

This photographic journey shows us that to look at our everyday surroundings in an “archaeological” way means to consider objects for their materiality and chronological information, and as coming from an intermixed past. It is also to visualize our built environment as a stratified multi-period urban landscape.

Anyone can develop an archaeological way of looking at their surroundings, but that certainly isn’t enough to become a professional archaeologist. However, a taste of and engagement with past material culture gives a sense of the past’s thickness that could help to develop our own fruitful dialogue with the present.

Michaël Jasmin has a PhD in Archaeology from the Sorbonne, Paris, and makes site-specific “archaeological” installations. Email: michael.jasmin@mae.u-paris10.fr Website: www.michaeljasmin.org

□ Digging Up and Digging Down: Urban Undergrounds

- Paul Dobraszczyk
University of Manchester
p.dobraszczyk@ucl.ac.uk
- Carlos López Galviz
University of Lancaster
c.lopez-galviz@lancaster.ac.uk
- Bradley Lannes Garrett
University of Southampton
b.garrett@soton.ac.uk

Archaeology is the academic discipline most preoccupied with what is underneath us. It is also a field of study that until relatively recently has been predominated by work in non-urban areas. We are three urban scholars who have our own fixations with the underground. In fact, we have just compiled an edited collection called *Global Undergrounds* (Dobraszczyk *et al.* 2016), which surveys 80 underground sites from every continent, including Antarctica. This process coincided serendipitously with this call to consider whether we are indeed all archaeologists now. From the ruins of disused sewage systems to the churning of subterranean space by tunnel-boring machines, we, like archaeologists, spend more time with our thoughts under street level than anywhere else. What we would like to suggest in this short paper is that the excavation of urban undergrounds, as a sort of reverse archaeology where the newest stratigraphy must always go further down, is feeding an intellectual interest in underground spaces which has been accelerating since the large-scale nineteenth-century excavations of cities like London and Paris. Our key argument is that excavation is not just an archaeological praxis: it is also the process that has led to layer-upon-layer of infrastructure crowding

the underground, separating functions, often in the interest of circulation. Circulation is of course another disciplinary bridge we could build between geography and archaeology, trade and mobility being central to both disciplines.

Consider the construction of Crossrail in London as a point of crossover (Figure 1). The BBC documentary series *The Fifteen Billion Pound Railway* (2014) not only gave insight into the sheer diversity of challenges that engineers have faced and responded to; another striking element was how the project has also opened up unique opportunities (and indeed challenges) for archaeologists, in particular in relation to shedding new light on the period of the Great Plague (1665). Similar connections might be drawn between the building of railways in Victorian London and the interest of figures such as Charles Roach Smith in recovering the domestic, mundane, and fragmentary as part of London's Roman ancestry.

We seek here to forge links between urban, industrial, and contemporary archaeology and the broad range of themes that confronted us in the process of collating and making sense of the 80 entries on global undergrounds for our new book, a good number of which brought us into contact with recent scholarship by archaeologists and what has been called the “vertical turn” in geography.

The politics of subterranea is a topic that social and cultural scholars have turned to with increasing attention in the past decade. In the words of Stephen Graham and Lucy Hewitt, the “flattening of discourses and imaginaries [that] tends still to dominate critical urban research in the Anglophone world” needs to be challenged (Graham and



FIGURE 1: The Crossrail excavation under London, where archaeology and infrastructure intersect (photograph by Theo Kindynis).

Hewitt 2013, 71–72). Graham and Hewitt suggest shifting geographical imaginations to underground infrastructure as a means of combating this “horizontalism”. Indeed, in recent years, a clutch of new geographic literature has sprung up that thinks through our relationship to vertical space (e.g. Adey 2010; Elden 2013; Graham 2014). Yet much of this work has continued to see the subterranean as space out, over, and under what we know—continuing to render it conceptual, forbidden, and even exotic. Archaeology, as a discipline that invites the public to participate in the excavation of knowledges in various ways, seems to us to offer a more participatory perspective for engaging with underground spaces. Gavin Bridge, a geographer, recently suggested that:

Shafts, tunnels, mines and other holes into the ground serve as conduits connecting the plane of existence (the surface) to a radically different space below. As conduits, their function is to connect—to enable movement by bringing two spaces into relation.

(Bridge 2013, 55)

We find three promising links in the passage above in the context of seeking intersection between urban geography and archaeology. First, we see the underground as an intertwined space: in opening our imagination to the vertical, we do not wish to pitch it against the horizontal, for the cultural entanglements that move along and within both axes are enmeshed and inseparable. Just as archaeology recognizes that space is fundamental to the understanding of time, we contend that time is crucial to the construction of space and place. Second, conduits connect places and meanings; undergrounds are vehicles for powerful narratives, from personal stories of labour and fear to more structural issues that perpetuate asymmetries across class, gender, or wealth. Third, undergrounds crystallize one of the functions that are most essential to cities enmeshed in global networks of mobilities today: circulation. A separate infrastructure suggesting a sectional understanding of the city where people, goods, capital, information, and waste circulate—cut off from the turbulent rhythm of streets and daily life—is something that deserves our attention and that of archaeologists, not least because of the connections between space and politics that converge underground (Galviz 2013).

