

LOOKING FORWARD BY STUDYING THE PAST IN EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN ARCHAEOLOGY: THE NEXT 50 YEARS

Miriam Stark

Department of Anthropology, University of Hawaii, miriams@hawaii.edu

INTRODUCTION

I am pleased to contribute this discussion to the collection of articles resulting from Nam Kim and Alison Carter's 2013 conference entitled, "Recent Advances in the Archaeology of East and Southeast Asia." Participants introduced recent archaeological research from East and Southeast Asia that addressed a wide range of issues from every time period and major artifact class under archaeological study. As the conference's keynote speaker, I sought overarching themes and offered a vision for East and Southeast Asian archaeology's next 50 years. Upon reflection, variability is the first most important theme of the Wisconsin conference papers: many participants offered new approaches, and several challenged conventional wisdom.

How do we move from this eclectic field of study to prognostication, particularly at a time when so many of the field's most influential scholars are retiring (and some have now died)? Looking backward in time generates some institutional memory, which is essential for looking forward. Nearly three decades of internal critique within archaeology has underscored the need to understand social and political contexts that affect archaeological practice at any point in time. Accordingly, I start my discussion fifty years before the published JIPA papers appeared in 2015. I then review major themes in the conference papers, and discuss future directions.

LOOKING BACK IN TIME

East and Southeast Asia in 1965 was a dynamic and turbulent world for its inhabitants and for the world at large. China, and its emergent (Great Proletarian) Cultural Revolution, lay at the region's center. Following the five-year, catastrophic Great Leap Forward project Mao Zedong sought to consolidate power and convert China into a modern industrialized state. By the end of 1965, China's Central Committee of the Communist Party officially approved the definitive edition of *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung*, with the goal of reaching 99 percent of China's people. Against this backdrop, Japan and Korea normalized diplomatic and economic relations through an official agreement that became effective as of December 18, 1965, as Tokyo's population surpassed New York City to become the largest city in the world.

Southeast Asia's context was no less dynamic in the Cold War world: new countries (like Brunei and Singapore) emerged from their colonial beginnings; Ferdinand E. Marcos was first inaugurated on Dec 30, 1965 and would steer the Philippines for the next two decades; and Major General Suharto led the Indonesian government's three-year pushback against a putatively communist coup that would kill between 500,000 and one million communists, ethnic Chinese and alleged leftist Indonesian citizens. The United States escalated its military involvement in Indochina and began plans to triple the number of American troops in Vietnam to 400,000. This engagement, which continued for a decade, drew many Western countries into the fray and plunged much of mainland Southeast Asia into political turmoil that took decades to calm down.

Western countries were also gripped by political events in 1965 that forced social transformations: from Civil Rights marches, urban riots (Watts) and assassinations (Malcolm X) pushed Americans toward more equitable voting rights legislation and resistance to international intervention. The passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) not only reversed decades of exclusion and restrictive immigration into the United States: it brought millions of East and Southeast Asians onto American shores. Similar changes in immigration law in Australia and New Zealand over the next decade changed the complexion of these three Western countries whose academics have worked with their Asia-based colleagues to transform the face of East and Southeast Asian archaeology.

EAST AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN ARCHAEOLOGY IN 1965

East and Southeast Asian archaeology's practitioners lived within, and were affected by, these dynamic contexts. The Cultural Revolution slowed Chinese archaeological research progress and involved internal criticism, but China's archaeologists embraced radiocarbon dating in 1965 (Chang 1977:627). Debate persists regarding whether this period constituted Chinese archaeology's "Golden Age" (e.g., Tong 1995:190-191), but Chinese archaeologists continue to work uninterrupted (Wang 2011:48) in Mainland China and in Taiwan.

Japanese archaeology was transitioning from a purely academic small-scale pursuit to one that increasingly incorporated salvage (CRM) archaeology by 1965. The Jap-

anese middle class burgeoned in the 1960s (Hudson 2005:132; Hudson 2006:415), and a group of archaeologists emerged who would become the leaders in the fields of academic and administrative archaeology (Fawcett 1995:239). North Korean archaeology flourished in the decade following the Korean War (1950-1953); South Korea's archaeological community emerged slightly later after the first college-level archaeology program opened at Seoul National University (Kim 2014; Nelson 2005).

Southeast Asian archaeology also flourished in unlikely places, and despite far-reaching regional military conflicts. Contra arguments that Western colonial scholars shaped historical and archaeological scholarship, Cherry (2004, 2009) contends that both history and archaeological practice were intrinsic to post-Independence Vietnamese state-making. Indeed, Vietnamese archaeologists ran field projects throughout the Second Indochina War, and the Institute of Archaeology was established in 1968 (Cherry 2009:106; Tong 2007).

Ripples from the Indochina War affected the Mekong countries of Thailand, Cambodia and Laos, where international plans were afoot to dam the Mekong, build reservoirs, and hydroelectrify parts of the region to win hearts and minds. This 235,000 square mile area held 17 million people (Solheim and Hackenberg 1961:2460), as well as rich archaeological resources. Accordingly, the University of Hawaii's Wilhelm Solheim and his crew launched a project to survey and run test excavations in the vicinity of each planned reservoir in NE Thailand. By 1965, they were in third year of their archaeological salvage program (Solheim and Gorman 1966): work focused on the sites of Don Kok Pho, Non Nok Tha and Don Pa Daeng. Ultimately, and for geopolitical reasons, the massive dam project was not completed although reservoirs were built. Yet Solheim's work with his students and colleagues through this salvage program (Solheim and Gorman 1966) began what has now involved more than five decades of field-based archaeological research in the region, directed in recent decades by Charles Higham (University of Otago) and his former student Nigel Chang (James Cook University).

By 1965, East and Southeast Asia not only engaged with the West, but their archaeological boundaries had begun to fade. It would be another two decades before significant numbers of Western-based archaeologists would venture into East Asia armed with both linguistic and archaeological competencies and a research agenda, but Japanese archaeologists (through Chester Chard's direction) flocked to the University of Wisconsin-Madison to translate Japanese archaeological publications, participate in workshops and seminars, and collaborate with US-based scholars; still others trained in French Paleolithic archaeology (Ikawa-Smith 2011:687-688).

