CHAPTER 4

Bourdieu's Fields and Capital in Community Archaeology

An Example from Jordan

Päivi Miettunen
University of Helsinki

Abstract

This chapter discusses Bourdieu's field theory, capital and Habitus as possible theoretical tools for planning and establishing an archaeological community project. Collaboration and cooperation with local communities and stakeholders is acknowledged as an essential part of archaeological projects – not only as a means of decolonising the research field but, overall, to provide an ethical way to create long-term empowerment and benefits for local communities, and to make the research transparent and accessible. Various methods and tools have been proposed and tested for building and assessing community projects, but the heterogeneity of cultures and communities makes standardisation a challenging task. Using the Petra region in Jordan as a case study, I examine how Bourdieu's theories could be utilised in understanding com-

How to cite this book chapter:
Miettunen, P. 2023. 'Bourdieu's Fields and Capital in Community Archaeology: An Example from Jordan'. In *Living Communities and Their Archaeologies in the Middle East*, edited by R. Bonnie, M. Lorenzon and S. Thomas, 65–90. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33134/HUP-19-4.

munity structures, as well as in collaborating and creating long-term benefits before, during and after an archaeological project.

Keywords: community archaeology, Bourdieu, field theory, Jordan, archaeological ethics

Introduction

In the foreword to the 2002 issue of *World Archaeology*, Yvonne Marshall framed community archaeology as the fourth big-picture social context, alongside the nationalist, imperialist and colonialist contexts defined by Trigger (1984) two decades earlier. Over the two decades since then, community archaeology has grown into a central topic of discussion within the field of archaeology. In an attempt to define and describe different types of interactions between archaeologists and communities, scholars have come up with a variety of names. The terminology used is just as diverse as the attempts to define it. 'Public archaeology' can be regarded as the wider umbrella term, which comprises various methods and degrees of engagement (Gould 2016; McDavid and Brock 2015; Moshenska 2017). Other terms include 'engaged archaeology' (Kurnick 2020), 'open archaeology' (Milek 2018; Roberts, Gale and Welham 2020), 'communal archaeology' (Rivera-Collazo et al. 2020) and 'collaborative archaeology' (Tully 2009). Atalay (2012, 47–48) has presented a collaborative continuum, based on levels of community participation and decision-making within projects. The continuum ranges from fully participatory and community-driven partnership (CBPR or community-based participatory research) through community-based consultancy, multivocality and public archaeology ('outreach'), to legal consultations. However, developed in and for the American Indigenous context, its uses are limited (Roberts, Gale and Welham 2020). Moshenska's (2017) list includes seven types, all with varying – and overlapping – methods and goals: archaeologists working with the public (community archaeology), archaeology by the public (amateur archaeology), public sector archaeology (cultural resource management or heritage management), archaeological education, open archaeology, popular archaeology and academic public archaeology.

In North America, especially in connection to the Indigenous communities, and in the UK, collaboration and partnership already had long roots but was traditionally placed under the umbrella of cultural or heritage management, while academic research remained a separate endeavour (Baram 2011; Marshall 2002). A major change took place in the 1980s, when the post-processual movement started to gain ground as a mainstream intellectual framework in archaeology, questioning the role of the archaeologist as an objective interpreter of past realities. Post-processualism emphasised relativism, and regarded the archaeologist as one subjective observer among a plurality of voices and interpreters attempting to understand and read the past (Shakour, Kuijt and Burke 2019; Simpson and Williams 2008; Thomas 2017). This understanding of knowledge production as subjective, contextual and pluralistic process challenged the monopoly status Western archaeology had had in producing and controlling the narratives of the past over local cultures and communities. The history of archaeology was seen in the light of colonialism, as a political endeavour, perpetrating Western values and building the myth of its scientific superiority, and consequently constructing social, cultural and economic structures that patronised and disempowered communities around the globe and disconnected them from their past (de Vries 2013; Hodder 2003; Näser 2019; Smith and Wobst 2005). A new archaeological approach had to be developed. This call for inclusiveness, collaboration and cooperation has resulted in diverse ways of engaging the public.

While archaeologists were focusing on the post-processual discourse, neoliberal philosophy re-emerged in the political and economic fields. From the 1970s onwards, it gained a dominant role in state policies around the globe. Neoliberalism emphasises entrepreneurship, privatisation and an unrestricted free market as means for generating wealth and welfare. Public budgets are subjected to austerity, while the state should not try to regulate or restrict the markets. Thus, the state has no other role in the *laissez-faire* system than maintaining strong policies that enable it. For academia, neoliberal policies have resulted in the decrease of public funding and the need to seek funds from multiple sources. All funding comes with the expectation of gain: taxpayers as well as other funding bodies must be convinced of the utility of projects in return for their investment (Abu-Khafajah, Rabady and Rababeh 2015). Archaeology is not an exception: in order to receive funding, there is an increasing need to convince stakeholders of the 'value' of archaeological research, and in many cases, this value is economic (Gould 2016; Matsuda 2019, 15; Oldham 2017; Simpson and Williams 2008, 73). The commercial value of archaeological finds is of interest to private investors but also to state officials, and even citizens often consider archaeological heritage mainly as an economic asset that increases tourism, creates jobs, and bolsters trade and investment (Burtenshaw 2013, 2017; Baram 2011, 122).

