practices it actively intervenes in a politics of knowledge in archaeology, but we would argue that these interventions

are of a reactionary nature. WAC has absorbed, and now reproduces, a remarkable conservative model of the relationship between disciplinary knowledge and contemporary political economy. The disciplinary metropole (the place of aid) is the site not only of resources, but of new knowledge, theory, techniques, and innovation. The periphery (the place of need) is there to listen and learn, and to be a grateful recipient of these energies. Disciplinary knowledge is conceived as essentially benign; the project here is around proliferating disciplinary knowledge (more archaeology, archaeology everywhere). Styled as aid, this is the modernist/colonialist consensus, recapitulated in the postcolonial postmodern.

Strikingly absent in the current iteration of WAC is any notion of critique, debate, or disciplinary self-examination. For WAC, it is as though the postcolonial turn had never taken place (so that our own intervention takes the form, in part, of a belated 'writing back'). Benignly centred in the place of aid, WAC becomes 'archaeology with a conscience', dispensing comfort to the disadvantaged. What began as a challenge to the disciplinary mainstream now becomes situated entirely comfortably within it, reinforcing a core disciplinary distinction between centre and periphery, simultaneously absorbing resistant energies, channelling them as aid, and shutting down critique. Out of the extraordinary richness, complexity, and division of contemporary social, political, economic, cultural, and disciplinary contexts, WAC distils a story about individual need and an ethos of happy multiculturalism.

Part of our argument here concerns the potential for, and the actuality of, harm that arises from such a stance and set of practices. The corollary of the place of aid is a politics of dependency which produces and requires — demands — states of abjection. In the optic of international aid, those on the other side of the border only become visible in an abject state. A criticism sometimes levelled at the two of us is that we are insufficiently 'disadvantaged'. We are not meant for WAC, or WAC is not meant for us, but for some other kind of archaeologist, properly mired in bare life. This potential for harm goes beyond the manner in which it reproduces the politics of the begging bowl, to the production of actual trauma. WAC's practice is characterized by vigorous incursions at the level of the local, often on the basis of poorly understood versions of local contexts, and armed with nothing better than a multiculturalist ethos and an idea about the beneficent effects of the global gaze. In our experience over the past six or seven years this has resulted in various traumas, discomforts, crises, often to WAC's local allies and correspondents.

The amazing thing is that this is WAC, an organization that began as a self-consciously critical intervention in the politics of knowledge in archaeology, and which continues to operate under the sign of principled dissent. But perhaps it is wrong to be amazed. Perhaps what we confronted in Melbourne was our own naiveté in imagining that an organization like Rio Tinto would be abhorrent to WAC's principles. In the logic of international aid, the place of an organization like WAC is as an adjunct to an organization like Rio Tinto. They/we need each other, as we were told repeatedly over the two days. The weight of opinion in the room was in favour of the deal. How awkward that a few of us should have failed to understand the rules of the game, the deal that was being entered into with a nod and a wink. What world do we inhabit? For it is clearly not the world of WAC.

In and out of WAC

The nature of the struggle in the postcolonial postmodern can be expressed through the key concept of location. In one of its guises, globalization/modernity expresses itself as the struggle of the global against the local. In the battle between localization and globalization, archaeology plays a central role. It translates (transforms) locality (antiquities, ways of life, landscapes, knowledges) into a global discourse (the archaeological resource, the disciplinary object, heritage), fostering and enabling global intervention beyond the marks of local history (Haber, 2009a, 2009b; Shepherd, 2010). In these terms, to be archaeologized is to be captured, disciplined, interpolated to a set of global disciplinary discourses. This is not always (or necessarily) a bad thing. But neither is it always (or necessarily) a good thing. Deeply embedded in global disciplinary discourses, and more generally in what has been termed occidentalist or Western knowledge (Escobar, 2008; Mignolo, 1999, 2008; Said, 1978), is a double potential: on the one hand, a potential for subjugation, exploitation, annihilation. On the other hand, a potential for human freedom and the fulfilment of individual creative potential. Modernity itself has been a phenomenon of two faces, demands a kind of double-entry bookkeeping: in the one column, racial slavery, colonialism/imperialism, genocide, mass poverty, and environmental catastrophe; in the other, real advances in human health and well-being, undreamed of freedoms, advances in knowledge, and a set of aspirational conversations about social emancipation.⁸ This is why our own position is not a defence of some essentialized conception of the local over and against the global, any more than it is anti-modern. Rather, it is a call for thoughtful, creative, politically and theoretically informed modes of engagement between disciplinary discourses and local contexts, which run against this logic of subjugation/exploitation.

