JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY ARCHAEOLOGY & HERITAGE
https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2018.1529550

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The place to be: Community archaeology as a tool for cultural integration

V. Camille Westmont [a] and Andreas Antelid [b]

[a]Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA; [b]Heritage Academy, Centre for Critical Heritage Studies, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

ABSTRACT

This article presents two case studies in which public archaeology was used to attempt to shift local perspectives on migration and migrants. The two archaeology projects, which took place in the United States and Sweden, emphasized participants' connections to places and shared experiences in the past rather than to ethnic groups in an attempt to combat the use of heritage and archaeological interpretations as a mechanism for xenophobia. Here we discuss our experiences with this form of social justice-oriented public archaeology, including identifying methods, observations, and approaches that can be adapted for other contexts, and explore the possibilities for archaeology to be used to address pressing and widespread concerns in society today.

KEYWORDS

Migration; nationalism; public archaeology; integration; critical heritage

Introduction

As archaeology becomes more reflexive and more critical, a need to understand more thoroughly who, what, and how archaeology benefits the greater public has arisen. More recently, archaeologists themselves have begun to question who their audiences are, what the public benefits of archaeology are (as well as who those publics are), and what futures archaeology intends to preserve the past for (see Funari 2001; Merriman 2004; Little and Shackel 2014; Bollwerk, Connolly, and McDavid 2015; Högberg et al. 2017; Moshenska 2017). Here we explore if and how community archaeology can be adapted to address social issues facing the world today, namely the social integration of migrants. In shifting the interpretive framework of our public and community archaeology projects, we seek to address migrants' frequent inability to claim local heritage narratives for themselves by presenting interpretations that value people's relationship to places over their relationships to previous populations.

Migration has been a central part of the human experience for millennia yet remains a contentious issue in the twenty-first century. Today, claims that migration disrupts imagined cultural and/or ethnic homogeneity in receiving countries frequently cite national or regional heritage or history for support – thereby ignoring the role that earlier migrations had in creating those existing heritage narratives. In these debates about the impact of the migrant on host communities, heritage is often used as a proxy for defending xenophobic and ethnocentric attitudes. We argue that this use of heritage is successful, at least in part, because of the ways that heritage has historically been used and the ways it continues to be framed (as a discussion about people, not places) when working with the public. The aim of this article is to outline two community archaeology case studies in which interpretations that favoured biological connections to previous populations were disregarded in

CONTACT V. Camille Westmont vcwestmont@gmail.com Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

favour of interpretations that emphasized participants' connections to lived experiences within places. The two independent programmes that we review here use public archaeology to increase community cohesiveness and show how heritage can be used to promote unity by emphasizing people's connections to places rather than to earlier populations.

Heritage, archaeology, and nativism

Intentionally tailored narratives of the past have consistently been used for political purposes throughout history, and the political implications of both heritage and archaeology continue to shape how these fields of study are received and used in society today. Although frequently presented without reference to its underlying political leanings, archaeology does not exist in a political vacuum. On the contrary, it has developed alongside, and been influenced by, a wide array of political and social movements (Kohl 1998; Gustafsson and Karlsson 2011). Archaeology has a political dimension that requires attention and awareness from its practitioners. In the wake of the rise of nationalistic movements that influenced the formation of nation-states of the twentieth century came a political will to unite societies around essentialized categories such as ethnicity, race, and 'folk geist.' This movement arose in order to counteract dividing factors such as class conflict. These nationalistic ideologies, with their focus on essentialism, influenced archaeological discourse and theories on material culture: connections to ethnic groups and races gained influence at the expense of the former evolutionary-based discourse, where differences in material culture were interpreted in evolutionary terms. This shift resulted in archaeologists seeking to trace the history of different ethnic groups and specific peoples in culture-historical archaeology. In Europe, this created an archaeology focused on identifying the development and movements of groups of people through archaeological material. Gustaf Kossina's (1911) work in tracing the Germanic peoples in Germany is a good example of this development. Taken to an extreme, this type of thinking enabled some German archaeologists to use the lack of other ethnic groups in the historical period in the area of present day Germany as a tool to proclaim the purity and supremacy of modern Germans (Trigger 1995, 268f; Gustafsson and Karlsson 2011, 15).

Similarly to archaeology, heritage arose during the nineteenth century as a way to consolidate national identity and served as a foundational component of nationalism, with archaeological evidence frequently being used to support these heritage narratives (Hobsbawm 1990; Trigger 1995). Nationalism was necessary to emphasize the primacy of the nation-state over the network of extant communities already present within the state's formal boundaries as well as to fight territorial claims from other nations (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000, 12). Indeed, heritage helps establish national identities that work as binding elements within what Anderson (1991) refers to as imagined communities. However, as globalization has increased, pushback in the form of recently-revived nationalist and nativist movements has kept pace.