Together, post-processualism and neoliberalism continue to define the philosophical framework of archaeological endeavours around the globe. This trend is also noted in the theoretical models of public archaeology. Some of the models focus on the way archaeologists interact with the 'public', distinguishing between traditional top-down approaches, where the archaeologist has the role of an expert, mentor or guide, and post-processual pluralist or multiple-perspective approaches (Grima 2016; Merriman 2004). Building on the earlier models, Matsuda (2019) has constructed a theoretical model where the focus is on how the approaches relate to neoliberal philosophy. Educational, public relations and pluralist approaches all agree with the neoliberal view on public archaeology and comply with its underlying demand for the economic benefit of archaeological activities. The fourth, critical approach challenges the existing paradigm where archaeology has been harnessed in the service of the markets, revealing and critiquing power structures instead. Matsuda (2019, 17) claims that in order to survive, (public) archaeology must find a middle way between critique and acceptance of neoliberal structures and their expectations.

Scholars recognise that public archaeology exists in numerous, overlapping and divergent forms, making any attempt to provide a full definition inefficient (Moshenska 2017; Thomas 2017). Attempts to categorise communities are challenged (Carman 2011; Damick and Lash 2013; McDavid and Brock 2015) when the concept of 'community' itself is under debate. First, in any situation, archaeologists are not dealing with just one homogeneous community that shares goals, interests and needs. The reality of communities is complex, multidimensional and constantly fluctuating (Damick and Lash 2013; Moualla and McPherson 2019, 20). Second, it is false to assume that a 'community' for a community project pre-exists (Carman 2011, 495). Archaeologists often envision the community as comprising those people who live on or close to the site or have a genetic or cultural relationship to people who lived there in the past (Tully 2003, 15; Marshall 2002). Yet they should not assume that the communities they end up interacting with during a project represent or speak for all of these 'primary' communities (McDavid and Brock 2015, 171). New communities emerge as public archaeology projects are carried out (Mirof and Versaggi 2020, 404). These context-specific and self-defined communities consist of people who consider themselves to have an interest in, a connection to or a 'stake' in the project. Thus, the concept of 'stakeholders' is often used (Carman 2011; McDavid and Brock 2015). Third, archaeologists are also members of various communities and stakeholder groups. They are active subjects involved in power networks, policymaking and community creation, and they should regard themselves as such (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015; McDavid and Brock 2015, 171).

What, then, counts as a successful community project? Reports and studies aim to inform other archaeologists about finished and ongoing community projects, and to highlight the good, the bad and the ugly in these endeavours. These reports are as diverse as the projects themselves (Atalay 2012; Kersel and Chesson 2013; Kurnick 2020; Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015; Näser 2019; Simpson and Williams 2008). However, the lack of strong methodology and sustainability in community archaeology has been widely acknowledged (Burtenshaw 2017; Gould 2016; Roberts, Gale and Welham 2020). As a response, a number of guidelines for 'best practice' have been presented over the decades (Atalay 2012; Greenberg 2009; Roberts, Gale and Welham 2020; Shakour, Kujit and Burke 2019). In the context of the MENA (Middle East and North Africa) region, one such oft-cited guideline was created for a community project in Quseir, Egypt (Moser et al. 2002; Tully 2009). It contains seven key components for collaborative involvement: (1) communication and collaboration, (2) employment and training, (3) public presentation, (4) interviews and oral history, (5) educational resources, (6) photographic and video archive, and (7) community-controlled merchandising (Moser et al. 2002, 229). Finally, especially in the neoliberal context, where proof of increased economic and cultural value is expected in return for investment, an objective, quantitative evaluation and analysis of results is also considered lacking (Oldham 2017, 14).

Thus, community archaeology is being constrained on one hand by its own slowness to produce comprehensive methodology and evaluation of success for projects, and on the other hand by the realities of the collaboration, where the conflicting interests of the various communities must all be taken into account. All the while, the colonial elements are still present within the discipline, and even magnified by the neoliberal ideology that determines the expectations and goals and defines them based on globalised market values. There are many examples of community projects that have failed to do good for local communities and have instead benefited mainly global stakeholders, tourists or limited groups in the region (Abu-Khafajah, Rabady and Rababeh 2015; Brand 2000; Greenberg 2009). A well-intentioned attempt to empower and include groups or communities may result in taking away power from and excluding others (Kurnick 2020; Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015), and the most-pessimistic views on community archaeology see it as nothing but a 'naïve fantasy' (Simpson and Williams 2008, 72).

At the same time, there is a growing consensus that working with, for and by communities is the ethical approach in archaeology. It goes without saying that enthusiastic idealism is not enough to create a sound community project with positive impact. If archaeologists wish to create collaboration and partnership, they need an in-depth anthropological study of the communities involved, their needs and expectations (Hodder 2003; Kersel and Chesson 2013; Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015; Moser et al. 2002; Steen et al. 2010). Still, ethnographic studies alone do not empower communities, nor do they offer ready answers when – not if – conflicts arise and power struggles between stakeholders emerge. The study should produce a 'map', where the underlying potentials, relationships, networks and power structures are visible. When all of these elements are identified and recognised, different potentials can be acknowledged and encouraged, networks utilised, and clashes avoided or mediated. It is possible to analyse these interactions and patterns by using sociological perspective. In the following sections, I will explore Pierre Bourdieu's social theories and concepts as analytical tools for planning community archaeology projects.

