
INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: Good morning everybody. Good to see you all.

A few announcements to make as we get into the conversation of today. First is there's this upcoming presentation on Thursday at 3:00 which cuts into our class but if you are interested in going please feel free to depart a bit early from our course. It's an important conversation and I encourage you to attend. Secondly my office hours are insistently intruded upon by the department's meeting obligations so if you are trying to connect with me I suggest you send me an email, I am around sometimes during those blocks but I'm also available at other times. I'm very happy to make a dedicated meeting for any of you. Especially as our first assignment of larger assignment is coming up the position paper. If you want to talk through what your plans look library and what you may be thinking of I encourage you to do so. And the last observation is that the residential school denialism. Did anybody go to the countermovement. I didn't go obviously because slightly terrifying and I was it was advised not to.

The British Columbia association of professional archaeologists has just released a statement on residential school denialism. It's an interesting read not only in support of the broader effort to acknowledge the significance of this history and to attend to it and to push back on those

who deny it's truth. It has some interesting statements too. Including this one, archaeology is not a tool for validating or invalidate delegate truth. Which fascinating. I think it is very appropriate to have this statement around residential school landscapes I'm surprised to see that BC APA make this case because it undermines some of the work that archaeologists do around issues of interpretation and the did he employment of archaeology within the evaluative frames such as legal context so I'm interested to see how and how widely this is accepted or if it passes without debate. So a place to go for a little more information on this subject and you can see it's an emerging conversation that echoes around archeological corridors. And appropriately so

Let's go back to my slideshow. Success. So discussion questions have been really good. I've been very enthused by your commitment to engage you with the subjects to drawing on information from our readings to thinking it through through your own experiences and perhaps through other courses and really contesting and evaluating these complex and challenging subjects. So well done. The marks are really really great. This week we are taking a slight departure towards something that is a little bit more engaging. I hope. And I'm interested to hear if you can think of a fictional example of archaeology. Perhaps video game space or popular media. An imagination of archaeology

as a place that you can relate to the rest of us. I encourage you to use pictures and maps and whatever you want in your discussion post to see if you can convey the space within which archaeology seems to exist in these imaginary worlds. I'll confess that I've spent a lot of hours playing *Zelda: Breath of the Wild* with my son which of course if you've played any of the iterations of that video game you'll know there is historical landscape with archeological record which is part of the narrative of it. My interest is not just because it's cool and fun to think about but because it acts as this fictional spaces tend to reveal some of the undisclosed assumptions that people make about the very issues that archaeology contends with. Implied by human nature the operations of culture and how as examiners of that legacy we might gain an understanding. It's a fun conversation in fiction perhaps less fraud than some of other conversations.

STUDENT: I was wondering about answering this discussion question obvious how I feel like I would be able to maybe tie in some stuff from the readings this week but I feel compared to prior weeks this question is fairly separate.

INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: It is but it has a fundamental role which is can you discern in the fictional space within which archaeology is presented any of these assumptions. The undercurrents of what the authors of that fiction are making

about human nature and human history via the lens of a fictional archaeology.

STUDENT: Would it also be okay to draw in prior weeks.

INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: Absolutely. The conversations we've had, conversations elsewhere. You can see that anthropologists are very good at making fun ideas and making them pedantic and complex and making them work. It's an interesting space to exam within a fictional narrative what the stories are if you will, what the archetypes that people bring to the blank canvass that is fiction and I've suggested to you that archaeology itself presents us with something of a blank canvass the distance between what we want to know and the past and what the past reveals with archaeology is quite large. There's a lot of contribution that archaeologist brings to conversation. It's not there when we talk to individuals about their lives in health know graphic space individuals can talk back to us, archeological record less capacity to do so. I had a colleague who suggested to me it might be considered blasphemous to you *Star Wars Lord of the Rings* and *Harry Potter* are all the same story, they are identical echoes of exactly the same thing. You may have favourites in that and you may find that a bit offputting but the point is we continually reach out ourselves the same stories over and over again in order to make them real. In order to generate a purchase. We have a hard time seeing

them in ourselves but I'm consistently reminded every time I turn on or go to the movie that the American narrative of rugged individualism and the kind of individual against the odds of the oppressive state seeking freedom in heroic manner, in my view the Americans aren't the heroes they are the fascist state but they keep telling themselves they play the role of hero in opposition to the powers of as Mark Carney put it last week hegemony. Evans would suggest otherwise. Why do they keep telling this story when it appears to be contrary to what the truth is. Because stories matter, they give people a place of reassurance and self-fulfilling identity and prophecy. Easy to pick out the stories of others as we've talked about in the conversations of positionality harder to look at them for ourselves. Fiction gives us a space to what we hope the world to be and what we assume it to be and that is the question of this week via the fun lens of your enthusiasm if you have one for fiction or video games or some other constructed space. Am I correct in saying assuming that because you all have laptops many of you play video games? I see some nods excellent. Watching movies reading books. These are the spaces where we might find examples to query and I'm not asking so much for a deconstruction although you can certainly do that, but simply an iteration, how is the world of history via archaeological materiality presented... Communities from certain points of

view will find a different way of narrating. I did last spring go to a conference in Winnipeg and I encountered a video game from an *Anishinaabe* community in which to bring youth into the conversation about their traditional scholarship and teachings. It was a clever combination of a culturally informed way of knowing the world and the modern interface of video games but it was quite different from what you might find if you buy a video game off the shelf. Intentionally so and perhaps a consequence of the positionality of the authors of that fictional space. That is a question today.

