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EDITORIAL

Plague and Prejudice: Archaeology, COVID-19, and the Resurgence of Social Justice Movements
Panos Kratimenos & Lucy Sladen

Introduction
For a brief moment in time, it seemed like everything had changed. In the United Kingdom, where this journal and its editors are based, the relevant moment marking this change was 8:30pm on 23rd March 2020 when the then-Prime Minister (we’ve had two since then and are staring down the barrel of a third in the not-too-distant future) announced the first of what turned out to be three lockdowns to stop, or at least slow, the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. With this statement, life as we knew it came to a halt: schools and universities, pubs, restaurants, shops, workplaces, sporting and leisure venues and places of worship were closed indefinitely. Non-manual workers were now expected to work from home leading to – in spite of the objections (see, for example, Felsted 2020; Ambrose 2023; Bloom et al. 2023; Partridge 2023) of micromanagers concerned for their own obsolescence and commercial landlords who feared abandonment of their rental office space – an, at worst, ambiguous impact\(^1\) on productivity and workers’ mental health (see, for example, Kitagawa et al. 2021; Felstead & Reuschke 2023; Hall et al. 2023). Low-wage (often migrant [Fasani & Mazza 2020; Fernández-Reino 2020]) workers whose jobs still required physical attendance were rapidly rebranded as ‘critical’, ‘essential’ or ‘key’ workers and lauded as heroes keeping society functional, at potential cost to their own health and wellbeing (Cominetti et al. 2021; May et al. 2021; Topriceanu et al. 2021) and with negligible, if any, improvement in pay or conditions (Trades Union

\(^1\) At the time of writing, no consensus has emerged on the impact of work-from-home regimes. This situation will, it seems, take years to clarify if, indeed, it ever fully does. On one hand, some workers report increases in productivity and wellbeing, seemingly from increased autonomy and being able to avoid arduous commutes; while, for others (particularly those with school-aged children, caring responsibilities and the like), working from home eroded boundaries between professional and personal lives which was detrimental to overall productivity and wellbeing. What is clear, however, is that home-working has proven viable for many more than would probably have been anticipated pre-pandemic.
Congress 2020; International Labor Organization 2023). The National Health Service (NHS), a consistent source of pride amongst the British public (Sanders 2022; Buzelli et al. 2023), was sanctified to new heights with performative banging of pots and pans at 8pm on Thursday evenings (Clap for Our Carers 2021), temporarily obfuscating calls for sustainable pay and conditions for staff (Puntis et al. 2020; Manthorpe et al. 2022). In a frenzied public discourse concerned with providing any and all necessary resources to the NHS and other front-line support systems, an estimated £33.6bn of public money was lost to fraud and wastage (Goodier 2022) which serves, alongside scandals such as ‘Partygate’ as the backdrop for an ongoing independent public inquiry into the United Kingdom’s response to the pandemic (UK Covid-19 Inquiry 2023a). The pandemic even came with its own lexicon; we all became familiar with an entirely new nomenclature including terms such as “social distancing”, “self-isolation”, “lockdown” and “flattening the curve” to the extent that several glossaries now exist to standardise their use (see, for example, PAHO 2020; Vagnoni & Bunn 2022). This ‘new normal’, as it came to be known, had a widespread impact on all facets of life from personal relationships to workplace organisational structures.

Then, with a similar rapidity to which it began, around the world the pandemic was declared ‘over’. In the United Kingdom, the same Prime Minister who had ushered the nation into the first lockdown almost two years previously declared the lifting of all remaining COVID-related measures on 24th February 2022 with the intention of “chart[ing] a course back to normality as soon as possible” (UK Government 2022). He had, of course, made the same pledge of returning to ‘normal’ in both July 2020 (Murphy 2020) and July 2021 (Smout & James 2021), and his credibility was likely not helped by alleged statements in opposition to a second lockdown in late-2020 such as “No more fucking lockdowns – let the bodies pile high in their thousands” (Elgot & Booth 2021), a claim supported by both his then-chief advisor, Dominic Cummings2 (Science and Technology Committee, and Health and Social Care Committee 2021) and then-Downing Street Chief of Staff Edward Udny-Lister (UK Covid-19 Inquiry 2023b). However, for all intents and purposes, March 2023 saw the