Such engagements turn out to be more complex and more difficult than the orthodoxies of modernist/colonialist knowledge allow, with their essentially benign view of disciplinary processes and the global gaze. At the same time as this double potential exists in global disciplinary discourses, the run of logic and practice in the postcolonial postmodern, expressed in unexamined practices and received ideas, is in the direction of subjugation/exploitation. We state this in relation to archaeology not as a theoretical proposition, but as an empirical observation. The particular conjunction at which archaeology situates its disciplinary project means that many, perhaps most, archaeologists are called on to facilitate the vertical relationship between global interests, TNCs, and global and local elites (on the one hand), and local communities, territories, resources, and interests (on the other). This need not be in overt and outlandish forms, as in WAC's fantastically misconceived adventure with Rio Tinto, but more subtly and more ambiguously through a myriad disciplinary practices and contexts of work.

For example, probably the most important structural transformation in the discipline of archaeology in the twenty-five years since WAC's founding has been the widespread ascendancy of the discourse and practice of cultural resource management (CRM). CRM has changed the face of archaeological work. It has transformed structures of employment in archaeology, as well as lines of reporting, conceptions of audience, and notions of accountability. Yet, with some exceptions, there has been almost no discussion of the social, political, and epistemic consequences of CRM.

Discussions under the heading of archaeological theory have tended to follow an autonomous logic and genealogy, and to be taken up with other topics and concerns. We might say that from the point of view of theory in archaeology the effects of CRM have been decisive, but these express themselves as a kind of anti-theory which bypasses discussion and articulation and passes directly into practice. Archaeological practice is now dominated by notions of 'cultural resources', 'heritage values', 'stakeholders', and by particular (and delimited) notions of 'community', 'consultation', and 'participation'. The effects of CRM are multiple, ambiguous, and contested, but it seems likely that the net effect of CRM discourse has been to domesticate locally situated sites, material cultures, and bodies of memory and practice to the interests of global capital, and to global and local elites.

Inside South Africa, the immediate aftermath of the events around WAC_I in the mid-1980s saw the arrival on these shores of the discourse of CRM (in 1988–89, from mainly North American sources). In an ironic/unironic development typical of the postcolonial postmodern, this meant that the much heralded advent of democracy in the country was accompanied not by a long-overdue discussion around public accountabilities and the terms of archaeological engagement, but rather by a reorientation towards business models and a client/services approach (Shepherd, 2008b).

Thinking and working differently as an archaeologist, working against the grain of this logic of subjugation/exploitation, involves a mode of thoughtful dissent, and the strenuous task of (re)conceptualization. It involves escaping from aspects of our own disciplining, to the extent that we are ourselves formed within disciplinary discourses and colonialist/modernist knowledge, deeply marked by their strictures and their ambiguous gift of tongues.⁹ The ambiguities of this site of critique, of being both inside and outside the disciplinary gaze, have been expressed for us in the practical dilemma of being in and out of WAC. The potential meanings and significance of WAC are too important for us to remain silent, or to walk away. We need to take WAC back from the current orthodoxy in the organization, or we need to be clear about what WAC is and is not, name it as such, and move beyond WAC to found new forms of organization and new ways of thinking the global in the local.