Several of Southeast Asia's countries (particularly Thailand and the Philippines), and also Taiwan, welcomed Western-based archaeologists 10-15 years earlier than did East Asian countries. The only regional archaeological organization, begun in 1929 in conjunction with the Pacific Science Association, became a permanent,

stand-alone Far Eastern Prehistory Association in 1953 on November 27, 1953 as part of the Fourth Far-Eastern Prehistory Congress in Manila, Philippines (Groslier 1957).

By the 1970s, Southeast Asia and its archaeological record had ascended the world's stage as a crucible for the kinds of "firsts" and "earliest" that attract media attention and invited educated non-specialists to learn about our field. Regrettably, several "firsts" and "earliest" claims using fieldwork from the mid-1960s were not supportable: Bill Solheim's (1972) claim that Spirit Cave held evidence for the world's earliest agriculture evoked skepticism from those within and beyond the region (Flannery 1973:287), but turned heads toward Asia. Solheim's (1968) claim for the world's earliest metallurgy from Ban Chiang has also been dismantled through a series of painstaking chronometric debates that continue to the present (e.g., Higham et al. 2015; White and Hamilton 2014; White 2015). Despite these missteps, East and Southeast Asian archaeologists and archaeology rose in prominence in the West during the 1970s. International field-based programs brought western and Asian archaeologists together in Thailand, despite raging military conflict next door. China's doors began to creak open to international collaboration, and some Western funding agencies (like the Ford Foundation) established initiatives to support Southeast Asian art and archaeology, most notable of which was the Ford-University of Pennsylvania postgraduate program (Lyons 1977; review in Shoocongdej 2011: 712-716). In 1976, Wilhelm Solheim and his colleagues reconfigured the Far-Eastern Prehistory Association into the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association.

Developments in East and Southeast Asian archaeology proliferated since the 1970s, and are too numerous to summarize here. Our collective chronologies grow increasingly precise, our area coverage becomes progressively more comprehensive as researchers continue to study new and important localities, and our international collaboration becomes ever more reciprocal as new generations of archaeologists assume the mantle. Our region's work is mainstreamed more and more into comparative archaeological edited volumes, and much enriches global understandings of humanity's key transformations: to becoming anatomically modern, to embracing plant and animal domestication, to developing metallurgy and forging cities, and to crafting states and empires. With these developments come what Paul Wheatley (1982:17) called "paradigm-subverting changes" in how we view East and Southeast Asia: they were not simply passive recipients, and they still provide some "firsts" or "earliest" that attract global attention. No scholar questions, for example the pre-eminence of East Asia for the world's very earliest ceramic tradition, found in China, with well-dated samples from 18,300 YPB (e.g., Boaretto et al. 2009), and for the earliest robust ceramic tradition in Japan, where initial (or even incipient?) Jomon potters manufactured a wide range of earthenwares by at least 9500 years ago (Habu 2004: Figures 2.4, 2.5). Models for the emergence of modern humans got a lot stranger after Michael Morwood

and his team launched long-term archaeological field investigations on Flores (e.g., Morwood et al. 2004). Denisovans' appearance on the world stage (e.g., Krause et al. 2010) required paleoanthropologists to add an Asian "cousin" to the Archaic Human family tree. Consensus now holds that Denisovan ancestry exists in living Southeast Asian and Pacific populations (Reich et al. 2011), and the world's oldest dated cave rock art comes from Southeast Asia (Aubert et al. 2014). The Asian Paleolithic, writ large, plays an ever-larger role in understanding human evolution (e.g., Demeter et al. 2014; Dennell and Porr 2014; Mijares et al 2010; Rabett 2012).

Archaeology matters; our research complements and challenges other lines of evidence within and beyond anthropology's purview; and East and Southeast Asia offer innumerable opportunities to try new research methods and techniques to answer perennial archaeological questions. East and Southeast Asian archaeologists face linguistic, interpretative, and of course logistical challenges in our daily work. Enough of us meet these challenges routinely that we can now revisit the question that lurks behind every discussion of our data patterning: are East and Southeast Asia unique, and thus not comparable with examples from the west? Was Hallam Movius (1948) partly right in viewing this region as qualitatively distinct from Europe and the Near East? I use conference papers (and selected other examples) to explore how work in the most recent decades addresses this question. I then begin the arduous task of charting one future for East and Southeast Asian archaeologists by asking, "How can archaeologists practice their craft and make their work relevant to the modern world?" I use the March 2013 conference papers (and in some cases, publications on which these papers were based, and that appear elsewhere than JIPA) to guide my discussion. Because my specialty lies in Southeast (rather than East) Asia, I apologize for any geographic bias that pulls the discussion toward Southeast Asia.

STUDYING THE PAST

Four central themes that structured many papers in the March 2013 conference compel us to expand our global definitions: Pleistocene – Holocene forager dynamics, the Bronze Age, premodern globalization, and the materialization of heritage. Heterogeneity is key; so too are changes in degree, rather than kind (as Ben Marwick pointed out in his conference paper) when one turns to Pleistocene and Holocene forager dynamics in East and Southeast Asia. Issues of mobility/sedentary, dietary breadth, and the break between agriculture and domestication all matter here. Archaeologists guided by the European-derived Three Age system will struggle with East and Southeast Asian examples, where Pleistocene foragers from the Middle Yellow River Valley experimented with would-be domesticates as early as 14,000 years before populations settled into an agricultural lifestyle (Li, this issue).

If "Paleolithic" foragers were also proto-farmers, then where does one draw the "Neolithic" line in East and Southeast Asia? The line thins considerably in Japan,

where a protracted Jomon sequence stretches over more than twelve millennia and involves sophisticated resource managers who gradually narrowed their dietary breadth through time. Both Chinese and Japanese examples exhibit increased dependence on grindable plant food (see Habu and Hall 2013 as one case study) through time, which – at least in the Jomon case – may have been accompanied by population increase. Habu suggests that reduction in subsistence diversity tipped the balance, and led to a demographic and organizational collapse at Sannai Maruyama by c. 4300 BP.