Hobsbawm (1990, 65) notes that although many nineteenth century European nationalist movements did not originally rely on an ethnic identity, many adopted such requirements along the way. In these more recently revived nationalism movements, ethnic identity plays a central role in maintaining 'cultural exclusivity' by defining who can claim what heritage (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000, 59). These groups can then leverage this heritage to justify or excuse anti-social behaviour, including serving to justify exclusion of other groups; indeed, nationalism only works if a particular representation is privileged at the expense of another (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000, 74). However, because the heritages that underlie these nationalistic claims to power are entirely dependent on 'constructed versions of the past,' versions that oftentimes require as much forgetting as they do remembering, their authenticity can be challenged and the narratives can be changed (Silverman 2011, 113). Therefore, re-structuring the way heritage is presented to a public audience can help in shifting a heritage narrative from one of exclusion to one that is inclusive of a wider set of communities (Merriman 1997).

Re-framing heritage interpretations

In his study aimed at understanding how Sweden's County Administrative Boards (CAB), which serve as the regional supervisors of heritage sites and cultural landscapes as well as the supervisor of regional contract archaeology, attempted to develop their perspective of cultural heritage management, Anders Högberg noted the distinction between *ethnos* and *demos* heritage interpretations and narratives (Högberg 2015, 48ff).

While the framework of the *ethnos* perspective focused on ethnicity and a common cultural heritage based on imagined kinship, blood ties, or other homogenizing identities, the *demos* perspective is based not on essentialism but instead on the shared present and a community based on a mutual future. The citizens share a sense of belonging based on a mutual understanding of key democratic values and rules (Högberg 2015, 48ff). In the American context, the Star-Spangled Banner, the national anthem of the USA, is an example of a performed nationalism that fosters a shared sense of belonging and civic citizenship. The anthem is often played at the opening of public sporting events, with the words projected onto screens so that the audience can follow along. The ritual nature of the performance of the anthem and its low barrier to access (follow the instructions to stand and read the lines on the screen) can help newcomers to the country to feel that they are a part of a larger national identity. Examples like the performance of the national anthem show how shifting definitions of community from ethnicity-based to based in shared meanings and understandings can help to bring people together and provide a more inclusive form of togetherness.

Högberg (2016, 47) explains why the heritage sector needs to re-think its approach to ethnicity and heritage:

> A heritage sector that has ambitions to work inclusively and against xenophobia, but does not understand heritage beyond essentialism, will not work in new ways. Instead, confirming old thoughts with new words, there is actually a risk of contributing to xenophobia: by saying that who you are and what you are supposed to do (origin – *ethnos*) matters more than who you want to be and what you actually do with heritage to create a shared present and a shared future (process – *demos*).

Högberg's insight into the risks associated with interpretation and perpetuating xenophobia simultaneously highlight the potential for archaeological interpretations to confront societal xenophobia: by organizing archaeological projects (in our cases, community-based public archaeology projects) around a heritage framework that utilizes a *demos* perspective, we can promote a version of the past that builds individuals' sense of democratic citizenship. Public archaeology is uniquely situated to take advantage of this form of community building. Due to archaeology's cache within Western popular culture, attracting groups from a variety of backgrounds is relatively easy, especially when done in collaboration with local community organizations (Holtorf 2009). In our work, we mobilize this public interest to bring together non-traditional groups and present interpretations of the past that emphasize individuals' connections to place rather than their ethnic connections to historic populations (for other forms of migrant place-making, see Soto 2016, 2017). Because archaeology is a uniquely place-based discipline, our *demos*-derived interpretations offer a middle ground in which it is possible to emphasize aspects of identity other than ethnicity.

Public archaeology and heritage

Public archaeology arose with the professionalization of archaeology as a discipline in the 1970s and 1980s (Merriman 2004, 3; Matsuda and Okamura 2011; see McGimsey 1972), although it was not until the late 1990s that public archaeology developed into its modern form (Moshenska 2017, 5). Broadly speaking, public archaeology is 'any area of archaeological activity that interacted or had the potential to interact with the public' (Schadla-Hall 1999, 147). Moshenska (2017, 6) recognizes seven distinct forms of public archaeology, ranging from 'popular' archaeology to archaeology done by or with the public, while Little (2012) recognizes three motivators that drive public archaeology: cultural resource management (CRM), outreach and education to combat looting, and archaeology to solve social

problems in communities. Our work utilizes Little's third motivation: archaeology to solve social problems. However, all of these different forms of public archaeology are in use within the field today, representing the variety of methods and approaches archaeologists are using to expand the reach of their work.