So go forth and have fun. Pictures are most welcome our story this week then is to ask what are these narratives what are these archetypes if you will or the principles by which archaeologists bring to the conversation. I have identified what I think to be three key ones that I like to reflect on. Here I'm thinking about what I call and orthodoxy, older traditional space in which the genealogical history of which archaeology was formed. I think these continue to linger. I would like to reflect briefly on each as we move into the readings which will take us on a tour of some of these ideas. These will be helpful as we explore how archaeology is consumed and deployed. Next week we'll look the at Indigenous scholars who not provide... will look ahead what will it become as it's framed as Indigenous

endeavour. These are issues that still linger today we might encounter archaeologists who disagree but I think they have echo across even the contemporary landscape of how archaeology is conducted to not tend to them I think would be to willfully blind to some key generative moments. These include materialism optimization logics, taxonomies of people when there are many of these. It's hard I think in the modern era to avoid the construct of race and ultimately notions of evolution and success fitness in the vernacular in some ways, the notion of competition and history as a narrative of these traits.

We'll take a look at each of these in brief. Before we get there I want to mention the narratives are really important. They are to some extent projections of what we expect ourselves and the world to be, but they have a quality of being self-fulfilling. They involve assumptions. This is your question, what are we looking for in these fictional landscapes, things like this assumptions about human nature, ideologies of culture, what cosmological forces are influencing, creating ideas that we have about history and behaviour and society. Both tensions and appropriate manifestations. And these narratives often create expectations of reality even as they are presented to some extent as fictions. They often create places of division and I think we are seeing that to some extent with denialism. I

think denialists among the many things that they are doing are holding on to a curating a vision of Canada, a story a narrative of what Canada is ha is contradicted by the evidence of Canada's residential school history. So instead of changing their story of Canada, this country of a just society as Pierre Trudeau said, instead of rejecting that notion they are rejecting the contrary evidence. Evidence of challenge that idea. So these I think are deeply held emotionally curated stories we tell of ourselves and each other and world. Why do they happen in society? Well that is more than just another course, it's another discipline with many many decades of scholarship but I will suggest there's a relationship between individuals in societies and the structures of the societies and cultures they engage in. If you had a chance to look through the slides ... We'll return to it at times. My interest today is to look at the top left corner of that weird little cyclical pattern. There are many ways to present this notion of a duality of structure. It's a dynamic that we see in a lot of contemporary social theory and deployed by archaeologists in many ways. Stories that individuals are both responding to the structures and knowledge that they inherit and they are exposed to and they also generate them. Which seems contradictory and it is a little bit. Individuals are both the engine that drives the creation of the structures that

then constrain them and that then engender new adherence to the belief that those structures exist and have agency. So agency is the power of individuals to make choices and these structures are these are typical frameworks within which we occupy and if we believe them which constrain our agency, our choice. I've mentioned a few trivial examples, habits of sitting in the same places and our enthusiasm in some cultures for things like queuing these are things that we learn. When gauge the world even as children and adults that teach us the rules unspoken and unwritten in some cases but that have profound influence on us. Social theorists such as Giddens pointed out that the unspoken unwritten rules are much more powerful over us than the ones that we think about. We know for example one shouldn't break the law most of us drive too fast on roads. But we are much less likely to violate the unspoken rules of queuing even though the sanction for doing them is small no one is going to give you a \$390 ticket. But there are a lot and we'll break that law a rule but we won't break others and the division that Giddens put to the unspoken ones have more control over us. We are probably less aware of them and they are embedded deep within our identity. Pierre Bourdieu referred to them as unconscious. As we go through the world we embody express and replicate these structures. That was Giddens point we walk through the world, live in the world we are influenced by those

structures and our response to them is in some cases are to reinforce them. We create new structures but we also use them to recruit adherents and not only are the adherents external to us other people might be part of our cultural group but we are an audience for our own cultural gestures. So we are recruiting ourselves into these ideas. Being human in this view is pretty complicated. There's a bunch of other stuff being on here which I'm not going to talk about today I want us to think about that dynamic. The relationship between you or between individuals and the narratives that we entertain. They are not just singular. We as people in this society don't all have the same narratives they are diverse, heterogenous complex but they do consolidate around certain notions of consensus. In my third year class I'll leave you with a tidbit, there was a famous anthropologist Sherry Bordner [phonetic] who as a senior decided to do ethnography of her high school interviewed 157 of more than 200 people in her graduating class she asked them what it was like and she came up with a taxonomy that she said explained not only her experience, 1950s predominantly Jewish high school but every other high school across the United States indeed North America I've had students in my third year class from around the world who said yes, the taxonomy of social identity within high schools the four part taxonomy, quadripartite, call it paradynamic taxonomy, this taxonomy she argues

existed every high school experience across North America. Why would it do that? What is the consolidation around that diversity of experiences to make them all instillable into a basic four part division of social identity. And her thesis is not high school. High school is not generating this as much as reflecting it. It's these are the narratives that high schoolers inherit from the society from families from media and they are replicating this contesting with becoming adults and they are replicating this quadripartite taxonomy of social identity that is the one they are exposed to that the one they are recruited to and they jump into it enthusiasm replicating the very thing that many of them chafe against. Fascinating example of a complex or illustration of this complex dynamic. So the point here is that the stories we tell are believe sometimes we don't tell them have a profound influence of how we understand and today's conversation is what are the stories that archaeologists tell about the world.