Northern Vietnam's seemingly continuous shift in resource procurement, from the Hoabinhian to Da But periods (Trinh and Huffer, this issue), echoes the East Asian sequence. Several researchers (e.g., Nguyen 2008; Paz 2005) previously have documented *canarium* and *celtis* in early Holocene contexts. We must now expand Doug Yen's (1977) model of "Hoabinhian horticulture" to encompass forest management (or perhaps even arboriculture) during the early to mid-Holocene: a more complex subsistence mix than one conventionally associates with foraging societies. That the East and Southeast Asian late Pleistocene/early Holocene shift does not parallel the European and Near Eastern Mesolithic is both theoretically interesting and discouraging for those who seek direct analogues between the East/Southeast Asian Neolithic and that of temperate Europe or the Near East. Conference papers also illustrated that East and Southeast Asian examples of the Neolithic are not monolithic: tempo and nature vary considerably, and the "Neolithic" in some areas of Southeast Asia involves a broad spectrum subsistence strategy (see Trinh and Huffer 2015; Li 2015:8] that Europeanists associate with the Mesolithic.

These East Asian case studies offer an alternative trajectory of Neolithization to those developed previously to explain developments in the Near East and Europe. Mainland Southeast Asia, and particularly northern Vietnam, offers an excellent lens for monitoring this long-term shift toward plant domestication, where it did happen in Southeast Asia's prehistoric sequence. Zhang and Hung (2010) elegantly document the cultural transmission of agricultural techniques from "South China" into "Southeast Asia." An intricate mix of intensifying subsistence strategies, population movement, and the spread of ideas seem more appropriate for explaining the "origins of agriculture" in Southeast Asia than unidirectional models that ignore local dynamics, particularly because local populations did not always embrace a Neolithic package. The island of Borneo is an increasingly well-researched example of this latter behavior (e.g., Barker and Richards 2012; Barton 2012).

Conference papers also applied new analytical techniques to Shang Bronze Age materials excavated recently from the 2nd millennium BCE site of Yinxu (close to Anyang). Archaeologists have worked at this World Heritage Site intermittently since 1928, and it continues to provide a rich information source regarding China's first Bronze Age polity. Zhichun Jing and his Anyang Project colleagues presented several papers on their research since

2002 at Yinxi. His macro-scale urban analysis (reported in Jing et al. 2013) characterizes the Yinxi urbanization process as an ‘evolution of simplicity’ that accompanied the institution of China’s earliest state tradition. Artifact-based research from four of his colleagues complemented this macro-scale perspective on Yinxi. James Stoltman’s technical study of ceramic technology used in Shang bronze metallurgical activities offers insights on the nature of bronze production (and particularly on raw materials used for making metallurgical tools). Qinlin Li’s preliminary study of earthenware water pipes from Yinxi suggests that potters used different recipes – and perhaps different kilns – to make plumbing apparatus than they did to make utilitarian ceramics for daily use. J. Mark Kenoyer explored the Shang lapidary tradition, focusing on carnelian and jade beads. James Burton’s isotopic analysis of elite burials from Yinxi indicated variability in origin areas of the interred individuals, including some whose childhood was spent significantly south of this capital region.

Ancient globalization in East and Southeast Asia was another theme that ran through several of the conference papers: its form, its scope, and its timing. Although scholars commonly restrict the term globalization to the last 1000 years (e.g., Robertson 2003), a growing number of examples from East and Southeast Asia challenge the shallow time-depth of this concept. East and Southeast Asia experienced multiple, successive globalizations for more than two millennia. These political pulses involved intercultural exchanges that cajoled or compelled subject populations to accommodate outside ideologies and political systems.

The Han empire’s expansionary dynamics remain one of the earliest well-documented examples in East and Southeast Asia: both texts and, in recent years, archaeological data shed light on the process which most scholars gloss as Sinicization. Francis Allard’s paper (this issue) plays documentary and archaeological data against each other to challenge conventional models of Han acculturation along the empire’s southern frontier (see also Kim 2015). His data, from eastern Yunnan, include pre- and early post-contact mortuary contexts. His work suggests differential acculturation by local elites, whose earlier Bronze Age culture Alice Yao documents in her conference contribution. Her spatial analysis illustrates the development of an indigenous complex society replete with a monumental construction tradition (where burial mounds became multi-generational monuments) that celebrated social affiliation at the community level (see also Yao 2015).

Within a few centuries of the Han expansion, Southeast Asians embraced South Asian-derived traditions, which moved as Indic ideological packages, known as “Sanskritization” from Sheldon Pollock (2006). Documentary evidence is scarce for the first millennium CE Southeast Asia in which this process occurred, but a growing group of archaeologists is studying the material reflections of this important cultural contact (e.g., Manguin et al. 2011). What seems clear is that unidirec-

tional models of colonial contact/control and acculturation are too coarse-grained, and that – while these regions weren’t independent – neither were they slavish adopters of all things foreign. Han control brought advantages to local elites who were sufficiently nimble to balance competing pressures. Sanskritization also conferred advantages to tactical elite who harnessed the ideology to their social ascendance, taking full advantage of the cosmopolitanism that accompanied Sanskrit as it moved to Southeast Asia (see also Wheatley 1979).

