Chapter 25
Women in Southeast Asian Archaeology: Discoveries, Accomplishments, and Challenges

Rasmi Shoocongdej and Miriam T. Stark

Introduction

Contemporary Southeast Asian archaeology is less than a century old. It emerged slowly from its colonial roots in the region to become a professional field, divided unequally between applied archaeology (for heritage management) and academic archaeology designed to research the past. What in the mid-twentieth century was a largely Euroamerican male profession, it has become a more diverse field, as Southeast Asia-based archaeologists continue to graduate from overseas programs and women enter the field in more significant numbers. With this growth in Southeast Asian archaeology should come more self-reflection about how we work. Yet few archaeologists have considered the role of women in Southeast Asian archaeology, despite the fact that women archaeologists co-founded the regional archaeological association, made some of the region's most spectacular finds, published widely, and currently direct several of the longest-running research programs across the region.

Understanding women's impact on Southeast Asian archaeology requires some historical explanation of the field compared to its western counterparts. In the region, archaeology takes two tracks: a science-based approach (based on Geology) to study paleoanthropology, and a humanities-based approach (to study the rest of the archaeological past). Most Southeast Asian archaeologists are thus trained in fine arts (arts, languages, history), which aligns them more closely with Classical archaeologists and western-trained anthropological archaeologists and

R. Shoocongdej (✉)
Silpakorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
e-mail: rasmi@su.ac.th

M. T. Stark
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI, USA
e-mail: miriams@hawaii.edu

S. L. López Varela (ed.), *Women in Archaeology*, Women in Engineering and Science, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27650-7_25

prehistorians. Like their peers globally, most Southeast Asian archaeologists are employed in heritage management settings in the government sector; academic archaeologists remain a minority. Private commercial archaeology remains rare across Southeast Asia, and women archaeologists work in both academic and non-academic sectors. The region's colonial past explains why the first wave of its archaeologists were predominantly colonial civil servants and nearly all foreign to the country where they worked. Even in this period, women archaeologists made their mark.

Highlighting the research and accomplishments of female Southeast Asian archaeologists is a challenge, largely because their substantial contributions have been under-appreciated. Their efforts were foundational to training generations of archaeologists who now protect and research Southeast Asia's past and are unsung heroes in their own right. Our chapter reviews women archaeologists' contributions to Southeast Asian archaeology historically and holistically, balancing the work of both foreign and Southeast Asian practitioners and tacking between key discoveries and career-long contributions. We place these developments within historical and cultural contexts of Southeast Asian archaeology to understand women's roles, the diversity of perspectives they offer, the barriers that they face, and their remarkable contributions to Southeast Asian archaeology both nationally and internationally.

Historical Contexts of Southeast Asian Archaeology

Southeast Asians have long shared an appreciation for their premodern past, although the notion of archaeology is relatively recent. So is the concept of "Southeast Asia" which was introduced in the mid-twentieth century as a theater of War. With the post-colonial shift in the 1950s, a series of nation-states (eleven at present) collectively comprise Southeast Asia, and their status is codified in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). The entire region is tropical or semi-tropical. It breaks into two sections: a mainland contiguous with China and Bangladesh and an insular or island region bounded by the Philippines to the east and Timor Leste to the south, with multiple archipelagoes and thousands of islands. On large and densely populated like Java (Indonesia) and Luzon (Philippines), paleoanthropologists have recovered some of the deepest evidence of early humans in Southeast Asia.

Before the advent of European colonialism and (later still) archaeology in the region, Southeast Asians used a variety of documentary sources to understand their histories. Written records were both sacred and secular (Buddhist treatises, royal chronicles), and oral traditions were transmitted through chanted epics, legends, and performances. Sacred places also held historical significance to them, as did sacred symbols in Theravada Buddhism (Tunprawat 2009). These sources formed Southeast Asian perceptions of the past and often rested in the hands of local religious authorities and temple literati (who were mostly male; see Shoocongdej 2017).

Not only were relics of the Buddha considered sacred and curated by local monks and monastery patrons. So were archaeological objects, which local people viewed as talismanic. Premodern conservation took the form of architectural restoration, and repairing Buddhist temples – contemporary or ancient – was a form of merit-making (Karlstrom 2009; Shoocongdej 2017). Such veneration of the past was just as clear in island Southeast Asia.

Colonial Roots of Southeast Asian Archaeology

Previous reviews of the history of Southeast Asian archaeology (e.g., Shoocongdej 2017) illustrate European colonial perspectives of Southeast Asia's past. Most considered it shallow and rarely interesting (except, of course, "Java Man"). Colonial scholars viewed descendant populations like Cambodians as dim shadows of their ancestors, whose "lost" and "dead" civilizations far surpassed the modern-day. Out of this regard for the past/disregard for the present grew a series of European-driven antiquaries societies that ultimately stimulated the archaeological study of Southeast Asian archaeology: the Dutch in Indonesia (Batavia Society of Arts and Letters 1778), the British in Malaysia (Royal Asiatic Society 1784; Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 1877), the French in Indochina (École française d'Extrême-Orient [EFEO] 1898), the British again in Burma (Archaeological Survey of Burma in 1902, and finally a Thai-foreigner collective in Thailand (Siam Society 1904). More institutional history can be found in Aung-Thwin (1982, 1), Clementine-Ojha and Manguin (2001), Davis (1989), and Wai Sin 1998).

European reverence for a vanished past -- the hallmark of antiquarianism -- dominated early Southeast Asian archaeology, and the region's earliest museums were created as repositories for "artworks." Few of Southeast Asia's earliest archaeologists had formal training. Instead, most were colonial administrators, like Sir Stamford Raffles (who initiated conservation work at Borobudur), teachers like Paul Lavy and Louis Malleret (school teachers who excavated key Indochinese sites), or civil servants like Jean Commaille (who administrated Angkor). The few trained scholars who made contributions to prehistory were largely geologists, and those who offered insights about historical archaeology were either architectural conservators or art historians, which may explain a largely "Orientalist" approach to explaining the archaeological past (e.g., Genovese 2018, 2019).

However, this fluorescence of antiquarian interest and societies also contributed to the development of Southeast Asian scholarship on the history, archaeology, and sciences of the countries under their rule (Shoocongdej 2011). Trained archaeologists like P.B. van Stein Callenfels worked on Malaysia's and Indonesia's prehistory, H. R. van Heekeren documented Indonesia's prehistory, Olov Janse researched Vietnam, and H. Otley Beyer launched an Anthropology department at the University of the Philippines (Solheim II 1969). Local Southeast Asian scholars also emerged

during this time, from Taw Sein Ko (Burma's first archaeologist [Goh 2017, 111]) to a cohort of 'invisible Cambodians' (Heng et al. 2023) who were responsible for a half-century of restoration at Angkor under EFEO supervision. Southeast Asia's first regional archaeology association, The Far Eastern Prehistory Association, was first organized in Batavia, Dutch of Indies, in 1929; its first Congress was held in Hanoi in 1932 (Genovese 2018, 107–114; Groslier 1957).