Moving off of this slide. We'll come back to some of these other parts and I encourage you to read it. We've encountered two argument that is we are going to look knew archaeology as explanatory through basic principles of commonality law liken defer toss understand the human condition or relationship with the world giving as a model in which the subject history of archaeology is testable

verifiable and we can do so with an enthusiasm maybe even confidence for objectivity. That is a very power of model one is an engine in modern world. We have technological advances we understand the world because of the power of this model. The question that many anthropologist asks is it true when applied to humans are we vulnerable simply ethnocentric projections of our expectations. Very difficult to resolve. The second notion is that archaeology is constructed. History is a constructed endeavour that it's about how people choose to live in the world, how they have conduct themselves to create the cultural solutions and manifestations that they inherit and embody and replicate and each needs to be understood in own terms not based on some universality. That makes archaeology more challenging because it takes away some of the explanatory assumptions and tools that we might wish to have. Especially as I mentioned given the challenges of being archaeological. These are on the rise and have been for the last few decades but they leave us not doing a singular archaeology but a lot of different archaeologies. Everybody's is different. We lack in doing so we lose one the key tools that anthropologists hope exist of comparative frame. We gain insight into the particular by looking at the general models of history. I've illustrated with the image, here we have notions of explanation where you make choices as a scholar. If you think that function and utility are

driving why people do things, then you spend a lot of time looking at the behaviours explanations of behaviours and we look then at objects, we focus on material culture and we avoid talking about some of the more abstract cultural quotients that really become some as some anthropologists famously Louis Binford said ... Not relevant to the main archaeology. It is curtailing of what archaeology is into this relationship, behaviours and functions, purpose, utility, optimization, efficiency, things of that nature.

If on the other hand you are more interested in these things the arbitrary cultural abstractions, if you believe those are driving history, those are the key defining qualities of what makes a culture cultural you are much less interested in these things and more interested in the sociopolitical the abstracts the symbolic perhaps the semiotic, getting away from the functional explanations into more of the emblemative or iconic forms by which material culture or other parts of life take on a certain meaning or resonance. Moving into these kinds of symbolic and fascinating worlds that anthropologists engage in. To be honest archaeologists don't do it very often. We do it upon occasion. Archaeologists often pursue specifically symbolic forms of material record to do this. Rock art, hieroglyphic, places where the voices of people of the past seem to be intentional with an audience and seem to have a language like

narration. In the case of hieroglyphics often actually a language. There are subsets of the archeological landscape where we employ this analysis, can we take things that might be explained through architecture and ask questions of arbitrary meaning I'm enthusiast of architecture I'll Stella small anecdote one of my favourite authors, Alain De Botton his argument in sort of a semiotics of architecture he said MacDonald he is restaurants in the earliest forms are hideous. Architecturally unpleasant they are designed that way. Their purpose is to make you despair about being human. You walk into McDonald's restaurant you feel despondent the only thing left in life is to fill yourself with crappy food. I am not sure how true that is but his point is its intentional, to make you feel uncomfortable to get you out quickly and compare it to other forms of architecture that are inspirational in his mind that enliven that enrich, places where you want to linger. The point is you can look at something as functional as architecture and ask questions of arbitrary meaning. Archaeologists don't often do that. But this is core intention. Let's take a look at each ideas I could spend too long on each.

The first is this materialism and a correlate of it optimization. These are ideas that we might class under the notion of economics. Again you introduced to anthropologists who look at everything and put it under their endeavour even

though we have departments of economics who study this in greater sophistication. Materialism is a vision of economic dynamics that indicates that the circumstance of our lives is going to influence the cultural identity that we inhabit. The that the way that we live, the kind of conditions under which we live will have a relationship with our cultural identity. You can see perhaps how valuable this will be to archaeologists because if it's true we need to understand the circumstance of life in the past in order to gain insight into what is cultural ... We have done this in anthropology. You've all encountered a basic premise of this idea. In the standard anthropology taxonomy. Who has taken first year anthropology. Many of you have and in your textbook I am sure they were had a table even if they acted as own self-critics of notions of ... Divide the world of anthropology into hunters and gatherers, forgers, farmers, market economies. We are arguing in that taxonomy not only is that a reasonable way to subdivide humanity but we subdivide with a purpose there's something about being hunting and gathering society. Either the format they break that down into different versions, forgers and collectors, to being in that condition makes all people who are in 245 condition have something in common. This is materialism. The expectation, the circumstance will influence our cultural identities and we have two different versions we can say it's

determined circumstance creates culture, less popular today, very popular in the 1960s, again a simplified model and dialectic, more common today. These are constraints or parameters within which we must live and so there is perhaps similarity because the circumstance creates the same conversations, the same challenges and permits perhaps similar solutions to those challenges. We have different versions of it, economically we have formalism which is this sort of argument determine niche ... And we have substantivism each society creates own economic rationalities, each culture is rationally different. I am quite a fan of poll any's model which is a synthesis argue there is a range of economic systems in the modern world that we draw and we change them around based on our social and cultural relationships. I will give you an example.