East and Southeast Asian archaeologists are also essential to reconstructing segments of the “silk roads”, both maritime and overland, along which goods and ideas moved in the centuries before European contact and colonization (e.g., Carter 2013). Archaeologists now study settlement and ideology in states in Silk Road regions that structured the system. The 13th-14th century CE Mongols, who initially controlled the Silk Road, for example not only took over China, but also became the largest land-based empire in world history. They drew from a deep tradition of steppe-based expansionist polities that trace back to the Xiongnu (or Huns), and whose archaeological record offers complementary perspectives to those penned by the Xiongnu’s southern enemies (see Honeychurch 2015). For pragmatic (i.e., heritage management) as well as intellectual reasons, East and Southeast Asian archaeologists have turned their gaze to the 10th through 14th century polities that shaped the region before European contact and colonization. Archaeological work has explored urbanization and political economy (e.g., Evans et al. 2007, 2013; Junker 2013; Stark et al. 2015); Niziolek’s paper blends maritime archaeological methods with geochemistry to study the organization and scale of Southeast Asia-oriented export production from kilns in southeastern China: Jiangxi (Jingdezhen) and Fujian (Dehua). Research on high-fired porcelains, long the domain of art historians, holds great potential for deciphering trade networks that linked East and Southeast Asia to interactional networks to the West. So, too, does the kind of large-scale CRM work in urban settings as part of Environmental Impact Assessment reports that international agencies increasingly require as part of both loan and grant packages.

That East and Southeast Asian archaeologists find their work intrinsically important is not sufficient justification for funding the kind of work that we do, of course, and it is in the world of historic preservation and heritage management that most practical archaeological work is carried out. Countries across the region now engage with UNESCO on World Heritage nominations. Bui Van Liem’s conference paper tracked the growth of heritage management in Vietnam recently, and examined the inscription of particular Vietnamese sites as UNESCO heritage sites. Much of the technical training in the region goes to students who will enter the heritage management industry in some capacity, or who will train the next generation of heritage managers from their academic base. So archaeologists steeped in an Ivory Tower intellectual tradition now confront a changing landscape, in which they

are expected to work with, train, and in some cases work as, heritage managers.

We are also well positioned to understand how the construction of heritage affects those who partake of it. Hyung-Il Pai's (2015) analysis of the life history of Seoul's historical South Gate (Sungnye-mun) documents a monument's role in legitimizing the modern nation-state. Her approach also illustrates how taking an historical anthropological perspective is essential to understanding the differential success of some buildings in becoming national icons. Heritage, like tradition, is both invented and revised through time and archaeologists play an increasingly important role in this process.

LOOKING FORWARD: THE NEXT 50 YEARS

More archaeologists now work in East and Southeast Asia than ever before. Nearly every country hosts archaeological research; most have a heritage management infrastructure tasked with stewardship of the country's archaeological resources. East and Southeast Asian archaeologists are active as heritage managers and as researchers; our work is published widely, and in a growing number of western-language venues. The quality of our research continues to improve, and archaeologists throughout the region are experimenting with new documentation (e.g., Evans et al. 2013; Tan 2014) and analytical (e.g., Li 2015) methods to interrogate the archaeological record (e.g., Hendrickson et al 2013). Such accomplishments—coupled with global geopolitics that are incrementally sealing off sections of the Near East to archaeologists – contribute to a new awareness of East and Southeast Asian archaeology among our western colleagues. Perhaps calling this trend a “pivot to Asia” overstates the change, but as East and Southeast Asia comes of age in global archaeology, we'd best consider what lies ahead.

We have many challenges: linguistic, intellectual, and ethical. Linguistic challenges are the most straightforward, although it is worth noting that East and Southeast Asia is the home to at least nine major language families and more than two billion speakers of a minimum of 57 discrete languages. Working across languages and cultures, placing Asia-based colleagues in long-term professional positions, and helping colleagues build the infrastructure needed for archaeological research are all logistical challenges that continue to face the field.

Linguistic challenges that face East and Southeast Asian archaeologists are all manageable, however, in comparison with challenges inherent in working between conflicting intellectual paradigms, by which I mean the sets of assumptions, concepts, values, and practices that undergird an intellectual discipline (see also White 2013). On the one hand, archaeologists working in East and Southeast Asia confront and must be conversant in local historiographical traditions (e.g., China [von Falkenhäusen 1993]) and in the canon of colonial scholarship (e.g., Cambodia's French scholarly tradition).

The bigger issue for Southeast Asian archaeologists, it seems, is stepping outside of what Joyce White (2013) calls the “mid-20th century Anglophone paradigm.” This

paradigm uses the Three-Age system, progressive/complexity narratives, and core-periphery framework to construct a normative view of Southeast Asia's past. This normative paradigm, based on essentialist or nominalist thinking (Marwick 2008), seeks closeness of fit with modal types instead of testing multiple working hypotheses that could explain the patterning, and produces what Binford (1981) called post-hoc accommodative arguments rather than new knowledge about the region's archaeological record. The paradigm is constraining, Eurocentric (Shoocongdej 2011:17), and normative in Southeast Asian archaeology, at least.

Can we transcend the confines of normative thinking in East and Southeast Asian archaeology? And how would our archaeological practice change if we did? For one, we would devote far less time to worrying about origins and focus instead on understanding process. We would also critically interrogate our source fields – indigenous texts or outsider reports – rather than using them uncritically as our starting point. Allard's (2015) study demonstrates why such source-side interrogation is essential to good scholarship. We would also tread carefully when applying ethnographically derived models. We would avoid the sloppy use of ethnographic analogy in general (i.e., citing one or a few analogical cases from elsewhere to bolster our knowledge claims), and view Southeast Asia's ethnohistoric and ethnographic records as transformed and only partly appropriate sources for model building.

Thanks to the efforts of previous generations of East and Southeast Asian archaeological researchers, and to crucial fiscal support from international organizations like the Henry Luce Foundation, we can do all of this and more. Opening East and Southeast Asian archaeology up to a wider range of paradigms will strengthen the field, even with the lively debate that a more eclectic environment will generate. Doing so requires abandoning some ideas that structure some current approaches concerning the fit between our East and Southeast Asian archaeological record (for the Paleolithic, the post-Pleistocene period, and the Bronze Age) and that of the Near East and Europe (e.g., Movius 1948:411); the break between a “prehistoric” and “historic” period in East and Southeast Asia's past; and a preoccupation with “prehistoric” archaeology at the expense of most recent periods. Casting these assumptions aside to instead privilege East and Southeast Asia's archaeological record, of course, is not enough. As Karl Hutterer noted in his review of *Early South East Asia* (Smith and Watson 1979) several decades ago, “it is one thing... to come up with new ideas and convictions, and it is another to support them with sound empirical data” (1982:560).

