7

Reflections on Archaeology and Contemporary Society

John Ertl

This chapter reflects upon the seminar series "Archaeology and Contemporary Society," hosted by the Kanazawa University International Center for Cultural Resource Studies between 2013 and 2016. It elaborates on the background discussions between the organizers and introduces the directions it has led us in. This chapter begins with a narrative account of the thoughts, conversations, and collaborative research that inspired this seminar series. The body is divided into three themes – crisis, obduracy, and diversity – that have extended through the different presentations and contextualizes them with a review of relevant literature. These themes are not all taken from the presentations directly, but are ones that the organizers have found formative to the seminar theme of archaeology and contemporary society. This chapter does not provide comprehensive summaries of the presentations and thus, to a certain degree, requires the reader to refer to the original chapters. The conclusion introduces some of the paths that this seminar series have opened over the course of the past three years.

Orientations

As Yoshida Yasuyuki explains in the introduction to this volume, this seminar series is rooted in discussions between the two of us since 2012. I had just returned to Kanazawa University after spending a year as a visiting scholar at the University of California, Berkeley Center for Japanese Studies, working on a new project titled "Ethnography of Archaeology."[1] Beginning with casual conversations about Japanese archaeology, Yoshida and I soon decided to form a reading group that focused on contemporary trends in English language archaeology. Our collaborative fieldwork began in 2013 with a trip to the United States where we talked with the organizers of an art exhibit titled Arts of Jomon at hpgrp Gallery in New York and, on the way back to Japan, a visit to Berkeley to talk with Professor Junko Habu about her project at the Research Institute for Humanity and Nature (RIHN).[2]

Our conversation with Professor Habu brought up a couple of topics that have

fomented the thoughts behind this seminar series. The first came from a discussion about the Jomon inspired art exhibit we had just seen. After listening to our descriptions of the exhibit and people we met, her response was "*ayashii ne*" (sounds dubious). Her comment was likely about the ways in which the people we interviewed (the head of the NPO Jomonism and the exhibit director) talked about the Jomon people and culture – using phrases such as "Native Japanese" (*netibu Japaniizu*) to connect Jomon people to North American Indians or "the Jomon lived happy and free for ten thousand years" (*Jōmon-jin ha ichiman-nen happii de furii*).

What we interpreted as disinterest in these art and activities we surmised was due to two factors. First, it was because of the looseness in which they used metaphors and designs of the Jomon period, without accounting for their place in the archaeological record. Second was that their comments about the Jomon people and culture could be easily connected to a naive nationalism that connects the Jomon culture to present-day Japanese. Largely agreeing with Professor Habu that something was "dubious" in their Jomon-inspired activities and comments, we also thought that they deserved attention they exemplify the interface between archaeology and society (see Yoshida and Ertl 2017).

This conversation brought a renewed sense of the boundaries of archaeology. NPO Jomonism and the Arts of Jomon exhibit, while inspired by Jomon archaeology, we assume are not subjects that many Jomon archaeologists would research. Moreover, as the members of Jomonism we talked to selectively pick from the archaeological record to fit their ideology, one could argue their actions are deserving of reprimand. In this, we felt the divide between archaeology and our interests in "cultural resources." Even public archaeology, which has reveled in the gap between archaeologists' professional knowledge and the public's understandings of the past, seemed to us too centered in an archaeological framework (see Merriman ed. 2004) to research such a subject free from evaluation.

Aims

The first aim in this seminar series came out of this conversation. We wanted to select topics and speakers who would broach themes that lie upon, between, or just outside the disciplinary boundaries. To better understand how archaeology constructs its knowledge of the past, we wished to look at practices that stretch from its center to its margins. The metaphor of boundaries has been central to the reflexive turn in cultural anthropology and the social sciences (Lamont and Molnár 2002; Gupta and Ferguson eds. 1997a, 1997b) and has been especially useful for

understanding themes untied to geopolitical boundaries. Our concern is in how the boundaries of archaeology have been established, how they function to protect its integrity from outside forces, and how people have attempted to refit them in response to changing social-political-economic conditions.