But why do public archaeology with an eye towards addressing social ills? Matsuda and Okamura (2011, 1) argue that archaeology has always appealed to people other than just archaeologists – despite the fact that archaeologists long considered engaging with the public irrelevant for their work (Little 2012). As archaeology has played a role in defining people's collective identities, involving the public (especially minority or under-represented groups) as collaborators in the process of heritage development and decision-making provides these groups with more cultural agency while removing professionals from positions as cultural brokers (Merriman 2004; Shackel and Chambers 2004, 2; Smith and Martin Wobst 2005; Little 2012). Organizing community archaeology projects in this way can help to empower historically disenfranchised groups (McDavid 2004; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006). However, even these forms of public archaeology can be harmful for communities, as these approaches to public archaeology primarily can end up serving archaeology's needs, such as the need for increases in public support and stewardship, rather than the needs of the communities in which projects are situated (McDavid 2010). Various public archaeologists have taken these original goals of public archaeology even further, such as through an emphasis on a reflexive, multivocal, and interactive archaeologies that emphasize the 'process and results of doing this work as part of an engaged social activism' (McDavid 2010, 37; see Hodder 2000).

This collaborative and engaged approach to archaeology is important, at least in part, because it provides a context for a broader discussion on heritage and opportunities for interactive heritage creation and the potential to use archaeology to address social problems (Shackel and Chambers 2004; Stottman Jay 2010). In our own projects, archaeologists leverage their positions as 'professionals' and the power of the authorized heritage discourse to argue for interpretations that advance inclusive heritage narratives rather than exclusive ones (Smith 2006). Fundamentally, the framing of these conversations about topics of social concern crosses the boundary from archaeology into heritage. Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge (2000, 17) define heritage as, 'the part of the past which we select in the present for contemporary purposes … the worth attributed to these artefacts rests less in their intrinsic merit than in a complex array of contemporary values, demands, and even moralities.' Because we, as archaeologists, use archaeological interpretations to argue for the creation of new perspectives on a region's past, we are ultimately creating new heritage narratives. In our examples, we intentionally introduced a heritage narrative that countered the standard narrative for the area, thereby creating tension between the original and our re-interpretation. In creating interpretations with the aid of the local community, we aim to create a 'consumable' heritage: one that is created and negotiated through conversations and exchanges around an idea. Public archaeology, with its emphasis on collaboration and cooperative constructions of understandings of the past, is the perfect venue to attempt this type of perspective change. In both cases, our re-interpretations focused on integrating migration and migrants into the historical narrative. In re-framing the heritage narrative as a story about place in our Swedish example, and a story about experiences within a place in our US example, we hope to integrate migration into the larger heritage narrative and normalize the relationship between heritage and migrants – thereby breaking down some of the historical legacy of nationalism and exclusion that is inherent within heritage.

Case studies

Our two projects are based on Högberg's *demos* perspective where the focus is not ethnicity or ethnic heritage. Instead, we use heritage to create a relationship between the present inhabitants of the place and the history of the place, with the aim to build a common future and a common sense of belonging. In both cases, our excavations focused on working with teenagers, which added important dimensions for growth as well as unique obstacles (see Smardz 2000).

Vems historia?

The project *Vems historia?* (´Whose History?´) took place in a rural community in the municipality of Ale in Western Sweden in 2013 and was led by the archaeologist Andreas Antelid. The aim of the project was to question the preconceived notion that only the group of people who had an ethnic heritage claim to the place could take ownership of the local history (Antelid and Synnestvedt 2016). Sweden, like many nations, has a history of linking historical presence to origin and *ethos*. Cultural heritage management has traditionally played an important part in supporting this notion (Högberg 2015, 49).

Cultural heritage management and archaeology in Sweden has a history of being influenced and used by nationalistic movements in the nation building era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Gustafsson and Karlsson (2011) conclude that there always has been an influence from and an influence on politics by cultural heritage management and archaeology. This bond is by no means new or unique but always present. Sometimes it is easier to recognize, as in the context of Nazi Germany, and sometimes the bond is more complicated. It is however crucial for cultural heritage practitioners and archaeologists to be aware of the bond between archaeology and politics and recognize its consequences.

Vems historia? took place in 2013 in a context where xenophobic tendencies were on the rise in Sweden. The most apparent sign of this shift was the success of the ultra-right-wing party, the Sweden Democrats (SD). SD's primary platform agenda is immigration and integration policies. The party is also interested in cultural heritage as a tool to build a sense of Swedishness that excludes groups and people not viewed as 'real' Swedes. To achieve this, SD wants to redirect cultural heritage focus towards a more nationalistic and culturally 'clean' practice, thereby effectively washing out multicultural tendencies that broaden the scope of cultural heritage to include all people in society (Niklasson and Hølleland 2018, 5f).