Bourdieu's Field, Capital and Habitus

Pierre Bourdieu is considered one of the most influential sociologists of the latter half of the twentieth century. Although his later work focuses on theoretical reflections of social structures, the anthropological foundation of his research was laid during his fieldwork among the Kabyle in Algeria (Bourdieu 1977). All the models and concepts have been extensively debated, elaborated and developed by Bourdieu (1977, 1986, 1989, 1993) and other scholars (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Kuusela 2012; Burtenshaw 2013; Winzler 2014), and it would be impossible to discuss them here in detail. Instead, I will briefly explain some key concepts, which I also consider central to the goal of acquiring a knowledge of the stakeholders, or 'communities', at the start of an archaeological project. These concepts are field, capital (social, cultural, economic, symbolic) and habitus.

Bourdieu's field is a social construct, or an area of action, created by shared fundamental interests, understandings and agreements. The agents in a specific field acknowledge the field's 'currency'. In other words, they agree on the forms of capital present and their relational values within the field and, as a result, position themselves in the field relative to each other according to the weight of the different types of capital in their possession (Bourdieu 1989, 17). Fields, in turn, are positioned in the social space relationally to each other. The structures of the social world – the hierarchies and interrelations – are determined by these configurations (Kuusela 2012, 158). Bourdieu compares fields to games (Bourdieu 1993, 74; Bourdieu and Wacquand 1992, 97–98). Each individual is a 'player' in the game, all players knowing and agreeing upon the rules by which it is played. The players' positions in the game depend on their success in acquiring whatever the rules state is required to advance in the game.

Capital is 'any resource, monetary and nonmonetary, tangible and intangible' (Bourdieu 1986, 243). In capitalist societies, economic capital can be converted directly into money, but in other times and spaces, economic capital can mean camels, goats, fields and their crops, or squirrel pelts. Social capital consists of 'connections' – personal relationships and social networks. These may include social capital acquired at birth – for example, a noble title, or being a member of a prominent tribe – via marriage, or through education, work or hobbies. In specific situations, the capital in possession of these social circles can be added (physically or symbolically) to the person's own capital, thus raising their credentials and influence in the field (Bourdieu 1986, 247). The people in possession of the social capital can also concentrate it in the hands of one individual, who then represents the whole group (Bourdieu 1986, 249). Establishing, maintaining and reproducing social capital often requires time, energy and investment of other capital.

Cultural capital exists in diverse forms depending on the field. It can manifest itself in the institutionalised state, as education, academic degrees and titles, and formal qualifications. In the objectified state, it includes works of art, literature and music, as well as other items seen as having cultural value, such as expensive cars or designer clothing. The embodied state of cultural capital includes knowledge of the field's cultural patterns and histories, as well as behaviour, manners and attitudes. In Western society, it would include appreciation of what is considered 'high culture' – for example, museums, theatre and opera.

Bourdieu calls these 'capitals' because they can be accumulated, and because they are all indications of social power and power relations (Winzler 2014). In certain conditions, they are also exchangeable (Bourdieu 1986, 242). Symbolic capital, on the other hand, does not actually exist as a separate form of capital. Instead, it is created from the other capitals. It can be understood as a recognition of a person's capitals, perceived as legitimate (Bourdieu 1989, 17). Through this legitimisation, symbolic capital becomes the basis for power. Power relations are formed within and across fields, thus creating a web of hierarchies, which are constantly changing as individuals and fields gain or lose their symbolic capital.

Bourdieu (1989, 19) defines habitus as 'both a system of schemes of production of practices and a system of perception and appreciation of practices'. Based on the tacit knowledge of each field, and on the relative 'value' of their accumulated capital, individuals have a sense of their place – and accordingly, of the place of others – in their social fields. People display internal dispositions that they perceive as belonging to their relative position. On one hand, these practices, manners, tastes and goods connect those who occupy similar positions in the field; on the other hand, they separate them from those in different positions. In other words, our patterns of speech, manners, everyday dress, home decoration, holiday destinations, cultural interests and tastes are choices embraced or absorbed based on our position in the field.

Reflecting the habitus through these choices and assessing others through their habitus are unconscious or semi-conscious actions, where the perceived structure is seen as self-evident and taken for granted (Bourdieu 1993, 866–87; 1989, 19). However, while the habitus may appear immutable, dispositions are constantly changing. For example, the tastes and manners of those occupying higher social positions tend to be copied by other groups. Thus, when the middle or lower classes adopt a certain element from the habitus of the elite, members of the elite create new expressions that maintain the distinction between the groups (Kuusela 2012, 159).

The theories formulated by Bourdieu are not alien to archaeological research (Kuusela 2012). In studies of community projects, and especially in relation to neoliberal values, the 'exchange rate' between cultural and economic capital has been frequently discussed (Baram 2011; Burtenshaw 2013, 2017; Merriman 2004), although scholars have also studied social and symbolic capital (Kurnick 2020; Moualla and McPherson 2019; Shackel 2014). However, the types of capital never exist in a vacuum. They, along with the habitus, can be understood only within the context of fields. In order to understand the complexity of the existing social structures, all of these concepts are relevant.

For example, a person enters the field of archaeological science by studying the discipline. Over time, they gain cultural capital, especially in its institutionalised form, through academic degrees, qualifications and positions. Simultaneously, they can increase their social capital via collaboration, active conference participation, mentoring and so on. The interrelatedness of capitals becomes evident in a case where the person proceeds to initiate a new archaeological project. In order to increase their economic capital (finding funds for the project), they must draw on their cultural capital (titles, degrees) and social capital (finding referees for the application, attracting a professional and trustworthy team for the project). A successful result will bring them prestige and recognition, thus increasing their symbolic capital.