Archaeological activity accelerated until Japan invaded Southeast Asia during World War II. Most western colonial archaeologists were imprisoned; some were killed; and — inexplicably — one lived to report discoveries made during his work on the "Death Railway" of Thailand (van Heekeren and Knuth 1967). Despite the halt to archaeological activity from 1941 to 1945, this period proved an inflection point in Southeast Asian archaeology. Southeast Asians grew increasingly interested in using archaeological strategies to build their histories as emerging nation-states (Glover 1999). As the region's countries emerged from colonialism in the 1950s, local education systems developed: and then the Second Indochina War or "Vietnam War" overtook the region (Shoocongdej 2017, 99–100). Within this geopolitical turmoil emerged the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) in 1965 as a regional intergovernmental organization to promote regional cooperation in education, science, and culture across Southeast Asia's countries. Archaeology was also part of its work.

Despite the geopolitical conflict, archaeology continued across the region from northern Vietnam to Java (Kim 2017; Shoocongdej 2017,101–102; Simanjuntak 2017). War-related international economic development drew salvage archaeologists to areas like NE Thailand that were slated for inundation under new Mekong dams (Solheim II and Hackenberg 1961). Locally-led Southeast Asian archaeology came of age under the aegis of SEAMEO, initially envisioned as ARCAFA (Applied Research Centre for Archaeology and Fine Arts) in 1972 with its center in Phnom Penh, and then in 1985 as SPAFA (SEAMEO Program in Archaeology and Fine Arts) in Bangkok, Thailand. As SPAFA was institutionalized, it connected Southeast Asian archaeologists across the region and with foreign archaeologists.

The pace of archaeological research accelerated after the end of the Second Indochina War, and has produced many unexpected discoveries of new empirical data from across the region. Work has become increasingly interdisciplinary, including research by local Southeast Asian archaeologists (Shoocongdej 2011, 713–177). Stakeholders in contemporary Southeast Asia's archaeology world now include academics from within and beyond the region who teach at national universities in every country except Timor Leste. These academics train the majority of working Southeast Asian archaeologists whose employment outside the academy is mainly in governmental agencies responsible for heritage preservation and museums as well as commercial archaeology (Shoocongdej 2011). Increasing numbers of women have entered Southeast Asian archaeology as teachers, researchers, and practitioners.

Major Contributions by Women in Southeast Asian Archaeology

Many women in Southeast Asian archaeology have dedicated their careers to advancing archaeological knowledge through innovative theoretical and methodological approaches. Some have also made the kind of great discoveries that popular archaeology books and magazines feature (e.g., Zuraina Majid from Malaysia or Rasmi Shoocongdej from Thailand). Yet, contributions by women archaeologists in this region transcend conventional indicators like international stature and membership in prestigious organizations. They have impacted their field by constructing new archaeological and artifact traditions, introducing new methodological and theoretical approaches to Southeast Asian archaeology, and founding institutes and regional organizations that undergird the contemporary field of practice. Nevertheless, several factors have rendered them less visible than their male peers, from structural sexism and local cultural norms to specific personalities whose careers have involved concerted efforts to silence female voices.

We begin by discussing some demographics in Southeast Asian archaeology. Hundreds of archaeologists work in most Southeast Asia's countries, except in its smallest countries like Brunei and Timor Leste. Most archaeological professionals are employed in the heritage management sector, with a disproportionate number in government positions. Individual Southeast Asian countries' economic health determines the relative prestige of archaeology as a field and the kinds of students that pursue an archaeology career. Increasing numbers of female students attend college as higher education becomes more important across Southeast Asian countries. In the region's wealthiest countries, bright young women are increasingly directed to professional fields like medicine rather than archaeology. However, even in those countries, the proportion of female archaeologists is rising. This pattern is evident in countries like Thailand, where 15 women archaeologists with Ph.D. degrees are employed in academia and another 47 in heritage management (Fine Arts Department). Women archaeologists with PhDs are active in Cambodia, Myanmar, Philippines, and Vietnam. Male archaeologists work in academia and the federal government but are outnumbered by women with MA degrees. Higher numbers of women working in Southeast Asian archaeology end up employed in heritage management than in academic settings, like in North America (Tushingham et al. 2017).

Despite their growing numbers, women archaeologists' status remains lower than their male peers. Like elsewhere globally (Kim et al. 2022), women researchers have lower chances of securing academic positions than men in every field. In countries like Vietnam, women are required to retire at 55, while men can work until age 60. It shows that Confucian ideology still constrains women's professional advancement in education (Ngoc 2017). Changing normative expectations for women discourage many from specific roles associated with professional archaeology.

Women archaeologists in Southeast Asia face a second set of barriers beyond the linguistic challenges of postgraduate study abroad and recruitment out of archaeology and into high-ranking governmental administrative positions upon their return with postgraduate degrees. Fewer women than men's voices are heard in Southeast Asian archaeology, particularly among local practitioners. One reason may be that most archaeological research written in Southeast Asian vernacular languages is cultural-historical in focus rather than "theoretical" in global terms; the other lies in structural sexism in the archaeological academy, both within Southeast Asia and beyond it. Some women archaeologists, for example, rarely get adequate credit for work that they fully co-direct for most of their professional careers (e.g., Higham and Thosarat 1990).

Substantive Contributions: Important Women Culture Historians

Women's contributions to Southeast Asian archaeology include science-based and humanities-based research. Since these latter fields lie beyond this chapter's scope, we first highlight several women whose substantive contributions built the field and then turn to scholars whose methodological innovations redefined the analytical scales and subjects within Southeast Asian archaeology. Our section concludes by highlighting women archaeologists whose articulation of theoretical frameworks (on multiple periods and subjects) has helped make our field more legible to archaeologists who work outside Southeast Asia. In nearly every case, this work has been minimized or overlooked entirely by the dominant male archaeologists working in the field. The one exception is where we begin: with Dr. Madeleine Colani, whose contributions to the field brought her recognition during and especially after her lifetime.

Madeleine Colani made a more profound impact on Southeast Asian archaeology than any other foreign woman scholar of her time (Colani 1927, 1935). Born in northeastern France in 1866, shortly before the Franco-Prussian war, Madeleine Colani first worked as a primary school teacher in France and – after 1898 – in French Indochina as an *institutrice*. After fifteen years of teaching primary school in Vietnam, she joined the Service Géologique of Indochina. Her next 17 years involved major field-based contributions to mainland Southeast Asia's prehistory: with her younger sister Eléonore as a partner. Madeleine Colani defined Southeast Asia's Hoabinhian period in 1929, co-hosted the first congress of the Prehistorians of the Far East Association in Hanoi in 1932, and published a two-volume monograph on Laos' Plain of Jars in 1935: all after the age of 50 (see Genovese 2019; Ha 2014, 208–210; Källén 2015). Her use of a comparative and ethnographic approach (Colani 1938) distinguished her from most of her peers, whose fine arts approach to the past emphasized epigraphy, art history, and architecture (Källén 2015, 89).

Madeleine Colani's colleagues recognized her accomplishments during her lifetime and immediately after she died in 1943 (Levy 1944; Robequain 1929, 364). Her celebrated legacy continues to the present day.

Most Southeast Asian women archaeologists who have made significant contributions have not been similarly recognized. Thai-born Dr. Phasook Indrawooth, whose lifelong work on Dvaravati-period pottery, is our first example. Born in 1945, she earned her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Maharaja Sayajirao University (India). She spent more than 30 years of her professional career at the Department of Archaeology (Silpakorn University), where she mentored multiple generations of Thai archaeology students (Shoocongdej and Ray 2017, 268–269). She specialized in historical archaeology in an era where foreign archaeologists only valued Southeast Asia's prehistoric past. However, her commitment to publishing in the Thai language for Thai scholars and her meticulous research on the sixth-eleventh century CE Dvaravati period set the standard for subsequent scholars: particularly as general scholarly interest has grown in the archaeology of early state formation in Thailand (Fig. 25.1).