In the national Swedish parliamentary election of 2013, SD entered parliament for the first time with 5.7 percent of the votes. The following election, SD received 12.7 percent of the votes, thereby illustrating the rise of nationalistic and xenophobic tendencies within Sweden and people's willingness to elect leaders with these attitudes.

Vems Historia? was a way to counteract these xenophobic tendencies and show how archaeology can be used as an inclusive tool that embrace a wider definition of Swedishness and who is able to participate in cultural heritage practices. The project focused on an archaeological excavation that a group of young immigrants, who had recently moved in to the community, conducted. The project leader gave an introduction to the local history of the place prior to the excavation. The site was located at a small cottage that once housed families employed by a nearby manor house in the early twentieth century.

The excavation took place during three rainy days in October 2013 and resulted in several finds connected to the cottage and the time preceding it (see Figure 1). The teenagers interpreted the finds and created an exhibition at local libraries where they presented new knowledge about the local cultural heritage. By co-creating new knowledge about the site through excavations, the group of migrant teenagers demonstrated that it is possible for new community members to contribute to local cultural heritage. Thus, we fulfilled the aim of the project. When asked in an subsequent evaluation of the project if the youths felt that the history of the place they excavated felt like their own history, some of them reflected that they obviously could not claim ownership of the events that had taken place there prior to them arriving at the place, but that they could claim the written version of these events as their own. In a way, this can be significant for all archaeological knowledge. It is not possible to claim ownership of the actual events, one can only claim the narrative of these events.

Another episode that took place during the project that has relevance here is an encounter between the excavating team of immigrant teenagers and a man who lived in the cottage at the site as a child during the late 1930s and 1940s. To find out more about the cottage and to perhaps get some interesting information about the finds of the excavation, we invited him to

Figure 1. A group of young immigrants excavating a square metre pit close to a cottage during the 2013 project *Vems historia?* in the municipality of Ale, Sweden. Photo by Andreas Antelid.

come and visit the archaeology group after the dig. This meeting was an interesting event and highlighted several of the issues that the project wanted to address. We organized the meeting as an interview between the youths and the man. When talking about life during the 1940s, some of the youths from Afghanistan and Somalia recognized the circumstances he described, such as the lack of refrigerator, freezer, and other conveniences. Some aspects of the 75-year-old man's childhood were very similar to the more recent living conditions of the teenagers. This seemed to create a connection between them that they were not aware of before meeting each other, because they could both relate to the place where the archaeological excavation had taken part in the same way. The older 'Swede' had had personal childhood experiences at the place that were similar to the teenagers' personal experiences growing up in other countries. The connection between the specific experience and the place made it possible for both to relate to the place, however in different ways. It is also obvious that the place-experience connection made an impact on all involved parties and their understanding of each other. The teenagers that could relate to the older 'Swede's' childhood experiences expressed that they couldn't imagine that a 75-year-old man from Sweden could relate to and understand anything about their childhood in Afghanistan before this meeting, and the older man said the same about them (for more on deprivation and the materiality of migration, see De León 2013).

Although the meeting between the youths and the older man was a mutually positive experience, the project was not entirely without negative reactions. It was, for example, hard to engage the local historical society in the project and some of the visitors of the final exhibition failed to see the meaning of letting immigrants take part in the local heritage work and labelled the result as 'naïve' and 'childish' (Antelid and Synnestvedt 2016).

Vems Historia? shows how it is possible to connect a personal cultural heritage to the history of a place. In this example, the teenagers could relate their personal experiences to events that had taken place at this place several decades ago and thereby form a personal bond to the place. In this way,

these migrant teenagers were able to form a closer, more personal connection to their new home that could potentially extend to other aspects of their developing relationship with life in Sweden.

Anthracite Heritage Project summer mentorship programme

The Anthracite Heritage Project summer mentorship programme began in 2014 in order to start conversations about the treatment of immigrants in the anthracite coal mining region in the past and the present. In the previous two decades, the USA has experienced intense racial tensions stemming from a national uptick in xenophobic and nationalistic rhetoric and legislation. At the local level, this rhetoric culminated in the passage of a series of anti-immigrant ordinances in the town of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, in 2006. These ordinances, which were among the first blatantly discriminatory in the nation but part of a rising tide nationally of anti-immigrant sentiment, were eventually found to be unenforceable and in violation of the US Constitution, but their intent – to provide a legal mechanism by which to harass and intimidate migrants – was felt throughout Hazleton's Latino community. In an ironic twist, the native-born population that passed these anti-immigrant ordinances were themselves the descendants of migrants who had faced similarly dogged discriminatory treatment a century prior (Shackel and Roller 2012; Longazel 2016). Feeling unwelcome and unwanted, many Latinos, the majority of whom are American citizens, made plans to leave the town of 25,000, while others sought to weather the political crisis and still others continued to arrive, replacing those who had left (Matza 2016).