2 A man whose reported views on eugenics (see, for example, Rose 2013; Shanks 2013; Mason & Sample 2020; Saini 2020; Shanks 2021; Rutherford 2022: 206–7) are profoundly uncomfortable. Eugenics, its historical relationship with many social scientific disciplines (particularly archaeology and anthropology), this journal’s own university’s historic ties with the movement (see below), and its apparent resurgence in popularity as a consequence of the genetic revolution of recent decades (see, for example, Saini 2019) are themes of considerable importance which our disciplines are uniquely placed to engage with.
beginning of a ‘return to normal’ across the UK, largely in step with most nations across the world, and in line with vaccine rollout (Hale *et al.* 2023).

*Après le déluge: society ‘after’ the pandemic*

Many health professionals would, of course, disagree that the COVID-19 pandemic is ‘over’ (see, for example, Galvão 2023), as would the estimated 1.9 million people in the United Kingdom (Office of National Statistics 2023) and 65 million globally (Davis *et al.* 2023) still suffering from the poorly-understood ‘long COVID’. However, a portion of the British public was undeniably in some form of agreement, with a reported downturn in compliance to COVID-related measures over time (Tomlinson *et al.* 2022). As we move to a phase where COVID-19 becomes (or, at least, we have collectively decided to treat it as) endemic, the numbers are stark. According to the World Health Organization ([https://covid19.who.int/](https://covid19.who.int/)), as of 8th November 2023, there have been over 771 million confirmed cases of COVID-19, with a low-end estimate of almost 7 million people having lost their lives to the disease (although the same organisation reports that this number may be as high as 14.9 million [Taylor 2023]); a number which would doubtlessly be orders of magnitude higher but for the over 13.5 billion vaccine doses administered globally.

However, to write off our communal experience of these extraordinary two years as some sort of collective nightmare, best left in the past as we return to the *status quo ante*, is patently reductionist. In spite of the difficulties, pain and horror of the pandemic, it is undeniable that there were silver linings which should not be ignored in spite of a desire to get ‘back to normal’. On a social level, in the early days of the pandemic in particular, many people felt a rebirth of some sort of community spirit, as exemplified by social movements such as Clap for Carers and the occurrence of socially-distanced street parties across the nation (see, for example, Saner 2020). Similarly, the potential for feelings of isolation and loneliness which many found severely challenging, has led to an enhanced awareness of, and empathy with, mental health issues (Nealon 2021) which appears to have endured beyond the end of lockdowns. This has dovetailed with shifting perceptions on work-life balance, with many re-evaluating the relative importance of careers compared to time spent with loved ones and the impact of their former work lives on their overall wellbeing. In particular, the pandemic provided a massive proof-of-concept for the viability of increased work from home regimes for many non-manual workers, bolstered by
rapid innovations, uptake and literacy with regard to remote working technologies, seemingly leading to marked shifts in worker attitudes (see, for example, Chung et al. 2020; Chung 2022). This technological innovation borne through necessity was most impressively manifested in the creation and safe rollout of various novel vaccines against COVID-19 which have no doubt hugely reduced mortality and morbidity rates (see, for example, Watson et al. 2022). Moreover, on a grander scale, the temporary death of the commute for many had a marked effect on pollution levels (see, for example, Bhat et al. 2021; Yang et al. 2022), lending support to the viability of climate targets (United Nations 2015) previously derided by detractors to be impossible or, at the very least, economically terminal.

None of this, of course, is to belittle the suffering, sacrifice or seriousness which the COVID-19 pandemic represented for many people. However, it does point to the potential for lessons to be learned – through successes and progress, rather than exclusively from failures and tragedies – from our collective experiences over the last few years. In spite of an understandable urge among many to pretend that the last few years never happened, get ‘back to normal’, and pick up where life seemingly left off, to do so would be to forgo the opportunity to learn and grow from experiences. Not simply in terms of awareness in preparation for the next pandemic or comparable disaster, but in terms of re-evaluating and improving on the present and into the future.