The second aim the seminar series has been to create a forum for participants talk about archaeology free from the structures, the painfully obvious as well as invisible ones, that bind the discipline. We hoped to create discussions that allow speakers and audience alike to engage in reflection, introspection, and critique. Or more simply, we strove to create a public forum to discuss aspects of Japanese archaeology that are commonly kept private. This aim also stemmed from a conversation with Professor Habu, who explained that an inductive approach is much more common in Japan than in North America. Clarifying, she mentioned that Japanese archaeologists, especially well-established scholars, draw upon their knowledge garnered from long careers working with remains to make interpretations. This is a problem when they are not explicit in discussing how they came to their conclusions, which works to silence the important thought processes that go into the production of archaeological knowledge.

Stemming from these two aims, our larger objective has been to expand the boundaries of archaeological discourse in Japan. This desire is rooted the problems explained in this volume by Mizoguchi (Chapter 3-1), and expanded upon by Yoshida (Chapter 3-4), who relayed a dissatisfaction with the limited "discursive space" of Japanese archaeology. This can be seen in Mizoguchi's involvement as president of WAC-8 Kyoto and his desire, conveyed by Yoshida (Chapter 3-4: 148), to establish a Japanese version of the Theoretical Archaeological Group (TAG). Our interest is not to bring Japanese archaeology into alignment with Anglo-American archaeological discourse. Rather, by focusing on boundaries and opening the "black boxes" of archaeological discourse in Japan, we hope to better understand the problems that beleaguer the discipline and to diversify the types of contributions that archaeologists can make to society.

Crisis

Crisis is one of the recurring themes in this seminar series. The nature of the crisis affecting Japanese archaeology is multifaceted and the presenters raised different aspects in each of their talks. One of the most utilized narratives is that of "decline." Statistics on buried cultural properties published by Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunkachō) show that from the mid-1990s there has been a sharp drop in num-

bers of rescue excavations and reduction in the yearly budget as well as the numbers of government-employed "buried cultural properties specialists" (*maizōbunkazai senmon-shokuin*).[3] These figures were brought up by Junko Habu, who argues that this decline is reflective of a change away from an "excavation first" attitude and that there is a pressing need to "rethink the relationship between archaeology and society" (Chapter 4-1: 154). Problems relating to fewer "archaeologists" came up repeatedly. Okamura (Chapter 3-3: 129) talked about the need to rethink what it means to be an "archaeologist," especially in terms of contribution to the broader community (Chapter 3-2), Akatsuka and Okayasu talked about this decline to set up their visions for non-governmental archaeology (Chapter 5), and Matsumoto indirectly brings this issue up when talking about the gender imbalance in archaeology (Chapter 4-2).[4]

For the organizers, this crisis in Japanese archaeology comes from a perceived lack of social or political relevance, which makes it difficult to justify it as a meaningful activity (see also Akatsuka, Chapter 5-1). In the rapid economic growth period – spurred on by cultural resource legislation, standardization of excavation and resource management practices, and successive grand discoveries – the relevance of archaeology was taken for granted. During this time, it seems that the growth of archaeology was the primary, although not the only, measure of its importance. Large-scale salvage excavations connected to development projects (industrial parks, housing projects, and baseball stadiums) brought about many discoveries that were, in turn, utilized for local-community building, tourism expansion, and symbolic reservoirs for collective-identity construction. However, declines in attendance at archaeological parks and museums, the aging of museums and related facilities, and even the retirement of charismatic and influential archaeologists are making it ever more difficult to justify archeology's relevance. The vitality of archaeological institutions is often dependent upon the stimulus of new excavations and artifacts, innovative interpretations, and designation of sites and artifacts as national treasures or World Heritage. As a result, today there are numerous archaeology centers that are understaffed, underutilized, underfunded, and undergoing decay.