However, launching the new project will bring archaeologists into contact with diverse new fields. Some of them – for example, formal state organisations or global funding bodies – are more familiar to the researcher, and some scholars may also be members of these fields. Others – usually known as the 'community' or 'public' – tend to be stranger, especially if the communities in question belong to very different ethnic, cultural or social fields than the researchers. In such a situation, an archaeologist can easily find themselves a 'fish out of water'. In colonialist archaeology, the typical solution would be to superimpose the researcher's own scientific field over the community's fields, ignoring their social structures, capital and habitus. Such a manoeuvre is enabled by archaeologists bringing actual economic capital – some of which may be distributed to the community as payment for labour – and offering the potential to acquire further economic capital in the future if the site becomes a tourist attraction, and also holding symbolic power, often in the form of formal mandates from state organisations and international bodies. As discussed at the start of the chapter, this is hardly an acceptable and ethical way of doing archaeology today.

Case Study: The 'Tribal Field' of Petra

In 2005, I was conducting field research in Petra, Jordan. One day I walked down from the village where I lived to the ancient city, to meet an older woman who was said to be an expert in old folk songs. I found her sitting in front of one of the countless Nabataean tombs carved in the rock, and I spent the afternoon sitting and chatting with her. I soon found out that the tomb was her former home. She had moved there as a young bride, raised her children and lived in the cave until 1984, when the tribe was relocated. As we talked, several tourist groups passed by. Some of the tourists took a quick peek at the cave, but most seemed like they had already seen their dose of rock-carved chambers. Nearly all of them tried to avoid looking at my host or the cheap Chinese trinkets that she had displayed on a blanket next to her. I doubt any of them even realised that they were looking into her home.

Since the visit of Burckhardt to Petra in 1812, and the presentation of his discovery to the Western public, the contemporary communities living in and around the ancient city have also attracted much scholarly interest (e.g., Bienkowski 1985; Canaan 1930; Musil 1907; Simms and Kooring 1996). More recently, Burtenshaw et al. (2019; see also Burtenshaw 2013) has studied the economic capital of the region, though a full mapping of fields and capitals is yet to be made. However, as archaeological research will, without doubt, also be conducted in the Petra region in the future, such mapping could be very useful for both local and international archaeologists. This chapter introduces the region and its people, and provides the setting where a scholar aspiring to conduct a Bourdieusian ethnography can come to understand the fundamentals.

I came to Petra for the first time in 2000 as a member of a Finnish archaeological team whose task was to excavate the Byzantine pilgrimage centre on top of Jabal Haroun, Aaron's Mountain, some three kilometres south-west of Petra. In terms of 'public archaeology', the excavation itself was a traditional endeavour, where the interaction and partnership with the local community was limited to hiring labourers for the excavation and seasonal camp. Public outreach targeted the audience in Finland, with a museum exhibition, lectures, and guided tours to Jordan. However, the project plan also expressed an interest in understanding the significance and role of the mountain to the contemporary communities of the region. Over the years, I assumed the major role in this part of the project, studying the ethnographic material and oral traditions. Thus, the observations presented here are the result of interviews and participant observation among the local tribes during several visits to the Petra region over the past two decades (Miettunen 2021).

There are actually three main tribes inhabiting the Petra area. The modern town of Wadi Musa, in the past also known as Elji, is home to several subtribes of the Liyathne. The perennial spring (Spring of Moses) provided water for the tribe's fields, gardens, and flocks of sheep and goats. Members of the tribe also live along the 'Scenic Road' leading south from Wadi Musa, as well as in the town of Al-Taybe, approximately seven kilometres south. The Bedul, on the other hand, used to live within ancient Petra, utilising the natural caves and carved Nabataean tombs as their dwellings. The Bedul herded goats and sheep, but starting with the great land reform in 1933, they also established gardens and fields in the wadis surrounding Petra. The third tribe, the ʿAmarin, consider themselves to be descendants of the Bani ʿAtiya, moving from the Hijaz into Palestine and staying near Gaza until they were forced to move east across Wadi Araba. In the nineteenth century, a member of the tribe called ʿAwwad bought land in Beidha and was later followed by many of his relatives, whose descendants still live in that region. Members of the tribe have also settled in other villages, including Qurayqira at the western end of Wadi Faynan. A visitor passing through the region may also meet the Saʿidiyin, who traditionally herded camels in Wadi Araba but whose territories became divided by modern borders. Many have settled down into villages, such as Risha and al-Rajif.

Among the tribes, economic capital has been, and remains, unequally distributed. The uneven opportunity to profit from tourism business – or archaeological projects – is one of the big reasons for growing inequality. This causes a number of problems, from drug use and domestic abuse to resentment between tribes and clans. The availability of opportunities partly depends on location, but cultural and social capital has also played a significant role in the matter. The Liyathne not only possess a good location for extensive farming, but they have been able to sell their products to the pilgrims travelling the Hajj route to Mecca, and to the other towns in the region, such as Maʿan and Kerak. The Hijaz railway, completed in 1908, also provided economic opportunities for the Liyathne and tribes residing further east. At the same time, the Bedul suffered from poverty, Turkish raids and droughts, and their numbers eventually decreased to about 150.

