

March 2020

Archaeology and the Philosopher's Stance: An Advance in Ethics and Information Accessibility

Dina Rivera
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [Other Anthropology Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Rivera, Dina, "Archaeology and the Philosopher's Stance: An Advance in Ethics and Information Accessibility" (2020). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/8290>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Archaeology and the Philosopher's Stance:
An Advance in Ethics and Information Accessibility

by

Dina Rivera

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Applied Anthropology
Department of Anthropology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Diane Wallman, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Jonathon Bethard, Ph.D.
Sarah Taylor, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
March 13, 2020

Key Words: ethics, archaeology, information accessibility, professionalization, digital and
social media, decolonization, Indigenous archaeology
Copyright © 2020, Dina Rivera

Acknowledgments and Dedication

For my family, without which this thesis may have been done a little sooner.

My thanks to my advisors Dr. Jonathan Bethard, Dr. Sarah Taylor, and Dr. Diane Wallman for their flexibility and advocacy in incorporating my work into a successful thesis.

Special thanks to the committee for the Archaeological Ethics Database for this momentous opportunity to expand the technical skills of database management, as well as expose my career and education to the multiple venues available for researching archaeological ethics. My thanks to the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (Cifa) for making this experience possible and for their progressive vision regarding outreach and education.

A personal acknowledgment for guiding light Patricia Markert for her patience and understanding as she led me through this endeavor. Many thanks to the Ethics Committee, RPA, and Cifa executives and Dr. Nancy White for recommending me for this great opportunity. I hope the Archaeological Ethics Database continues to offer these opportunities to other interns, growing and evolving along with the profession and informing future archaeologists and advocates.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Introducing an Ethical Prologue	1
Cultivating a Theoretical Garden.....	8
Chapter 2: Final Ethics Internship Report	23
Introduction.....	23
Contract Details	23
Summary of Contract Results	24
Codes of Ethics	25
Online Resources	25
Blog Entries	25
Books	26
Journal Articles	26
Course Descriptions and Syllabi	26
Social Media Campaign	26
Ethical Dilemmas	27
Suggestions	27
Chapter 3: Reaping what has been sown: Discussion and Concluding Statements.....	31

Chapter 1:Introduction

Introducing an Ethical Prologue

The exploration of ethics has been a tradition of philosophers for millennia. The framework of ancient Greek scholars has scaffolded the trajectory of ethical examination for several fields beyond philosophy, providing guidance for principled management and practicum within professions. From the Society of Antiquaries of London (1718) to the Society of American Archaeology (1934), the professional study of anthropogenic material remains has evolved in practice, theory, and ethical erudition. This “backward-looking curiosity” has existed in the historical record long before becoming codified into verifiable and standardized institutions (Fagan and Durrani 2016:3). The profoundness of human curiosity in the past has driven generations to explore and expand methods and theories into accepted practicum and concepts of ethical implementation. Ancient Babylonian kings and Greek authors wrote of their encounters with archaeological sites or exciting discoveries of treasures beneath their feet. Crusading knights brought home artifacts for fortune and glory, justified by power, greed, and religious zealotry. Wealthy tourists of the West picked and dug through the wonders of Egypt and the Middle East from Napoleon to Champollion. Touring Classical sites such as those found in Biblical tales were popular for Europe’s wealthy elite. Powerful religious entities disputed any evidence which may discredit their doctrine and imposed restrictions on the publication of archaeological discoveries. Under these obligatory religious sanctions, the scientific pursuit of the past was stifled, and limited to the desks of religious scholars and well-funded gentry. However, progressive secular academics began to accrete interdisciplinary models and perspectives which soon gave new translations to the people of the past and new models for predicting human behavior in the future (Fagan and Durrani 2016). Once scientific methods were

applied to the study of human material remains, the regimented practice would underpin the development of academic archaeological institutionalization.

The institutionalization of archaeology came well after the temptation to excavate and acquire the bits and pieces of human history that were pillaged from the conquered and colonized filled coffers and exhibitions. Established standards guaranteed a basic development of qualifications set by academic entities, as well as advanced the profession beyond the studies of wealthy antiquarians and religious scholars (Carager 2017). Structures and processes dominated professional archaeology for a time (1930s-40s), as the global adoption of dedicated “research, interpretation, and protection of archaeological heritage in the Americas” became industrialized to accommodate growing domestic development and economy (Careger 2017; SAA 2019). The myths and legends of treasure hunting gave way to scientific hypotheses and rigid standardization (Fagan and Durrani 2016). These standards of practice benefitted a select population and focused primarily on establishing marketable theories or methods which would be accepted for publication, and less upon the ethical implications on communities and descendants. As a result, archaeological standards have come at high prices to minorities and marginalized populations, as best practices were deemed solely the realm of the well-read, often Euro-American male academic (Tall-Bear 2003). Indigenous rights to their heritage locked in museum and academic collections came after extensive civil rights activism culminating in the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA 1990, Walker 2003). By generating value through academic novelty, the splintering of accepted concepts fragmented academic study into hyperspecialized fields of archaeological research. The critique and theoretical innovation developed professional disciplines and standards into established qualifications which led to greater inclusiveness, albeit required structured support to ensure areas of specialization could

work cohesively (Carager 2017). The vast diversification of specialized skill and narrowed theories left conceptual gaps in the reconstructed human past to be filled by the eager and myopic. The inception of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1945 would establish and encourage international collaboration for human rights and heritage preservation. The UNESCO World Heritage Program, adopted 1972, listed sites which should be monitored and conserved for posterity and began an international debate on the ethical treatment of artifacts and the cultures that surround them, past and present (UNESCO 2018).

Humanity exists in the long shadows of its pasts, searching for meaning or trophies that grant insight and prestige to the present; such trophies are weighed with questions of ownership, rights, responsibilities, and heritage (Powell et al. 1993). The destructive logistics of traditional archaeology becomes questionable and problematic as further consideration is made regarding historicity, social dynamics, and residual interpretation. The spreading specialization of professional archaeology has become more inclusive for Indigenous and other descendent communities, informed by post-Colonial perspectives (Watkins 2003). The effort to examine ethics in archaeological theory and practice is less than fifty years old, and excessively competitive and saturated academic publications are still debating the minutia of cultural repatriation from over-encumbered collections. In the deluge of novel research and academic promotion, specific principles for an ethical embodiment of archaeological practicum emerges and are being swept aside by the volume of articles focused on processual archaeology (Hamilakis and Duke 2007; Wells et al. 2014).