In looking at the relationship between archaeology and contemporary society, we see a correspondence between Japan's postwar development of archaeology and its rapid economic growth. Many facets of the crisis discussed in this seminar series are connected to the end of the bubble economy in the early 1990s. In the ongoing era of economic stagnation, it appears as if Japanese archaeology has not

been able to realign itself to changing conditions, only some of which are economic in nature. This inability to change is not for a lack of vision, as the presenters in this seminar series all have clear ideas about how archaeology should change. This inability to adapt and innovate to changing conditions, even in cases where there is an agreed upon understanding of the problems and shared vision of the future, has been examined in many sections of this volume with the concept of obduracy.

Obduracy

In this seminar series, the concept of obduracy was introduced during a discussion (Chapter 1-3: 31–32) about the continued use of thatch for the roofs of Jomon period building reconstructions despite evidence from Goshono site that the roofs were covered in sod. Takada Kazunori explained that when the earliest reconstructions were built at Toro (Yayoi period) and Hiraide (Jomon to Heian periods) sites in the late 1940s and early 1950s, there was little information about the roof structure or roofing materials. As such, the architect at Hiraide modeled the roofs off buildings from the Edo period, which happened to utilize thatch (Chapter 1-3: 31). Despite knowing that sod or bark are equally viable options for roofing materials – and are found in ethnological examples – these initial decisions continued to be replicated in prehistoric reconstructions throughout Japan. Existing reconstructions, including the body of knowledge and research that went into designing them, do not only provide models for how new reconstructions should be built. They function as "actors" (see discussion of participatory diversity below) that influence any subsequent reconstruction practices.

Obduracy is explained in detail by Anique Hommels (2005). Her review of obduracy is contextualized in three case studies on urban change and draws largely from theory developed in science and technology studies (STS). Her basic question is why it is difficult to change the urban landscape despite efforts to "unbuild" existing structures. Hommels begins by refuting four "commonsense" explanations for why urban spaces resist change. These are: 1) change is too expensive; 2) there is no agreement on what should be done; 3) people in positions of power keep things as they are; and 4) the materiality of urban structures make them difficult to change (19–20). These "single-factor explanations" are inadequate, Hommels argues, because the city is a "socio-technical artifact," which consists of different physical elements that embody the various concepts that go into making them as well as the social activities that take place in them. As such, to change the city is to engage in a "laborious, time-consuming, and precarious process marked by a deli-

cate interplay of various social, technical, cultural, and economic factors" (20).

Hommels introduces three different models of obduracy, each related to another, but differing in respect to the explanatory mechanisms and what aspects of obduracy are emphasized (2005: 21). The first is "dominant frames," which explains that obduracy is a result of the differences between individuals in the process of developing technological artifacts. These "differences" are the roles of individuals in various professions or specialties and the divergent ways of thinking. This borrows from Bijker's (1995) notion of "technological frames," which explains technological development begins with a stage of "interpretative flexibility" where different groups compete over the development and meaning of artifacts. Over time this will eventually stabilize and one meaning will become dominant over others, leading to closure of debate and the obduracy of an artifact (Hommels 2005: 22–23). The dominant frames model explains that obduracy is not the result of the material immobility of objects, but it is a result of the various actors' ways of thinking (professional conventions, values, definitions of problems) that are "built up around an artifact" (26).

The second model of "embeddedness" emphasizes the coevolution of technology and society, where new technological innovations are not only shaped by society but may also impact society in various ways (26). The concept of embeddedness explains that technological artifacts cannot be viewed in isolation, but are rather set within a larger system or network. Once embedded in a network an artifact becomes obdurate, because to change one part of a system may require dislodging it from (or changing) its other elements (27).