Eventually, both tribes were affected by growing tourism. Tense relationships existed between Liyathne and Bedul, as the former had the advantage of being situated right in front of the entrance to Petra, with direct control over the tourist trade. The second half of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century have been periods of increasing tourism and archaeological activity in Petra. Wadi Musa has grown into a tourist centre with numerous hotels, restaurants and souvenir shops, and the people have settled permanently into modern houses. The Bedul, on the other hand, were relocated in 1984 to the village of Umm Sayhoun, north of the Petra Valley, out of the way of the growing number of tourists. The area allocated to the tribe was not large enough to sustain the rapid expansion of the population. While some of the members of the tribe have chosen to reside in tents and caves on the fringes of the national park and in Beidha, most now live in permanent houses in Umm Sayhoun and heavily depend on tourism as their main source of income. The Bedul still consider the ancient city of Petra the ancient home of the tribe. The old family caves are now reused as coffee shops and souvenir stalls. The ʿAmarin, who live in the outskirts of Petra, have not had as great an opportunity to profit from tourism. They have sold drinks and souvenirs to a small trickle of tourists who pass by for a quick visit to ‘Little Petra’, and recently they have also established tourist camps and organised ‘Bedouin nights’ for tourist groups in their area. The Saʿidiyin, on the other hand, still have little contact with tourists, or with the economic opportunities created by tourism.

Inequality is also increasing within tribes. For example, some Bedul families have been able to mobilise their social capital (especially Western connections) to expand their tourism businesses. Families own tourist camps as far away as Wadi Rum, where Syrian refugees have been employed since 2011. The emerging middle class of Petra is also building villas decorated with Nabataean-style reliefs and columns (Figure 4.1). This cultural-capital-turned-habitus has become common among wealthy Jordanians, and such lavish houses are found around the country, especially in the elite suburbs of Amman (Jacobs and Porter 2009, 78–79).

During busy seasons, Petra’s tourism provides income for a large number of families. Women and girls sell souvenirs and tea, boys and young men offer camel and donkey rides and learn multiple languages while socialising with the tourists. The expectations of tourists have even affected the habitus of these men: apparently, one visitor believed that a local Bedouin looked like the character Jack Sparrow in the *Pirates of the Caribbean* films. As

Figure 4.1: Nabataean tombs in Petra. The architectural features have become inspiration for Jordanian middle- and upper-class homes.
(Photo: Janne Hägglund.)

a result, more and more young Bedul men began wearing heavy eye makeup, along with headscarves and dreadlocks or braids. For these men, a day's work with a donkey or camel provided them with a good salary. When I met them at Jabal Haroun, they admitted that the work at the excavations paid much less than what they would earn in Petra. They seemed to join for the sake of social interaction, or a change of scene.

However, not all local workers had that kind of luxury. I also encountered poorer members of Bedul and Saʿidiyin for whom the salary paid at the excavations was vitally important. Many of them were elderly men, who experienced challenges in adapting to modern life. As the people become more sedentary, the traditional cultural capital of the Bedouin – the knowledge of living in and from the arid natural environment – becomes less relevant. Simultaneously, formal education gains an increasing role as cultural capital. The tribes have become aware of the negative notions that others have of them. The Bedul girls I interviewed believed that by educating themselves they would set a new example and change the old opinions. They wanted to show that the Bedouin are not ignorant and uneducated people without culture. This was evident also in my fieldwork in Lebanon in 2018, where the people frequently emphasised how the tribes nowadays have members in universities, working as doctors, lawyers, politicians – that they are not ignorant and poor. Awareness of 'formal' histories has also made people very careful when giving information. Many times, when interviewing people, they would make a phone call to check the information they were providing – usually contacting a sheikh or academic member of the tribe for verification.

Both the Liyathne and the Bedul claim to be descended from the ancient inhabitants of the region. The Bedul usually state that they were originally part of the Huwaytat – a prominent South Jordanian tribal confederation – and are of Nabataean origin. In turn, the Liyathne mention literary sources attesting to their presence in the region already in the Middle Ages, and quite probably even earlier. For the people in Petra, the Nabataeans, as tribal Arabs who built and ruled a vast trading kingdom, provide another dimension for their Bedouin identity. Nabataeans are ancestors they can be proud of, whereas many other nations and empires of the past have little connection or emotional meaning to the people today – they see Romans, Greeks, Crusaders, Turks and the British as outsiders.[1]

Field Meets the Field: Using Bourdieu As a Theoretical Tool in Community Archaeology

My case offered only a small glance into the diverse realities of the local fields, yet even such a short presentation provides concrete examples of various capitals and their relations, expressions of habitus, and networks of power. The fields become increasingly complex when other stakeholders, such as global institutions, state organisations, international entrepreneurs, NGOs and others, are added to the mix. The national discourse of Jordan is characterised by an ambivalent situation, as the state today is under pressure to develop, to modernise and keep up with the speed of global change. Neoliberal rhetoric has gained much ground, and global funding bodies have become important stakeholders in local economic and heritage building projects (Abu-Khafajah, Rabady and Rababeh 2015).

Petra itself is an interesting case, as it is often regarded as a kind of economic success story in Jordan and at many other sites, archaeologists have to deal with unrealistic expectations created by the 'Petra syndrome' (Burtenshaw et al. 2019). In Jordanian law there is a statutory partition of sites and objects into pre-eighteenth-century 'antiquities' (*athar*) and the younger 'heritage' (*turath*). Many of Jordan's contemporary tribes arrived from the Arabian Peninsula during and after the eighteenth century, and thus 'heritage' is connected to their own past. For a nation to exist, it must build a 'heritage', a narrated common past that unifies its inhabitants and creates a sense of identity. For Jordan, the Bedouin heritage was a conscious choice: the steppe and the nomads became the foundation of the Jordanian national narrative and identity. This became the cultural capital of the Jordanian tribal communities. Archaeology, and antiquities, on the other hand, came to be seen mostly as foreign creations, for (Western) tourists and the local elite (Ababneh 2016, 59; Jacobs and Porter 2009, 74–75). Their value for the communities is in the economic capital they can potentially produce.