It's unlikely although possible that your parents will give you an invoice for all the costs they incurred of your childhood. They might want to and as a parent I have a thought of it occasionally, but unlikely to do it most parents don't even though there is a considerable economic costs if knows economic relationships if we bear a cost we ask somebody to pay we don't because poll any suggestions we are in a reciprocal relationship which means in a generalized reciprocity we give without expectation of return we don't do it to anybody we do it to the people we love dearly and care

about. To do is it to your local grocery store would be weird. Acting in a reciprocal way that would be odd. They expect a market economy. The market has an important social dimension one of the key attributes of market economic social security the distance between the consumer and the producer. And we benefit from that. You do not want to know the people who made your life ... You don't want to know the people who made your inexpensive shoes the impoverish that they face are subsidizing the wealth of Canada. The system is designed to separate those out when you don't feel guilty when you buy something on sale. And when encounter the counternarrative, the fair trade conversation where it's like we want you no know the people who are making your coffee and we are going to ask you to pay a little bit more so their lives are supported to confront the asymmetries of the world. Poll any's point is we have different economic systems for different forms of social relationship and this complexity is part of our lives. So it's not so simple but still modelable even with androgyny. An important relationship. This is what anthropologists and archaeologists, archaeologists particularly focus on these items? Why? What make these kinds of arguments persuasive for archaeologist. The answer I'm sure you are thinking of is we have stuff, we have materiality, we might not want to ... Materiality but we have it we might want other things but in archaeology that is

pretty much what you get. We have a lot of material stuff. If we were to argue materiality is inconsequential to culture we would be arguing ourselves out of a job. We have a lot of enthusiasm for these ideas.

These take a couple of forms to echo some of the conversations we are about to have. One is notions that humans are optimizers that our life is all about getting the most for the least. This is the underlying rationality of humans. You'll see it linking to evolutionary ideas. In this is the generator of human choice. It obscures other things as well as revealing the truths of choice. Obscuring other things mean that is we could argue and people have religious choices are designed to fulfill optimization logic. They are not really about religion at all. They are about the economic benefits that accrue by certain belief systems compared to others. That makes some sense anthropologically but it is a shock if you are adherent of a belief system and some anthropologist shows up at your door and says your belief system is veneer obscuring an economic relationship that which you benefit.

Others focus not so much on how these are deployable but how conflict created overresources, overmateriality is the engine of history of culture. Marxian or neoMarxist are one of the foundational principles of this that people are not so much working against the challenges of the environment

of the circumstance they face to find solutions but instead in competition with each other over those resources. Same pieces different arrangement. Those are some of the choices that we have.

I have a small picture. Of Marxism. You can take these abstract arguments and put them together. This is not a curse we are going to dwell on. I want to point out that notions of economics through Marxism are powerful. Arguing that how economic forces generate wealth, the argument there is a certain dynamic that creates the qualities of culture, anthropologists we might be interested in this economic engine of foundationally built around conflict of resources general rates much of the rest of culture and that it feeds back on itself creating a story that obscures the essential conflict which Marx called false consciousness. As the system is built out of a conflict, it creates the illusion that there is no conflicts. A fascinating example. I'm dwelling a lot on American politics but here is a potential example of false consciousness. Many of the adherents of the trump administration and it's so-called MAGA movement seem to be putting their own self-interests aside in order to elect an administration by its own admission is treating them poorly because they think, I don't know, a better world will ensue or maybe they think others will suffer worse than they. That conversation though that masks the truth of

economic principles Marx referred to as false consciousness. The idea though is at the centre and the core of our endeavour as humans is our economic wherewithal. Two difference versions of the same argument that I think archaeologists frequently deploy. They are one of the two usually. Either focusing on these issues not always Marx but versions of these kinds of conflict and theories or they are focusing on function and optimization, the arguments that solutions to the challenges of circumstance either create or influence the cultures, cultural forms that people build and those exist within our expectations. Our purpose is I am not trying to teach you about Marxism, I'm trying to illustrate what I think are some of the core narratives that archaeologists are mainstream. This is one. Importance of things and driving force through different kinds of model that is things have on the circumstance of our lives.

Powerful relationships nevertheless on a macroscopic scale because if we run out of things disaster ensues especially if those things involve basic necessities like food and shelter. Many revolutions have borne about not because of political agitation but economic collapse forcing people who would otherwise put up with a political system that was unfair to challenge it because they have nothing left to lose. That I think is a dynamic we see in the modern world. This is a complicated space I haven't made it simpler

with my drawings but one that I think has a core story at its heart which is that culture is built out of our relationship-wise the circumstance of the world and the things that we populate it with.

STUDENT: I was wondering thinking about this other day it seems like a good time to ask you, what are your thoughts on applying Marxist theory to far enough back in the past in which there isn't a capitalism in the way that he was writing about in the systems that we live in today.

INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: Many have tried to take Marxist 19th century a lot his thought was consolidated for a wider audience in which he was creating a critique of certain era of industrial capitalism and arguing that it was creating deep inequalities by exploiting labourers who were working within factories and had terrible lives, minimal health conditions no safety conditions their lives were expendable but the efforts of their work were generating extraordinary wealth for certain segments of class. His was an analysis, weigh wasn't arguing the world to be revolutionist he was saying this is how the world exists he did accommodate the notion over here which you can say in my chart that if you I can employ people long enough they will revolt and doing so Marx later angles suggested that you can go through a series of social forms ultimately ending up with an idolized space which they call capitalism. You can see why revolutions around communism

invoke Marxist thinking because he anticipated that space. But in fact most communist spaces are these, they never fulfill the ideals of well-being for all instead they tend to mask inequality by creating the narrative the well-being for all but actually are either some feudal or despotic system and the capitalism reigning as it is today is in part the economic inequalities are least profound. I was interested to read Mark Carney invoked a Czechoslovakian author, what was his name, Havel which he wrote about the communist under the communist Soviet block about the dance one has to do to demonstrate support for the very system that you oppose. And that his point was that it takes small gestures in the collective to reveal the system is unfair. By the way, and I know this week it's sort of resonates with us, there is an example that we have but never fulfilled of what Marx had in mind, a society base on equity, merit, where inequalities were disappeared and we were left instead with Utopian space that we all imagine could exist. Anybody think what I'm thinking of? Where in fiction do we see this world? Where in science fiction do we see this world?

STUDENT: *Star Trek*.

INSTR. ANDREW MARTINDALE: *Star Trek*. Exactly. This is the narrative of *Star Trek*. This is the world. It is in fact what Marx anticipated. People get to do what they want there's no shortages technology is our saviour. This is an imaginary

fictional space that fulfills many of Marxist expectations angles of well as what human capacity could look like. Not the Bolshevik revolution in Russia but *Star Trek* is more appropriate analogue. The question you ask is how do we go back in time and apply these ideas. Many anthropologists have tried famously Richard B Lee Toronto, my former supervisor, attempted to look at communities that did this and to find ways to explore their cultural identity through the logic that Marx provided. Has anybody read *Christmas in the Kalahari* for one of your classes. I will give you a brief synopsis. Richard Lee is doing a Marxist analysis of Dobe'Kung people, 'k-u-n-g. You perhaps have encountered it that explanation mark is clck sound. Clicks, labial clicks also known as Ju/'hoansi. I won't ask you to spell that one out. His point was he spent a year in a Land Rover following these communities around. Highly nomadic modest communities in central Africa, they no longer live this life the last true hunting and gathering societies disappeared in the 190s. This was 1960s he followed them around and wanted to know how their economic system worked, how they lived. But anybody seen the film *The Gods Must Be Crazy*. It features actors who are of this community and apparently there's two versions of the movie, visible is the same movie, they speak this language that only a few thousand people speak during the movie they recruited an actor to play the main lead role ...

And in doing so they had scripted out all his dialogue but then they realized nobody understood the language so it didn't matter what he said. So they would just say to him just talk. Nobody will put the subtitles on nobody will know. He talks through the movie and when they wanted to repay the community for supporting them they brought generators out and screens and they played the movie for the communities that he belonged to and noticed that everybody laughed at all the wrong places that is because the actor in the movie was populated the movie with an ongoing conversation about how ridiculous things were. He was talking to the screen like in the movie but he wasn't saying you know whatever the subtitles were he was talking about how silly the whole thing was how his actor was going to flub his lines they were going to do this all over again his community thought this was very funny so two movies one film. Richard Lee after a year of modelling these -- the society of these people decided at the end of the year Christmastime to give a feast and he donated a very large ox for the feast. And in the buildup to the event everybody made fun of him. Everybody mocked his choice that it was a poor animal that it was ridiculous that he made that choice that he spent too much money nobody was going to have fun. He had ruined Christmas for everybody. In the end that is not what happened. Everybody ate and it is delightful he went to his

friends and said what happened. You have been telling me for months this is a terrible choice they explained to him of course we are. Because in our society to be successful at getting food is not something we want people to parlay into political or social influence so we make fun of them and the appropriate response is you are absolutely right, my choices are terrible. I am not good at hunting, not good at providing then the system remains... It's enforced form of equity that frustrates in Lee's visions the notions of this power of economic engine to Foster difference and create exploitation. It's cultural system to create enforced level playing field so people who are good at hunting can't turn that skill into political denomination. Why people who are good at economic things run politics. That is our world. Why because they do. In the Dobe'Kung people they don't, maybe they do now but they didn't because there were cultural protocols to prevent them from doing those. You can try taking these arguments back in time archaeologists do various iteration toss help us explain the choices of people of the past have made. I was a student of Richard Lee's I found his effort to take these arguments back in time fascinating they ask us a richer understanding of the past than might be available through other means I am not sure they are entirely appropriate or correct but they invite us into a conversation that I think is more complicated than otherwise we might

encounter.

Add this one because as we have seen with our surveys by Hodgetts and others archaeology is pretty asymmetrical in who conducts it. We ask who the archaeologists are through a matrix of race or racialization we get a skewed vision. As Hodgetts point out that may correlate with a ... Harassment we have few minorities in the archeological project. Yet the archeological project, the one that examines the history of all people. Of course in Canada we know it typically spend a lot of time exploring non-white people. Is that balance -- is that imbalance going to have an impact on the way archaeologists see the world. I don't believe it can't because this is the taxonomy, the dimension of the modern world you can't understand today without thinking of this concept, to do so would be to avoid the obvious. Scholars have pointed out that the history the United States is the history of race. We cannot ignore it nor can we ignore its generative qualities. How do we make use of that is a challenging subject one that I would have full answers for but I want to invited you into this conversation. It's a subject that archaeologists in Canada until Hodgetts et al I don't think have had. There is a new article coming out a Val I'm editing where the minority archaeologists in Canada have presented a narrative of their experience collectively and individually in this article. It will be one of the

first examples of archaeologists in Canada relating how race intrudes and influences their endeavours. I think it will be important. It's 2026 and we are starting to have this conversation. I think sometimes when we avoid conversations it's a signal this they are important. Perhaps that is what is going on here.