Hommels' third model of obduracy is "persistent traditions," which "address the idea that earlier choices and decisions keep influencing the development of a technology" (30). Where the two previous models focus on localized interactions and contexts, this model is focused upon "long-term, structural developments" that are part of the "wider cultural context" in which the development of technological artifacts takes place (30). One of the metaphors used to explain this aspect of obduracy is "momentum" (Hughes 1994): the idea that a system, which in its early stages may be malleable and susceptible to outside influences, loses its ability to change because of decisions that have set it in motion.

These three models of obduracy are similar in many respects, although Hommels intentionally emphasizes their differences. These models are not independent from each other, but each provides a very different way of explaining obduracy. Where the dominant frames model focuses on the "interactions" between differ-

ent actors, the embeddedness model focuses on the "relations" between various "material and non-material elements" (Hommels 2005: 36), while the persisting traditions model emphasizes the "enduring" processes that are embedded within the broader society.

As Hommels concept of obduracy is contextualized in case studies on attempts to change urban structures such as highways or apartment complexes, her descriptions do not directly transfer to Japanese archaeology. In the above example of prehistoric reconstructions at site parks, these can be considered "socio-technological artifacts" that encompass the ideas of the people who designed and built them. This may also be seen in reconstructions of Jomon period clothing and images discussed in Aki and Koyama's (Chapter 2) presentations, as both openly discuss how their thought processes, research, and their personal preferences went into their reconstructions. However, archaeology encompasses a broad range of practices, organizations, and ideas that are obdurate in nature but are not material in form. As Yoshida observed in this volume in his analysis of Mizoguchi's presentation on the communication system and discursive spaces of Japanese archaeology (Chapter 3-4: 136–138) and Akatsuka and Okayasu's presentations on the persistence and control of the bureaucratic organizational structure of archaeology research (Chapter 5-4: 257–258) these immaterial aspects of archaeology can also be analyzed using the concept of obduracy.

Diversity

The organizers' interests in diversity extend to before this seminar series (Graburn, Ertl and Tierney eds. 2008; Ertl 2011, Ertl and Hanson 2015; Yoshida and Ertl 2017). In planning this seminar series, we sought out presenters who could identify how "diversity" can provide better understandings of the "crises" in Japanese archaeology and expose new routes to resolve them. The following review of diversity in archaeology draws from earlier research outlining a three-part model of diversity (Ertl 2013: 12–15) that explains: 1) the processual and contextual aspects of archaeological interpretations, 2) the varied interests of (human and non-human) actors in archaeological knowledge making practices, and 3) problems of incompatibility stemming from multiple sources of data.

Diversity is a concept that has been used broadly throughout the sciences. Stirling (2007) explains that scientists' concerns with diversity are two-fold. Firstly, as the classification schemes within a discipline are often contested fields, attention to diversity is considered necessary to understand what kinds of principles are being

challenged. Secondly, diversity is recognized as necessary for disciplines to "promote innovation, hedge ignorance, mitigate lock-in and accommodate pluralism" as well as achieve qualities necessary for sustainability (Stirling 2007: 715).

In archaeology, diversity has been used in calls for research programs that challenge well-established classification or typological schemes as well as broaden the range of methodological and interpretative practices. Doing so, one may hope, will create a more robust, pluralistic, and sustainable discipline. In recent years, part of archaeology's concern with diversity relates to a loss of disciplinary isolation (Hicks 2003) and a fragmentation of the discipline into multiple-narrow specialties (Hodder 1999; Mizoguchi 2006). These concerns have coupled with calls to address political and ethical issues that may be seen in the growth of public archaeology and ethnographic approaches to archaeological knowledge production and utilization (Edgeworth 2006).