Fig. 25.1 Phasook Indrawooth (center) received her Emeritus Professor from Silpakorn University. (Photo Rasmi Shoocongdej)

Fig. 25.2 Zuraina Majid. (Photo Rasmi Shoocongdej)

Perhaps no Southeast Asian women prehistorian has shaped the field as much as Dr. Zuraina Majid. Malaysia-born in 1944, she earned her Ph.D. at Yale University in 1979. Her doctoral research produced the first systematic work from the West mouth of Niah Cave, Sarawak, after extensive unpublished fieldwork by British Tom Harrisson in the 1950s and early 1960s. Her post-PhD research in the Lenggong Valley (Perak state, Malaysia) helped inscribe it in 2012 as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. She also constructed a broader field program that involved four of Malaysia's states, founded the Center for Global Archaeological Research at the University of Science Malaysia in Penang in 1995, and formerly served as Commissioner of Heritage, the Department of National Heritage, Malaysia (Chia 2017,129; Majid 1982; Fig. 25.2).

Methodological and Theoretical Contributions to Southeast Asian Archaeology by Women

Several women archaeologists working in Southeast Asia since the 1980s have made innovative methodological contributions largely overlooked in favor of later research by male authors, from the use of remotely-sensed and microbotanical data to ethnoarchaeological research techniques. Most Southeast Asian archaeologists

ignored Janice Stargardt's use of remote sensing data in the early 1970s at Satingpra in peninsular Thailand (e.g., Stargardt 1983). The lone exception was Jane Allen's (1988–1989) stinging critique essay, which strikes an odd note since reviews from outside that community identified contributions of the work (Carey 1986). Few archaeologists credit Elizabeth Moore's early analysis of Thai and Cambodian aerial photographs from the Williams-Hunt collection (e.g., Moore 1988) and her subsequent work with JPL-NASA colleagues at Angkor (Moore and Freeman 1997). Yet, such work helped stimulate what is now a multi-decade remote sensing program on water management and landscape archaeology at Angkor. Lisa Kealhofer's multi-decade environmental phytolith and landscape-based research offers new approaches to understanding land-use changes associated with state formation (Kealhofer and Grave 2008). Ceramicists working in several other world regions have adopted Miriam Stark's Kalinga ethnoarchaeological research on ceramic production and social boundaries (e.g., Stark et al. 2000). Karina Arifin's ethnoarchaeological research on prehistoric hand stencils in south Sulawesi offers comparative perspectives on Southeast Asia's tropical rainforests (Permana et al. 2015).

Women archaeologists' field-based work has revised the conventional view of Southeast Asia's Pleistocene as part of a broader "region of cultural retardation" (Movius 1948, 411). Southeast Asia's Pleistocene is deeper and more complex than we thought, which is evident from Sue O'Connor's research on island Southeast Asia's Pleistocene occupation. Working from eastern Indonesia to Timor Leste, her field-based projects have identified a 42,000-year-old occupation east of the Sunda shelf and early pelagic subsistence adaptations in Southeast Asia (O'Connor 2007).

Research by Rasmi Shoocongdej demonstrates that Pleistocene/early Holocene hunter-gatherer mobility was organized differently in tropical environments than in mid-latitudes, where most previous theoretical work had been done (e.g., Shoocongdej 2000, 2006). Katherine Szabó and Sue O'Connor's (2004) synthesize Southeast Asian archaeological evidence to critique Neolithic migration models. Lisa Kealhofer's early to the mid-Holocene forest findings and field weed management practices (e.g., Kealhofer 2003) further illustrate why conventional forager-to-sedentary-farmer models do not fit tropical regions, where people retain varied subsistence strategies after adopting food production.

Women archaeologists have also used field-based research to challenge conventional Southeast Asian paradigms focused on the Three-Age system (e.g., Hutterer 1976; Kanjanajuntorn 2020; White 2017, 68–69). Southeast Asian Neolithic farmers did not abandon other subsistence strategies when they adopted food production: a pattern evident in career-long bioarchaeological research by Nancy Tayles and her many students (Halcrow and Tayles 2011; Tayles et al. 2012). Their research suggests that the timing and nature of Southeast Asian shifts did not follow the conventional European and Near Eastern trajectories. Initial agricultural intensification brought enhanced (not diminished) health (Clark et al. 2014), and little evidence exists for Bronze Age warfare as reflected in physical violence (Domett and Tayles 2006). The region's tropical ecology is one reason, and so might have been long-standing symbiotic relations between foragers and farmers, which Laura Junker has explored in multiple publications (e.g., 2002).

Other women archaeologists have also challenged conventional Eurocentric models of Southeast Asia's Metal Age (White and Hamilton 2009; White and Pigott 1996). Bronze metallurgy, for example, appeared more than a millennium earlier in mainland Southeast Asia than it did in Island regions and – regardless of timing – did not coincide with the kind of warring societies observed in the European Bronze Age. Perhaps ironically, Southeast Asia's most impressive bronze items are large bronze drums and flasks manufactured during the following "Iron Age." Women's research on gender dynamics in the Philippines and Thailand (Bacus 2002, 2007; Barretto-Tesoro 2008, 2013) suggests more equality between prehistoric and precolonial men and women than generally assumed and more gender fluidity than archaeologists believe exists.

With few exceptions, women have dominated the study of complex societies in Southeast Asia for several decades, from research on political economy to state formation. Bérénice Bellina has explored the maritime silk road between the Mediterranean, India, Southeast Asia, and Southeast China Sea (Bellina and Glover 2004; Bellina 2014). Laura Junker has used political economy to frame her career-long Philippines research on coastal/upland exchange systems vis-a-vis external contact (e.g., Junker 1999, 2004). Several women archaeologists, from Janice Stargardt (1990) and Karen Mudar (1999) to Miriam Stark and Alison Carter (Carter et al. 2019; Stark 2006), have studied Southeast Asia's premodern urbanism and early states using comparative anthropological perspectives. These approaches are novel for a region where archaeology is traditionally viewed within the humanities, not the social sciences. Finally, another important topic on heritage studies and the history of Southeast Asian archaeology, Anna Karlstrom has introduced the local Buddhism concept of impermanence to explain heritage conservation in Southeast Asia (Karlstrom 2009). Such work has garnered international attention and begun to move Southeast Asian archaeology onto the world stage in studies of state formation.

Discussion: Trends and Tendencies

Our brief review of women's contributions to Southeast Asian archaeology sketched a historical context for the field and placed women within this frame as historical luminaries and active scholars in the contemporary landscape. Some salient patterns emerged from this exercise. First, most women archaeologists have concentrated on building local archaeological sequences and identifying specific traditions, a kind of historical particularism foundational to knowledge construction that garners little international fame. Few have sought the 'first' and "earliest" finds in human evolution or key technological transitions. Nor have women archaeologists privileged grand narratives or models from Euroamerican archaeological traditions as their male colleagues (see also White 2017, 67–68). Perhaps this focus on foundational

research, rather than celebrity archaeology, partly explains why women's contributions to Southeast Asian archaeology are difficult to see in the literature.