To address the scattered literature of ethics in archaeology, the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) entered into a joint

effort to manage an ongoing project designed to condense and collate resources for the study of ethics in archaeology (ArchaeologicalEthics.Org 2019). The Archaeological Ethics Database includes over five hundred articles, books, chapters, blogs and syllabi examining subjects such as artifact privileges, display and ownership, student mentorship, sexual misconduct, cultural distinctions and interpretations, community involvement, and many more. This intern managed database is built on a WordPress Weblog platform, with a search bar to query keywords, names, phrases or titles, and the ability to browse by defined keywords, codes, and standards, topics, issues, or type of resource. Types of resources include codes of ethics for archaeological and historical societies, journal articles relevant to ethical issues in archaeology, blogs and blog posts by professionals and other professional observations, as well as courses and syllabi for exploring academic studies relevant to ethical theory and practice. Each entry is optimized for bibliographic information through BibText, and linked to live web references. The joint management of RPA and CIfA employed paid interns for the development and maintenance of the WordPress site. Intern responsibilities include testing functionalities of search, links, and pages, updating or eliminating broken links, and adding new entries in each category. Ph.D. candidate and historical archaeologist, Patricia Markert, was the inaugural intern in 2017 who compiled the initial dataset from hundreds of journals, institutions, and societies from across the United States. She also served as Chair to the RPA Ethics Committee and guide for future interns as they influence and shape the evolving dynamics of the database. As the third RPA intern, in the summer of 2019, my contribution involved expanding keywords to include issues relevant to LGBTQ representation, #MeToo activism, globalization, nationalism, and decolonizing archaeology. I was also tasked with the creation of a social media presence which would increase site exposure and readership.

Database enabled study creates opportunities for open research, expanding data pools and scientific perspectives around the globe (Wells *et al.* 2014). The personal and professional development of researching archaeologists are bolstered by accessibility and exposure to a wide variety of topics that address ethical questions in their field. The goal of my research through the internship was to examine the effectiveness of the database, ensuring it enables exposure to new materials, intern-driven research, and social media marketing for information dissemination by academic entities. This endeavor aims to observe the current state of ethics study in archaeology through the self-reflective lens provided by the compiled datasets contained in the Archaeological Ethics Database. These research articles, books, sites, and all other available resources create a robust and rich analysis for the evolving scope of ethical concepts. Historically, ethics studies were singularly researched; the inception of a database creates and ferments cohesive theory with open accessibility.

Archaeology as a profession, standardized by Western academics in the Global North, evolve through three phases of action: random, routine, and reflective (Perry 1989). Even as Babylonian kings sought the treasures of the past beneath their feet in 6th century BCE, so too did Thomas Jefferson, making stratigraphic observations in his excavation of an Indigenous Virginia mound in 1784, search for clues to the past. The unscientific, random luck and lottery of treasure hunting was superseded by a routinized scientific method. Application of interdisciplinary sciences makes archaeology as a profession invaluable and flourish in academic subjects, mostly benefitting the institutionalized and industrialized status quo established by foundational colonial scholars. Further development of archaeology as a profession turns the gaze inward, reflecting on the interrelated constructs of questions, hypotheses, problems, and conjectures. This relatively young development of professional introspection is essential for

providing inclusivity, respect, and cooperation in order to build and rebuild paradigms that are less harmful to communities and descendants.

Cultivating a Theoretical Garden

The inception of UNESCO in 1945, representing a coalition of 37 countries, endeavor to create a culture of universal respect and peace with education and communication. Dr. Henk ten Have, medical doctor and philosopher, as well as a professor at Duquesne University, was a practicing physician before teaching philosophy and directing the UNESCO division of Ethics in Science and Technology. According to ten Have, the constitution of this organization would codify the advances science and technology within a “framework of universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms” (ten Have 2006:333). While noting the importance of freedom in research projects and scientific exploration, UNESCO sought to manage the destructive human influence on cultural landscapes, artifacts, and cultures by encouraging that scientific development be used for well-being of citizens in “forward looking reflections” (Ten Have 2006:334).

Systems for consultation and sponsorship were established to make UNESCO a nexus for organizing and sponsoring international information exchange and dissemination of ethical practices beginning in the 1980s, focusing particularly on bioethics and human genome in the 1990s. UNESCO’s International Bioethics Committee (1993) was created to recognize due regard for the dignity and identity of human individuals, and the contribution of technological advances in biomedical and life sciences (ten Have 2006). Dr. ten Have (2006: 334) believes “the current revolution in science and technology has led to the concern that unbridled scientific process is not always acceptable” and thereby requires the staunch adherence to common values and benchmarks which promote ethical principles and standards. Ethical considerations for the

human biological remains used in scientific study which may have no other voice for themselves rely on principled researchers to advocate for acceptable standards. UNESCO's participation in promoting a fundamental transnational perspective of ethical applications for science and technology spurred archaeological academia to self-reflect on its colonial and morally questionable past and in which ways previous investigations were lacking, as well as how future research can avoid ethical pitfalls.

Hyper specialized archaeologies have explored emerging gender concepts, continuums and the arbitrary binaries set by a colonially narrow scope of biology in order to mitigate the damages by a male-centric colonial past. The academic specialization reinforced autonomy, and was a key asset for economic utility in academia, but created hyperfocused lenses that may or may not overlap with others' interpretation of acceptable archaeological methods (Carager 2017). Just as political perspectives and personal ideologies influence approaches in archaeology, and even in the choice of research topics, so to do they influence the field itself. In the mid-1980s, much of professional archaeology was dominated by perspectives and interpretations of white masculinity by the primarily white male archaeologist (Conkey 2007). Not only were past populations forced into present-day ideological gender roles, those roles would be reinforced in professional contexts. Beyond the research potential of a male-dominated field, the obstacles posed by the expected portrayal of an archaeologist as traversing the field while women did the professional "house cleaning" of lab work, organization, and assessment were detrimental to a successful career for women archaeologists (Gero 1985).

Pioneer of feminist archaeology Joan M. Gero (1944–2016) was an American focused on gender and power issues in prehistory, particularly in the Andean regions of Argentina and Peru. She co-edited the groundbreaking 1991 volume *Engendering Archaeology: Women and*

Prehistory with Margaret Conkey. Gero taught archaeology, anthropology and women's studies at American University in Washington, D.C. Joan Gero died on July 14, 2016. Her understanding of the socio-political influences of archaeology and within archaeology explains her perspective in the “Socio-Politics and the Woman at Home Ideology” (Gero 1985).