For as long as diversity has been heralded, Japanese archaeology has been criticized by Anglo-American archaeologists for its perceived lack of diversity. The criticisms focus on its firm foundations in cultural history (Barnes 1993, Ikawa-Smith 1982), its bureaucratic rescue-oriented management system (Okamura 2011), and in its lack of alternative discursive spaces (Mizoguchi 2006). The ongoing critique of its orientation in cultural history has explained that this as a problem because has kept the discipline from engaging with the methodological, theoretical, and ethical concerns developed in the processual and post-processual movements (Ogasawara 2004: 213–214). Focusing on the absence of diversity serves not only to reflect upon its negative effects but also as way to justify new alternative approaches. The presentations in this seminar series utilized this rhetoric in different ways.

As an example, the presentation by Professor Otsuka (Chapter 6-2) explained the legacy of Yamanouchi Sugao's research on Jomon pottery typology from the 1930s and how it has continued to constrict the practice of Jomon archaeology to this day. Otsuka recognizes Yamanouchi's pottery typology as remarkable – as it provided, at a glance, a clear vision of continuity, change, and regional variation in the Jomon period – but he also finds it has had an unfortunate effect in constraining the discourse and research methodology for future generations of Japanese archaeologists. Not only have scholars continued to refine Yamanouchi's typological model, but all Jomon archaeologists, even those who would wish to make a clean break from Yamanouchi's influence, must deal with it at a foundational level. The most basic questions of identification, reporting, and classification of data (labeling an object "Jomon pottery") demands working within, or at least referencing, Yama-

nouchi's model. Otsuka explained that it is reproduced through the education of students as well as in the standardization of archaeological reports. That is, Yamanouchi's research continues in the embodied practices, institutionalized structures, and ideological foundations of Japanese archaeology.

Interpretative Diversity

Turning to diversity in the context of this seminar series, the first aspect of diversity is "interpretative diversity," which itself is divided into two related concerns. First, interpretative diversity is commonly addressed in archaeology as the issue of multivocality. Following the postmodern challenges to scientific authority (Hodder 1999; Shanks and Tilley 1992), archaeologists have been increasingly attentive to the diverse range of people who have differing claims over and interests in material heritage, which, in turn, leads to differing visions of what archaeological remains mean and how they should be utilized. The most direct example of this from the seminar series is Matsumoto Naoko's (Chapter 4-2) discussion of gender bias in archaeological displays. Related to the arguments of several Anglophone scholars (Conkey and Spector 1984; James 1999), Matsumoto explained how displays in Japan contain, for example, a focus on male-centered activities and mirror contemporary Japanese familial gender roles. At the root of this problem is the lack of gender diversity in archaeology research centers and museums. That is, the feminist push to increase gender diversity is justified in that it will bring about more balanced and attentive interpretations of the past.

Second, interpretive diversity relates to the processual and contextual aspects of archaeological knowledge production. A linear model of archaeological research practices could divide it into successive phases that begin with proposal writing, move through research planning, excavation, laboratory analysis, and end with an interpretative stage where articles and books are written. Berggren and Hodder (2003) discuss the conceptual divide between archaeology as a physical activity in the field or laboratory and an intellectual activity during writing. Their argument is that interpretations occur throughout the entirety of archaeological investigation, including the most basic practice of excavation. They explain that interpretations made at any one stage shape future activities as well as work to revise earlier evaluations.

This processual aspect of interpretations was discussed in the two seminars that centered on reconstructions: of buildings by John Ertl and Takada Kazunori (Chapter 1) and of clothing by Koyama Shuzo and Aki Sahoko (Chapter 2). Recon-

structions are generally considered interpretations that occur after the data-making activities (excavation and analysis) are completed. Takada largely follows this idea when he explains the reconstructed buildings at Goshono were built to accurately reflect the evidence obtained through analysis of remains. Also referencing Goshono, Ertl focused on the variety of scientific disciplines that analyze the remains and help to fill in the gaps between the data obtained on remains and information needed to justify the buildings' final shapes. While the process of experimental reconstruction at Goshono appears to follow a linear process from excavation to analysis to interpretation, in both presentations Takada and Ertl emphasize the potential of the buildings themselves to provide data to better understand prehistoric building practices and even revise earlier interpretations of archaeological remains.