Using public archaeology as a platform, the archaeologists associated with each case study sought to draw local teenagers from both the Latino and white populations into a mentorship programme. High school students would work one-on-one with undergraduate and graduate student 'mentors' enrolled in the University of Maryland's Archaeological Field Methods course. Because the rates of college attendance for the Hazleton area are lower than state averages, we hoped that mentors would provide the high school students with a glimpse into the variety of opportunities available at college, relate their own experiences, and answer questions pertaining to college admissions and life away from home (Shackel 2018). At the same time, we sought to start a conversation about the treatments of immigrants and direct students to think critically about the rhetoric surrounding migrants in the past and how those lessons might also be useful in understanding modern rhetoric on migrants. The company towns of the anthracite region are the perfect foil for conversations on the treatment of migrant groups because of the area's long history of transnational migration, ethnicity-based xenophobia, and labour heritage, topics which are resurfacing today in alarming and ironic ways. Most importantly, the mentorship programme created an opportunity for students begin to understand one another. The Hazleton area public school has effectively self-segregated through the establishment of two school campuses: a regular public school and the Hazleton Area Academy of Science, a public STEM-oriented (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) school that requires an entrance exam and has a waitlist for admission.

The mentorship programme runs alongside the normal Archaeological Field Methods course and takes place during the last three weeks of the course (see Figure 2). The first year of the programme took place in Pardeesville, a former coal town, and the subsequent four years have taken place at Eckley Miners' Village Museum. Eckley Miners' Village is a state-owned and operated outdoor museum that interprets anthracite company town life at a former anthracite company town. In the first year of the programme, we worked directly with local high schools to recruit students. In the third year of the mentorship programme, the collaborations with the high schools expanded through a partnership with the Hazleton Integration Project (HIP), a community-based non-profit. HIP operates the Hazleton One Community Center, which provides after-school and extra-curricular opportunities for all students, with an emphasis on providing opportunities for Latino children (Shackel and Westmont 2016). Participation increased after the partnership with HIP was established, with some students returning for multiple summers.

Figure 2. High school volunteers and undergraduate students at work during the 2014 Anthracite Heritage Project Summer Mentorship Programme. Photo by Paul A. Shackel.

Among the most poignant and impactful aspects of the programme were the conversations the programme started between not only the Latino and white communities, but also between the students and the area's older residents who had grown up in these company town environments when the mines were still active. Latino students and older residents shared personal stories about overcrowded houses and dangerous and tenuous living conditions. Through these conversations emerged a shared experience of labour abuses, economic deprivation, and social discrimination. The archaeology and the conversations around it helped build a mutual understanding of the lived experiences of the working class. For us as organizers, the platform that archaeology provided to spur conversations on these topics was of secondary importance to the process of bringing these otherwise segregated and opposing groups together to recognize their shared commonalities and build greater respect as neighbours with equal claims to the region's past.

The archaeology project also provided room for students to grow in unanticipated ways. One participant told us at the end of his first week that this was the most time he had ever spent in 'nature' in his entire life. He discovered a deep interest in bugs and eagerly questioned us about how 'nature' (referring to bugs, roots, rodents, and other bioturbation processes in addition to industrial decay and abandonment) affected archaeological sites and our understanding of history. We had thought the student, an immigrant himself, would feel most connected to the immigrant history; instead, he developed a stronger connection to the area through experiencing the richness of the post-industrial environment.

However, not everything went smoothly. Although the majority of feedback has been positive, anger has also surfaced. One commenter was 'disturbed' that the archaeological interpretations made reference to modern immigrants. Another said they supported our project, but asked us not to describe Hazleton as xenophobic, despite the anti-immigrant ordinances (Shackel 2015, 10–11). In another instance, a white participant was asked not to return because he used racial slurs when referring to the Latino participants.

Discussion

Although the countries, historical contexts, and migrant groups of our two projects are markedly different, a synthesis of the lessons learned and approaches adopted can help public archaeology to create new programmes that use archaeology as a platform with which to tackle today's major social problems. In this specific instance, despite having dramatically different immigration histories, our two cases demonstrated the ability of changing how interpretations are presented – from an *ethnos* to a *demos* perspective – can foster a new way of managing how certain minority groups, such as migrants, relate to heritage and their place in it. Additionally, by shifting the framework as a whole rather than adapting interpretations for each individual instance of community archaeology, we believe that this approach can be applicable for a wider array of practitioners.