Attempts to understand all of the interrelations, power structures, and visible and invisible capital in the fields can easily feel overwhelming, with the various skills needed for the task going beyond archaeologist's training (Burtenshaw 2019; Gould 2016). In addition to being experts in their own profession, expectations of collaboration can add pressure on archaeologists to also become anthropologists, economists and political scientists with a business orientation. Another option – depending on the budget – would be to expand archaeological projects to include scholars and experts from these various fields (Hodder 2003, 66; Richardson and Almansa-Sánchez 2015, 204).

But despite the complexity, knowledge of the fields and the capitals involved can in the long run help to make archaeologists' work feel less arbitrary and frustrating, as they become familiar with the underlying structures, conflicts and interests. As an analytical tool, this framework can give clarity on three issues:

- understanding the local 'field': for example, the power relations of the region and its communities, as well as finding out which parties possess symbolic power;
- determining various 'capitals' present in the field, which can result in sharing and giving room to the local cultural and social capital as a part of the project;
- reflexivity: awareness of the archaeologists' and team's own dispositions in the field, as one of the subjects possessing various capital and habitus.

Power relations and hierarchies exist within and between the fields. They should not be disregarded as irrelevant, as individuals are always interested in increasing their capital. Archaeologists have the potential power to create new cultural capital as a project progresses, but within the neoliberal context, the cultural capital of ancient or heritage sites is expected to be converted into economic capital. Unfortunately, there is often a great imbalance between the reality and the expectations, which needs to be addressed from the beginning (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015; Näser 2019, 384).

Researchers must find a way to merge the fields in order to create a new field for the project, which requires archaeologists to be willing to share and acknowledge different capital and renegotiate power relations. This means that the data collection and knowledge production in the project needs to be transparent. Objects found on the site are often taken elsewhere for study, never to be seen or heard of again by the community. Milek (2018) suggests doing as much of the lab work as possible on the site, allowing everyone to know what happens to the objects.

Lorenzon and Zermani (2016) present a concrete example of acknowledging local social and cultural capital. During the archaeological work at Tell Timai in Egypt, the local professional mudbrick maker and his apprentice were hired for the project. The use and distribution of his knowledge benefited both the project and the community. In any community project, one of the goals in understanding the local field should be to learn about local knowledge, interests and expertise. Many local workers employed in archaeological excavations may have years, even decades, of experience. Yet, this experience is often given little to no recognition. In marginalised communities, employing people based on poverty and personal needs may feel like a charitable thing to do, but in the long run it may end up only enforcing the colonial structures.

By providing means of recognising the expertise and skill of local people, projects can build paths for them to increase their social and cultural capital – and gain symbolic power – within the field, thus raising the value of archaeological knowledge in communities. This could also include opportunities to train and advance careers (Moualla and McPherson 2019, 5). A person interested in traditional construction or conservation, for example, could assist the team's conservator, or vice versa, as in the case of Tell Timai, or the project budget could include funding for a local student's studies in archaeology.

Turning to the local experts for information about the landscape and land use, such as water sources and their maintenance, travel routes, or locations of fields and pastures, can provide archaeologists with a much more diverse understanding of a site in a wider context (see Figure 4.2). Listening to oral traditions and learning from local communities can be highly beneficial, and this approach has been successfully utilised, for example, in conservation biology (Fernández-Llamazares and Cabeza 2018, 4). Archaeologists studying prehistoric sites are also collecting this type of knowledge (Damick and Lash 2013, 147), but such data can be equally significant in archaeological research and site management regardless of the time period (Ababneh 2016, 41). However, while information about heritage, the environment and the landscape is collected from members of the community, they

Figure 4.2: To local people, heritage sites carry meanings and significance that differ from a scholarly viewpoint. In 2018, women from a Jordanian family belonging to the Bani Khalid tribe visited the Byzantine ruins at Umm al-Jimal to collect *khubbeza*. Mallows grow as common weeds in the region, and the women mentioned old ruins as good places to find them. The plant is a staple food, cooked and served with bread.
(Photo: Päivi Miettunen.)

should not be seen as relics of the past, frozen in time (de Vries 2013, 137; Hodder 2002). A comprehensive understanding of the cultural capital in the field can also bring to light the kind of capital that is not valued by all in the community but can be given a voice by the archaeologists. This may include the oral traditions of marginalised groups, including women and children (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2015).

Conclusion

Studying social structures and creating a 'social topography' should be part of project plans – and budget plans – from the beginning. Having such a map at hand can help significantly in later phases, when understanding the underlying structures of power can provide solutions for different situations and challenges. Taking into account all forms of capital may enable archaeologists to find a balance between satisfying the economic expectations of stakeholders and criticising neoliberal policies and underlying power structures. Understanding the role of economic capital is crucial in this endeavour (Kurnick 2020, 690). Archaeologists may wish to empower communities by focusing on cultural and symbolic capital, but they also need to acknowledge that economic capital is not separate from the other two. The questions that archaeologists need to ask include: who really has symbolic power in the project, whose cultural capital can be acknowledged, and who collects the economic capital at the end? Excluding local communities, lack of respect and empty promises are not the kinds of things archaeologists would want to have to write about in their community project reports. If there is economic potential in the project, that needs to be explored with and by the communities involved. Equally, if the project has no resources to create a community-empowering, sustainable project with high gains, those responsible for it need to be clear about this and to define their goals and processes accordingly from the beginning.