**No justice? No peace?: Social justice in the time of COVID-19**

A parallel current, both predating and running concurrently with (and, indeed, according to some research, linked to [Jørgensen et al. 2022]) the COVID-19 pandemic, was the emergence and resurgence of a variety of social justice movements across many societies globally. In the space of a decade or so, a wide array of social justice movements – from #MeToo, to Black Lives Matter, to indigenous struggles (both long-standing and new), to a litany of regional and global class-, sex-, gender- and ethnicity-based movements – have exploded into (and back into) life across the world. Concomitantly, various reactionary, nativist and revanchist tendencies have emerged, aiming to stifle and, in many cases, roll back the achievements of such movements. This fractious political environment has fomented in a time of increasing economic inequality and precarity, with two supposedly once-in-a-lifetime global economic cataclysms occurring barely a decade apart (2007/8 and 2019 to
present). All of this, of course, cannot be separated from the ongoing climate emergency and, in particular, the seismic demographic and economic shifts which this catastrophe has and will continue to entail.

Crucially, the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have been fundamentally unequal (see, for example, Ahmed et al. 2020; Blundell et al. 2023; McGreal 2020; Patel et al. 2020), with the bases for this differential impact largely centred around many of the same vectors at the root of the myriad social justice movements outlined above (e.g. Isaac & Elrick 2021; Valencia et al. 2021). As such, the pandemic has served to draw into clearer focus the structural inequalities which underpin these injustices. Sex- and gender-based inequalities, including many highlighted through global permutations of the #MeToo movement – such as femicide, domestic violence, uneven distributions of unpaid care and domestic work, and workplace precarity – have been reportedly amplified during the COVID-19 pandemic (Tabbush & Friedman 2020; Kabeer et al. 2021). In the United Kingdom, these issues of sex- and gender-based inequalities rose to the surface most explicitly during the pandemic in the aftermath of several high-profile murders of women in London – including Bibaa Henry and Nicole Smallman in Wembley in June 2020 (Skopeliti 2021), Sarah Everard in Brixton in March 2021 (Dalton 2023) and Sabina Nessa in Greenwich in September 2021 (Rawlinson 2022) – sparking debates about societal attitudes towards women, the differential media and public response to these cases (and the intersection of ethnicity as an explanatory mechanism for these discrepancies) and the role of government and state organs such as the Metropolitan Police force. Similarly, in terms of race-based inequalities, the murder of George Floyd by police officers in Minneapolis, Minnesota in May 2020 acted as the spark which (re-)ignited a global social movement – Black Lives Matter – highlighting issues concerning racism, discrimination and inequality across many countries. In the UK context, this manifested in a wave of protests which occurred in response to Floyd’s murder, evolving and combining with elements of movements such as ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ (Mohdin 2020; Timalsina 2021) into broader societal debates concerning ongoing racial inequalities, the nation’s colonial history and uncritical memorialisation of certain individuals with problematic biographies, most clearly that of Edward Colston in Bristol (see, for example, Choksey 2021; Cole 2023).
Debates such as these concerning Britain’s colonial past inevitably reinvigorated longer-running disputes concerning the repatriation of artefacts in museums ranging from the Parthenon Marbles to the Benin Bronzes (see Ibbetson 2021 for recent British public opinion on the matter), as well as more novel critical perspectives on individuals and ideas, including this journal’s own university’s historical ties to the eugenics movement through individuals such as Francis Galton, Karl Pearson and Flinders Petrie (see, for example, Challis 2013; Das 2020; UCL 2020; MORE Subgroup 2020). Such society-wide debates have been reflected in many other nations across the world with (settler) colonial legacies. Many of these have intersected with more immediate and direct issues concerning the ongoing marginalisation of indigenous communities who, in many cases, have seen these marginalisations acutely sharpened through their differential experience of the COVID-19 pandemic (see, for example, Díaz de León-Martínez et al. 2020; Mallard et al. 2021; The Yucatecan Times 2021).