The value of this approach lies in the versatility of its applicability, which is demonstrated in the variation of the contexts of our two projects. There are some important differences in the legacy of migration between the two countries, which has impacted how nationalism has developed. In Sweden, ethnic nationalism is formed around the concept of the Swede and Swedishness as being the native cultural group of the nation. This perspective imagines there to be a straight line between the 'first Swedes' that migrated to Sweden after the end of the last ice age and ethnically 'pure' Swedes today. This has of course been widely questioned and falsified with archaeological evidence, but it has nevertheless formed the nationalistic discourse in Sweden. This narrative has led to the view that immigration is a threat to the Swedishness among xenophobic nationalists.

The US relationship between migration and nationalism is different. Although immigration and claims of being a 'Nation of Immigrants' abound in modern American culture, there have long been discussion on who the 'right' immigrants were. National origin, ethnicity, race, religion, criminal history, mother-tongue, and financial status, among others, were all attributes that could find immigrants unwelcome in the 'Nation of Immigrants' (Reimers 1998). However, for those English-speaking, wealthy, white, Protestant, law-abiding few that arrived after the American Revolution, the USA could hold more opportunities and greater freedoms. For those that did not meet that threshold, discrimination was a fact of life, especially for those that arrived during the migrant 'waves' of the nineteenth century. Interestingly, migrants were largely free of direct ethnic discrimination by the second or third generation as new migrant groups arrived and redirected nativist efforts and xenophobia. Therefore, although a majority of (white) immigrants to the US faced cultural, social, and institutional challenges, they could expect their children or grandchildren to be better integrated into society. In the USA, unlike in Sweden, white migrants can expect acceptance as 'Americans,' although migrants who do not meet the racial, ethnic, religious, and/or wealth barriers are often denied the same recognition. Currently, Latino and Latino-appearing migrants and citizens are routinely targeted by xenophobic and nationalistic rhetoric that uses terminology such as 'flood,' 'invasion,' 'crisis,' and 'illegal' and accuse these groups of ruining American culture or taking more than their fair share (Chavez 2008).

Given the differences in migrants' integration experiences and development of identities as cultural or ethnic citizens in the USA versus in Sweden, the fact that this approach of using a *demos* perspective when conducting community archaeology projects worked in both instances is an important observation. In our Swedish example, the deployment of 'Swedishness' as a qualification for relating to or understanding local heritage acts as an exclusionary force when it comes to the creation of the common cultural heritage; however, this type of exclusionary rhetoric was successfully combated by demonstrating the similarities of experiences between migrants and ethnic Swedes, such as the experience of growing up in a rural, non-electrified home. In the US example, demonstrating that shared experiences in Northeastern Pennsylvania between the historic migration population and the modern migrant population helped to overcome some of the divisions that xenophobia and ethnic discrimination have wrought in the community. In both cases, we were able to use community archaeological to relate the heritage of the specific place to the individual experiences of the teenagers that took part. Thus, it was possible to create a relationship between the place and the practitioners that did not rely on kinship, blood and soil, or any other *ethnos*-relationship. The result

indicates that community archaeology can be used as an inclusive tool to create relations between individuals with different backgrounds and cultural heritage to a place where they live and/or operate (see also Colomer 2013).

The differences in historical context and historical migration experience between our two case studies demonstrate the strength of using community archaeology as a method to promote an inclusive form of togetherness through heritage. This approach to community archaeology provides practitioners with a new tool with which to affect social change. Beyond the shift of interpretation from an *ethnos* perspective to a *demos* perspective, this method has three additional primary attributes: acknowledging and negotiating the political nature of the work, incorporating local stakeholders, and the specific aim to foster deeper connections to place and building a place-based identity (rather than an ethnic identity).

What we propose is the adoption of a critical approach to community archaeology. Responding to calls for a public archaeology that emphasizes engaged social activism, we propose a fundamental shift in interpretive framework that would aid in helping minority communities see themselves as members of a community because of their connections to place rather than their connections to previous people. This perspective is, inherently, a political one. When one considers the fact that archaeology is a practice that is constantly influenced by current political and social movements, it is not difficult to see it as a tool and method to influence it in a desirable direction. It is, however, crucial to do it in an open and aware manner so that the aim and purpose is apparent to all participants. In order for this tool to be successful, an open acknowledgement of the political agendas motivating the work should be discussed, negotiated, and refined with the input and active involvement of the community.

Because archaeologists are often not personally connected to the communities in which we excavate, having connections to local community organizations can help bolster interested in the project, reach groups who might not identify as local culture bearers (such as immigrants), and help to better incorporate the local community into the planning and execution of projects, including developing research goals. Our local partnerships helped to solidify our standing within the community and granted our interpretations a more impactful role.