Notes

1 Steen et al. (2010, 166–67) mention a similar connection between the modern inhabitants of Dhiban and the Iron Age kingdom of Moab. The people see Moab as a tribal state of shepherd nomads, and thus as similar to themselves. On the other hand, they expressed no such connection to the Nabataeans.

References

Ababneh, A. 2016. 'Heritage Management and Interpretation: Challenges to Heritage Site-Based Values, Reflections from the Heritage Site of Umm Qais, Jordan'. *Archaeologies* 12 (1): 38–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-016-9290-6.

Abu-Khafajah, S., R.A. Rabady and S. Rababeh. 2015. 'Urban Heritage "Space" under Neoliberal Development: A Tale of a Jordanian Plaza'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21: 441–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2014.945615.

Atalay, S. 2012. *Community-Based Archaeology: Research with, by, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Baram, U. 2011. 'Archaeology in the Public Interest: Tourist Effects and Other Paradoxes That Come with Heritage Tourism'. In *Ideologies in Archaeology*, edited by R. Bernbeck and R.H. McGuire, 107–29. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Bienkowski, P. 1985. 'New Caves for Old: Beduin Architecture in Petra'. *World Archaeology* 17 (2): 149–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1985.9979959.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. 1989. 'Social Space and Symbolic Power'. *Sociological Theory* 7 (1): 14–25. https://doi.org/10.2307/202060.

Bourdieu, P. 1986. 'The Forms of Capital'. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. Richardson, 241–58. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and L. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brand, L. 2000. 'Resettling, Reconstructing and Restor(y)ing: Archaeology and Tourism in Umm Qays'. *Middle East Report* 216: 28–31. https://doi.org/10.2307/1520213.

Burtenshaw, P. 2017. 'Economics in Public Archaeology'. In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, edited by G. Moshenska, 31–42. London: UCL Press.

Burtenshaw, P. 2013. 'The Economic Capital of Archaeology: Measurement and Management'. PhD thesis, University College London. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vxm8r7.7.

Burtenshaw, P., B. Finlayson, O. El-Abed and C. Palmer. 2019. 'The DEEP-SAL Project: Using the Past for Local Community Futures in Jordan'. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 21: 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13505033.2019.1638669.

Canaan, T. 1930. 'Studies in the Topography and Folklore of Petra'. *Journal of Palestine Oriental Studies* 9: 136–218.
Carman, J. 2011. Stories We Tell: Myths at the Heart of 'Community Archaeology'. *Archaeologies*, 7 (3): 490–501. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-011-9180-x.
Damick, A. and A. Lash. 2013. 'The Past Performative: Thinking through the Azraq Community Archaeology Project'. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 76: 142–50. https://doi.org/10.5615/neareastarch.76.3.0142.
De Vries, B. 2013. 'Archaeology and Community in Jordan and Greater Syria: Traditional Patterns and New Directions'. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 76: 132–41. https://doi.org/10.5615/neareastarch.76.3.0132.
Fernández-Llamazares, Á. and M. Cabeza. 2018. 'Rediscovering the Potential of Indigenous Storytelling for Conservation Practice'. *Conservation Letters* 11 (3): 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12398.
Gould, P.G. 2016. 'On the Case: Method in Public and Community Archaeology'. *Public Archaeology* 15: 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2016.1199942.
Greenberg, R. 2009. 'Towards an Inclusive Archaeology in Jerusalem: The Case of Silwan/The City of David'. *Public Archaeology* 8: 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1179/175355309X402745.
Grima, R. 2016. 'But Isn't All Archaeology "Public" Archaeology?' *Public Archaeology* 15: 50–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2016.1200350.
Hodder, I. 2003. 'Archaeological Reflexivity and the "Local" Voice'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 76 (1): 55–69. https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2003.0010.
Jacobs, J. and B. Porter. 2009. 'Excavating *Turath*: Documenting Local and National Heritage Discourses in Jordan'. In *Ethnographies and Archaeologies: Iterations of the Past*, edited by L. Mortensen and J. Hollowell, 71–88. Gainesville: University Press of Florida
Kersel, M.M. and M. Chesson. 2013. 'Tomato Season in the Ghor Es-Safi: A Lesson in Community Archaeology'. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 76: 159–65. https://doi.org/10.5615/neareastarch.76.3.0159.
Kurnick, S. 2020. 'The Contradictions of Engaged Archaeology at Punta Laguna, Yucatan, Mexico'. *Heritage* 3: 682–98. https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage3030039.
Kuusela, J.-M. 2012. 'Style as Distinction: Burials Reflecting Distinction and the Development of Social Stratification of the Iron Age Elites of Southern Ostrobothnia, Finland'. In *Archaeology of Social Relations: Ten Case Studies by Finnish Archaeologists*, edited by T. Äikäs, S. Lipkin and A.K. Salmi, 155–80. Oulu: University of Oulu.
Kyriakidis, E. and A. Anagnostopoulos. 2015. 'Archaeological Ethnography, Heritage Management, and Community Archaeology: A Pragmatic Approach from Crete'. *Public Archaeology* 14: 240–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2016.1221988.