Inevitably, such social justice movements have triggered reactionary tendencies opposing the aims and objectives of these groups as well as, in many cases, seeking to roll back hard-fought victories of recent decades. Such revanchism has ranged from far-right populism in the political sphere (see, for example, Cammaerts 2022) to Orwellian doublespeak mantras such as “All Lives Matter” (see West et al. 2021) and whole ecosystems of misogynistic online ‘influencers’ targeting disaffected young people (Bates 2020) via another peri-pandemic ‘new normal’: that of reactionary conspiracy theorists taking aim at everything from vaccines to 5G mobile networks technology to carbon emission reduction efforts (see, for example, Sturm & Albrecht 2021; Freeman et al. 2022). All of these themes which research suggests (Freeman et al. 2022; Kużelew ska & Tomas zuk 2022) proliferated during periods of lockdown are linked, simply, by a reactionary, insular and contrarian outlook that perceives any critique of contemporary injustices as a civilisational, if not existential, assault. Moreover, an ever-increasing tendency among elements of the far-right who inevitably involve themselves in opposition to such progressive movements is that of the appropriation of the past – whether real or imagined – in the pursuit of their ends (see, for example, Richardson & Booth 2017; Niklasson & Hølleland 2018; Hakenbeck 2019; Barclay & Brophy 2020).
Archaeology, museums, cultural heritage and the intersection of COVID-19 and social justice movements

What then, is the relevance of these parallel currents to archaeology, cultural heritage and museums? Academic and cultural pursuits cannot be separated from the broader social context within which they operate. This was a cornerstone of the postprocessual turn in archaeology some 40 years ago and is common sense to most archaeologists today. Similarly, the social role and impact of museums and cultural heritage represent rich veins of research in recent decades. As such, on a more quotidian level, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on museums, universities and professional life was consistent with that of society at large: periods of shutdown, an instantaneous shift to the remote or virtual world and all of the dislocation which this entailed. This was paired with an accentuation of already acute issues relating to worker precarity, pay and conditions which, reflective of broader societal trends, appears to have been felt most extremely by those already most marginalised (see, for example, d’Alpoim Guedes et al. 2021; Flewellen et al. 2021; Hoggarth et al. 2021).

However, beyond these factors, the idiosyncratic nature of these academic pursuits clearly resulted in equally idiosyncratic impacts.

Plague and prejudice within the academy

Archaeology is an intensely practical discipline. Material culture is the stuff of archaeology and, as such, ours is a discipline which necessarily requires much physical ‘doing’, whether in terms of research or teaching/learning. It was this capacity to ‘do’ much archaeology that was the most superficially apparent impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdowns on the discipline. Our ability to undertake excavations and other forms of fieldwork ceased or, at least, was dramatically reduced for a considerable period of time and, even when fieldwork was possible, often a certain amount of reorientation or reimagining was required on the part of practitioners. Where planned research-linked fieldwork proved impracticable, there naturally occurred a general enhanced focus on previously excavated materials and re-evaluation of legacy and grey literature (Geser 2021) for many workers. Given the widely appreciated ‘storage crisis’ the discipline has faced for at least the last half century (see, for example, Marquard et al. 1982; Kersel 2015 and associated papers; Childs 2022) and associated underutilisation of existing archaeological data – a phenomenon that a cursory peruse of any museum or university archaeological stores
will readily confirm – this was certainly for the best. However, with the lifting of travel restrictions in the post-pandemic world, many of us (the present authors included) have picked up where we left off in terms of conducting fresh excavations and further burdening over-stretched storage facilities with copious quantities of new physical data. Hopefully, the renewed attention to already-existing data and materials will not prove to be a COVID-induced flash-in-the-pan in the long run (including, importantly, in the eyes of funding bodies); however, the desire to get ‘back to normal’ many of us feel does certainly increase the risk of forgetting such pandemic lessons.

Similarly, the teaching of archaeology was hugely impacted during the ‘COVID years’. This was most acutely felt by the cohort of young archaeologists who began their university careers in 2019 and 2020, for whom the lack of possibility for in-field excavation training was most keenly felt. However, other facets of archaeological pedagogy were certainly impacted, ranging from a variety of practical sessions in subdisciplines such as human osteology, zooarchaeology, material sciences, archaeological sciences and conservation, all the way through to considerable alterations to traditional lecture and assessment formats. As archaeology, museum studies and cultural heritage degrees moved online, questions emerged about various facets of this enforced shift including increases in staff and student workload, the mental health impact on both students and instructors, what was potentially being lost in terms of the social side of the university and the impact on often already precariously employed instructors regarding copyright of recorded lecture material.