Naming the Indigenous

We close with an exercise in decolonial thinking. The notion of the Indigenous has been important to WAC as a foil to hegemonic conceptions of the discipline, and as a basis for articulating alternative forms of practice. Within WAC, the notion of the Indigenous is at once valorized as a site of subaltern consciousness, and conceived in essentialized terms as denoting rooted, timeless 'peoples' whose thought and existence exist as the irreducible Other of disciplinary knowledge (and Western science). In other words, the Indigenous is admitted to the discipline, but as a minor term, appearing under the sign of culture/tradition, where archaeology appears under the sign of science/knowledge. Practice in relation to the Indigenous becomes a matter of 'respect' for differences coded as 'cultural differences' (rather than political, economic or epistemic differences), and in which archaeological knowledge is the final arbiter of the truth and meaning of these encounters. As a shorthand for this epistemic stance, we might say that it is about bringing the Indigenous into the space of the

discipline (disciplining the Indigenous). So what would another form of practice look like, one which might be described as ‘bringing the discipline into the space of the Indigenous’ or, better still (the position that we would subscribe to), opening a third space in which discipline and Indigenous might encounter one another free of the epistemic qualifiers of either the discipline (essentialized science) or the Indigenous (essentialized identity)? What would be involved in conceptualizing such a space? How do we think of the Indigenous from the perspective of a decolonial archaeology?

A starting point in our own conceptualization of the Indigenous is the recognition that it exists in a double sense, first as a product of colonialist discourse, in which it appears as an inverted image of the Western self, second as a site of local refusal and resistance to the effects of globalization/modernity. As regards the first point: modernity stages itself as a moment of historical rupture such that everything that precedes it, or that lies outside its borders, becomes something else (the pre-modern, the non-modern). For modernity to appear new and extraordinary, phenomena and states that lie outside its borders need to appear static, timeless, ruled by tradition. From this perspective, the notion of the Indigenous only makes sense in as far as it exists as the inverse of something else: the universal, the cosmopolitan, the travelled, the hybrid, the settler. Moreover, it becomes a way of naming territories and ways of life in the global south (or the periphery). Modernity is never described as being indigenous to Europe (or to the West); its sign is the universal. If the Western self is conceived as universal, ‘at home in the world’, free to travel and roam, remaining everywhere the same (identical), bringing the West to the world and the world to the West, then the Indigenous is conceived as rooted, tied to a particular time and place. At the same time, the Indigenous is tied to a particular bundle of concepts, chief among which are notions of primordialism, timelessness, and isolation. The Western self is in time (in history); in fact, it is the principle agent and motive force of history, conceived teleologically as the story of the transformation and completion of the Western self. The Indigenous stands outside of time/history.

From this perspective, the Indigenous is only authentic to the extent that it exists as the Other of the Western self; the greater the distance (cultural, temporal, spatial), the better. For the Indigenous, the task becomes the baffling and paradoxical one of articulating (asserting) a contemporary self that exists outside of history, even as histories of colonialism and modernity have intervened so decisively to construct the present juncture. A further characteristic of the category of the Indigenous conceived within colonialist discourse is its radically homogenizing nature. Out of the multiplicity of ways of life, logics, material cultures, all of the richness, density and diversity of life in the global south, it distils a single category: the Indigenous. For modernity, life before and life outside is only worth contemplating as an anachronism, a singularity whose meaning is its own obsolescence.

All of this is by way of saying that the notion of the Indigenous exists as the product of a particular episteme, Western knowledge, as a way of naming alterity/difference from within the logic of that episteme. To the extent that there exist ways of life and logics that are impenetrable to the modern gaze, and to the extent that radical alterity is experienced as threatening, the notion of the Indigenous interpolates (domesticates) alterity/difference, placing it under the sign of culture/tradition and the

exotic. In so doing it trims it of its radical potential, cancels the epistemic challenge presented by local thought and logics which exist outside the purview of Western knowledge, and nullifies the critique of Western lives contained in local socialities and ecologies. As a form of shorthand we might say: Indigenoussness eats alterity.