A second reason may be that women archaeologists invest more deeply in service activities than their male peers, including mentoring their students and junior colleagues and institution-building. We have already credited Dr. Zuraina Majid for her work in Malaysian archaeology. Indonesian archaeologist Dr. Satyawati Suleiman not only built the field of Srivijayan studies but served as the Indonesian cultural attaché to India (1958–1961), directed the National Research Center of Archaeology (1973–1977) and organized regional SPAFA workshops on Srivijaya from 1979–1985 (Wolters 1988). Many contemporary Southeast Asian women archaeologists fall into this category, including Dr. Lam Thi My Dzung (National University of Hanoi, Vietnam), Dr. Le Thi Lien (Institute of Archaeology, Hanoi, Vietnam), Dr. Grace Barretto-Tesoro (University of the Philippines), and Dr. Rasmi Shoocongdej (Silpakorn University and this chapter's co-author; see Conrad and Karlstrom 2019). Rasmi Shoocongdej is also the first Southeast Asian female to serve as president of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association. Next, we explore issues unique to women archaeologists working in Southeast Asia and then discuss those issues they share with women archaeologists working elsewhere in the world.

Region-Specific Factors?

We suspect that other factors contributing to women's semi-invisibility in Southeast Asian archaeology may be specific to the region. The first is a *region-wide emphasis on particularistic research instead of comparative social scientific approaches*. This stems from a close historical link between archaeological practice and nationalism in Southeast Asian archaeology (Glover 1999, 2004; Shoocongdej 2011). Because archaeology is taught as a discipline of the Humanities across most of the region, students largely read vernacular literature rather than western-language international peer-reviewed publications. The second is a *persistent bias against historical archaeology in favor of prehistoric "scientific" archaeology that also* limits women's visibility in Southeast Asian archaeology, even those women who direct archaeological field projects. Dr. Le Thi Lien, for example, has contributed to our understanding of first and early second-millennium cultures in southern Vietnam by publishing more than 80 papers (and several books) in both English and Vietnamese (e.g., Le 2011). Dr. Lam Thi My Dzung has directed archaeological field investigations in central and southern Vietnam and published more than 35 publications on Sa Huynh, Cham, and northern Vietnamese civilizations in both Vietnamese and English (e.g., 2011). Thai historical archaeologists like Amara Srisuchat have also published extensively in Thai and English on protohistoric archaeology and art history (e.g., Srisuchat 1998). Indonesia's Mimi Savitri has also made important contributions to recent historical and public archaeology, but primarily in Indonesian,

except for Savitri (2021). Finally, those Southeast Asians who complete postgraduate degrees abroad (and particularly doctorate degrees) are often, upon returning home, recruited for high-level positions outside the archaeology and heritage management sector. Dr. Somsuda Rutnin, for example, earned her Ph.D. degree from the Australian National University and was a former director-general of the Fine Art Department, Ministry of Culture in Thailand.

Commonalities beyond Southeast Asia

Only some of the previous factors may be particular to women in Southeast Asian archaeology, who share other challenges with female peers elsewhere that contribute to their low visibility in the field, including their typical career trajectories from student to archaeological professional. Women have fewer Ph.D. degrees than men, so senior Southeast Asian archaeologists mentor fewer female students than males. Few female archaeology students in Southeast Asia are encouraged to pursue high-prestige specialties that involve leading field-based projects (for American parallel, see Moser 2007) and are instead frequently encouraged to pursue non-field-based technical studies that garner less attention, like ceramics (e.g., Rispoli et al. 2013), beads (Carter 2015), prehistoric textiles (e.g., Cameron 2011, 2017), or ethnobotany (Castillo 2011; Castillo et al. 2016). Consequently, only some female students become senior archaeological field project directors.

Women archaeologists who get academic jobs in Southeast Asia are always in the minority. Also, like their North American peers (Guarino et al. 2017), they are given disproportionate service loads and fewer advancement opportunities. Coupled with these chilly climate issues are challenges with family commitments and a lack of a support structure for working archaeologists who are mothers: factors that create a "leaky pipeline" in Southeast Asian archaeology, in which women leave the field or at least become invisible to the global archaeological audience (see Hamilton 2014; Shelzer and Smith 2014 for Anglophone parallel).

Systemic sexism makes it harder for women than men to pursue archaeological careers in Southeast Asia, both within and beyond the region. A deep tradition of female erasure and exclusion works against women who earn their degrees and enter the field as full professionals. By "erasure," we include the advisors who insist on lead-authoring their student's work, preferentially offer professional opportunities to their male students, and fail to cite women's research on topics they study. Jack Golson's (1998) omission of Madeleine Colani as a founding organizer of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association (he credits only van Stein Callenfels) exemplifies this problem. Excluding women authors from edited volumes on Southeast Asia is another marginalizing tactic.

Active denigration of Southeast Asian women archaeologists also renders them less visible. Janice Stargardt received such treatment for her 1970s field research at Satingpra (e.g., Stargardt 1983). Although most Southeast Asian archaeologists

ignored her work (save Jane Allen's [1988–1989] searing critique), reviewer Andrew Sherratt concluded that "this book deserves to be read" (1984, 430). Southeast Asia historian Peter Carey described it as a "magnificent achievement" (1986, 194). Southeast Asian archaeologists' rebukes of Stargardt intensified with the publication of her (1990) monograph on the Pyu of Burma. Peter Bellwood (1992) criticized her use of the term "urban" to describe Pyu sites, which rings odd given their place in the current dialogue on early Southeast Asian urbanism (e.g., Gutman and Hudson 2004:157–163; Stark 2006). Stargardt refuted Bellwood's multiple technical criticisms patiently and with some humor, in her "Battle of Beikthano" (1993a). Such heated criticism of female archaeologists, often ill-founded and poorly researched (see Bronson 1992 for another example), has rarely characterized debates between male scholars in Southeast Asian archaeology: and marginalizes women scholars in our field (Stargardt 1993b).

Parting Thoughts

Women have made outstanding accomplishments in Southeast Asian archaeology for nearly a century, both discoveries with broad public appeal and foundational work building chronologies, defining tool traditions, and tracing interactional networks. Such work is required to build and maintain our professional field and ensure high-quality historic preservation of the past. We conclude by considering ways to create a more inclusive future where all archaeologists have equal access to telling stories of Southeast Asia's past.

One strategy is to pursue research on the sociopolitics of Southeast Asian archaeology. Presenting time-series data identifies trends in the field that reflect gender-based discrimination, from women's representation as students and recruiting practices to women's representation in research citations and publications. Another is to create social networking and mentoring opportunities to encourage young women to enter and remain in the field. Including early-career colleagues in research projects and publications, and supporting women students in their search for post-graduate opportunities are equally important.

Language barriers remain a stubborn obstacle within Southeast Asia, and many women archaeologists we highlighted published largely in vernacular journals, books, or reports and published in Southeast Asian language publications with restricted circulation (Silpakorn of the Fine Arts Department, Khao Co Hoc of the Institute of Archaeology, Hanoi, Viet Nam). Such regional publications in local languages rarely receive global attention or recognition. Through the professional network, the local and foreign archaeologists can support each other to bridge this language barrier and bring the research done by women Southeast Asian archaeologists to wider audiences. We can take as an example the Japanese and Luce models, which support translation projects from local languages to English and from English to local languages.