Particularly in archaeology – although also a factor in other disciplines such as museum studies, heritage and conservation – the long-term impact of the lack of (or, at least, disruption to) fieldwork and other practical experience through the duration of undergraduate and Master’s training on this ‘COVID cohort’ is as yet unclear. However, at the very least, we can say that an undergraduate education in archaeology with severely limited, at best back-loaded, fieldwork experience represents a considerable break with traditional archaeological pedagogy. Lucas’ (2015) famous invocation of the trowel as metaphor for the archaeological appropriation of theory

---

3 Although, it is important to note – as alluded to below – that access to grey literature and materials held in archives is a significant issue which remains to be overcome in spite of accelerated progress in the digitisation of such materials as a consequence of the pandemic (see, for example, Casarotto 2022).
from other disciplines is intriguing in this light. If, as is often feared by archaeologists, little of the theoretical frameworks upon which our interpretation of the past rest, can be said to be endogenous to the discipline, what implications does this deprivation of fieldwork opportunities and other practical elements of archaeological training (that is, the truly distinguishing features of archaeology as a social scientific discipline) have? Or, to put it another way, to what extent would a (hypothetical) purely theoretical archaeology degree actually constitute a degree in archaeology as distinct from history, anthropology or any other historical or anthropocentric field concerned with the past (or a combination thereof)? In some ways, this can be considered allegorically to spending several years studying music theory before you are allowed to pick up an instrument for the first time. It certainly can be done and, indeed, there may be some benefits to such an approach; however, there surely exist good reasons why this is generally not done.

Conversely, what may be the advantages to such an approach in the very specific milieu which the intersection of the COVID-19 pandemic and (re)surgence of social justice movements represents? In a time when ‘new norms’ are being established and broader societal debates and renegotiations are taking place, as outlined above, could there be said to be an advantage in a more theoretically-laden initial training in archaeology, museum studies, cultural heritage and other related disciplines before focusing more intensely on the practical elements of these disciplines? Our collective experience over the last few years has undeniably shifted perspectives on a number of issues, meaning there is certainly scope for novel theoretical interventions on a number of topics. For example, the experience of living through a plague, and the social, cultural, economic and political reactions to it, could certainly be said to have imbued many of us with something more approaching an emic perspective on comparable periods in the past. Similarly, a more acute appreciation of the differential impact of disasters on different strata of society (in whatever socially constructed way these are defined) could well stimulate a keener awareness of the heterogeneous lived experience of past peoples. Before and during the pandemic, we began to see an increasing amount of scholarship concerned with, for example, critical perspectives and calls to action concerning the role archaeology plays in perpetuating and upholding certain injustices within society (see, for example, d’Alpoim Guedes et al. 2021; Flewellen et al. 2021; Hoggarth et al. 2021). Alongside these prescient calls to action concerning the practice of archaeology, both in the field and within the
academy, it will be intriguing to see what the implications of these more clearly articulated perspectives on our role in perpetuating inequalities on archaeological interpretations and theoretical models will look like and the extent to which these can prove impactful on mainstream debates beyond internal disciplinary discourse.

Plague and prejudice in the industry
Similar debates have also been taking place across the museum sector and cultural heritage more broadly, accelerated by the intersection of the COVID-19 pandemic and the wider social justice issues outlined above (see, for example, Puddle & Katwala 2023: 6 for the British context). In the first instance, the impact of the pandemic on the museum sector was huge. Financially, some museums across Europe experienced a 75–80% reduction in income at the onset owing to a lack of visitors (NEMO 2020). This necessitated a wholesale shift towards the digital realm across the sector, with a marked uptick in collection digitisation, virtual exhibitions and social media engagement (see, for example, Burke et al. 2020; McGrath 2020; King et al. 2021; UNESCO 2021; Giannini & Bowen 2022). Moreover, the pandemic stimulated novel collection practices to document the event, alongside updated contemporary guidelines on doing so ethically (Atkinson 2020). The persistence and long-term consequences of this enforced shift in practice remain unclear; however, given many of the approaches adopted during the pandemic appear to represent hastening of trends already discussed within digital heritage fields, it seems probable that many elements of novel (or enhanced) digital approaches will continue into the future.