But that is not all: the notion of the Indigenous exists in a second, indispensable sense in the postcolonial postmodern, and it is to this that we now turn. Globalization modernity defines itself through its penetrative powers, its ability to reach into the most distant territories, the furthest outposts of life and imagination. Led by capital in its restless search for new resources and new investment opportunities, this appropriative extractive logic enfolds local knowledges, territories, and ways of life. At the same time, it prompts myriad local resistances, as groups, communities, and social movements mobilize against these effects. One of these forms of mobilization takes place under the sign of the Indigenous. Indeed, an adjunct of the contemporary phase of globalization — its other face, if you will — has been the growth of the Indigenous Movement, in which the resources of culture/identity/tradition are mobilized to resist the effects of globalization/modernity. Resistance is aimed at both the political/economic consequences of globalization, and its epistemic consequence: the imposition of a single logic, the logic of capital. Framed in Indigenous (or, more broadly, in ethnic) terms, such struggles frequently involve subaltern groupings, that is collectives who have themselves been sidelined by the (postcolonial) state, or who bear the costs of globalization without enjoying its fruits. A defining feature of such struggles is their backward- and forward-looking nature. Framed in primordialist terms as mobilizations of culture/tradition, they are firmly situated in the postcolonial postmodern, as sets of struggles around rights, resources, representation, and restitution. Such struggles are directed at the (postcolonial) state, as well as at global and local elites, and transnational agencies, interests, and corporations. As strategic mobilization of culture/tradition they involve forms of contemporary ethnogenesis and the (re)invention of tradition. To the extent that they are framed as responses to globalization, and to the extent that they are phenomena of the postcolonial postmodern, they are correctly understood as part of the landscape of modernity itself rather than its Other; in other words, as alternative modernities, or counter-modernities.

The materiality of archaeological sites, sacred sites, and remains in the ground (including human remains, or the remains of the ancestors) become powerful points of organization and mobilization in struggles against property developers, mining activities, encroaching dams, unwanted infrastructure, and agribusiness. This is a response to globalization played in a different key, organized as a set of performed responses involving resonant materialities, the significations of landscape, the intercession of the ancestors. The very characteristics invested in the notion of the Indigenous in its foundation (primordialism, timelessness, isolation) become points around which to articulate a resistant response to globalization. The double nature of the Indigenous comes to the fore: as a residual category of the Western self, and as an attempt to name ways of life and logics which exist outside of the frame of Western knowledge and global/modern experience, albeit from within the logic of globalization/modernity itself. Even as it subjects difference to an alien logic (in which it figures as Otherness), it retains, as it were, the pressure and possibility of alterity

(of a resistant logic). In this double and ambiguous play, we ask: are these forms of resistance which escape (evade) the logic of globalization/modernity? Or, in accepting the sign of the Indigenous, are they forms of resistance from within the logic of globalization/modernity? Or (as seems likely) are they both of these things?

The challenge, as we have set it out here, is to think the Indigenous outside of the triangulation of three dominant discourses: colonial ethnography (alterity as Otherness), nativism/essentialism (the Other as self), and developmentalism (the Other as project). This involves understanding the Indigenous as transforming historical phenomena. It also involves understanding the complex nature of its address: situated in the (postcolonial postmodern) present, drawing on the materials of pastness (culture/identity/tradition), and addressed to possible futures. The particular ambivalence of the notion of the Indigenous derives from its attempt to name that which exists outside of the logic and experience of colonialism/modernity, within the terms of that same logic. It takes alterity (dense, polysemous, unknowable), and reframes it as Otherness (an inverted image of the Western self). Framed in these terms, the challenge presented by notions of the Indigenous is both more complex and more embracing than that conceived by WAC. At the core of the notion of the Indigenous is an epistemic challenge to the discipline of archaeology, the challenge of 'worlds differently known'. How do we recognize local, subaltern, and fugitive knowledges of deep time (the gone past) as knowledge in its own right, and not as its Other (tradition/belief/superstition)? Rather than accepting the binary between Western self and Indigenous Other as a basis for a disciplinary project in archaeology, we should ask rather: what happens when the Indigenous is the self? Or when neither Western self nor Indigenous Other describes the position of the archaeologist self? How are we differently invested in locality?