Koyama and Aki's presentations on Jomon period clothing reconstructions began by criticizing how a lack of research and interest led to a reproduction of images of the Jomon as "savage" (*yaban-na*) hunter-gather-fishers who wore monochrome animal-skin clothing. Referencing images of clothing on clay figurines (*dogū*) for clothing design (as well as hairstyles) and looking to lacquerware for possible colors (red and black), Koyama and Aki reimagined the Jomon as "stylish" (*oshare-na*). Their image of "stylish" Jomon clothing has been reproduced often – such as the National Museum of Japanese History exhibit Jomon vs. Yayoi – and has been influential in how other aspects of Jomon life ways are envisioned.

Participatory Diversity

The second component of diversity that appears in this seminar series is "participatory diversity." At its most basic level, this refers to the participation of multiple actors in archaeological practices who, in the framework of public archaeology, are often called stakeholders (Castañeda and Matthews eds. 2008). The term stakeholder was introduced to emphasize that archaeology is not conducted by individual archaeologists, but is done in concert with many individuals and institutions that each influence the direction and practices of any one project.

The notion of participatory diversity is an expansion of the concept of stakeholders. It incorporates Michel Callon's (2004) "hybrid collectives," in which he explains that the various "actors" (Latour 1987) in knowledge producing projects include both humans and non-humans (e.g. technologies, artifacts, or concepts). Callon explains hybrid collectives as: 1) having boundaries that are not set within any one organizational structure; 2) involving participation by people of different backgrounds and specialties; 3) changing in composition or disappearing over

time; and 4) aimed at producing knowledge or resolving problems (Callon 2004: 4). Callon's notion of hybrid collectives allows one to view archaeology as a project-based activity that brings together people from different backgrounds who individually and collectively direct the various activities during investigation. Further, by emphasizing the importance of non-humans, it includes the physical landscape and material culture discovered through excavation as active participants in the production of archaeological knowledge.

Previous studies (Fawcett 1995, 1996; Habu and Fawcett 2008) have introduced the stakeholders involved in Japanese archaeology – including bureaucrats, politicians, journalists, business leaders, scientific specialists, funding agencies, or tourists – and explained how their differing interests in archaeology assist or counteract the work of archaeologists. To include "non-humans" to this list of actors who influence the practices of archaeology is one way to emphasize that the material culture discovered is not simply manipulated by archaeologists. Rather, artifacts, landscapes, as well as the concepts that frame archaeology (e.g. the concept of "the Jomon") actively make demands upon the other stakeholders involved in the process of an archaeological project.

An example of non-human actors came out during the discussion following the first seminar series on reconstructions. Kunugi Tsukasa from Togariishi Site in Nagano Prefecture explained that Togariishi, one of the first Jomon period sites to reconstruct pit dwellings, was currently considering how to repair or rebuild the pit dwellings located there (Chapter 1: 32–34). He explained that the discovery and reconstruction of sod-roof buildings at Goshono Site opened a basket of questions about the accuracy of the buildings at Togariishi. Hearing this led me to comment that Goshono in this case is an actor, as both the burnt-dwelling remains (archaeological data) and reconstructed buildings (interpretations of data) have imposed themselves into the negotiations on how to rebuild Togariishi.

Yoshida (Chapter 5-4: 255–257) also provides an example of non-human actors in his analysis of the Aotsuka Kofun. In his title "to climb or not to climb" he is raising a debate about whether visitors should be free to walk on top of a burial mound that contains human remains. This issue arises because of differences in the perspectives of its stakeholders, which include the public (institutionalized by the *maibun* government-based archaeology system), the members of NPO Niwasato Net who maintain the grounds and guide visitors, as well as Oagata Shrine and its constituents who own the land. The argument "to climb" is based in a recognition of Aotsuka Kofun as a national historical site park rebuilt and maintained by

public funds, where arguing "not to climb" is to recognize its sacredness as both burial site and religious grounds. Yoshida explains the current "re-sacralization" (*sai-seichika*) of Aotsuka Kofun is a continuation of its "life history," where it has shifted repeatedly between these frames of sacred and secular. What can be seen in Yoshida's discussion is that Aotsuka Kofun is not simply an object utilized by people in various ways, but it rather can be regarded a central actor that, through its obdurate materiality, asserts and makes demands upon the people who may wish to interact with it.