I just wanted to point out that race is a constructs. It's a social imagination. There is no statistically significant association between what we call race, ie, biology and culture. People believe it's true. I use the word truthies which I think was constructed by Stephen Colbert before he was Stephen Colbert. Remember the Colbert Report. He is leading the late show circuit before he was pant too many of extreme right wing pun net and he invented the word truthiness to illustrate when people encountered evidence they didn't like they made up their own truth and he called that truthiness creating a narrative because you feel like you should and it makes you feel better. I think explains modern politics in the U S right now. Anthropologists have advocated and challenged the power of race for many years. Boas considered this disproof in 1908. If you take any two groups of humans and say what is the difference genetic difference between the two groups, the genetic difference within the one group or either group is always greater or equal to the difference between the groups.

The groups don't exist. They only exist because people believe they exist. And I am not saying that race isn't true of course it's true, it's extraordinary powerful problem most powerful of the modern world but it's not true the way people believe it to be true. There is no biological quotients. There is no genetic -- there is genetic variability in humans absolutely explicable in a number of ways but there is no subdivision subraces of humanity. In part because of human history. Humans are adventurous, travel a lot, haven't been around for very long and after we reach new places among the first things we seem to do is reproduce and that creates commonality in the population of humans. If at some point in the future if *Star Trek* doesn't work we populate marches and leave people there for 50,000 years maybe then we will have a subunit of humanity but until then the differences within genetics is only dis... Not enhanced. It's imaginary, it exists. Most concepts of race focus on 15 traits, they are all facial. Primatologists have pointed out that primates are attentive to faces we have very expressive faces as primates, colourful we move them a lot we convey a lot of communication we read faces it's not surprising that we spend a lot of time thinking about faces in the face issues might be underriding this notion of race. But if we try to define it and people have tried, they put a lot of effort in figuring out what races are. Perhaps most famously the

Nazis, they want to figure out what made their race different than others. They were mathematically unable to figure out that constellation of traits that define their what they imagine their race to be. The reason was because it doesn't exist we are all much more similar to each other. But it has considerable social and cultural power and I think for archaeology it has this, it's encoded partly in discursive ways we talk about it not enough in archaeology and in non-discursive ways. That is the place where we embed assumptions. The question we ask ourselves is this largely white endeavour that is archaeology that studies largely non-white people, are we embedding within that conversation undeclared assumptions about the nature of the people we study? All the conversations we are having around colonialism and Indigenous critique of archaeology point to this issue. It is manifest. Absolutely. We encounter my predecessor Charles Borden who spent a great deal of intellectual career effort arguing that his colleague Andrew Charles was a recent migrant to the Musqueam territory. A colonist and he did it based on race. From skulls found at looted from major Musqueam sites arguing there were an earlier people that 1,000 years ago got replaced by contemporary people. The contemporary people were Musqueam the earlier people as he framed it mysterious people. There is a great book by Li Susan Roy anthropologist called these

mysterious people which is Borden's language for the predecessors that he identified as being on the land before they were displaced by the Musqueam colonists. As outsiders looking back we can see what is he doing. He is telling a story using rates that legit mates colon alienation. That displaced the Musqueam ... Justifying Charles Borden's endeavours in archaeology. If you look at his evidence which we aren't going to do here there's a lot of very, very obvious errors in his taxonomy of belongings and his mathematics of radio carbon dates. So much so that my colleagues have argued that he did this intentionally. He cooked the books that arrive at a story he wanted to be true based on an impression of race. That one is pretty easy to unpack. The harder question is what else is being influenced. What are the stories that we don't notice that are going on in the conversation around archaeology today and I don't know what the contents of those stories are but I am he pretty confident they are happening. So whenever we encounter explanations of history, lack evidence, the contain rhetorical fallacies and might be based on implicit but undeclared assumptions we should be attentive to wondering what the influences are and do they include this issue. I suspect many of them will. So bit of open-ended question.

These two ideas tend to come together a bit through this notion of the third of my stories of archaeologists, the

archaeologists tell about the past and about themselves. This one is an explicit analogy between history and one of the most powerful dimensions of our understanding of the development of life on this planet, evolution. We can include into this idea a notion of progress, that things are changing. Evolution is agnostic unimprovement. It goes in different directions. It's untethered from ideas of progress but archaeology I put the two together. It's complex packaging of nature and culture. Let's take a look and see if we can understand it a bit more and if we can what is going on. We all know a little bit about biological evolution. Summary from your high school biology classes. Don't need to know anymore than this. These are Darwin's three postulates. Variation exists in any population, selective threshold occurs some form and over time the nature of that population will transform. Variation selection transmission, the three postulates that Darwin published on the origins of species in 1869 I believe. He had by the way a chapter at the end of that which is deeply racist, lesser known where he explored the issues of how evolution and race created racial taxonomy that he saw around him in the high society of London of the late 19th centuries. His son-in-law, first name is last name is Lubbocke. First name eludes me right now, he was an archaeologist he wrote a book a foundational text used as a textbook into the 1920s using