Work presented at the 2013 Madison conference derived from truly collaborative research projects linking Asia- and western- based colleagues, the latter who have invested in long-term relationships with different host countries that involves public outreach and capacity building (e.g., Lape and Hert 2011). Papers recognized the link between archaeology and nationalism, and treated it with

care (following Glover 2005; Nelson 2005; Shoocongdej 2011:718-720; Silverman 2011). Participants introduced new methodological approaches that blended science with archaeology, and most were involved in large-scale, international and interdisciplinary research teams engaged in long-term research projects in East and Southeast Asia.

Conference discussions ranged widely, and identified a variety of research topics that merited pursuit in East and Southeast Asia. Consensus emerged that more work was needed on paleoenvironmental reconstruction with an archaeological sensibility; while the volume of paleoenvironmental research in the region expands by environmental scientists, too little is done with an understanding of human-landscape dynamics that is needed to explain anthropogenic influences in the patterning (e.g., Kealhofer and Grave 2008; Stark 2006; Yao et al. 2015). Participants identified a need for more archaeologically-infused interdisciplinary research designs to expand our exploration of the origins and emergence of cultural diversity across East and Southeast Asia (following White 2011), refine our understandings of early human origins and migrations, clarify the processes involved in the origins/diffusion of plant and animal domestication at the pan-Asia scale, and outline multiple types of and often overlapping interactional networks across nation-state boundaries before the formation of the nation-state. Some large-scale geochemical studies, including nephrite ornaments (Hung et al. 2007) beads, metal and other materials (e.g., Carter 2015; Calo et al. 2015; Lankton and Dussubieux 2013; Pryce et al. 2011) illustrates the power of such large-scale artifact based studies to delineate interactional networks for different points in the prehistoric and early historic periods.

Participants also provided examples of how East and Southeast Asian archaeological research is well suited to study several themes that thus far have been restricted to what western archaeologists call Historical Archaeology. Archaeological research on the southern Han periphery by Francis Allard (2015), Nam Kim (2015), and Alice Yao (2015) offers insights to global studies of culture contact/entanglement; so does work in eastern Indonesia by Peter Lape (2000a, 2000b). Research on the post-1000 CE period, and particularly on the premodern to Early Modern transition, would fill gaps historians have found in explaining 15th-17th century transformations in the region. Relatively recent interest in “charter states” (*sensu* Lieberman 2011), and particularly of Angkor and Thai neighbors, have opened new avenues of research that require intensely interdisciplinary research (e.g., Evans et al. 2007, 2013; Stark et al. 2013; Wood et al. 2008). So do archaeological studies of commodities that circulated (e.g., Grave et al. 2005) and even of key events (e.g., Kimura et al. 2014) and complement documentary sources on this period.

PARTING THOUGHTS

The western world’s recent “pivot to Asia” represents the most recent geopolitical turn in a very long history of interaction between East and Southeast Asia and areas west

which, if archaeology is any gauge, began more than 40,000 years ago when Denisovans headed eastward. This finding surprises no East or Southeast Asian archaeologist. After all, the maritime and terrestrial Silk Roads linked both ends of Eurasia by the Han empire (e.g., Bellina and Glover 2004); such robust interregional interaction patterns within East/Southeast Asia extend back at least 5,000 years, moving raw materials and finished products over sea- and landscapes (e.g., Hung et al. 2007). A recent funding influx from the Henry Luce Foundation’s Initiative in East and Southeast Asian Archaeology has accelerated new research initiatives in the region. So, too, has an increased demand for heritage protection legislation across East and Southeast Asia that at least supports CRM work prior to development.

To secure a seat at the table of international archaeology, we must communicate our research to the global archaeological world using familiar frameworks and terminology (Kim and Carter 2015:1). Archaeology, however, is both a “science” and heritage management; it must also be relevant to thrive in the next 50 years. How can East and Southeast Asian archaeologists practice their craft in a relevant and responsible manner? Capacity-building, community engagement, (see examples in O’Connor et al. 2013), and professional service must become part of every East and Southeast Asian archaeologist’s career dossier for the field to grow strong: offering post-graduate training, organizing conferences, workshops and training opportunities, and funding participation by in-country team members for international events. We must also make our work more accessible to the host communities and to the region as a whole. This is done through public outreach and lectures, through making vernacular-language abstracts of publications available, and through supporting extramural funding initiatives to translate publications into (and out of) the host country’s vernacular language.