Above all, we remark on its doubleness; ways of life and identities named as Indigenous are neither one thing nor the other, but both together, strung between the poles of accommodation and resistance. Rather than being reified as an historical special case, it joins a number of other actually or potentially resistant forms. As with so much in the postcolonial postmodern, its chief characteristic is its availability, as much to development agencies, transnational capital, and local elites (including Indigenous elites), as it is to Zapatistas, Maya Movement activists, and San land claimants. Understanding the terms on which it becomes available, as well as the possibilities and limitations of a politics that derives from it, forms the basis for an intellectual project and a decolonial politics.

Archaeology Inc.

We have covered a lot of ground in these pages, so let us be completely clear. This is a challenge and a call for open, critical debate and discussion, inside and outside the organization, about the contemporary meanings and possible futures of the World Archaeological Congress. We challenge the current WAC leadership to respond in kind, with a reasoned and analytical defence of their actions, stance, politics, and with their own account of the meaning of WAC in the postcolonial postmodern. We challenge Rio Tinto and its representatives and community relations professionals to enter the space of open debate, with their own account of what it means to be a

'trusted broker'. We challenge WAC members, onlookers and bystanders, partisans, advocates, and opponents, to respond with their own versions of WAC's meanings, histories, possible futures.

Our own notion of a mode of practice and engagement in the postcolonial postmodern is built around four positions. First, a defence of open, critical, ongoing debate, discussion and disagreement: no off-limits topics, no holy cows, no attempt to manage or direct responses. It is only through debate and dissent that we can develop the conceptual resources and robust positions able to orient practice in the postcolonial postmodern. Second, a commitment to articulating a set of counter-practices, by which we mean forms of practice that run against the grain of unexamined practices and received ideas, in as far as these unexamined practices and received ideas acquiesce to a logic of subjugation/exploitation. Third, a notion of locality, expressed through close engagements with the particularity of local contexts and 'entanglements'. Fourth, a defence of multiplicity. To the extent that globalized modernity has been an attempt to assert a single logic and a predetermined fate over the people and phenomena of the world, we assert the possibility of other ways of thinking and being, including other ways of thinking and being an archaeologist.

It should be clear that the critical force of this project is not directed outwards towards some immiserated Other, but inwards at the discipline itself. We are our own project (we are our own problem). At the very least, the idea that archaeology (or WAC) is in a position to offer comfort and direction to 'Indigenous groups', 'First Nations peoples', or practitioners from 'economically disadvantaged countries' should be treated with circumspection. Rather, in a spirit of humility, epistemic openness, and listening, we should say: what can we learn from one another? How do we begin a conversation about the things that you know, and the things that I know? There are many possible futures for the discipline. One of these is its wholesale accession to the interests of global capital, and the advent of 'Archaeology Inc.' This is a version of the future on whose edge we stand poised, in which WAC now plays its part. We are demanding different disciplinary futures, more interesting, open, creative ones. Through this simple, not so simple, act of writing we wish to open a space for those futures to come into being.

Notes

¹ According to their own promotional literature 'Rio Tinto is a leader in finding, mining and processing the earth's mineral resources . . . The group's activities span the world but are strongly represented in Australia and North America with significant businesses in South America, Asia, Europe and southern Africa' (RioTinto, 2005).

² Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) partners are selected on the basis of their 'capacity to act as a trusted broker between Rio Tinto and relevant communities/organisations' (RioTinto, 2007f).

³ 'In initial discussions with members of the WAC Executive they had advised their interest in engaging with Rio Tinto is based on our record in improving CHM outcomes for relevant communities in

Australia, and their interest in helping the company to do likewise elsewhere in the world . . . Countries and/or regions where Rio Tinto's heritage threats and opportunities are highest, and where a relationship with WAC could deliver greatest value have been identified through the internal consultation process . . . [various regions] have been identified as areas of Rio Tinto activity in which heritage partnerships could deliver significant business and heritage management benefits' (RioTinto, 2007f).

⁴ According to Friends of the Earth International: 'Rio Tinto has long been the target of environmental and community campaigns around the world, from native Indian groups in Canada to Maori people in New Zealand. These campaigns have

focused primarily on three areas of the company's activities: land rights, human rights abuses and environmental pollution. These days, Rio Tinto in only too aware that protests from local communities, desecration of the environment and human rights abuses can bring bad press and it has worked to improve its image as a socially responsible company . . . But the impacts of such "responsible capitalism" are not always apparent on the ground. Many of Rio Tinto's operations continue to attract controversy and the impact on the environment is still being felt' (Anon., 2004). SourceWatch describes Friends of the Earth International as 'the world's largest grassroots environmental network'. (SourceWatch, 2011) More pointedly, James Vassilopoulos writes of Rio Tinto: 'It is the quintessential capitalist corporation, skilled at maximising profits irrespective of environmental and human rights concerns' (Vassilopoulos, 1997).

⁵ Sample copies of two Rio Tinto/third-party agreements were circulated at the WAC/Rio Tinto meeting, a 'Memorandum of Understanding' (2007) and a 'Relationship Agreement' (2007), both of which contain confidentiality clauses. However, contra the position of the WAC leadership, no

agreement around confidentiality was entered into during the two days of the WAC/Rio Tinto meeting, nor was this ever mentioned as a condition of our discussion.

⁶ With the backing of the Editorial Board, the editors of *Archaeologies* have declined to act on this instruction.

⁷ Anon., 2010.

⁸ For a recent (and elegant) statement of this fundamental point, see Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Commonwealth* (2009): 'Modernity is always two. Before we cast it in terms of reason, Enlightenment, the break with tradition, secularism, and so forth, modernity must be understood as a power relation: domination and resistance, sovereignty and struggles for liberation' (p. 67). Walter Mignolo (2007 and elsewhere) notes that there is no modernity without coloniality, because coloniality is constitutive of modernity.

⁹ For a discussion of the value of 'undisciplinary' approaches, see the so-called MCD (modernity/coloniality/decoloniality) school of Latin American theory, whose principal contemporary figures are Arturo Escobar and Walter Mignolo.

References

- Anon. 2004. Friends of the Earth International media briefing, 7 April 2004. [online] [accessed 12 march 2011]. Available at : <http://www.foe.co.uk/resource/press_releases/rio_tinto_threat_to_madaga_06042004.html>.
- Anon. 2007. War Profiteer of the Month: Rio Tinto Alcan. *War Resisters' International*.
- Anon. 2010. World Archaeological Congress [online] [accessed June 2011]. Available at: <<http://www.worldarchaeologicalcongress.org>>.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Castells, M. 1998. *End of Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. 2010. *The Power of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Comaroff, J. L. & Comaroff, J. 2009. *Ethnicity Inc*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Deacon, J. 1986. Editorial, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 41: 4.
- Escobar, A. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Giddens, A. 2009. *The Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Haber, A. 2009a. Animism, Relatedness, Life: Post-Western Perspectives, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 19: 418–30.
- Haber, A. 2009b. Back to Life: Archaeology and the Decolonial Turn. Paper presented at *Advanced Seminar on Theory in Archaeology: South Africa/Argentina Bilateral*, University of Cape Town, 12–15 November 2009.
- Hall, M. 2002. Going Local? The World Archaeological Congress and Effective Action. *World Archaeological Bulletin*, 15: 1–9.
- Hall, M. & Bombardella, P. 2005. 'Las Vegas in Africa'. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 5(1): 5–25.
- Hall, S. & du Gay, P. eds. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: SAGE.
- Hall, S., Held, D. & McGrew, T. eds. 1992. *Modernity and its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hamilakis, Y. 2003. Iraq, Stewardship and 'the Record': An Ethical Crisis for Archaeology. *Public Archaeology*, 3: 104–11.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. 2009. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap/ Harvard.