At the time Dr. Gero published her article in *American Antiquity* 1985, two-thirds of male archaeologists operated in the field while a similar proportion of women archaeologists worked in the lab. She noted that a greater number of National Science Foundation (NSF) grants are awarded to the field-oriented, male-guided research than women ran non-field operations. According to Gero, archaeology is value-laden and validated by dominant social and political interests which serves the ideology of the state (Gero 1985). In order for archaeology to progress, there must be an awareness of “how present-day values, prejudices, norms, and politics come to be embedded in our work and how we, perhaps unwittingly, participate in the process of imposing present on past” (Gero 1985:343). These “unexamined assumptions” validate and fulfill gender stereotypes which skews professional objectivity.

These skewed perspectives are further addressed by Enrique Moral de Eusebio, a Ph.D. candidate in History at the Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona Spain. He received his Master’s in Archaeology at Complutense University of Madrid and Bachelor’s Anthropology from the Universidad Nacional de Educacion a Distancia (UNED). He is also an Alumni of the University of Leeds where he received an MA on Gender, Sexuality and Queer Theory. His research interest includes transformations in native sex and gender systems due to the Spanish colonization of Guam (Mariana Islands) as well as the interrelation of power and sexuality through materiality, architectural structures, and ethnosexual conflicts derived from the different sexual epistemologies between the colonizer and colonized.

In “Qu(e)rying Sex and Gender in Archaeology: A Critique of the “Third”, he questions the gendered view of a binary past taken by traditional archaeologists which typically ignored, or paid little attention, to the presence of third genders (Moral 2016). Despite extensive evidence collected from ethnographic research and oral histories of genders beyond the binary, most archaeologists carefully classify gender into the present day, socially acceptable paradigms. However, as Moral carefully lays a deliberate framework for both philosophical and archaeological evidence of the nonbinary context of gender, he also outlines his critique for the “otherness” of this third gender classification.

Moral shows, through the oral histories, that body and spirit were not considered separate, so the embodiment of gender and the physical manifestation of sex were seen as one and the same. Binary classifications and even the oft used otherness of the “third” gender, according to Moral, are pigeonholed into a “third” by archaeologists which often fail to consider the “corporeality” of sex and gender in past populations (Moral 2016). Gender degrees of variation and the accompanying nomenclature suggest a more fluid approach to sex-gender nonessentialism to challenge these stagnant ahistorical categories. The representation of gender and sex continuum in the biological and archaeological record is another condition of human identity requiring ethical principles and standardization in academia.

Until the 1950s, the practice of American archaeology focused primarily on the retrieval, classification, and categorization of archaeological artifacts, with little ethical guidance. Antiquarians, collectors, curators and archaeologists alike rushed to discover and rescue rapidly disappearing sites and artifacts with varied motivations. Fame and fortune notwithstanding, conservation became an important professional focus as looting and illegal antiquities trade became problematic for continued research. This push resulted in vast collections of artifacts on

display or in storage gathering dust as specimens without a cultural context. Following the culture history tradition of Franz Boas and the Direct Historical Approach and Relative Dating teaching methods of Kroeber, Julian H. Steward and Frank M. Setzler critiqued the taxonomic methodologies that typified their field. They placed an importance on the artifacts as cultural “tools employed by human beings in some pattern of behavior” (Steward and Setzler 1938:8).

As a student of Alfred Kroeber, Steward was an influential American anthropologist which developed methods for understanding concept and culture change. He studied and taught at Berkeley with Kroeber before establishing the anthropology department at the University of Michigan. He later gained a position at the Smithsonian and was a participant in the creation of the American Association of Anthropology and the National Science Foundation. He also worked with Gordon Willey in Peru. Setzler, also an American anthropologist at the Smithsonian was a curator of the National Museum of Natural History and a primary investigator of the Hopewell burial mounds. Their development of cultural ecology theory has been influential in archaeological methodology.

This fundamental theory of cultural ecology focuses on the human adaptations to social and physical environments, examined by viewing artifacts as functional assemblages of certain configurations (Steward and Setzler 1938). These assemblages had a functional place in human behavior and could be used to compare and contrast the differences between cultures and traditions throughout time. As archaeologists up to then had recorded and cataloged their finds with little interpretation or consideration of broad questions, Steward and Setzler integrated cultural configurations as functional interpretations for human adaptation.

Current archaeologists still grapple with fragmentary objectives in the professional field, and methodologies vary with a personal approach. Anthropology and by extension, American

archaeology is disparate in focus and interdisciplinary in practice. The rescue and recording of sites and artifacts are necessary, and much is lost and/or missed at first glance. The importance of functionality and configuration as they relate to cultural ecology is an important concept for the working archaeologist to use as a guideline. “Techniques are tools,” and professional archaeologists must be open and aware of any cross-disciplinary associations that may further expand and expound their research (Steward and Setzler 1938:5). However, the relationships between artifacts and humans have been studied more extensively and has been discovered as far more complex in their interpretations, ethical and otherwise.

The highly scientific, male oriented focus of archaeology has been critiqued in recent years, moving towards more inclusive and nuanced perspectives on the past and on ethical practices of professional archaeology. Gaining support in the field, post-colonial theories have yet to acquire a stable foothold in the profession as a whole against years of colonial tradition and Eurocentric education. On an epistemological level, postcolonialism challenges the authority of anthropologists to speak for the “other”, specifically indigenous cultures. Criticizing essentialist characterizations of people and cultures, postcolonial theories developed in response to the Imperialist violence and catastrophic displacement of global expansion and industrial capitalism (Bayly 2016). One of the most profound contributions to postcolonial theory was Dr. Edward Said’s 1978 book “Orientalism” in which he defined the historically patronizing representations of the “West” on the people of the “East.” The professor of literature at Columbia University is considered a founder of the academic study of postcolonialism. Indigenous archaeologist, Dr. Sonya Atalay further works to understand and bring about the institutional changes required to support engaged and transformative scholarships and ethical principles.

Hers, and a growing movement of other indigenous voices in archaeology, assert that Indigenous knowledge is just as valid as those from Imperial or colonial sources (Atalay 2006)

Exploring the artifactual relationships, professor of European Archaeology and Director of the Institute of Archaeology at Oxford, Chris Gosden studies landscapes and identity in medieval Europe, Celtic Art and ancestry, Eurasian connections as well as humanity in Papua New Guinea. He was also a curator for the Pitt Rivers Museum at the University of Oxford and has published on Roman colonialism in Britain, colonialism and material culture, and social ontologies. Gosden proposes a different lens in which to view the archaeological relationship that shifts the ethical gaze onto artifactual analysis in an “object-centered approach to agency” where strands of continuities accorded to objects have effects on people and societies (Gosden 2005). By examining objects as if artifacts could have social power and efficacy, they would enrich social analysis as an active part of material culture and encourage the pursuit of newer concepts for ethical management. In Gosden’s theory: “Things create people, who thereby create things” (Gosden 2005).