As East and Southeast Asia experience rapid economic development that pulls populations out of poverty, this process also threatens their archaeological heritages. We must work actively with Asia-based colleagues to protect and promote heritage – and, by extension the archaeological record -- if we want research material for the future. Looting for collectors is one major factor in the destruction of heritage (Davis and Mackenzie 2014; Glover 2015; Mackenzie and Davis 2014), and training the next generation of heritage managers and sponsoring in-country educational events is critical. So is encouraging our respective western government agencies operating in the host countries to support these initiatives and collaborating with our respective western governments to stop trafficking in illicit antiquities through inter-governmental agreements, direct collaboration with law enforcement, and through work with national and international archaeological and museums/heritage organizations to publicize problems and pursue initiatives. If we can collectively commit to these kinds of activities, then the future of East and Southeast Asian archaeology is bright indeed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to first thank Nam Kim, Alison Carter, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Anthropology program, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, and Center for East Asian Studies) for inviting me to participate in the March 15-16, 2013 conference; it was well-funded and immaculately organized. I also appreciate their comments and patience with me during the writing process. I want to thank colleagues from a session at the 17th Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association Congress in Taipei, Taiwan (2002) entitled, "Southeast Asia: The Next Generation (Session organizers: L. Kealhofer and P. Grave)." What began as pleasant dinner conversation morphed into a lively two-part session that forced many of us to reflect on our field and several of us to transcribe: big thanks to Lisa Kealhofer, Peter Grave, Elisabeth Bacus, Victor Paz, and Rasmi Shoocongdej. I also owe a debt to Wilhelm Solheim, my predecessor here at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa who was a kind of archaeological visionary. I finally thank Helena Kolenda and the Luce Foundation for their support of the East and Southeast Asian Archaeology and Early History Initiative, which touched many dozens of colleagues and a large number of university departments. I am grateful to Helena for heeding our call for support, and for working with us so professionally on this initiative. Any mistakes in the paper are my responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Allard, F. 2015. China's early impact on eastern Yunnan: incorporation, acculturation, and the convergence of evidence. *JIPA* 35:26-35.
- Aubert, M., A. Brumm, M. Ramli, T. Sutikna, E. W. Saptomo, B. Hakim, M. J. Morwood, G. D. van den Bergh, L. Kinsley and A. Dosseto. 2014. Pleistocene cave art from Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Nature* 514:223-227.
- Barker, G. and M. B. Richards. 2013. Foraging-farming transitions in island Southeast Asia. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 20:256-280.
- Barton, H. 2011. The reversed fortunes of sago and rice, *Oryza sativa*, in the rainforests of Sarawak, Borneo. *Quaternary International* 249:96-104.
- Bellina, B. 2014. Maritime Silk Roads' ornament industries: socio-political practices and cultural transfers in the South China Sea. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 24(3):345-377.
- Bellina, B. and I. Glover. 2004. The archaeology of early contact with India and the Mediterranean world, from the fourth century BC to the fourth century AD. In I. C. Glover and P. Bellwood (eds.) *Southeast Asia, from Prehistory to History*, pp. 68-89. Routledge/Curzon, London.
- Boaretto, E., X. Wu, J. Yuan, O. Bar-Yosef, V. Chu, Y. Pan, K. Liu, D. Cohen, T. Jiao, S. Li, H. Gu, P. Goldberg and S. Weiner. 2009. Radiocarbon dating of charcoal and bone collagen associated early pottery at Yuchanyan Cave, Hunan Province, China. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106(24):9595-9600.
- Calo, A., B. Prasetyo, P. Bellwood, J. W. Lankton, B. Gratuze, T. O. Pryce, A. Reinecke, V. Leusch, H. Schenk, R. Wood, R. A. Bawono, I. Dewa K. Gede, Ni L. K. Cith Yuliati, J. Fenner, C. Reepmeyer, C. Castillo and A. K. Carter. 2015. Sembiran and Pacung on the north coast of Bali: a strategic crossroads for early trans-Asiatic exchange. *Antiquity* 89:378-396.
- Carter, A. 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. 2013. Glass artifacts at Angkor: evidence for exchange. Paper presented at Recent Advances in the Archaeology of East and Southeast Asia, Madison, WI, March 15-16, 2013.
- Carter, A. K., and N. C. Kim. In press. Globalization at the dawn of history: the emergence of global cultures in the Mekong and Red River Deltas. In (T. Hodos (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Globalization and Archaeology*. New York, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Chang, K. C. 1977. Chinese Archaeology since 1949. *Journal of Asian Studies* 36(4): 623-646.
- Cherry, H. 2004. Social communication and colonial archaeology in Viêt Nam. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 6(2):111-126.
- Cherry, H. 2009. Digging up the past: prehistory and the weight of the present in Vietnam. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies* 4(1):84-144.
- Davis, T. and S. Mackenzie. 2014. Crime and conflict: temple looting in Cambodia. In J. Kil and M. Balecells (eds.) *Cultural Property crime: an Analysis of Contemporary Perspectives and Trends*, pp. 292-306. Brill Publishers, Leiden.
- Demeter, F., L. Shackelford, K. Westaway, P. Düringer, A-M Bacon, J-L Ponche, X. Wu, T. Sayavongkhamdy, J-X Zhao, L. Barnes, M. Boyon, P. Sichanthongtip, F. Sénégas, A-M Karpoff E. Patole-Ecoumba, Y Coppens, and J. Braga. 2015. Early modern humans and morphological variation in Southeast Asia: fossil evidence from Ta Pa Ling, Laos. *PLOS One* 10(4):e0121193.
- Dennell, R. and M. Porr (eds.) 2014. *Southern Asia, Australia and the Search for Human Origins*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, D. H., C. Pottier, R. Fletcher, S. Hensley, I. Tapley, A. Milne and M. Barbetti. 2007. A comprehensive archaeological map of the world's largest preindustrial settlement complex at Angkor, Cambodia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (36):14277-14282.
- Evans, D. H., R. J. Fletcher, C. Pottier, J.-B. Chevance, D. Soustif, B.S. Tan, S. Im, D. Ea, T. Tin, S. Kim, C. Cromarty, S. De Greef, K. Hanus, P. Bâty, R. Kuszinger, I. Shimoda, and G. Boomazian. 2013. Uncovering archaeological landscapes at Angkor using lidar. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110(31):12595-12600.
- Fawcett, C. 1995. Nationalism and postwar Japanese archaeology in P. L. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds.) *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, pp. 232-246. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Flannery, K. 1973. The Origins of Agriculture. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 2:271-310.
- Glover, I. C. 2005. Some national, regional and political uses of archaeology in East and Southeast Asia. In M. T. Stark (ed.) *Archaeology of Asia*, pp. 17-36. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken New Jersey.

