Decolonize Whom, What, or When?

Matthew C. Reilly

Zitiervorschlag
Matthew C. Reilly. 2023. Decolonize Whom, What, or When? In Raphael Greenberg and Yannis Hamilakis, eds.: Archaeology, Nation, and Race – Critical Responses. Forum Kritische Archäologie 12: 118–121.

URL https://www.kritischearchaeologie.de

DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/refubium-41348

ISSN 2194-346X

Decolonize Whom, What, or When?

Matthew C. Reilly

City College of New York, mreilly@ccny.cuny.edu

The book of Raphael Greenberg and Yannis Hamilakis (2022) comes at a time when archaeology could be said to be at an inflection point. For many of the reasons outlined in this book, it is less and less possible to undertake business as usual as we recognize the politically charged nature of our work and the absolute necessity of engaging with communities and the public more broadly. I therefore want to focus on two pressing archaeological themes that emerge throughout the text, namely the archaeology of coloniality (or the coloniality of archaeology) and archaeological epistemology.

Reading this book was a refreshing reminder that antiquated temporal and geographic siloing is no longer hindering valuable archaeological scholarship. It's the tethering of temporalities that allows for pivoting from the Bronze Age, to the Ottoman Empire, to the contemporary to be fruitful in understanding how sites that date to antiquity play a role in (often contentious) claims of national identity and belonging. Archaeology is never neutral or apolitical. This point is now widely accepted within the field, but it bears repeating for the heightened role that the past, or perhaps a perceived past, is playing in the present.

This moment of archaeopolitical reckoning allows us to reflect on previous archaeologies of comparative colonialism while simultaneously grappling with a newer brand of coloniality within archaeological science. It was roughly two decades ago that comparative colonialism took hold as one of the most prominent archaeological endeavors (Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002; Gosden 2004; Stein 2005). This was in part sparked by the postcolonial turn, which later became more explicitly theorized within the field (Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Lydon and Rizvi 2010). Clamoring for vocabulary, models, and processes to put imperial projects of the past in dialogue with one another, archaeologists thought critically about the convergences and divergences of Romanization, the Assyrian Empire, and the expansion of European empires into the Americas. Such projects are less popular than they once were, though Raphael Greenberg and Yannis Hamilakis inspire a reflection on comparative coloniality from a different perspective.

The authors are quite careful in articulating that Greece and Israel represent spaces that did not go through more violent or geopolitical forms of colonialism as did regions like Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, and South Asia. They also point out how the crypto-colonized, borrowing from Michael Herzfeld (2002), can become the crypto-colonizer. Perhaps this represents a spectrum of coloniality, though I imagine they wouldn't put it so tepidly. Still, I wonder what such a spectrum might mean for a comparative approach to colonialism in the midst of ardent calls for decolonization. As anticolonial thinkers from colonized regions mentioned above have proclaimed for generations, there's hardly anything cryptic about colonial violence and forces of White supremacy. Do we therefore need to reconsider how we analyze colonial pasts, or do we need to be more careful in how approaches to archaeological decolonization are deployed?

Parsing or typologizing colonial pasts may prove to be a hinderance to the kind of anticolonial or, more specifically, decolonial project that Greenberg and Hamilakis espouse. Despite its wide usage across the field, archaeologists have yet to fully unpack decolonization as a conceptual framework, methodological tool, or practice. It has of course been used metaphorically, though our authors are explicit that it must also be practical, methodological,

political, and active. In response to the swift ascension of decolonization, Nigerian philosopher Olúfẹ́mi Táíwò recently published *Against Decolonisation: Taking African Agency Seriously* (2022). The author, while at times essentializing the broader scope of the decolonial mission, makes compelling arguments for how current uses of decolonization can unconsciously erode the revolutionary efforts of anticolonial movements. For one, he sets boundaries between what he refers to as decolonization 1 and decolonization 2, the former being the geopolitical work of ridding the colonial territories of their colonial overlords, the latter being the ongoing struggles to eradicate the social, political, economic, and cultural colonial leftovers. Táíwò also cautions against colonialism carelessly being used synonymously with related yet distinct tropes like modernity, the West, White supremacy, and capitalism. Finally, he notes that in the frenzy to sever the colonial, whatever it might mean, we run the risk of erasing the agency of those who labored under the forces of colonialism to produce something novel in terms of thought, practice, and resilience. For the latter point, Greenberg and Hamilakis should be commended for taking such a charge seriously, noting throughout the text the alternative forms of what we might consider "archaeology" bubbling below the surface for centuries.