According to Dr. Gosden, the inter-artifactual domain is an en masse effect; produced with a recognizable set of form and style which have an influence on how and which artifacts are made and used. Objects, in this manner, are seen less as indicators of ethnicity than a universe unto their own. Gosden explains that the mass power of objects, and subtle interactions with masses, create visible clues in the material record (Gosden 2005). These artifacts are acting together, accumulating cultural influence, and populations of artifacts are displaying their own behaviors, bringing about their own reproductions. Changing styles of shipbuilding or pottery making through time shows how artifacts can have agency beyond human intention that can only be understood through redefining the context of artifact style. As human populations grow and

develop around and along with a style of artifacts, or body of artifacts, those objects become integral parts of cultural identity and are embodied in future representations and reproductions of those artifacts.

This independence of style redefining the notions of context reveal styles and body of styles that can be studied in association to the material record to provide conjecture for other like artifacts that will likely reveal social being for people structured by the surroundings of their material culture. In the case of the Romans, Gosden proposes the object-oriented framework is a post-colonial approach to colonial forms of agency that replace the previous colonist “top-down” perspectives. He sketches the creation of the Roman Empire as an evolution of associated objects via the study of the agency of an object’s form, genealogy, and source. As styles of objects are adapted and evolved, form and shape can be traced through the material culture as they are physically incorporated into everyday life, building patterns, and social interactions. Objects evolve with stylistic adaptations that can be traced and associated with social groups, politics, and conditions. Where an object originated, or the material from where it was sourced, may obfuscate the dynamics of daily use, but reveal a novel usage when transported and incorporated transcolonially as in the example of Roman glass in the British Isles (Gosden 2005).

Ethical “ownership” of artifacts and material remains entails debates over cultural property and repatriation. From 1801 to 1812, Sir Thomas Bruce, the seventh Earl of Elgin toured East, and bribed a sultan for the opportunity to drag home tons of marble artwork, snatched from the rubble of the Parthenon, to don his foyer. Like many other wealthy Western European antiquarians of the 1800s, he receives a dubious permission to loot and pillage wholesale many the surviving sculptures from the ancient Acropolis of Athens. This act of cultural vandalism was sanctioned under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, which recycled

Greece's antiquities into hearths and steps as the ancient ruins were picked apart. Elgin made the perilous journey back to England, suffering much along the way, and incited a cultural revolution of new art and architecture with their infamous import (Taylor 2014). The collection remains in the ownership of the British Museum in London, despite Greece finding independence and requesting their return many times between then and now. These demands have been met with significant resistance, which remains an ongoing debate (Taylor 2014).

Britain's murky claim to ownership rests on a suspiciously obtained permission by an occupying force. A Sultan magistrate granted Elgin permission to remove the artifacts from England. That Elgin suffered danger, disease, and financial ruin for the quest belies the significant place it has found in the warp and weft of British society (Taylor 2014). As part and parcel of the British Museum, it is privy to the free access of millions each year. As the Parthenon had been reduced to rubble by recent warfare at the time of the Marbles' excavation, Britain's claim to primacy and preservation of world history and the Marbles' resultant influence upon their society is tantamount to their keeping of the debated artifacts. While the Greek people were trying their best to survive under Ottoman occupation, they reabsorbed their heritage as parts of their homes and lives. There may have been no plans to rebuild a Parthenon underneath foreign occupation, however, independence has a way of impressing upon the people the importance of their cultural heritage (Taylor 2014). Arguments for ethical repatriation state that by returning the Marble friezes back to Athens, a continuity of cultural association can be preserved with new restorations and heritage carved by the hands of their own ancestors. The repatriation of the Marbles in their homeland would have been a gesture of global magnanimity and recognition towards Greece as a more important influence in the Western world.

Fundamental perspectives and assumptions regarding the control of cultural property are polarized into nationalist versus internationalist. Nationalist advocates for cultural property espouse the importance of cultural heritage to remain close to its place of discovery for context and local connectivity with the past. Internationalists adhere to the belief that history belongs to “all mankind,” often while justifying their possession of cultural artifacts that are not their own. Lacking any heritage claim, other than social significance, to these artifacts, Britain should return the Marbles to Athens, where they may be joined in context with their original landscape (Taylor 2014). Their fear of creating precedence for the depletion of museum stock around the work follows a slippery slope fallacy that may have little credence; if it should call for the repatriation of artifacts to their homelands, the ample artifacts that lay gathering dust in the archives of British history can be put on display. Cultural property has value, more than economic, of heritage and social impact for the descendants of those that created them. Even if the Greek people demanded their artifacts for monetary reasons, it is their history to garner the economic advantages from, rather than fatten the wallets of the country that had stolen it hundreds of years ago. It is a long-time past since England left behind its imperial condescension and lost its Marbles.

The importance of human relationship with the artifactual pasts and the ethical consultation and participation of descendent and local communities is explored by sociocultural anthropologist specializing in political structures, oral histories and multiculturalism in Mexico and Latin America, Smith College Professor, Fernando Armstrong-Fumero as he pairs with local Mexican archaeologist Julio Hoil Gutierrez to find a truly collaborative path between archaeologists and the community they work within, specifically in the Yucatan. Fernando-Armstrong received his MA and BA at the University of Pennsylvania and his Ph. D at Stanford.

Gutierrez, of the institutional platform CIESAS Peninsular that exists as an extension of the Scientific Innovation and Research System of Mexico, conducts archaeological, ethnographic, and documentary research out of the facilities at the Science Technology Park of Yucatan.

In their collaborative effort “Community Heritage and Partnership in Xcalakdzonot, Yucatan,” Armstrong-Fumero and Gutierrez (2016) outline the typical interaction of archaeologists and the community as cursory and most often hierarchical. The communities where the research took place had little power over how or why research commenced, leading to tensions spanning professional archaeological history. Archaeologists would often hire and train local Mayan laborers, directing their attention and efforts, to fulfill a range of legal and institutional research agendas that might influence the community without their input. Also, lacking in local engagement meant the ethnographic information from descendent communities such as oral histories which could be used for archaeological research was limited.