Data Diversity

The third aspect of diversity guiding this seminar series is "data diversity." Geoffrey Bowker (2000) examines data diversity in relation to the biodiversity sciences and their attempts to create databases of all floral and faunal species throughout history. Bowker explains these databases should ideally: 1) be theory neutral; 2) serve as a common basis for several disciplines; and 3) be reusable and possible to manipulate by others. In contrast to this ideal, Bowker shows these databases are intertwined with the politics, ethics, and histories of disciplines in different regional-national settings, the result of which are different classification systems and incompatible datasets. This incompatibility stems from problems such as the naming of things (where things are classified in different or multiple ways or not at all), the complex differences in measurement standards and representational practices, and the fact that data "decays" over time and making it impossible to verify results or repeat analysis. The standardization of data across disciplines (and arguably even within one) is not a goal that may be resolved simply by agreeing upon names or temporal and spatial measurements, but requires attention to the histories of academic disciplines and the communication between disciplines and their significant "legal and political bodies" (Bowker 2000: 677).

For archaeology, this idea of data diversity is useful for understanding problems of incommensurability between data that has resulted from a rapid increase in analytical (data-making) technologies such as geographic information systems (GIS), x-ray fluorescence analysis, or accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) (Ertl 2013: 15). The application of different scientific analysis to archaeology has made it possible to examine macro-level spatial relationships as well as micro-level molecular or genetic qualities of remains. These advances in archeometery have made it possible to analyze remains that were previously disregarded and, in turn, have impacted the very basic practices of excavation, collection, and storage of materials. Incom-

mensurability arises from the multiple layers of data that can be extracted from remains, where the data from one type of analysis may not directly correspond or translate to that of another.

One example in Japanese archaeology is how radiocarbon dating has not only challenged chronologies previously based on pottery typology but also affected other issues such as population estimates. Habu's research (Chapter 4-1) is attempting to resolve this issue of "data diversity" stemming from the "legacy data" available on pottery typology with new data provided by radiocarbon dating, pollen analysis, and isotopic analysis of bones – the goal of which is to better understand the effects of climate change on the population during the Middle to Late Jomon periods.

The presentations by Okayasu and Akatsuka (Chapter 5) both touch on data diversity in different ways. In Okayasu's talk, he argues that the "generalist" model of archaeologists within the government-bureaucratic cultural properties (*maibun*) system should be replaced with a system that encourages specialization. Such a system would bring only the people who are needed and those who best qualified to a site and thereby improve efficiency (Chapter 5-2: 237). His desire to move from a general to specialized model for archaeology, in part, can be understood as underlined by the many advances in analytical technologies. In Akatsuka's presentation, he discussed his efforts to push for the standardization and digitization of "core" archaeological data (Chapter 5-1: 211–215). His vision of standardization does not extend to pottery typology or excavation practices, but is focused on the most basic data that may allow one to evaluate a site and its features (e.g. XYZ coordinates and photographic images). Creating such a standardized database would allow scholars access to information that can be analyzed based on his or her research interests, unlike today where information publicly available in site reports or municipal websites is not easily usable. However, Akatsuka explained that even after thirty years working within the current *maibun* system, this project of data standardization was unable to take off in any sustained way.