One very important component of a richer awareness of the underground is a reflection on where we look for the discourses and practices of subterranean space and how they have been transformed in the past. This view tends to privilege those who have the power to plan, transform, and manipulate urban space: the architects, engineers, emperors, kings, religious leaders, aristocrats, wealthy merchants, artists, and politicians who often have the resources to excavate. While we should never lose sight of the important histories of those excavations, there are other stories that can be recovered: testimonies to labour, beliefs, mythologies, and subversive tunnelling and underground dwelling. The long histories of many cities are as much about processes of sinking as they are about reaching for the skies, not just through the successive stacking of material remains but through the laying of the foundations of rising cities, and of the stories that go hand in hand with them.

The underground is both a collection of spaces and events in need of recordation, and a place of connections between surface, subsurface, and even supersurface matter.

We would like to encourage moves away from a sense of sites, surfaces, and linearity when approaching undergrounds, and closer towards—following Peter Sloterdijk's suggestion—spherical constellations of meaning that imagine urban space as an "intimate, enclosed and shared round shape, spread out through joint inhabiting" (Sloterdijk 1999, 1011). No other definition better captures the multiplicities of the vast connections and movements that the contributors to our *Global Undergrounds* book have made apparent through their essays. Central to those connections and movements are the human dimensions of the undergrounds that we explore: whether built to escape war and destruction, or planned as a conscious exercise in building national identities, these spaces speak to both our primordial fears and also to our desire for intimacy and enclosure; they articulate both lost histories and alternative futures. They are spaces of function and meaning and also spaces of becoming.

Our aim in this short article is simply to point to, and demonstrate, a fruitful path toward exploring these multiplicities; one that engages as many different perspectives as can be (reasonably) gathered, and that is predicated on *exploration* rather than *explanation*. For some, this may seem like an abdication of the responsibility to commit, a revelling in ambiguity for its own sake, yet we believe strongly in a stance that *listens*, *gathers*, and *assembles* rather than coheres and orders.

Our collective attachment to subterranea has accelerated in direct relation to the fact that most people on the planet now live in cities, where their relationship with the underground is both practical and expansive in its meanings and associations. Though we do not argue this awareness has imbued everyone with the sensibilities of archaeologists, as scholars fascinated in processes of place-making we argue that urban undergrounds are more important than they ever have been. Perhaps as archaeology, geography, and history become increasingly intertwined, so too can we expect that people will have a greater awareness of the intersections between time and space as the worlds that we inhabit continue to sink.

References

- Adey, P. 2010. "Vertical Security in the Megacity: Legibility, Mobility and Aerial Politics." *Theory, Culture & Society* 27(6): 51–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0263276410380943>
- Bridge, G. 2013. "Territory, now in 3D!" *Political Geography* 34: 55–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2013.01.005>
- Dobraszczyk, P., C. López Galviz and B. L. Garrett. 2016. *Global Undergrounds: Exploring Cities Within*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Elden, S. 2013. "Secure the Volume: Vertical Geopolitics and the Depth of Power." *Political Geography* 34: 35–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2012.12.009>
- Galviz, C. L. 2013. "Mobilities at a Standstill: Regulating Circulation in London c.1863–1870." *Journal of Historical Geography* 42: 62–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2013.04.019>
- Graham, S. 2014. "Super-tall and Ultra-deep: The Cultural Politics of the Elevator." *Theory, Culture & Society* 31: 239–265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0263276414554044>
- Graham, S. and L. Hewitt. 2013. "Getting off the Ground: On the Politics of Urban Verticality." *Progress in Human Geography* 37(1): 72–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0309132512443147>
- Sloterdijk, P. 1999. *Sphären II: Globen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Paul Dobraszczyk is a researcher and writer based in Manchester, UK, and a visiting lecturer at the Bartlett School of Architecture in London. Address for correspondence: 80 Warwick Road, Stockport, Cheshire, UK, SK4 2NL. Email: dobraszczyk@yahoo.co.uk

Carlos López Galviz is a Lecturer in the Theories and Methods of Social Futures at Lancaster University. Address for correspondence: Institute for Social Futures, c/o Educational Research, County South, Lancaster University, LA1 4YN, UK. Email: c.lopez-galviz@lancaster.ac.uk

Bradley L. Garrett is a lecturer in Human Geography in the Department of Geography and Environment at the University of Southampton. Address for correspondence: Shackleton Building (44) University of Southampton Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK. Email: b.garrett@soton.ac.uk