The continued lack of mutual understanding creates a significant social disparity between the Mayan communities attempting to make living wages as laborers or selling artifacts in the tourist industry, and the archaeologists, achieving political and economic capital based upon the work done in Mayan landscapes (Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez 2016). Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez further denote this disparity with the example of Mayan groundskeepers, excavators, and masons on research and restoration projects which have no formal archaeological training and therefore no academic clout, despite having geographical and cultural familiarity with the sites on which they work. Lacking official means for collaborating with institutional entities, communities often feel excluded and resentful, creating tension for both groups (Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez 2016).

The Xcalakdzonot (Ish-Ka-Lak-Sen-Oh-Tay) project aimed to establish a reference for future dialogues with the Mayan community in the town of Xcalakdzonot. Instead of focusing on global heritage, Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez instead value the approach to community patrimony to highlight overlaps and develop expansion in the practices of institutional archaeology towards more inclusivity. More than recognizing that different cultural discourses on the landscape exist, their efforts included members of the host community as long-term partners in determining the research agenda as well as establishing stewardship of the data they have produced. They initiated open meetings with local committees and accompanied collaborators to sites. Town members from Xcalakdzonot were allowed to participate and authorize site surveys to a greater extent than historically recorded in Mayan archaeology. Their final product will be an interactive map of the landscape that integrates the local indigenous cosmology and social narratives that will be available to the local schools and libraries as well as the greater investigative community.

The goal for Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez to create and embody a good faith example of archaeological practice that incorporates descendent communities is to provide a venue for their voices to share in the archaeological narrative and thereby influence wider legislation and social influences. This model of partnership and repatriation of archaeological knowledge is an important step for “development of more inclusive, postcolonial, and critically multicultural heritage practices” (Fernando-Armstrong and Gutierrez 2016:413).

Decolonizing archaeological practices to create a more ethical future for archaeological research requires the examination of Indigenous rights. Associate professor of Native Studies at the University of Alberta, Dr. Kim Tall-bear, has been influential in her studies of Indigenous peoples, technoscience, and the environment as well as decolonizing sexualities from indigenous

perspectives. As a member of Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, and descended from Arapahoe and Cheyenne tribes, Dr. Tall-bear brings a robust analysis of unethical and colonialist archaeologies critiquing Native DNA, Indigenous peoples' engagements and disenfranchisements, and cultural politics within human genetic research. As an Indigenous person in academia, Dr. Tall-Bear has pioneered the critical analysis of privileges, biases, and prejudices in fields where foundational material in the Americas is typically generated by those of colonist ancestry. In addition to the long and exhausting battle for the rights of ancestral remains and culturally significant artifacts, Dr. Tall-bear examines the rights of Indigenous peoples to their own genetic material when such legislation is ambiguous and skewed towards colonizer politics and definitions of identity. Although fraught with challenges, the legislation to repatriate the remains of the Indigenous population is a culmination of a slow and arduous civil rights movement (Watkins 2003). The right to reclaim ancestors and return them to traditional burial is barely thirty years old, and still, there are institutions that are reticent to inventory their possessed remains (Watkins 2003; Tall-Bear 2003). Nineteen separate institutions within the state of Florida have inventoried culturally identifiable human remains or associated funerary objects (AFO), however, none are from the University of South Florida (USF).

Examination of the available online database for the National NAGPRA Program created by the National Park Service, reveals that the total MNI for culturally unidentifiable human remains (CUHR) is 7295, and an AFO of 10,594 in 72 separate institutions. The total minimum number of individuals (MNI) that have been inventoried in Culturally Affiliated Database from Florida, US, alone is 700, with the total number of AFOs at 8701. Many of the inventoried remains are deposited in northern, out of state institutions such as Pennsylvania or Wisconsin. Much of the culturally affiliated inventories within the state are in the possession of Department

of Interior, or Department of State. Only one set of remains is documented to have been repatriated. There are 14 documented MNI currently housed at the USF Anthropology Department, with 0 documented AFOs.

State institutions were found most likely to be compliant with “Final Rule” 43 CFR 10.11(c)(1), with the statute appearing 51 times in conjunction with searches with culturally identifiable Florida remains. Roughly 15-20 institutions could be seen as noncompliant. Most conspicuously absent from this “Final Rule” is the entire collection of the Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Florida State University, the Department of Agriculture, Department of Defense and several institutions other outside the state of Florida (ie Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, etc.). The genetic and biological information gleaned from the archaeological study of Indigenous remains has created consequences in blood quantum, DNA, and racialization of tribal identity (Tall-bear 2003). Colonist views on indigenous culture are systematically ingrained in continental American education and an ethical road forward requires active reassertion of Indigenous perspectives (Tall-bear 2003; Atalay 2006)

The soil in which archaeology digs has been made fertile with blood and tragedy from ignorant, colonial practices. The tilling of such soil and the planting of ethical theories takes careful cultivation from an assortment of perspectives, experiences, and cultural lenses in which to grow a robust, and rich crop of resulting concepts. The continued self-reflection of professional archaeology has created a doctrine of principles were marginalized and minority voices can participate in the narrative and can edify further employees of archaeological theory. Codes of Ethics, such as those created by the Society for American Archaeologists (SAA) provide a framework in which new research can grow and become fruitful, reseeding the future with outcomes that are mutually beneficial and culturally inclusive. Just as with any garden,

ethical concepts, theories, and practice must be weeded of detrimental frameworks and pruned of subjective biases. Reference tools, such as the Archaeological Ethics Database, enable the hands, minds, and trowels of current archaeologists to find sustainable and ethical methods in the innovations of their peers.

Chapter 2: Final Ethics Internship Report

Introduction

In June of 2019, the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) accepted me as a consultant intern for the RPA Ethics Commission in order to complete a series of tasks associated with the maintenance, troubleshooting, and updating of the new RPA and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) *Archaeological Ethics Database* website which was launched in May of 2018 (<http://archaeologicaethics.org/>). Initially created, compiled and structured by the primary intern Trish Markert (2017), this current consultant will serve as the third RPA Ethics Intern tasked with the follow-up and continuation of the work of the first.