Equity issues we highlight in this chapter characterize and transcend gender in Southeast Asian archaeology. Creating a more inclusive field of Southeast Asian archaeology for women requires documentation, acknowledgment, and a commitment to change how we do what we do. Southeast Asian archaeology still holds many secrets, and embracing a broad range of equity practices – in the classroom, in the field, and our workplaces – will help the next generation of Southeast Asian archaeologists, regardless of identity, discover them.

References

Allen, Jane. 1988–1989. Agriculture, Hydraulics, and Urbanism at Satingpra. *Asian Perspectives* 28 (2): 163–177.

Aung-Thwin, Michael. 1982. Burma Before Pagan: The Status of Archaeology Today. *Asian Perspectives* 14: 123–133.

Bacus, Elisabeth. 2002. Accessing Prestige And Power: Women in the Political Economy of Visayan Polities. In *In Pursuit of Gender: Worldwide Archaeological Approaches*, ed. Sarah M. Nelson and M. Rosen-Ayalon, 307–322. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

———. 2007. Expressing Gender in Bronze Age Northeast Thailand: The Case of Non Nok Tha. In *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues*, ed. Sue Hamilton, Ruth D. Whitehouse, and Katherine I. Wright, 312–334. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Barretto-Tesoro, Grace. 2008. *Identity and Reciprocity in 15th Century Philippines*. Oxford: BAR International Series. 1813.

———. 2013. The Changing Meanings of Objects: Calatagan and Archaeological Research in The Philippines. *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 61 (3): 263–296.

Bellina, Bérénice, and Ian C. Glover. 2004. The Archaeology of Early Contact with India and the Mediterranean World, from the Fourth Century BC to the Fourth Century AD. In *Southeast Asia: From Prehistory to History*, ed. Ian C. Glover and Peter Bellwood, 68–88. London: Routledge/Curzon Press.

Bellina, Bérénice. 2014. Maritime Silk Road's Ornament Industries: Socio-Political Practices and Cultural Transfers in the South China Sea. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 24 (3): 345–377.

Bellwood, Peter. 1992. Early Burmese Urbanisation: Inspired Independence or External Stimulus? *The Review of Archaeology* 13 (2): 1–6.

Bronson, Bennet. 1992. Review. The Ancient Pyu of Burma. Vol. 1: Early Pyu Cities in a Man-Made Landscape by Janice Stargardt. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 23 (2): 435–438.

Cameron, Judith. 2011. Iron and Cloth Across the Bay of Bengal: New Data from Tha Kae, Central Thailand. *Antiquity* 85: 559–567.

———. 2017. Matting Impressions from Lo Gach: Materiality at Floor Level. In *New Perspectives in Southeast Asian and Pacific Prehistory*, ed. Philip J. Piper, Hirofumi Matsumura, and David Bulbeck, 357–367. Canberra: ANU Press.

Carey, Peter. 1986. Review. Janice Stargardt, Satingpra I. The Environmental and Economic Archaeology of South Thailand. *Archipel* 31: 193–194.

Carter, Alison K. 2015. Beads, Exchange Networks and Emerging Complexity: A Case Study from Cambodia and Thailand (500 BCE – CE 500). *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 25 (4): 733–757.

Carter, A.K., M.T. Stark, S. Quintus, Y. Zhuang, H. Wang, P. Heng, and R. Chhay. 2019. Temple Occupation and the Tempo of Collapse: A Case Study from Angkor Wat, Cambodia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116 (25): 12226–12231.

Castillo, Cristina Cobo. 2011. Rice in Thailand: The Archaeobotanical Contribution. *Rice* 4 (3): 114–120.

Castillo, Cristina Cobo, Bérénice Bellina, and Dorian Q. Fuller. 2016. Rice, Beans and Trade Crops on the Early Maritime Silk Route in Southeast Asia. *Antiquity* 90 (353): 1255–1269.

Chia, Stephen. 2017. A History of Archaeology in Malaysia. In *Handbook of East and Southeast Asian Archaeology*, ed. Junko Habu, Peter Lape, and John W. Olsen, 125–141. Springer Science+Business Media.

Clark, Angela L., Nancy Tayles, and Siân Halcrow. 2014. Aspects of Health in Prehistoric Mainland Southeast Asia: Indicators of Stress in Response to the Intensification of Rice Agriculture. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 153: 484–495.

Clementine-Ojha, Catherine, and Pierre-Yves Manguin. 2001. *A Century in Asia: The History of the École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1898–2006*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Colani, Madeleine. 1927. L'âge de la pierre dans la province de Hoa-Binh (Tonkin). Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient. Mémoires du Service géologique de l'Indochine, XIV, i, Hanoi.

———. 1935. Mégalithes du Haut-Laos (Hua Pan, Tran Ninh), l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, XXXV, Paris.

———. 1938. Ethnographie comparée. *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient* 38 (1938): 209–254.

Conrad, Cyler, and Anna Karlstrom. 2019. Shoocongdej, Rasmi. In *The Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, ed. C. Smith. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51726-1_3523-1.

Davis, Bonnie. 1989. *The Siam Society Under Five Reigns*. Bangkok: Siam Society.

Domett, Kate M., and Nancy Tayles. 2006. Adult Fracture Patterns in Prehistoric Thailand: A Biocultural Interpretation. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 16: 185–199.

Genovese, Lia. 2018. The Birth of French Research into the Prehistory of Laos. In *Engaging Asia: Essays on Laos and Beyond in Honour of Martin Stuart-Fox*, ed. Desley Goldston, 91–122. Copenhagen: NIAS Press.

———. 2019. Madeleine Colani. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, ed. C. Smith. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30018-0_3436.

Glover, Ian C. 1999. Letting the Past Serve the Present – Some Contemporary Uses of Archaeology in Viet Nam. *Antiquity* 73: 599–602.

———. 2004. Writing Southeast Asian Prehistoric Archaeology: The Western Contributions — from Colonialism to Nationalism. In *Southeast Asian Archaeology: Wilhelm G. Solheim II Festschrift*, ed. Victor Paz, 64–80. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

Goh, Geok Gian. 2017. The History and Practice of Archaeology in Burma. In *Handbook of East and Southeast Asian Archaeology*, ed. Junko Habu, Peter Lape, and John W. Olsen, 111–117. Springer Science+Business Media.

Golson, Jack. 1998. From FEPA to IPPA. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 17: 3–12.

Groslier, Bernard-Philippe. 1957. The Far-Eastern Prehistory Association 1953-1957. *Asian Perspectives* 1 (1/2): V–XI.

Guarino, Cassandra M., M. Victor, and H. Borden. 2017. Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family? *Research in Higher Education* 58: 672–694.

Gutman, Pamela, and Bob Hudson. 2004. The Archaeology of Burma (Myanmar) from the Neolithic to Pagan. In *Southeast Asia: From Prehistory to History*, ed. Ian Glover and Peter Bellwood, 149–176. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

Ha, Marie-Paule. 2014. *French Women and the Empire: The Case of Indochina*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halcrow, Siân E., and Nancy Tayles. 2011. Human Diversity in Mainland Southeast Asia: The Contribution of Bioarchaeology. In *Dynamics of Human Diversity in Mainland Southeast Asia*, ed. Nick J. Enfield, 47–61. Wenner-Gren International Symposium Series. Canberra: Australian National University, Pacific Linguistics.