Darwin's ideas to explain the history of the earth and human culture through archaeology. So the distance between archeological deployments of biological evolution and race and archaeology is not that great. The name will come to me. L-u-b-b-o-c-k-e last name. He was Charles Darwin's son-in-law deploying these ideas. This is true, this is a theory that has with stood considerable efforts to disprove. It's largely unassailable although it has variation we now know that evolution can occur and can be influenced by the experiences of individuals which is often was an@make to this argument, perhaps you learned this. You were exposed to notions of epigenetics in your high school or university classes where the experience of individuals have molecular consequences in our DNA such that our experiences can encode change that is inherited by our offspring. The examples that I think of include deep traumas. Trauma in an individual's life can have implication in DNA and manifests in their offspring which is contrary to much of the 1950s modern synthesis of evolution but an interesting development. Not without change but still largely resilient to disprove. These are things that are going on.

We can ask this one, how does it appear. This is Darwin culture and race evolution is race. All the way up to the modern forms through the 20th century and into the 70s and today where we see different versions of it. We see

evolutionary ecology where it suggests that who we are as creatures emerges from our evolutionary ancestors and the time of change since we were paleolithic, since we were premodern biologically we are no different. Culturally we are very different so we bring with us instinctive behaviours honed over millennia maybe millions of years of evolution that are echoing those times and those adaptations to influence culture today. We have this notion of selectionism, the archaeology transmission of knowledge follows a pattern of evolutionary selection. Transmission of information. They coined the word meme through this logic we now encounter memes all the time it was originally created by evolutionary theorists who wanted material analogue for a gene so they create the word meme. Genes are subject to evolutionary transmission. Information is too in an analogous form. Let's come up with a cool word. They come up with a meme. It's kind of taken off in a different direction but that was where it came from initially.

There is a notion of dual inheritance. Biological and cultural that work in analogue and conversation with each other. These are the current conversations, is a small illustration of them. We all know this story population with some variation a selective threshold in this case bacteria was some resistance to antibiotics, the consistent application of antibiotics you will get antibiotic resistant

bacteria which apparently is ... We are on the cusp of the end of antibiotics being one of the engines of modern world health if we lose antibiotics who knows what will happen but it will not be good.

That is an example. You can do it with moths or Galapagos finches. You have probably all encountered those examples. We see in this biology variation, selection transmission, the causal mechanism is some process of selection. Not everybody gets to transmit to the next generation those that do carry on the difference that is perpetuated. In culture evolution you can come up with all crazy ideas of being human but some circumstance, some material circumstance will influence that and generate history whether that's food, shelter, population imbalances, what have you, survival against the harshness of the world limits such that not everybody who lives perpetuates. This is one model of culture as evolution still popular today. And then this is the culturalist vision why it is in fact the voice choices that you make within some reason that is create then history. The selective process occurs in how we make choices which ones are appropriate which ones gain acceptance which become common. Which ones circulate, that is what determines history. Again similar pieces, different emphasis. So this one isn't really evolution. But this one is. This middle one. And it's still very common in

archaeology. We see history as archaeologists in many ways. As survival of the fittest. Language which is often which has two meanings survival of the fittest in the evolutionary sense means that those who have the greatest fitness ability to reproduce to transmit their genetic complement to the next generation will influence evolution but it's spun as survival of the most appropriate the best equipped fitness being having the greatest capacity to do whatever. Exert power. How do we explain complex things unselfish behaviour. How do we explain that. Biologists arguing that evolution seems to be predicated on self-interest. People work towards their betterment and that of their offspring. How do we explain self-sacrifice, the argument is kin groups influence jet particular transmission, if you sacrifice yourself to benefit your near siblings and do you it enough a greater quotient of your genetic information will be transmitted to the next generation even you don't have chimp.

A great example of this one chimps and monkeys, I love chimps. They hunt monkeys. We talked about primates they are voracious hunters and terrible. They don't seem to do it for food when they hunt these little tiny monkeys that are very cute. They do it ritualistically. They will often chase the monkeys through the forest and isolate them in a tree. All the chimps down below and all the monkeys in the tree they don't have another tree to jump to so violence will

ensued and what do the monkeys do. Anybody know the story? Well they send down some monkeys to fight the chimps. Monkeys are the size of a beagle. Chimpanzees the size of much much bigger. The monkey is not going to survive. The monkey knows that. The ones that that go down and don't you love primatology because they do this typically are younger males. And they go down and die. They are killed by the chimpanzees again ritualistic they smash up the monkey they share the meat but they don't eat too many. And the question that we ask is what is going on with the monkeys why would that monkey who is up in the tree say I am going go down and sacrifice myself for the population in the tree when the obvious self-interested choice is don't go down and fight the chimps you are tiny. The answer is if that monkey's death permits that monkey's near siblings to survive and have children then his genetic complement will be transmit.

Altruism can have a genetic evolutionary explanation. We can see weird in this case antithetical ideas explicable through evolution. Not just about discarding evolution as a poor analogue. There are complex way that is it may manifest in archaeology and in the explanation of history.