- Kitchen, W. 1998. From Croatia to Cape Town: The Future of the World Archaeological Congress. *Antiquity*, 72: 747–50.
- Mignolo, W. 1999. *Local Histories/ Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Mignolo, W. 2007. Coloniality and Modernity/ Rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3): 155–67.
- Mignolo, W. 2008. The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference. In M. Morana, E. Dussel & C.A. Jáuregui, eds. *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke University.
- Moody, R. 1992. *Plunder: The Story of Rio Tinto Zinc*. London: Partizans. [Accessed June 2011].
- Perlez, J. & Bonner, R. 2005. Freeport Rio Tinto: Gold's other Price. *New York Times*, December 28, 2005.
- Rio Tinto. 2005. Rio Tinto: The Way we Work. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007a. Rio Tinto: Community Relations Guidance Note, Cultural Heritage Management Guidance. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007b. Rio Tinto: Community Relations Standard. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007c. Rio Tinto: Engagement Through Social and Environmental Partnerships and Relationships. From Global to Local. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007d. Rio Tinto: Working in Partnership. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007e. Rio Tinto: Working with Communities. Common Objectives, Diverse Cultures. Melbourne.
- Rio Tinto. 2007f. World Archaeological Congress and Rio Tinto Workshop: *Should we 'Partner' on Heritage Management*, Melbourne Business School, Australia, 1–2 October.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shepherd, N. 2006. What Does it Mean to Give the Past Back to the People? Archaeology and Ethics in the Post-colony. In Y. Hamilakis & P. Duke, eds. *Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, pp. 99–114.
- Shepherd, N. 2007. Archaeology Dreaming: Postapartheid Urban Imaginaries and the Bones of the Prestwich Street Dead. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7: 3–28.
- Shepherd, N. 2008a. At the Sharp Edge of the Trowel: Archaeology, Social Movements and the Politics of Memory and Identity. Paper presented at the *Material Worlds Seminar*, Brown University, September 14, 2009.
- Shepherd, N. 2008b. Heritage. In N. Shepherd & S. Robins, eds. *New South African Keywords*. Cape Town and Athens, Ohio: Jacana Media and Ohio University.
- Shepherd, N. 2010. Keynote Address: Archaeology, Coloniality, Modernity. *CHAT 2010 (Contemporary and Historical Archaeology and Theory)*, Oxford University, 5–7 December, 2010.
- SourceWatch. 2011. *SourceWatch*. [online] Available at: <http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=SourceWatch> [Accessed X Xxxxx 2011].
- Ucko, P. J. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid: The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.
- Vassilopoulos, J. 1997. Rio Tinto: The World's Worst Company? *Green Left Weekly* 300 [online] [accessed June 2011]. Available at: <<http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/15851>>.
- West, R. 1972. *River of Tears: The Story of Rio Tinto-Zinc Mining*. London: Earth Island.

Notes on contributors

Nick Shepherd was a member of the WAC Executive Committee (2003–8), is a member of WAC Council, and is editor of the journal *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress*.

Correspondence to: nick.shepherd@uct.ac.za

Alejandro Haber is editor of the WAC-affiliated journal *Arqueología Suramericana*, and is a member of various WAC subcommittees and working groups.

Correspondence to: afhaber@gmail.com