This intern driven model was built on the original content and structure of the Microsoft Access Ethics Database, in collaboration with a contracted programmer for the RPA. Launched in 2018, the WordPress format website displays an annually updated database, with searchable keywords, topics, codes relevant to the RPA, and “Source Types” including Codes of Ethics, Journal Articles, Books, Chapters, Edited Volumes, Course Descriptions, Syllabi, Blogs, Blog posts, and other Online Resources. Updates to the database commenced from June to September in 2018, and presently, June to August of 2019, in which the current intern utilizes WordPress online protocols to expand and innovate the known database as well as increase viewership through social media marketing.

Contract Details

Contractual obligations outlined general tasks and specific milestones (see below) slated to be completed during the period between June 1, 2019, and August 30, 2019. These milestones included a scheduled monthly operation for updating and managing database entries, creation

and implementation of strategies for social media marketing, policies, and research, generation of a framework for future management for social media platforms, composition and collating of ethics bowl scenarios, as well as suggesting possible goals and objectives for future intern management. As technology and access to resources continue to expand reach and resource, the constant evolution of a digital database is necessary and made possible through expanded engagement with archaeological communities and all those adjacent.

General Tasks included:

- working independently, reporting to the Chair of the Register's Ethics Committee as well as update the Ethics Committee at the end of each month on progress, needs, and next steps.
- research and compile resources related to archaeological ethics as related to the practice of archaeology and attribute by the categories listed under Register's Code of Conduct and Standards of Research Performance and the Keywords/Terms and Topics/Issue taxonomies in the existing database.
- update and maintain the existing database, testing the functionality of URLs, addressing any requests submitted through the online form, and updating content in existing entries.
- assist the Register's Ethics Committee with compiling ethical dilemmas into an archive independent of the database for potential use in future Ethics Bowls.
- promote archaeologicaethics.org as an online resource through designing and implementing ways to promote the database via social media, educational materials, or other online platforms.

Specific Milestones (as outlined by Consultant Agreement)

- To be completed by 30

June 2019:

- Updates to the database:
- Testing overall functionality of database entries and updating as necessary o
Updating ethics codes of archaeological societies in the US and internationally,
and any resources these societies have available on archaeological ethics o Updating
blogs and blog posts on archaeological ethics, professionalism, and related issues
 - Meet with the Committee Chair to discuss ideas for promoting
the database
- To be completed by 31

July 2019:

- Updates to the
database:
- Updating articles, edited volumes, books, and book chapters from
archaeological society journals and newsletters, as well as any other articles on
archaeological ethics and professionalism
 - Collecting and compiling ethical
dilemmas
 - Implementing plans to promote
archaeologicaethics.org

- To be completed by 31 August 2019:
 - Updates to the database:
- Updating syllabi and reading lists on archaeological ethics and professionalism from colleges and universities in the US.
 - Collecting and compiling ethical dilemmas
 - Implementing plans to promote archaeologicaethics.org
- To be completed at the conclusion of the internship (31 August 2019 or date otherwise arranged and approved by the committee):
 - A brief report (2-4 pages) of tasks completed and recommendations for future updates to the database.
 - Archive list of ethical dilemmas compiled for Ethics Bowls.

Summary of Contract Results

The continuance and maintenance of the Archaeological Ethics Database concluded successfully with reassociation of broken links, updated information for existing entries and numerous new additions. The most significant expanse of the database includes the course descriptions from undergraduate and graduate catalogs from over twenty-eight (28) separate institutions out of the potential 118 surveyed for courses in ethics and professionalism, implying an increase in interest and impetus for the education in ethical topics in archaeology. In addition

to the revalidation of links and new additions, the list of universities surveyed is updated with links to course catalogs for their respective institutions. Of new blog post additions, one-third of the new entries broach public, professional, personal and global representations of #MeToo in Archaeology. New books and chapters include Ph.D. dissertations encouraging ethical engagement with indigenous cultures and human remains, and encouraging digital incorporation of information production and curation in virtual spaces. The inclusion of new topics: “Globalization and global perspectives” and “Nationalism”, has been added to the database for expanded concepts regarding the ethical participation of archaeology as a global entity, social impressions, and constructs affecting the profession and all concepts related therein.

Codes of Ethics

The update and managing of the Codes of Ethics section resulted in 5 new additions and updates, including Laws and Ethics from the Society for American Archaeology and British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology, as well as an ethics statements from the *Antiquity* journal.

Online Resources

Four (4) new additions to the Online Resources included toolboxes for ethics research and interpretation from the Society of Historical Archaeology, Chartered Institute of Archaeology and resources for professional ethics.

Blog Entries

There were twelve (12) new blog entries specifically associated with ethics in archaeology, discussing handling human and animal remains, public interpretation and outreach,

as well as current developments regarding sexual harassment and the #metoo in archaeology campaign.

Books

The fourteen (14) new book, book chapter, and Ph.D. dissertation entries added to the database also include an update applied to all database entries for this classification which included a link for publisher or purchasing site information for facilitating research and expanding ethics topics.

Journal Articles

Twenty-six (26) new additions to the journal article section include topics on digital archaeology, interdisciplinary research, gender studies, looting, Indigenous archaeology and ethical engagement with human remains.

Course Descriptions and Syllabi

The most expansive addition to the database includes those of course descriptions and syllabi, which include one hundred fourteen (114) new entries from twenty-eight (27) institutions. The dramatic increase of courses regarding ethical interpretations of concepts, theories, and methods in archaeology may be due to expanding the keyword search possibilities to be inclusive of terms such as gender studies, decolonization, sexuality, climate, and environments.

Social Media Campaign

Social media marketing strategy was developed over the course of the three-month internship, including collaboration, research, approval, and implementation at the end of August

2019. The scheduled, low maintenance media campaign is set to apply weekly posts to three social media profiles set up and maintained by the Ethics committee until the next intern can shape following social media campaigns.

Ethical Dilemmas

Society for American Archaeologists (SAA) Ethics bowls at the Annual Meetings, beginning in 2004 to present, with a gap in online records from 2015-17, were archived online at the SAA Ethics resource website. An excel document detailing year, annual meeting, location, and associated keywords was created in order to facilitate future ethics bowl research. Ten (10) new ethics bowl dilemmas have been composed and compiled as the final file packet.

Suggestions

Future suggestions for the Archaeological Ethics Database may be the exploration of a “Wiki” plugin available for Wordpress programming which can increase database usership through crowdsourcing information. Concepts, theories and methods in archaeology can be further disseminated and defined for web browsers, augmented and annotated by accredited users, and thereby producing and participating in information relevant to expanding and understanding archaeological ethics.

Future ethics interns may benefit from engaging in patterned or themed searches to focus and border goals for the inclusion of new additions to the database. Prevalent themes, issues, or innovations in archaeology can influence and shape the scope of the database individually, based upon intern specialties.