Hamilton, S. 2014. Under-Representation in Contemporary Archaeology. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 24 (1): 1–9.

van Heekeren, H.R., and Eigil Knuth. 1967. *Archaeological Excavations in Thailand*. Vol. I. Sai-Yok. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Heng, Piphal, Sonetra Seng, and Sotheavin Nhim. 2023. 'Invisible Cambodians': Knowledge Production in the History of Angkorian Archaeology. In *The Angkorian World*, edited by Mitch Hendrickson, Miriam T. Stark, and Damian Evans, 42–63. Routledge Press.

Higham, Charles F.W., and Rachanie Thosarat. 1990. *The Excavation of Khok Phanom Di: A Prehistoric Site in Central Thailand*. Society for Antiquaries of London.

Hutterer, Karl L. 1976. An Evolutionary Approach to the Southeast Asian Cultural Sequence. *Current Anthropology* 17 (2): 221–242.

Junker, Laura Lee. 1999. *Raiding, Trading and Feasting: The Political Economy of Philippine Chiefdoms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Junker, Laura. 2002. Economic Specialization and Inter-Ethnic Trade Between Foragers and Farmers in the Prehispanic Philippines. In *Forager-Traders in South and Southeast Asia: Long Term Histories*, ed. Kathleen D. Morrison and Laura L. Junker, 203–241. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Junker, Laura Lee. 2004. Political Economy in the Historic Period Chiefdoms and States of Southeast Asia. In *Archaeological Perspectives on Political Economies*, ed. Gary Feinman and Linda Nicholas, 223–252. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Källén, Anna. 2015. *Stones Standing: Archaeology, Colonialism and Ecotourism in Northern*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Kanjanajuntorn, Podjanok. 2020. The Three-Age System: a Struggle for Southeast Asian Prehistoric Periodisation. *SPAFA Journal* 4.

Karlstrom, Anna. 2009. *Preserving Impermanence: The Creation of Heritage in Vientiane, Laos*. Uppsala: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Uppsala.

Kealhofer, Lisa. 2003. Looking into the Gap: Land Use and the Tropical Forests of Southern Thailand. *Asian Perspectives* 42 (1): 72–95.

Kealhofer, Lisa, and Peter Grave. 2008. Land Use, Political Complexity, and Urbanism in Mainland Southeast Asia. *American Antiquity* 73 (2): 200–225.

Kim, Lanu, Daniel Scott Smith, Bas Hofstra, and Daniel A. McFarland. 2022. Gendered Knowledge in Fields and Academic Careers. *Research Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104411.

Kim, Nam. 2017. The archaeology of Vietnam. In *Handbook of East and Southeast Asian Archaeology*, ed. Junko Habu, Peter Lape, and John W. Olsen, 79–82. Springer Science+Business Media.

Dzung, Lam Thi My. 2011. Central Vietnam During the period from 500 BCE to CE 500. In *Early Interactions Between South and Southeast Asia: Reflections on Cross-Cultural Exchange*, ed. Manguin Pierre-Yves, A. Mani, and Geoff Wade, 3–16. Singapore: ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute.

Lien, Le Thi. 2011. Hindu Deities in Southern Vietnam: Images on Small Archaeological Artifacts. In *Early Interactions Between South and Southeast Asia: Reflections on Cross-Cultural Exchange*, ed. Manguin Pierre-Yves, A. Mani, and Geoff Wade, 407–431. Singapore: ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute.

Levy, Paul. 1944. Madeleine Colani (1866-1943) et la préhistorie indochinoise. *CEFE* 37: 11–17.

Majid, Zuraina. 1982. The West Mouth, Niah, in the Prehistory of Southeast Asia. Special Monograph No. 3. *The Sarawak Museum Journa*l 31(52).

Moore, Elizabeth H. 1988. Notes on Two Types of Moated Settlement in Northeast Thailand. *Journal of the Siam Society* 76: 275–287.

Moore, Elizabeth H., and Anthony Freeman. 1997. Circular Sites at Angkor: A Radar Scattering Model. *Journal of the Siam Society* 85 (1&2): 107–119.

Moser, Stephanie. 2007. On Disciplinary Culture: Archaeology as Fieldwork and its Gendered Associations. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 14: 235–263.

Movius, Hallam L.J.R. 1948. The Lower Palaeolithic Cultures of Southern and Eastern Asia. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 38: 4.

Mudar, Karen M. 1999. How Many Dvaravati kingdoms? Locational Analysis of the First Millennium, A.D. Moated Settlements in Central Thailand. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 18 (1): 1–28.

Ngoc, Lan Thi Dang. 2017. Insights into Vietnamese Culture of Gender and Factors Hindering Academic Women's Advancement to Leadership Positions. In *Discourses on Gender and Sexual Inequality*, ed. Marla H. Kohlman and Dana B. Krieg, 19–47. United Kingdom and North America: Emerald Publishing Limited.

O'Connor, Sue. 2007. New Evidence from East Timor Contributes to our Understanding of Earliest Modern Human Colonization East of the Sunda Shelf. *Antiquity* 81: 523–535.

Robequain, Charles. 1929. Review of M. Colani: L'Âge de là pierre dans la province de Hoa-binh; M. Colani: Notice sur la préhistoire du Tonkin: deux petits ateliers; une pierre à cupules, stations hoabinhiennes dans la région de Phu Nho Quan. *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient* 29: 361–364.

Permana, R. Cecep Eka, Karina Arfin, and Ingrid H.E. Pojoh. 2015. Ethnoarchaeology of Prehistoric Cave Hand Stencils in South Sulawesi. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies* 3 (2): 173–178.

Rispoli, Fiorella, Roberto Ciarla, and Vincent C. Pigott. 2013. Establishing the Prehistoric Cultural Sequence for the Lopburi region, Central Thailand. *Journal of World Prehistory* 26: 101–171.

Savitri, Mimi. 2021. The Role of Local Wisdom on the Preservation of the Imogiri Royal Cemetery Site. *Berkala Arkeologi* 41 (1): 69–88.

Shelzer, Jason M., and Joan C. Smith. 2014. Elite Male Faculty in the Life Sciences Employ Fewer Women. *PNAS* 111 (28): 10107–10112.

Sherratt, Andrew. 1984. Review of Satingpra I: The Environmental and Economic Archaoelogy of South Thailand. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 50: 430.

Shoocongdej, Rasmi. 2000. Forager Mobility Organization in the Seasonal Tropical Environment of western Thailand. *World Archaeology* 32 (1): 14–40.

———. 2006. Late Pleistocene Activities at the Tham Lod Rockshelter in Highland Pang Mapha, Mae Hong Son Province, northwestern Thailand. In *Uncovering Southeast Asia's Past: Selected Papers from the 10th Annual Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists*, ed. Elisabeth E. Bacus, Ian C. Glover, and Vincent Pigott, 2–37. Singapore: NUS Press.

———. 2011. Contemporary Archaeology as a Global Dialogue: Reflections from Southeast Asia. In *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, ed. Ludomir R. Lozny, 707–729. Springer.

———. 2017. The History and Practice of Archaeology in Thailand. In *Handbook of East and Southeast Asian Archaeology*, ed. Junko Habu, Peter Lape, and John W. Olsen, 97–109. Springer Science+Business Media.