To return to the troubling terminology, is crypto-colonialism a useful framework for explicating the colonial nature of archaeological epistemes? With careful attention paid to the subtleties that separate colonialism/crypto-colonialism or colonizer/colonized, how might we avoid ambiguity and simultaneously draw careful lines between discursive projects from the real and persistent violence of colonialism? Uzma Rizvi masterfully articulates that, "This epistemic decolonization is not a new name for epistemic critique: decolonization is an active and purposeful undoing and un-disciplining that we acknowledge as required" (2019: 158). Rizvi's embrace of the speculative is the kind of disciplinary humbling needed to make the shift from archaeological studies of the colonial to a wide-eyed awareness of the coloniality of archaeology. What must follow is figuring out where that leaves us in terms of archaeological futures and what we can offer the communities we serve and broader publics who consume the knowledge we produce. This brings us to archaeological epistemology.

Our authors refer to a colonial ideology that's responsible for the kind of purification efforts at work in both Greece and Israel; I'm here referring to their treatment of site sanitation, cleansing, and mythic pasts of whiteness. Despite such ardent efforts to scrub eons of interaction and social ties across supposed "racial" groups, our authors demonstrate that the patina of multiple temporalities proves difficult to wash away, if only we care to look. Yet, as is made clear, some temporalities and materials speak, as it were, louder than others. This has serious implications for how we typologize the archaeological record and for how such interpretations reach public audiences.

Archaeology has long had a troubling relationship with the pots-to-people analogy. It's a 19th-century inheritance, often associated with the likes of Gustaf Kossinna, that found primacy in the culture-history school of archaeological thought. Well over a century later, the habit proves hard to break, with critiques of typology referencing how lingering dangers of overdetermination can often seep into archaeological interpretation/translation. Ceramic and site typologies are now joined by the science of ancient DNA to serve as material or biological markers of group identity. While the book highlights how the cases of Greece and Israel are cautionary tells of the dangers of pots-to-people, sites-to-people, or DNA-to-people, anticolonial struggles have often harnessed such power to reclaim, or even decolonize.

Are there geopolitical moments in which nationalistic agendas for archaeology are to be celebrated and others when they should be condemned? Perhaps the dichotomy isn't productive, as political shifts can dramatically alter how archaeological paradigms and individual sites are interpreted or remembered, but it's worth considering the work being done in the name of building national industries of archaeology and heritage. For instance, in a famous example from the Sub-Saharan world, an anticolonial shift in Rhodesia in the second half of the 20th century breathed life into a national identity tethered to archaeological heritage, birthing the nation of Zimbabwe, named after a magisterial medieval urban center. As Shadreck Chirikure has recently articulated, Great Zimbabwe "provided inspiration for the struggle for African independence" (2021: 6). Chirikure is careful to frame his anticolonial argument as an indictment of colonial violence and the erasure of African pasts rather than an embrace of postcolonial nationalism, but the hard-fought battles in the name of geopolitical decolonization can nonetheless to tethered to new forms of archaeological knowledge put into the service of nationalism.

As Greenberg and Hamilakis frequently point out, the press often misrepresents archaeology through soundbites and click-bait headlines that serve vitriolic nationalistic agendas. Such an acknowledgement highlights not only

the warping of archaeological knowledge but also how the public perceives our field and what they believe is its utility. Many archaeologists may not be comfortable with it, but the public has come to expect and rely upon quick and dirty "facts" from archaeology. Archaeogenetics is the latest confirmation of this state of affairs. As DNA testing continues to come under scrutiny, including with more attention being paid to what Alondra Nelson (2016) has called the social life of DNA, how should archaeologists approach a fallible science?