- Glover, I. C. 2015. Collectors and archaeologists with special reference to Southeast Asia. In Ruth Barnes, Emma Natalya Stein and Benjamin Diebold (eds.) *Gold in Early Southeast Asia*, Monograph 64. Southeast Asia Studies. Yale University, New Haven.
- Grave, P., M. Maccheroni and L. Lisle. 2005. The transition to the Early Modern Economy in East and Southeast Asian, 1400-1750 AD: production and exchange of stoneware jars. In *Proceedings of the International Conference: Chinese Export Ceramics and Maritime Trade, 12th – 15th centuries*, pp. 163-166. Hong Kong: Chinese Civilisation Centre, City University of Hong Kong.
- Groslier, B. P. 1957. The Far-Eastern Prehistory Association 1953-1957. *Asian Perspectives* 1(1):v-ix.
- Habu, J. 2004. *Ancient Jomon of Japan*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Habu, J. and M. E. Hall. 2013. Climate change, human impacts on the landscape, and subsistence specialization: historical ecology and changes in Jomon hunter-gatherer lifeways. In V. D. Thompson and J. Waggoner (eds.) *The Historical Ecology of Small Scale Economies*, pp. 65-78. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Hendrickson, M., Q. Hua and T. O. Pryce. 2013. Using in-slag charcoal as an indicator of “terminal” iron production within the Angkorian period (10th-13th centuries AD) center of Preah Khan of Kompong Svay, Cambodia. *Radio-carbon* 55(1):31-47.
- Higham, C. F. W., K. Douka and T. F. G. Higham. 2015. A new chronology for the Bronze Age of Northeastern Thailand and its implications for Southeast Asian prehistory. *PLoS ONE* 10(9):e0137542.
- Honeychurch, W. 2015. *Inner Asia and the Spatial Politics of Empire*. Springer New York.
- Hudson, M. J. 2005. For the people, by the people: postwar Japanese archaeology and the Early Paleolithic hoax. *Anthropological Science* 113:131-139.
- Hudson, M. J. 2006. Pots not people: ethnicity, culture and identity in postwar Japanese archaeology. *Critique of Anthropology* 26(4):411-434.
- Hung, H.-C., Y. Iizuka, P. Bellwood, Kim Dung Nguyen, B. Bellina, P. Silapanth, E. Dizon, R. Santiago, I. Datan, and J. H. Manton. 2007. Ancient jades map 3,000 years of prehistoric exchange in Southeast Asia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104(50):19745-19750.
- Hutterer, K. L. 1982. Early Southeast Asia: old wine in new skins? A Review Article. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 41(3):559-570.
- Ikawa-Smith, F. 2011. Practice of archaeology in contemporary Japan. In L. Lozny (ed.) *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, pp. 675-705. Springer, New York.
- Jing, Z. J. Tan, G. Rapp, and J. Stoltman. 2013. Recent discoveries and some thoughts on early urbanization at Anyang. In A. P. Underhill (ed.) *A Companion to Chinese Archaeology*, pp. 343-366.
- Junker, L. 2013. Conflictive trade, value and power relations in Philippine maritime trading polities of the 8th-19th century Philippines. Paper presented at Recent Advances in the Archaeology of East and Southeast Asia, Madison, WI, March 15-16, 2013.
- Kealhofer, L. and P. Grave. 2008. Land use, political complexity, and urbanism in mainland Southeast Asia. *American Antiquity* 73(2):200-225.
- Kim, M. 2014. Rice, ethnicity, and the collation of archaeobotanical data for prehistoric Korea. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress* 10(2): 168-193.
- Kim, N. C. 2015. Sinicization and barbarization: ancient state formation at the southern edge of Sinitic civilization. In V. H. Mair and L.C. Kelley (eds.) *Imperial China and its Southern Neighbors*, pp. 43-79. Institution of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS), Singapore.
- Kim, N. C. 2015. *The Origins of Ancient Vietnam*. Oxford University Press.
- Kim, N. C. and A. C. Carter. 2015. Introduction to the special issue: papers from the conference ‘Recent Advances in the Archaeology of East and Southeast Asia.’ *JIPA* 35:1-2.
- Kimura, J., M. Staniforth, Lê Thi Lien, and R. Sasaki. 2014. Naval battlefield archaeology of the lost Kublai Khan fleets. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 43(1):76-86.
- Krause, J. Q. Fu, J. M. Good, B. Viola, M. V. Shunkov, A. P. Derevianko, and S. Pääbo. 2010. The complete mitochondrial DNA genome of an unknown hominin from southern Siberia. *Nature* 464:894-897.
- Lankton, J. and L. Dussubieux, 2013. Early glass in Southeast Asia. In K. Janssens(ed.s) *Modern Methods for Analysing Archaeological and Historic Glass*, pp. 413-441. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Lape, P. V. 2000a. Political dynamics and religious change in the late pre-colonial Banda Islands, Eastern Indonesia. *World Archaeology* 32(1):138-155.
- Lape, P. V. 2000b. Contact and colonialism in the Banda Islands, Maluku, Indonesia. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 20:48-55.
- Lape, P. V. and R. Hert. 2011. Archaeological practice in Timor Leste: past, present and future. In J. N. Miksic, G.Y. Goh and S. O’Connor (eds.), *Rethinking Cultural Resource Management in Southeast Asia: Preservation, Development, and Neglect*, pp. 67-87. London: Anthem Press.
- Li, L. 2015. A long process towards agriculture in the Middle Yellow River Valley, China; evidence from macro- and micro-botanical remains. *JIPA* 35:3-14.
- Lieberman, V. 2011. Charter state collapse in Southeast Asia, ca. 1250-1400, as a problem in regional and world history. *The American Historical Review* 116(4):937-963.
- Lyons, E. 1977. Southeast Asia. *Expedition Magazine* 19(4): 27-32.
- Mackenzie, S. and T. Davis. 2014. Temple looting in Cambodia: anatomy of a statue trafficking network. *British Journal of Criminology* 54(5):722-740.
- Manguin, P.-Y, A. Mani and G. Wade (eds). *Early Interactions between South and Southeast Asia: Reflections on Cross-Cultural Exchange*. Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Marwick, B. 2008. Beyond typologies: the reduction thesis and its implications for lithic assemblages in Southeast Asia. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 28:108-116.
- Mijares, A. S., F. Détroit, P. Piper, R. Grün, P. Bellwood, M. Aubert, G. Champion, N. Cueva, A. De Leon and E. Dizon. 2010. New evidence for a 67,000-year-old human pres-