Shoocongdej, Rasmi, and Himanshu Prabha Ray. 2017. Phasook Indrawooth. *Asian Perspectives* 56 (2): 268–271.

Simanjuntak, Truman. 2017. The Archaeology of Indonesia. In *Handbook of East and Southeast Asian Archaeology*, ed. Junko Habu, Peter Lape, and John W. Olsen, 143–150. Springer Science+Business Media.

Solheim, Wilhelm G., II. 1969. H. Otley Beyer. *Asian Perspectives* 12: 1–18.

Solheim, Wilhelm G., II, and Robert A. Hackenberg. 1961. The Importance of Anthropological Research to the Mekong Valley Project. *France-Asie/Asia* 169: 2469–2474.

Srisuchat, Amara. 1998. A Proposed Outline of the Chronology of Early History in Thailand: Dating and Re-Analysis of Data from Recently Excavated Sites in Thailand. In *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1996. Proceedings of the 6th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists, Leiden, 2-6 September 1996*, ed. M.J. Klokke and T. de Bruijn, 99–115. Hull: Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull.

Stargardt, Janice. 1983. *Satingpra I. The Environmental and Economic Archaeology of South Thailand*. Singapore: International Series 158. British Archaeological Reports, Oxford & Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Studies in South-East Asian Archaeology 1.

———. 1990. *The Ancient Pyu of Burma. V. 1 Early Pyu Cities in a Man-Made Landscape*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
———. 1993a. The Battle of Beikthano. *The Review of Archaeology* 14 (2): 26–35.
———. 1993b. Reply to B. Bronson's review. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 24 (2): 340–341.
Stark, Miriam T. 2006. Early Mainland Southeast Asian Landscapes in the First Millennium AD. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 407–432.
Stark, Miriam T., Ronald L. Bishop, and Elizabeth Miksa. 2000. Ceramic Technology and Social Boundaries: Cultural Practices in Kalinga Clay Selection and Use. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 7 (4): 295–331.
Szabó, Katherine, and Sue O'Connor. 2004. Migration and Complexity in Island Southeast Asia. *World Archaeology* 36 (4): 621–628.
Tayles, Nancy, Sian Halcrow, and Natthamon Pureepatpong. 2012. Regional Developments: Southeast Asia. In *Global History of Paleopathology: Pioneers and Prospects*, ed. Jane E. Buikstra and Charlotte Roberts, 528–540. New York Oxford University Press.
Tunprawat, Patcharawee. 2009. *Managing Living Heritage Sites in Southeast Asia*. Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to Department of Archaeology, Silpakorn University.
Tushingham, S., T. Fulkerson, and K. Hill. 2017. The Peer Review Gap: A Longitudinal Case Study of Gendered Publishing and Occupational Patterns in a Female-Rich Discipline, Western North America (1974±2016). *PLoS One* 12 (11): e0188403.
Wai, Sin Tiew. 1998. History of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (JMBRAS) 1878-1997: An overview. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science* 3 (1): 43–60.
White, Joyce C. 2017. Changing Paradigms in Southeast Asian archaeology. *Journal of Indo-Pacific Archaeology* 41: 66–77.
White, Joyce C., and Vincent C. Pigott. 1996. From Community Craft to Regional Specialization: Intensification of Copper Production in Pre-State Thailand. In *Craft Specialization and Social Evolution: In Memory of V. Gordon Childe*, ed. Bernard Wailes, 152–175. University Museum Monograph 93, University Museum Symposium Series 6. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.
Wolters, O.W. 1988. In Memoriam: Satyawati Suleiman, 1920-1988. *Indonesia* 46: 122–125.

Rasmi Shoocongdej is a Professor at the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, Thailand. Her research studies the mobility organization of hunter-gatherers as one mechanism of adaptation in highly seasonal tropical environments. She specializes in late-to post-Pleistocene tropical foragers, Southeast Asian Prehistory, and cave archaeology. She has directed a long-term multidisciplinary project in highland Pang Mapha, northwestern Thailand (between Thailand and Myanmar) since 1998. Her current research in Thailand has three primary foci: heritage management in multi-ethnic contexts, archaeology, contemporary arts, and archaeology as community engagement.

Miriam T. Stark is a Professor at the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa and directs her university's Center for Southeast Asian Studies. Her long-term archaeological research program in Southeast Asia focused on Cambodia's deep history, political economy, and urbanism in the Mekong Delta and Tonle Sap regions. She has focused on Angkorian-period archaeology since 2010 and blends research with capacity-building (particularly for Khmer archaeologists) in her archaeological practice.

Women in Engineering and Science

Sandra L. López Varela *Editor*

Women in Archaeology

Intersectionalities in Practice Worldwide

Springer

Women in Engineering and Science

Series Editor
Jill S. Tietjen, Greenwood Village, CO, USA

The Springer Women in Engineering and Science series highlights women's accomplishments in these critical fields. The foundational volume in the series provides a broad overview of women's multi-faceted contributions to engineering over the last century. Each subsequent volume is dedicated to illuminating women's research and achievements in key, targeted areas of contemporary engineering and science endeavors.The goal for the series is to raise awareness of the pivotal work women are undertaking in areas of keen importance to our global community.

Sandra L. López Varela
Editor

Women in Archaeology

Intersectionalities in Practice Worldwide

Springer

Editor
Sandra L. López Varela
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Mexico City, Mexico

ISSN 2509-6427 ISSN 2509-6435 (electronic)
Women in Engineering and Science
ISBN 978-3-031-27649-1 ISBN 978-3-031-27650-7 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27650-7

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To the daughters, mothers, and wives in our families

Preface

Women in Archaeology joins The Springer Women in Engineering and Science series at the invitation of Jill S. Tietjen, editor of the series. The series aims to raise awareness of the fundamental contributions of women in science and engineering, going deep into their experiences in practicing in an unusual combination of the personal and professional. *Women in Archaeology* extends the series to the social sciences and the humanities with the support of 43 remarkable female archaeologists working in different socio-economic and political environments in six world regions at all levels of their professional careers. The 29 chapters in this volume introduce their research and experiences in practicing archaeology in the Americas, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Australia. In uniting this group of dedicated archaeologists, I made sure to represent the concerns and experiences of those women from less privileged areas in the world. Together, they tell the stories of many women worldwide who dedicate themselves to advancing knowledge and human understanding in academia and the private and public sectors. The authors in this volume celebrate women who are no longer with us, reminding us of their contributions to archaeology at a time when women had almost no voice, nor were they credited for their work by their brothers, fathers, husbands, and male colleagues. Thus, this volume demonstrates that women have always been present in the development of archaeology as a profession.

Despite the vast literature covering women in archaeology, this volume is different. It not only brings together an international group of scholars but also extends beyond gender and feminist approaches to investigate the difficulties of practicing archaeology. Yet, the contributions in this volume debunk the androcentric construction of archaeological knowledge. Indeed, the practice of archaeology has systematically privileged men to a point in which the default history contributes to "mankind," not humankind. However, the volume is not "anti-men." It reminds us that, on many occasions, their actions have managed to obscure the indisputable fact that women have always been in the field while being mothers, sisters, or wives. Practicing archaeology in a world where men have been and continue to be inherently more powerful is not the only challenge to practicing archaeology by female archaeologists.