Greenberg argues that "[DNA] is being bandied about and used in such loose ways that undermine almost everything that we try to do in the archaeology that we practice, which talks about identity being a construct, something that is imagined, negotiated and re-evaluated" (Greenberg and Hamilakis 2022: 143). While I don't disagree, it's worth asking: of what utility is such an approach in moments of heightened political fractures and social catastrophe? If we are to denounce, as we should, the sensationalizing headlines of population replacements and the antiquity of racial "belongings" to specific landscapes, what can archaeology offer in its place? Rebuttals that simply point to the complexity and messiness of the human past may not do the trick. Even if the majority of archaeologists denounce bad science and the determinism of archaeogenetics, such protestations may not prohibit the return of race science (Saini 2019).

Perhaps we as archaeologists can spill less ink over ontology and engage more seriously with epistemology. The expansive critique of purity and purification that runs throughout the volume is an essential contribution in the battle to eradicate epistemic violence from the field and denounce the influence of White supremacy in how archaeology has been practiced and publicly interpreted. We should be cautious, however, in such pursuits if the historical construction of whiteness becomes synonymous with that of White supremacy. Philosopher of whiteness Linda Martín Alcoff has warned that, "The left-wing push to abolish whiteness is not based in denying racism or the power of white identity so much as it is motivated by a fatalism about the ability of whiteness to disentangle itself from white supremacy" (2015: 150). This disentangling might be crucial for recognizing the mutability of whiteness and eschewing the fool's errand of charting purity. Archaeology is well-positioned for such an endeavor (see, for instance, Epperson 1997; Orser, Jr. 1998; Hall 2000; Paynter 2000; Bell 2005; Matthews and McGovern 2015; Reilly 2022), but it means thinking carefully about what we can meaningfully say about the construction of race in the past through the material record.

References

Alcoff, Linda Martín. 2015. *The Future of Whiteness*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Bell, Alison. 2005. White Ethnogenesis and Gradual Capitalism: Perspectives from Colonial Archaeological Sites in the Chesapeake. *American Anthropologist* 107(3): 446–460.

Chirikure, Shadreck. 2021. *Great Zimbabwe: Reclaiming a 'Confiscated' Past*. New York: Routledge Press.

Epperson, Terrance W. 1997. Whiteness in Early Virginia. *Race Traitor* 7: 9–20.

Gosden, Chris. 2004. *Archaeology and Colonialism: Cultural Contact from 5000 BC to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greenberg, Raphael and Yannis Hamilakis. 2022. *Archaeology, Nation, and Race: Confronting the Past, Decolonizing the Future in Greece and Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, Martin. 2000. *Archaeology and the Modern World: Colonial Transcripts in South Africa and the Chesapeake*. New York: Routledge Press.

Herzfeld, Michael. 2002. The Absent Present: Discourses of Crypto-Colonialism. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101: 899–926.

Liebmann, Matthew and Uzma Z. Rizvi, eds. 2008. *Archaeology and the Postcolonial Critique*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Lydon, Jane and Uzma Z. Rizvi, eds. 2010. *Handbook of Postcolonial Archaeology*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Lyons, Claire L. and John K. Papadopoulos, eds. 2002. *The Archaeology of Colonialism*. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.

Matthews, Christopher N. and Allison M. McGovern, eds. 2015. *The Archaeology of Race in the Northeast*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Nelson, Alondra. 2016. *The Social Life of DNA: Race, Reparations, and Reconciliation After the Genome*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Orser, Jr., Charles E. 1998. The Challenge of Race to American Historical Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 100(3): 661–668.

Paynter, Robert. 2000. Historical Archaeology and the Post-Columbian World of North America. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 8(3): 169–217.

Reilly, Matthew C. 2022. Archaeologies of Whiteness. *Archaeological Dialogues* 29(1): 51–66.

Rizvi, Uzma Z. 2019. Archaeological Encounters: The Role of the Speculative in Decolonial Archaeology. *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 6(1): 154–167.

Saini, Angela. 2019. *Superior: The Return of Race Science*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stein, Gil, ed. 2005. *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Táíwò, Olúfẹ́mi. 2022. *Against Decolonisation: On Taking African Agency Seriously*. London: C. Hurst & Co.