The final aspect of this method is emphasizing the connection to place to help individuals build a place-based identity. Archaeology provides participants with the unparalleled opportunity to literally unearth new knowledge of a specific placés history. The physical process of personally interacting with the past allows one to build a unique and personal connection, and by getting to know the history of a place, one can develop a deeper relationship to that place. Perhaps one can compare it to getting to know and understand a person better when you know their personal history and background. In the same way that you relate another person's background to your own and find similarities that make you understand that other person in another way, it is perhaps possible to achieve the same result between an individual and a place through archaeology. By relating your personal cultural heritage to the cultural heritage of a place, you form a bond of the two entities that can be translated to a sort of sense of place. This can potentially help individuals build more personal and meaningful relationships with their surroundings.

Conclusion

We encourage the use of community archaeology as a tool in the process of integrating new minority members into a community and as a way to counteract heritage as a means of exclusion. This calls for an awareness and recognition among archaeologists and other heritage practitioners of the political dimensions of our trade and the acceptance of the fact that our practice has political implications. By recognizing the political dimension it is possible to explore how our practice can be used to influence communities to be more including and socially sustainable.

When properly framed, public archaeology can be a force for reckoning with the historical exclusivity of archaeological interpretations. Our projects illustrate the ways that public archaeology can

be a means for encouraging integration efforts by providing migrants with a sense of belonging. Archaeological narratives have the potential to change identities derived from heritage from people-focused to ones that are place-focused instead. This shift in emphasis can be used to integrate disparate populations through encouraging collaborative and inclusive versions of the past. If public archaeologists can successfully demonstrate the ability of archaeology to bring people together to overcome their social differences and see each other as equals with equal claims to an area's heritage, as we sought to do in our work, the value of heritage will be upgraded for society's purposes.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Drs. Paul Shackel and Mark Leone as well as the 2014, 2015, and 2016 participants of the University of Maryland Pennsylvania Archaeology Field School and Summer Mentoring Program. We also want to thank the participants of the project *Vems historia?* in 2013. Additional thanks to Michael Roller, Håkan Karlsson, and Anita Synnestvedt for their constructive feedback on an earlier draft of this manuscript. We are indebted to our anonymous reviewers for their constructive and useful suggestions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Cultural Affairs Committee of Region Västra Götaland; and the US National Science Foundation under Grant DGE 1322106.

Notes on contributors

V. Camille Westmont is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Maryland. Her research focuses on the roles of the built environment and material culture in workers' identity formation in industrial contexts. She is a former co-director of the Anthracite Heritage Project. She holds Masters in Applied Anthropology and Masters in Historic Preservation degrees, both from the University of Maryland. Her work has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the Society for Architectural Historians, Vetenskapsrådet (the Swedish Research Council), and the University of Maryland's College of Behavior and Social Sciences.

Andreas Antelid holds an MA in Archaeology and is a Swedish licensed teacher with experience from several projects with archaeological methods in a school environment. His academic work has specialized in discussing post-colonial theories applied to historical and archaeological works as well as analysing nationalistic tendencies in early twentieth century archaeology in Sweden. In 2013, he managed the archaeological project Vems historia? in Sweden.

ORCID

V. Camille Westmont http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4229-6340
Andreas Antelid http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2270-9892

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Antelid, Andreas, and Anita Synnestvedt. 2016. "Whose History? - Why Archaeology Matters." In *Heritage, Democracy and the Public - Nordic Approaches to Managing Heritage in the Service of Society*, edited by Torgrim Guttormsen, and Grete Swensen, 271–284. Farnham: Ashgate.

Bollwerk, Elizabeth, Robert Connolly, and Carol McDavid. 2015. "Co-creation and Public Archaeology." *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3 (3): 178–187.

Chavez, Leo. 2008. *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Colomer, Laia. 2013. "Managing the Heritage of Immigrants. Elderly Refugees, Homesickness, and Cultural Identities." *The European Archaeologist* 39: 17–22.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T. J. Ferguson. 2006. "Trust and Archaeological Practice: Towards a Framework of Virtue Ethics." In *The Ethics of Archaeology: Philosophical Perspectives on Archaeological Practice*, edited by Chris Scarre, and Geoffrey Scarre, 115–130. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De León, Jason. 2013. "Undocumented Migration, use Wear, and the Materiality of Habitual Suffering in the Sonoran Desert." *Journal of Material Culture* 18 (4): 321–345.

Funari, Pedro Paulo A. 2001. "Public Archaeology From a Latin American Perspective." *Public Archaeology* 1 (4): 239–243.

Graham, Brian, Greg Ashworth, and John Tunbridge. 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold.

Gustafsson, Anders, and Håkan Karlsson. 2011. "A Spectre is Haunting Swedish Archaeology – The Spectre of Politics: Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and the Present Political Situation in Sweden." *Current Swedish Archaeology* 19: 11–36.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, Ian. 2000. *Towards Reflexive Method in Archaeology: the Example of Çatal Höyük Monograph no. 28 McDonald Institute Monographs*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Holtorf, Cornelius. 2009. "Arkeologi - När resan är målet." In *Arkeologi och samhälle*, edited by Bodil Petersson, Kristina Jennbert, and Cornelius Holtorf, 125–139. Lund: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Lund University.