- ence at Callao Cave, Luzon, Philippines. *Journal of Human Evolution* 59:123-132.
- Morwood, M.J., Soejono, R.P., Roberts, R.G., Sutikna, T., Turney, C.S.M., Westaway, K.E., Rink, W.J., Zhao, J.-X., van den Bergh, G.D., Due, R.A., Hobbs, D.R., Moore, M.W., Bird, M.I. & Fifield, L.K. (2004) Archaeology and age of a new hominin from Flores in eastern Indonesia. *Nature* 431: 1087–1091.
- Movius, H. L., Jr. 1948. The Lower Palaeolithic cultures of southern and eastern Asia. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 38(4):329-420.
- Nelson, S. 2005. Archaeology in the Two Koreas. In M. T. Stark (ed.) *Archaeology of Asia*, pp. 37-54. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken New Jersey.
- Nguyen, V. 2008. Hoabinhian macrobotanical remains from archaeological sites in Vietnam: indicators of climate changes from the late Pleistocene to the early Holocene. *IPPA Bulletin* 28:80-83.
- O'Connor, S., S. Brockwell & D. Byrne. 2013. *Transcending the Culture-Nature Divide in Cultural Heritage: Views from the Asia-Pacific*. Terra Australis 36. Australian National University.
- Pai, H.I. 2015. Gateway to Korea: colonialism, nationalism and reconstructing ruins as tourist landmarks. *JIPA* 35:15-25.
- Paz, V. 2005. Rock shelter, caves, and archaeobotany in Island Southeast Asia. *Asian Perspectives* 44(1):107-118.
- Pollock, S. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Pryce, T. O., M. Brauns, N. Chang, E. Pernicka, A. M. Pollard, C. Ramsey, T. Rehren, V. Souksavady, and T. Sayavongkhamdy. 2011. Isotopic and technological variation in prehistoric Southeast Asian primary copper production. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38:3309-3322.
- Rabett, R. J. 2012. *Human Adaptation in the Asian Palaeolithic*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Reich, D., N. Patterson, M. Kircher, F. Delfin, M. R. Nandineni, I. Pugach, A. M-S Ko, Y-C Ko, T. A. Jinam, M. E. Phippes, N. Saitou, A. Wollstein, M. Kayser, S. Pääbo, and M. Stoneking. Denisova admixture and the first modern human dispersals into Southeast Asia and Oceania. *American Journal of Human Genetics* 89(4):516-528.
- Reid, A. 2015. *A History of Southeast Asia: Critical Crossroads*. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken New Jersey.
- Shoocongdej, R. 2011. Contemporary archaeology as a global dialogue: reflections from Southeast Asia. In L. R. Lozny (ed.) *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, pp. 707-729. Springer, New York.
- Silverman, H. 2011. Border wars: the ongoing temple dispute between Thailand and Cambodia and UNESCO's World Heritage List. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17:1-21.
- Solheim, W. G., II. 1967. Southeast Asia and the West. *Science*, New Series 157(3791):896-902.
- Solheim, W.G., II. 1972. An earlier agricultural revolution. *Scientific American* 226(4):34-41.
- Solheim, W. G., II and C. F. Gorman. 1966. Archaeological salvage program: Northeastern Thailand, first season. *Journal of the Siam Society* 54(2): 111-181.
- Solheim, W.G., II and R.A. Hackenberg. 1961. The importance of anthropological research to the Mekong Valley Project. *France-Asie* 17:2459-74.
- Stark, M. T. 2006. Early Mainland Southeast Asian Landscapes in the First Millennium AD. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 407-432.
- Stark, M.T., D. Evans, Chhay R., Heng P, and A. Carter. 2015. Residential patterning in the Angkor Wat enclosure. *Antiquity* 89 348:1439-1455.
- Tan, Noel. 2014. Rock art research in Southeast Asia: a synthesis. *Arts* 2014 3:73-104.
- Tong Trung Tin. 2007. Twentieth-Century Achievements in the Archaeology of Vietnam. *Vietnam Archaeology* 2:5-22.
- Tong, E. 1995. Thirty years of Chinese archaeology (1949-1979). In P. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, pp. 177-197. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Trinh Hoang Hiep and D. Huffer. 2015. The Da But period in northern Vietnam: current knowledge and future directions. *JIPA* 35:36-47.
- von Falkenhausen, L. 1993. On the historiographical orientation of Chinese archaeology. *Antiquity* 67:839-849.
- Wang, T. 2011. "Public Archaeology" in China: A preliminary Investigation. In K. Okamura and A. Matsuda (eds) *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*, pp. 43-56. One World Archaeology, Springer New York.
- Wheatley, P. 1982. Presidential address: India beyond the Ganges – desultory reflections on the origins of civilization in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Asian Studies* 42(1):13-28.
- White, J. C. 2011. Emergence of cultural diversity in mainland Southeast Asia: a view from prehistory. In N. J. Enfield (ed), *Dynamics of Human Diversity: the case of mainland Southeast Asia*, pp. 9-46. Pacific Linguistics, School of Culture, History and Language, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University.
- White, J. C. 2012. Changing paradigms in Southeast Asian archaeology. Keynote address for the 14th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists (EurASEAA), Dublin, September 18-21, 2012.
- White, J. C. and E. G. Hamilton. 2014. The transmission of early bronze technology to Thailand: new perspectives. In B. W. Roberts and C. P. Thornton (eds.) *Archaeometallurgy in Global Perspective: Methods and Syntheses*, pp. 805-852. Springer Verlag, New York.
- Wood, S. H., A. D. Ziegler, and T. Bundarnsin. 2008. Floodplain deposits, channel changes, and riverbank stratigraphy of the Mekong River area at the 14th century city of Chiang Saen, Northern Thailand. *Geomorphology* 1010:510-523.
- Yao, A. 2015. *The Ancient Highlands of Southwest China: An Archaeological History from the Bronze Age to the Han Empire*. Oxford University Press.
- Yao, A., Z. Jiang, X. Chen, and L. Yin. 2015. Bronze Age wetland/scapes: complex political formations in the humid subtropics of southwest China, 900 – 100 BC. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 40:213-229.
- Yen, D. E. 1977. Hoabinhian horticulture: The evidence and questions from Northwest Thailand. In J. Allen, J. Golson, and R. Jones (eds), *Sunda and Sahul: Prehistoric Studies in Southeast Asia, Melanesia, and Australia*, pp. 567-599. Academic Press, London.