Social media campaign continuance is easily malleable and can benefit from further active engagement, posting, reposting, replies and comments as the social media presence for the

Database increases. By providing visualizations to communicate database availability of information, the text-heavy dynamic of the database can create brand recognizability and increase usership.

A significant number of questions to ponder for future interns and committee members alike were accumulated throughout the contract period which could affect archaeological comprehension, facilitate research, promote diversity and inclusivity, or otherwise augment the mission of the ethics database.

- General Database:
 - In what conceptual geolocality are the majority of the concepts/ethics centered?
 - What best methods could be considered for furthering diversity and inclusiveness as well as increasing RPA member engagement w/database?
 - In what ways can the database be used for deeper inquiries? Within and beyond the profession?
 - In what ways can ideas for ethically informed projects be promoted?
 - Should the mission statements/ethics statements for CRM firms be included?
- Ethics bowl:
 - Are they too vague, to the point of almost stereotypical and micro-aggressive racisms? In the attempt to fictionalize for the sake of being inoffensive, is the opposite occurring with overgeneralized concepts and easily misinterpreted “facts”?
 - Indigenous rights are a common theme, but how many are written from Indigenous perspectives?

- Stylish reformatting with the “arrow” clip art could be construed as minimization of cultural importance?
- Missing years create an anomalous transition, how will this affect future studies of trends in archaeological ethics?
- Books, Social media:
 - How do I not order each and every one of these books?
 - How best do we curate media assets for marketing purposes? Researchers will begin accumulating data before the semester and relevant topics will require prior engagement with media groups early on.
 - How best to contribute positively to the archaeological community through social media campaigns?
 - How do we avoid political or social pitfalls of predecessors?
- Course Catalogs
 - Due to the increase of subjects exploring ethical topics would it be less cumbersome to organize courses by institution/region, rather than individually?
 - How many of these courses are undergrad/graduate level? How early are we influencing students relating to ethics in archaeology?

Chapter 3: Reaping what has been sown: Discussion and Concluding Statements

As a graduate student assigned to the indexing and cataloging of human remains in a university anthropology department, my primary responsibility was the ethical management of those persons in the care and collections which included responsibility for accuracy, historicity, and respect for the ancestors and descendent populations. However, as precarious politics and inaccessibility complicated matters, a student assignment became untenable. Several years of research and data will have to wait for later analysis while ethical issues are reexamined. Crucial resources that are easily accessible, such as those included in the Archaeological Ethics Database, provide ammunition for ethical critique, as well as inform social, political, and cultural transformations.

The three-month internship was a paid opportunity offered by the Register of Professional Archaeologists and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists to provide support, management, and maintenance for the Archaeological Ethics Database. The independent research and compilation of resources related to ethics in archaeology included updating and maintaining the existing database, testing link functionalities, and adding new content from archaeological societies, journals, and educators in the US and internationally. Threads of thought on new entries of various kinds, such as themes which cross cut media such as globalism or nationalism, can be discussed in the context of anthropology and archaeology by including how they influence politics in academia, concepts of ethical discipline between principle investigators, field and lab archaeologists, students and professors, as well as interactions with descendent and local communities impacted by anthropological studies. These themes, which occur simultaneously in the public and professional fields, alter new interpretations and fill gaps

where assumption and biases have previously resided. Another internship task required the creation of new dilemmas relevant to current issues for the SAA Ethics Bowl, a competition for student archaeologists to help bring awareness and practice situations for future encounters.

Other tasks include promoting the online database through designing and implementing ways to encourage user traffic via social media, education materials, or other online platforms. An official social media page for the ArchaeologicalDatabase.Org was created on three separate social media platforms: Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. Utilizing social media marketing for the sharing of information is a cost-effective method for capitalizing on near-instantaneous information dissemination over vast user engaged platforms. The accessibility and search capabilities allowable within these social media can create the semi-permanent digital links between Internet image, keyword or hashtag, and the evolution of information. With regard to the Archaeological Ethics Database, the adoption of these methods could easily increase site viewership and engagement, improve and augment database entries, as well as participate in the evolving understanding of ethical concepts in the archaeological profession. I propose that the Archaeological Ethics Database (AED) would increase viewership and professional influence through the implementation of a social media campaign through active engagement with those communities, combining ethical concepts and definitions with visual representations and informative textual narratives.

The creation of three social media pages via Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram is free of charge providing a cost-effective entry to these Internet communities. Free utilities for the creation of banner and logo art, and any future images as well as the overall management of the three social media pages, are available online. One popular application, Pixlr, offers an online photo editor similar to a limited version of Photoshop. The Later App, both available for mobile

and online management of social media, allows for the scheduled posting of content to each of the social media platforms without having to open each separate platform page.

The successful sharing of information on social media often follows either of two formats. The imagery and narrative chosen for exchanging ideas can be purely informational, with definitions and relevant pictures that provide a coherent and cohesive explanation of concepts. Examples of this method, “infodump”, include social media sites for Science.com or National Geographic. Alternately, “edutainment” is another means for utilizing infographics and humor to express and spread ideas as social media posts are shared between users. Edutainment sites IFLScience.com and Bad Archaeology use humor and pop culture to spread information widely. The AED would benefit from adopting a two-pronged methodology where these two modes of information transmission can be layered, accessible, and relatable to as many users as possible. While ethics in archaeology is a serious subject, including entertaining images, puns, jokes, and memes will promote relatability, sharable content, and cooperative participation with the evolving record.

Maximizing information dissemination through the cultivated use of Internet technology can be adapted from business models that rely on social media marketing. Keywords and hashtags (ex. #metoo) allow for search engine optimization, widening the possible user engagements across separate platforms. Associative concepts that are included with keywords and hashtags will also bolster future research and database management as more images and narratives are included. Users, beyond the archaeological profession, can also participate in this evolution, as they associate an image, narrative, and search engine optimizability in their own social media posts. The potential for growth is limited only by the imagination and accessibility to WiFi.

Weekly, or Bi-weekly content, with ethical definitions, relevant images, keywords, and hashtags has been generated and cross-posted to all three platforms. Other relevant news, information, or acceptable humor related to archaeology, was established to automatically update weekly with minimal maintenance. Social media campaign continuance is easily malleable and can benefit from further active engagement, posting, reposting, replies and comments as the social media presence for the Database increases. By providing visualizations to communicate database availability of information, the text-heavy dynamic of the database can create brand recognizability and increase usership. The framework established for social media platforms will be available for more complex marketing campaigns for future interns.