Högberg, Anders. 2015. "The Heritage Sector in a Multicultural Society: A Discussion From a Swedish Perspective." In *Identity and Heritage*, edited by Peter F. Biehl, Douglas C. Comer, Christopher Prescott, and Hilary A. Soderland, 47–53. London: Springer.

Högberg, Anders. 2016. "To Renegotiate Heritage and Citizenship Beyond Essentialism." *Archaeological Dialogues* 23 (1): 39–48.

Högberg, Anders, Cornelius Holtorf, Sarah May, and Gustav Wollentz. 2017. "No Future in Archaeological Heritage Management?" *World Archaeology* 49 (5): 639–647.

Kohl, Philip L. 1998. "Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 223–246.

Kossina, Gustaf. 1911. *Die Herkunft der Germanen. Zur Methode der Siedlungsarchäologie*. Mannus-Bibl. 6. Würzburg.

Little, Barbara. 2012. "Public Benefits of Public Archaeology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*, edited by Robin Skeates, Carol McDavid, and John Carman, 395–413. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little, Barbara, and Paul A. Shackel. 2014. *Archaeology, Heritage, and Civic Engagement: Working Toward the Public Good*. New York: Routledge.

Longazel, Jamie. 2016. *Undocumented Fears*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Matsuda, Akira, and Katsuyuki Okamura. 2011. "Introduction: New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology." In *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*, edited by Katsuyuki Okamura and Akira Matsuda, 1–18. New York: Springer.

Matza, Michael. 2016. "10 years after immigration disputes, Hazleton is a different place." *Philadelphia Inquirer*. April 4.

McDavid, Carol. 2004. "From 'Traditional' Archaeology to Public Archaeology to Community Action: The Levi Jordan Plantation Project." In *Places in Mind: Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*, edited by Paul A. Shackel and Erve Chambers, 35–56. New York: Routledge.

McDavid, Carol. 2010. "Public Archaeology, Activism, and Racism: Rethinking the 'Heritage' Product." In *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World?*, edited by M. Jay Stottman, 36–47. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

McGimsey, Charles R. 1972. *Public Archaeology*. London: Seminar Press.

Merriman, Nick. 1997. "The Peopling of London." In *Cultural Diversity*, edited by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, 119–148. London: Leicester University Press.

Merriman, Nick. 2004. *Public Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Moshenska, Gabriel. 2017. *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*. London: UCL Press.

Niklasson, Elisabeth, and Herdis Hølleland. 2018. "The Scandinavian far Right and the New Politicisation of Heritage." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 0 (0): 1–28.

Reimers, David M. 1998. *Unwelcome Strangers: American Identity and the Turn Against Immigration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schadla-Hall, Tim. 1999. "Editorial: Public Archaeology." *European Journal of Archaeology* 2 (2): 147–158.

Shackel, Paul A. 2015. "Meaning of Place in the Anthracite Region of Northeastern Pennsylvania." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 22 (3): 200–213.

Shackel, Paul A. 2018. "Immigration Heritage in the Anthracite Coal Region of Northeastern Pennsylvania." *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage* 5 (2): 101–113.

Shackel, Paul A., and V. Camille Westmont. 2016. "When the Mines Closed: Heritage Building in Northeastern Pennsylvania." *General Anthropology* 23 (1): 1–10.

Shackel, Paul A., and Erve Chambers. 2004. *Places in Mind: Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. New York: Routledge.

Shackel, Paul A., and Michael Roller. 2012. "The Gilded Age Wasn't so Gilded in the Anthracite Region of Pennsylvania." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 16 (4): 761–775.

Silverman, Helaine. 2011. *Contested Cultural Heritage*. New York: Springer.

Smardz, Karolyn. 2000. "Digging with Kids: Teaching Students to Touch the Past." In *The Archaeology Education Handbook*, edited by K. Smardz and S. Smith, 234–248. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Claire, and H. Martin Wobst. 2005. "The Next Step: Archaeology for Social Justice." In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*, edited by C. Smith and H. M. Wobst, 392–394. London: Routledge.

Soto, Gabriella. 2016. "Migrant Memento Mori and the Geography of Risk." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 16 (3): 335–358.

Soto, Gabriella. 2017. "Place Making in Non-places: Migrant Graffiti in Rural Highway Box Culverts." *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 3 (2): 174–195.

Stottman Jay, M. 2010. *Archaeologists as Activists: Can Archaeologists Change the World?* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Trigger, Bruce. 1995. "Romanticism, Nationalism, and Archaeology." In *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by Philip Kohl and Clare Fawcett, 263–279. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.