Directions

This chapter introduced the thoughts that have spanned throughout this seminar series. It has not provided a summary of the presentations (as the presentations can be read in whole) or a comprehensive analysis of them (which can be found in Yoshida's chapter reviews). The ideas presented here are those that have come out through discussions at the seminars and between the conference organizers during the periods of time between them. This chapter has attempted to contextu-

alize the presentations with our interests in social theory to explain our view of the relationship between Japanese archaeology and contemporary society.

Overall, these seminars have been more successful than anticipated. In planning each seminar, we sought out individuals who are at the top of their fields and asked them to address themes that we thought could, to a certain extent, be sensitive issues that might push them outside of their comfort zones. That everyone we invited accepted our invitations was surprising. That they embraced the themes we suggested (with negotiations to refine them) and have allowed us to publish their presentations and discussions (with only minor revisions) has been all the more so. Our aim of creating an open forum for discussion has been equally successful. This was largely due to the active participation of everyone who attended, many of whom came more than once.

For all that we have learned from organizing these seminars, we are equally excited for the paths that they have opened. The interest shown by presenters and attendees encouraged Yoshida and myself to broaden these research interests into other projects. The main project we are currently engaged in is a "joint research project" at the National Museum of Ethnology (Minpaku) titled *Ethnography of Archaeology: Diversity in the Production, Utilization, and Transformation of Archaeological Knowledge* (FY 2015–2018).[5] Its primary goal is to understand the diverse ways that archaeology constructs its knowledge and how it contributes to the construction of the physical and social landscape.

One of the many ways the seminar series "archaeology and contemporary society" has directed the Minpaku project is in the selection of its members. The seventeen members include many of the people we have met as presenters and attendees, and others include people we met during other individual and collaborative research activities over these past years. The selection of members and guest speakers, we hoped, would help expand the concept of stakeholders (as discussed in the above section on participatory diversity). All the members are involved in archaeology, yet their differences are as stark as their similarities. Members include specialists in paleobotany, bone chemistry, and starch analysis, people with backgrounds in fine art, museum studies, anthropology, or intangible heritage, and also archaeologists – some who work for national and municipal heritage centers and others who work in academia.

This project at Minpaku furthers the aims and objective that underlined this seminar series. Namely, to examine topics that are emphasize the boundaries of archaeology and to openly discuss the hidden (or taken for granted) structures

that limit archaeological practices. As this chapter has shown, the various "crises" affecting Japanese archeology are persistent, due largely to an inability to adjust to political, economic, and social changes. This chapter has argued that diversity is one route to establishing a more sustainable future for archaeology. Engagement with diversity is two-fold. It is, on the one hand, a call to better understand the diverse ways in which archaeology and society interact. It is secondly to build new structures or organizations that can open the "discursive space" and allow for a plurality of ways of engaging in archaeology. In hosting these seminars and publishing this book, we hope to have contributed to this goal.

Notes

1. The Ethnography of Archaeology research at University of California, Berkeley was supported by a grant from the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science titled "Strategic Young Research Overseas Visits Program for Accelerating Brain Circulation" (Project Number J2202). The immediate results of this research were published in 2013 (Fujii and Ertl eds. 2013).
2. Professor Habu's RIHN project is titled "Long-term Sustainability through Place-Based, Small-scale Economies: Approaches from Historical Ecology" (FY 2014–2016). Information on the project can be seen on the website: http://www.chikyu.ac.jp/fooddiversity/en/index.html (accessed 19 March 2017).
3. http://www.bunka.go.jp/seisaku/bunkazai/shokai/pdf/h28_03_maizotokei.pdf (accessed 15 March 2017).
4. See also Yoshida's comparison of the numbers and relative proportion of women membership in the Japanese Archaeology Association (17 percent) versus the Theoretical Archaeological Group, United Kingdom (42 percent) (Chapter 4-4: 205–206).
5. The Minpaku project description (in Japanese), member list, and meeting schedules can be seen at: http://www.minpaku.ac.jp/research/activity/project/iurp/15jr176 (accessed 20 March 2017).