Closing the gap to empower women and achieve equality in our profession requires far more than a gender perspective. Gender studies are interested mainly in the intersecting categories of age, sex, race, sexuality, and class. However, encountered barriers, as demonstrated by the contributions to this volume, extend beyond gender, identity, and discrimination. Contributors in this volume have referenced a long list of social, economic, and political phenomena affecting the practice of archaeology, including colonialism, poverty, global economics, politics, and even war. These challenges become self-evident when the practice of archaeology is placed at an international level. Therefore, this volume contributes to women's studies in general, not only to gender in archaeology, as it explores many more barriers hindering women in the world of work. Thus, I relied on the concept of intersectionality to introduce the contributions of this group of scholars, for it is a better framework to explain their facing differential micro- and macro-complexities in the practice of archaeology.

In 1989, Kimberlé Crenshaw introduced intersectionality as a legal term to address the constraints and conditions that characterize the subordination of Black women within antidiscrimination and feminist theories and politics. Crenshaw claimed the legal system privileged black men and white women in matters of discrimination, sexism, or racism. Thus, to protect black women from discrimination, it was not enough to consider they were just black, for they faced many other challenges than black men. Like Crenshaw, I, too, believe that addressing the difficulties in the practice of archaeology from a gender perspective is not enough, for women archaeologists are not a homogenous group. The use of intersectionality is meant to appreciate women in archaeology positions differently worldwide regarding existing inequalities in practicing archaeology. Inequality in the practice of archaeology and its varying and interrelated forms of oppression acquire different meanings depending on the social context in which they occur. Ignoring the challenges women archaeologists face in less privileged areas of the world leads to further inequality in the practice of archaeology, if not discriminatory practices, for these are subtle and extend to knowledge production.

Adopting intersectionality as the weaving thread to bring these contributions together in the introduction to this volume intends to describe the many ways female archaeologists from different backgrounds worldwide encounter our profession. The centrism of the West has made us believe that we all share the same living reality or have the same needs. When we step out of our conventional reality, it is easier to diagnose inequality in the practice of archaeology. If we are interested in eliminating power imbalances in the practice of archaeology, we have to acknowledge that others do not share the reality we live in. Many of the challenges described in this volume are shared with western practitioners of archaeology. However, these challenges shape differently when placed in others' social realities. Even if several contributors in this volume originate from impoverished countries or emerging economies, they know their writing originates from a context of privilege not shared by other archaeologists in their own country. Many archaeologists, regardless of gender, are excluded or affected by western academic dynamics, and with this understanding, I insist this volume is not anti-men. However, acknowledging their

situation does not erase the fact that those men still practice archaeology in a setting where they have been and continue to be inherently more powerful.

The use of intersectionality in this volume requests the archaeological community to take others into account when analyzing the status of women in our profession. The authors in this volume have not purposefully embraced intersectionality while addressing the disparities and inequalities in practicing archaeology. Thus, I am solely responsible for introducing their contributions to the theory of intersectionality to acknowledge the different economic, political, and social realities in which women practice archaeology.

Mexico City, Mexico Sandra L. López Varela

About the Editor

Since 2013, I, Prof. Dr. Sandra L. López Varela (Ph.D. in Archaeology, University of London, 1996; RPA 15480), have been a full-time Professor at the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM). Behind where I am now is my parents' history. I am the proud daughter of a civil engineer who attended school barefoot in the early 1920s and a remarkable woman who learned how to read and write later in life. After lifting himself from poverty, my father offered me the best education he could afford. I was privileged to be brought up learning four languages, taking piano lessons, and practicing challenging sports. Disclosing my interest in becoming an archaeologist was not welcomed by my father, for I had to be an architect, an unusual profession for a family forged by nineteenth-century ideas of what a Mexican woman should be. Nonetheless, my daughter Nathalie is now fulfilling my father's dream of having a woman in the family following a "man-oriented" profession.

My eldest sister Araceli (†), an accountant who lived for her family, shared her household income with me to support my B.A. studies in Archaeology. There were hardly any graduate programs and grants in Mexico fulfilling my interests in archaeology. My sister Graciela, a high school teacher, drove me around Mexico City's streets to visit embassies and find grants without much success, but it brought us closer. Since my parents' passing, she has been my most avid supporter.

When the Institute of Archaeology of the University College London accepted my application in 1987 to study an M.A. in Archaeology, my father modestly supported me. Once in London, I soon worked limited hours cleaning toilets and selling hamburgers at MacDonald's on Tottenham Court Road, and later classifying microfiches at a company on Oxford Street to support my graduate studies.

In 1996, I earned my Ph.D. in Archaeology from the University of London with a thesis on Formative Maya ceramics from Belize. Since my graduation did not come with a job, soon after, I applied for a Humboldt postdoctoral fellowship—one of the most prestigious grants a scholar could receive from the German government. I became the first woman archaeologist in Latin America to receive this distinction. At the University of Bonn, I became interested in archaeological sciences and

technology. The Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung remains the center of who I am as a professional.

In 1998, I became a full-time professor at the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos. Supported by the National Council of Science and Technology (CONACyT), I conducted ethnoarchaeological investigations of pottery production technologies at Cuentepec, Morelos. The research experience took me to adopt a critical and analytical stance toward economic and development growth policies to combat poverty in Mexico. Results from these investigations received the Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel-Forschungspreis award of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in 2012, granted for the first time to a Latin American woman archaeologist for her outstanding research accomplishments.

I am a survivor of the violence that took over Morelos, Mexico, which forced me to resign from my position at the university. The scar I carry has given me the strength to continue my research at UNAM with a new mission, preserving Mexico's heritage. In 2015, I developed a mobile application for iOS and Android Devices, México Alternativo, promoting peoples' heritage values (www.mexicoalternativounam.com). My most recent publications critically approach the national and institutional discourses of heritage and ethnicity in Mexico.

My commitment to the discipline has taken me to serve as President and Vice President of the Society for Archaeological Sciences (SAS 2009–2011). After being elected to the Executive Board of the AAA, holding the Archaeology Seat (2011–2014), I became Treasurer of the Sociedad Mexicana de Antropología (SMA 2015–2017) and Secretary of the Archaeology Division of the American Anthropological Association (2018-2020). Additionally, I have served as co-chair of the task force revising the Society for American Archaeology ethics principles (2021–2023).

Now that Springer is honoring me as editor of *Women in Archaeology*: *Intersectionalities in Practice Worldwide*, I am hoping this volume's contributions highlight women's invaluable participation in shaping our profession.

Acknowledgments

Women in Archaeology is the result of a collaborative effort of an international group of female archaeologists who wrote their contributions during the Covid-19 crisis. Therefore, we all share the complications of contracting the virus, losing our loved ones, the emotions of their passing, and those raised by forced confinement. Resilience is what made this volume possible.

I want to extend my gratitude to all the contributors in this volume for their time and dedication, including those who found themselves in unforeseen circumstances and could no longer participate.

Many contributors share their experiences in English as a foreign language. Thus, their writing in English for scientific communication should be highly praised and appreciated.

I am grateful to Jill S. Tietjen for choosing me, a Mexican archaeologist, to lead these remarkable women through the production and editing of this volume, shedding light on the imperceptible challenges female archaeologists face beyond the Western confines. It is an undeserved honor to share their knowledge and experiences for The Springer Women in Engineering and Science series.

Contents