Lorenzon, M. and I. Zermani. 2016. 'Common Ground: Community Archaeology in Egypt, Interaction between Population and Cultural Heritage'. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 3: 183–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2016.1207833.

Marshall, Y. 2002. 'What Is Community Archaeology?' *World Archaeology* 34 (2): 211–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/0043824022000007062.

Matsuda, A. 2019. 'A Consideration of Public Archaeology Theories'. In *Public Archaeology: Theoretical Approaches and Current Practices*, edited by I. Gürsu, 13–19. London: British Institute at Ankara/Oxford: Oxbow Books.

McDavid, C. and T.P. Brock. 2015. 'The Differing Forms of Public Archaeology: Where We Have Been, Where We Are Now, and Thoughts for the Future'. In *Ethics and Archaeological Praxis*, edited by C. Gnecco and D. Lippert, 183–95. New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1646-7_11.

Merriman, N. 2004. 'Introduction: Diversity and Dissonance in Public Archaeology'. In *Public Archaeology*, edited by N. Merriman, 1–17. London: Routledge.

Miettunen, P. 2021. *Our Ancestors Were Bedouin. Memory, Identity and Change: The Case of Southern Jordan*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.

Milek, K. 2018. 'Transdisciplinary Archaeology and the Future of Archaeological Practice: Citizen Science, Portable Science, Ethical Science'. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 51: 36–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/00293652.2018.1552312.

Mirof, L.E. and N.M. Versaggi. 2020. 'Community Archaeology at the Trowel's Edge'. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 8 (4): 398–408. https://doi.org/10.1017/aap.2020.28.

Moser, S., D. Glazier, J.E. Phillips, L. Nasser el Nemr, M.S. Mousa, R.N. Aiesh, S. Richardson, A. Conner and M. Seymour. 2002. 'Transforming Archaeology through Practice: Strategies for Collaborative Archaeology and the Community Archaeology Project at Quseir, Egypt'. *World Archaeology* 34 (2): 220–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/0043824022000007071.

Moshenska, G. 2017. 'Introduction: Public Archaeology as Practice and Scholarship Where Archaeology Meets the World'. In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, edited by G. Moshenska, 1–13. London: UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vxm8r7.

Moualla, Y. and G. McPherson. 2019. 'Making Change towards Inclusive Societies: The Soft Power of Community Archaeology in Building Cultural Heritage in Mozan, Syria'. *Sustainability* 11 (17): 4670. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174670.

Musil, A. 1907. *Arabia Petraea II*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder.

Näser, C. 2019. 'Exploring Attitudes towards the Archaeological Past: Two Case Studies from Majority Muslim Communities in the Nile

Valley'. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 19 (3): 379–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469605319867194.

Oldham, M. 2017. 'Bridging the Gap: Classification, Theory and Practice in Public Archaeology'. *Public Archaeology* 16: 214–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/14655187.2017.1499398.

Richardson, L.J. and J. Almansa-Sánchez. 2015. 'Do You Even Know What Public Archaeology Is? Trends, Theory, Practice, Ethics'. *World Archaeology* 47 (2): 194–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2015.1017599.

Rivera-Collazo, I., C. Rodríguez-Franco, J. Garay-Vázquez, H.M. Rivera-Claudio and R. Estremera-Jiménez. 2020. 'Towards a Definition and Practice of Communal Archaeology: Ethics, Informal Learning, and Citizen Science in the Practice of Indigenous Archaeology'. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 7: 120–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/20518196.2020.1712002.

Roberts, H., J. Gale and K. Welham. 2020. 'A Four Stage Approach to Community Archaeology, illustrated with case studies from Dorset, England'. *Internet Archaeology* 55. https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.55.6.

Shackel, P.A. 2014. 'Stakeholders and Community Participation'. In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by C. Smith. New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0465-2_389.

Shakour, K.E., I. Kuijt and T. Burke. 2019. 'Different Roles, Diverse Goals: Understanding Stakeholder and Archaeologists Positions in Community-Based Projects'. *Archaeologies* 15 (3): 371–99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11759-019-09380-9.

Simms, S. and D. Kooring. 1996. 'The Bedul Bedouin in Petra, Jordan. Traditions, Tourism and an Uncertain Future'. *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 19: 22–26.

Simpson, F. and H. Williams. 2008. 'Evaluating Community Archaeology in the UK'. *Public Archaeology* 7: 69–90. https://doi.org/10.1179/175355308X329955.

Smith, C. and H.M. Wobst. 2005. *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonising Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Steen, D., J. Jacobs, B. Porter and B. Routledge. 2010. 'Exploring Heritage Discourses in Central Jordan'. In *Controlling the Past, Owning the Future: The Political Uses of Archaeology in the Middle East*, edited by R. Boytner, L. Dodd and B. Parker, 159–77. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1jf2cjh.12.

Thomas, S. 2017. 'Community Archaeology'. In *Key Concepts in Public Archaeology*, edited by G. Moshenska, 14–30. London: UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vxm8r7.6.

Trigger, B.G. 1984. 'Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonist, Imperialist'. *Man* (New series) 19 (3): 355–70. https://doi.org/10.2307/2802176.

Tully, G. 2009. 'Ten Years On: The Community Archaeology Project Quseir, Egypt'. *Treballs d'Arqueologia* 15: 63–78.

Winzler, T. 2014. 'Pierre Bourdieu's Field Theory and Its Use for Understanding the Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Objects'. Working paper. Accessed 10 September 2022. https://traffickingculture.org/app/uploads/2014/04/Winzler2014.pdf.