Here is another one. Signalling theory. In this case we recognize the power of wherewithal to generate fitness success in this case the ability to have more and more offspring. Signalling theory suggestion that is it's

not so much about whether you have the resources as whether you can engage in the cultural gestures of distinction that differentiate you from others. We see this in animals, the extraordinary diversity of a bird behaviours and colours and rituals seems to be an association of this where we don't really need birds. Birds don't need to have this extraordinary displays of colour and unusual dances in order to survive but what they do is they affirm to a witnessing population the strength of their fitness. That they are healthy individuals capable then and worthy of transmitting their genetics to the next generation. The cultural analogue of that is material gesture. Is wealth and... arguably an example of this. Do we assume it's gravitate to gestures of wealth and significance, status. Are we status seekers in part because we are reflecting hidden evolutionary dynamic. A fascinating conversation. Your phone is not just a phone but it's a symbol designed to be part of a conversation around wealth and the suitability of individuals as attractive opportunistic mates for reproduction. Not that you'll find a partner, I confuse myself, maybe you will but it's part of a conversation material gesture that is a explicable as evolutionary frame. A beguiling thought one that has some power because many societies our own included have and venerate gestures of excess. We have encoded systems by which we can understand what is important versus

what is fake. Which are the authentic statements of wealth and power versus those that are occupied by posers. It's a fashion conversation, one that we are vulnerable through advertising that recruits us to the idea that a material things that we might buy will enhance this very quality of our lives. Not just going to make our lives easier it's going to make us cooler in doing so and that is something that we see in archaeology. With see symbols. Pervasive.

In the Northwest Coast here in BC it was an earlier habit perpetuated in the north for longer of using what are called labrets, stone or other materials plugged into earlobes or lower lip. Some of these become so large they are unwieldy. Really the size of that big. You got that pierced into your lip typically among women not exclusively creating this big thing. Thought of one explanation is that it's a signal of wealth and status, one that indicates that the person who has the labret is not able nor has to conduct menial tasks some of which involve using your teeth as tools. An argument it's replaced by cranial defatation where people would put children into braces to create a head shape and the argument there is that also signals status and power but it's not as you can't mimic. Once the child is a certain age you can't change the shape of head. You can add a labret to your face, it will be difficult, takes a long time but you can't fake other things. I am not saying these are right I am

saying you can see a archaeologists are mobilizing evolutionary thinking in ways that provide us with insight about why materiality and why culture is the way that it is in some archeological context. These three things then represent some I would suggest some of the major narratives of archeological think being the past. And if we want to understand what archaeology is and how it is deployed we need to remind ourselves of these things that is an endeavour that sees the world through a materialist lens, that hasn't yet fully attended to notions of race which are obviously dynamic within its discipline. And lastly that ideas of evolution continue to influence our understanding of the past. Things as simple as progressiveness, things going from simple to complicated which doesn't always happen in history but is a common assumption in archaeology. That we are seeing patterns going from modest to sophisticated from simple to complicated. Whether or not they are there in the data these are the manifestations of some of these expectations. And my suggestion to us is that as we proceed through exploration of archaeology we can attend it these think about them, it might help us understand the dynamics if, and my final example is this if we are looking at how archaeology and we will do this is consumed within a court of law in Canada we can ask ourselves to any of these great things influence not only how the archaeology is presented or constituted but how the court

consumes them. And I would say yes. In fact I've written an argue about it. I don't think I have that article for you but I can point to you in that direction.

What are these narratives. That is where we are going Thursday we take a look at another foundational argument by Atalay. Take a look at a court question by Marwick where are the scientific... archaeology. We look at an example of evolution example looking at culture through an evolutionary lens what does that look like to us as consumers of archaeologists. This is my YouTube. I find it funny but I feel a degree of anxiety that you might not.

>> Whoa feedback. All right let's try this voiceover for comedian movie trailer, take 1.

>> In a world where laughter was king --

>> No, in a world, Jack.

>> What do you mean no in a world?

>> It's not that kind of movie.

>> Oh okay. In a land that --

>> Not in a land either.

>> In a time --

>> I don't think so.

>> In a land before time --

>> It's about a comedian, Jack.

>> One man, where life is no longer your own.

>> What does that mean?
>> That is wrong.
>> In an outpost on the edge of space, two girls.
>> No.
>> Now more than ever --
>> Stop it.
>> A robot renegade cop --
>> You are fired.
>> You are fired.
>> No, you are actually fired.
>> I'm fired.
>> Get out of the booth, Jack.
>> No, I like it in here.

I find it funny. The movie wasn't that great but the trailer was spectacular it makes fun of every trailer that invokes these narratives the story that we think every movie is going to be different, they look all the same they tell us the same story they tell us the same story that not only that we expect to hear we want to hear. If we hear a different story it feels inappropriate. I ask the question social scientists do, how is that dynamic generating in us our understanding of the world that we live in. How is it confronted and how is it replicated. Here we go. Watch the movie but honestly the trailer is far better than the film. Thank you all very much. We'll see each other on ... If you

have questions about the upcoming assignments, please send me
a note.

Lana Grace Allen, RCR, RPR

Accurate Realtime Reporting Inc.

(604) 685-6050

Uncertified (Draft) Verbatim Transcript