Improved functionality of the database and social media campaigns includes further exploration and implementation of new methods to increase accessibility, user-friendliness, and promote readership. The basic search function available to the WordPress site has no advanced functions for specifying search parameters. Users can search by keywords, but not by institution, society, location or authorship. A significant number of questions to ponder for future interns and committee members alike were accumulated throughout the contract period which could affect archaeological comprehension, facilitate research, promote diversity and inclusivity, or otherwise augment the mission of the ethics database. These inquiries include conceptual geolocality of entries in the database, and what methods could be considered for furthering diversity and inclusiveness, and how might the database be used for deeper inquiries, both within archaeology and beyond. Ethically informed projects will ultimately benefit by engaging in patterned or themed searches allowed by the online database, increasing visibility, cognizance, and awareness. The ability for future interns to shape and influence the growing body of ethical theory is an exceptional opportunity to inject fresh perspectives from new archaeologists to

future users. This digital platform, with the convenience of remote maintenance, can be available and promote accessibility for future users as well as reflect the growing phylogeny of ethical theory.

The constant evolution of ethical understanding in archaeology requires aim at a continuous moving target. As society continues to change, rediscover and reevaluate professional praxes, the academic awareness of ethical engagement, participation, and study must also evolve. In this endeavor, a centralized database with expanded accessibility to a global audience taking advantage of social media marketing capacities greatly improves the likelihood in which ethical theories can be incorporated and assimilated into professional practice. The Archaeological Ethics Database is an advance in improved accessibility for a modern incarnation of ethical comprehension which is cultivated into a fruitful structure for a widely available and valuable resource for information dissemination.

References

1. “5 Ways to Win Sports Fans Over with Your Creative Campaigns” Facebook IQ: Digital Research and Insights. July 1, 2019.
<https://www.facebook.com/business/news/insights/5-ways-to-win-sports-fans-over-with-your-creative-campaigns>
2. “Media Consumption During Global Sports Events” by YouGov (Facebook-commissioned survey of 9,173 people aged 18-64 in AU, BR, FR, GR, JP, KR, RS, US, UK), Apr 2019.
3. Armstrong-Fumero, F., & Gutiérrez, J. H. (2016). : Community Heritage and Partnership in Xcalakdzonot, Yucatán. In *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology* (pp. 405-412). Routledge.
4. Atalay, Sonya (2006). "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice". *American Indian Quarterly*. University of Nebraska. **30** (3&4): 280–310. [doi:10.1353/aiq.2006.0015](https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2006.0015).
5. Bayly, Susan. "Colonialism/Postcolonialism." *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology* (2016).
6. Caraher, Bill “Professionalization and Fragmentation” *Archaeology of the Mediterranean World* <https://mediterraneanworld.wordpress.com/2017/02/28/professionalization-and-fragmentation/> (Carager 2017)
7. Chadwick, A. (2003). Post-processualism, professionalization and archaeological methodologies. Towards reflective and radical practice. *Archaeological dialogues*, 10(1), 97-117. (Chadwick 2003)

8. DeWitte, S. N. (2015) Bioarchaeology and the Ethics of Research Using Human Skeletal Remains, *History Compass*, 13, pages 10– 19. doi: [10.1111/hic3.12213](https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12213). (Dewitte 2015)
9. Fossheim Hallvard J., (2019) Past responsibility: History and the ethics of research on ethnic groups, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, Volume 73, Pages 35-43, ISSN 1369-8486, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2018.11.003>. (Fossheim 2019)
10. Gero, J. M. (1985). Socio-politics and the woman-at-home ideology. *American Antiquity*, 50(2), 342-350. (Gero 1985)
11. Ellick, C. J. (2016). A cultural history of archaeological education. *Advances in Archaeological Practice*, 4(4), 425-440. (Ellick 2016)
12. Fagan, B., Durrani, N. (2016). A Brief History of Archaeology. New York: Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621524> (Fagan and Durrani 2016)
13. Gosden, C. (2005). What do objects want?. *Journal of archaeological method and theory*, 12(3), 193-211. (Gosden 2005)
14. Hamilakis, Y., & Duke, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Archaeology and capitalism: from ethics to politics* (Vol. 54). Left Coast Press. (Hamilakis and Duke 2007)
15. Moral, E. (2016). Queering sex and gender in archaeology: a critique of the “third” and other sexual categories. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 23(3), 788-809. (Moral 2016)
16. Powell, S., Garza, C. E., & Hendricks, A. (1993). Ethics and ownership of the past: the reburial and repatriation controversy. *Archaeological Method and Theory*, 5, 1-42. (Powell et al. 1993)

17. Richardson, L. J., & Almansa-Sánchez, J. (2015). Do you even know what public archaeology is? Trends, theory, practice, ethics. *World Archaeology*, 47(2), 194-211.
(Richardson and Almansa-Sanches 2015)
18. Said's, Edward. *Orientalism*. London [ua], 1978.
19. Steward, J. H., & Setzler, F. M. (1938). Function and Configuration in Archaeology
1. *American Antiquity*, 4(1), 4-10.
20. Society of American Archaeology (2019) About page <https://www.saa.org/quick-nav/about-saa>. Accessed Feb 2, 2020
21. TallBear, K. (2003). DNA, blood, and racializing the tribe. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 18(1), 81-107.
22. Taylor, Matthew (2014) "Greece, the Parthenon Marbles & UNESCO" Elginism.com.
Published October 9.
23. Taylor, B. (1995). Amateurs, professionals and the knowledge of archaeology. *British Journal of Sociology*, 499-508. (Taylor 1995)
24. Ten Have, H. (2006). The activities of UNESCO in the area of ethics. *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*, 16(4), 333-351. (Ten Have 2006)
25. Watkins, J. E. (2003). Beyond the margin: American Indians, first nations, and archaeology in North America. *American Antiquity*, 68(2), 273-285.
26. Wells, J. J., Kansa, E. C., Kansa, S. W., Yerka, S. J., Anderson, D. G., Bissett, T. G., ... & Carl DeMuth, R. (2014). Web-based discovery and integration of archaeological historic properties inventory data: The Digital Index of North American Archaeology (DINAA). *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 29(3), 349-360. (Wells et a. 2014)

27. Zak, Paul J. (2015) “Why Inspiring Stories Make Us React: The Neuroscience of Narrative” *Cerebrum*. 2015 Jan-Feb; 2015: 2.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4445577/>