Concurrent with pandemic-necessitated shifts in working practices, discussions concerning the social role and responsibilities of museums and heritage practitioners have continued in light of these developments. Recent work exploring structural societal inequalities have focused on myriad vectors, including (dis/)ability, class, gender, race and sex (see, for example, Sandell 2002; Golding & Modest 2013; Janes & Sandell 2019; Iervolino & Sergi 2023), as well as broader concerns such as the ongoing climate catastrophe (see, for example, Harrison & Sterling 2021; McGhee 2021). Similarly, more specific actions have been undertaken, for example, in response to the toppling of the Colston statue in Bristol (Cole 2023) which may conceivably act as a blueprint for comparable future events. And, of course, questions concerning issues surrounding the repatriation of artefacts and objects held
in museum collections across the global north continue apace in an increasingly fraught discursive climate (see, for example, Olusoga 2021; Puddle & Katwala 2023).

The way in which the twin phenomena of the COVID-19 pandemic and the concurrent appearance and/or resurgence of a variety of social justice movements in recent years have impacted, and will continue to impact, our disciplines are fascinating debates warranting further engagement. At the core of these conversations are questions concerning accessibility. The rapid conversion of collections and exhibitions into the digital space has certainly made them more accessible than previously (although, importantly, not to everyone – this is not a panacea solution). However, the focus of many museums appears to have been geared towards accessibility for their audiences. The extent to which this will translate to increased accessibility to researchers across the world, the potential impact on increasing multivocality and underrepresented perspectives on museum collections that this may have, and what this means for the gatekeeping role museums have historically played in granting access to their collections for research purposes remains to be seen. Similarly, discourse on the role and future directions of the museum and heritage sectors appears to have become more accessible with an increase in these conversations occurring on social media alongside more traditional fora such as disciplinary journals and conferences. The quality and utility of this debate can be deliberated due to factors such as the lack of nuance on character-restricted platforms, the potential for disinformation, astroturfing and arguments made in bad faith, and a reduced capacity to discern expertise on certain issues among many participants. However, greater public engagement with these issues – alongside an increased democratisation of participation – is certainly a positive. What remains to be seen is whether the increase in broad-spectrum engagement which appears to have been a consequence of these twin phenomena is manifested in increased opportunities for professional (i.e. paid) engagement and career opportunities across the sectors.

The scope and aims of this special issue
It is questions and topics such as these which this special issue of Papers from the Institute of Archaeology seeks to address. In so doing, we hope to draw together researchers, lecturers, professionals and students to reflect on the intersection of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and resurgent social justice movements across
the world on archaeology, cultural heritage, museums and the study of the past more broadly. We encourage participants to consider the theoretical, methodological and practical impact of these themes, as well as to share experiences of how these last few years have shaped or altered their perceptions of these disciplines, inherent assumptions therein, teaching, research, learning and the role of these disciplines and fields within society more broadly.

The publication model for this special issue will also be somewhat novel. Instead of publishing all contributions *en bloc*, we will be trialling a rolling publication model for contributions. As such, contributions will be published as and when they are ready, in the hope that this will render this special issue a more ‘living’ entity and encourage responses and discussions around papers which feature in it. Debates concerning the issues outlined above are still ongoing – and, most likely, will continue to be contentious issues for years to come – meaning we hope that *Plague and Prejudice: Archaeology, COVID-19, and the Resurgence of Social Justice Movements* can serve as a potential forum for these debates as they evolve. Pandemics have, as Arundhati Roy (2020) has noted, “historically… forced humans to break with the past and imagine their worlds anew”. Most importantly, therefore, we hope that – whether here or elsewhere (in print, at conferences, or more informally in person as much important archaeological discourse seemingly occurs [Morel 2014; Rocks-Macqueen 2016]) – these conversations *do* occur across our disciplines which we feel have much to offer in these debates, and that the profoundly ambiguous experience we shared for some two years during the COVID-19 pandemic can stimulate new and innovative perspectives on human societies past, present and future.
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