

Introductions

IMAGES OF THE PAST

Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics

Ian Russell

Trinity College Dublin

INTRODUCTION

This volume investigates the relationship between archaeology and the heritage and tourism industries and the implications of such a relationship in a world dominated by mass production, replication, simulation and consumption. There is a need to engage with philosophical issues concerning this relationship in practical and ethical ways. Thus, the contributions to this volume highlight the need to move away from static, monolithic conceptions of archaeology as a modern science which searches for truth and fact to an understanding of archaeologies as reflexive discourses which express understandings about human agency and existence.

This volume is the result of a series of discussions, professional relationships and friendships that began in September 2004 at the meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists at Lyon, France. Debates which developed from the session “‘A souvenir from...’: Tourism, Heritage Industries and the Development of Archaeology’ quickly demonstrated that archaeology is involved in a complex relationship with modern societies. As antiquarianism developed from the Grand Tour and archaeology grew from antiquarianism, we were presented with the question of whether or not archaeology as the study of the past has ever been separate from the human concepts of heritage and practices of tourism. Given the current industrialised and commercialised

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

nature of heritage and tourism within many western nations and the current mass simulation of archaeological sites and replication of archaeological artefacts in interpretative centres, it became clear that archaeology's relationship to modern heritage and tourism industries was part of much more fundamental issues concerning archaeology's qualities as a modern science and the role of technology and science in founding epistemologies in the modern world. The exploration of these issues became more urgent as it also became apparent that whether or not archaeologists assumed an objective, impartial and scientific approach to the study of the past, the discipline was continuing to become more a part of popular culture. Concerns over archaeology's role in the production and marketing of images of the past to be consumed by modern individuals and what this implied for concepts of meaning and value for archaeological research were echoed throughout many comments. This volume is an exploration of these discussions and these concerns for the practices, presentations and theories of archaeology in a modern world increasingly driven by technology, science, economics, consumption, capitalism, marketing and images.

This volume is not offered as an authoritative text or reflection on what archaeology is, but rather it is an opening to a reflexive discourse about what archaeology can do. In order to maintain this volume as a contribution to an open discourse, at the close of each section the contributors of that section have been invited to read one another's work and put forward an informal response to the themes which emerge from the section. Thus, the volume functions more as a discussion or a series of dialogues between contemporary thinkers and practitioners concerned with the role of the past in contemporary society. Many differing perspectives will be shared from many different individuals and disciplines. There will be disagreements and there may be contradictions. These should, however, be embraced, for in the most harmonious of symphonies, there are always moments of discord. It is through presenting these different themes in archaeological thought that new spaces for discourse and development will be highlighted. Union can lead to static, monolithic agreement. Disagreement creates tension and dynamism, and the space created between different points of view is also the space where new ideas can grow.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

THE IMAGE AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

The true picture of the past flits by. The past can be seized only as an image which flashes up at the instant when it can be recognised and is never seen again. ... For every image of the past that is not recognised by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably (Benjamin 1992b, 247).

Written in 1940, these words are the reaction of Walter Benjamin (1892-1940) to the phenomena of historical awareness and perception. For Benjamin, the past was composed of images or imaginings of human being and agency. These 'images of the past', however, are not universal and continually occurring phenomena. The visualisation and imagination of the past as part of the great rush of historical development occurs when relevant to 'present' or contemporary 'concerns'. Benjamin's concept of a dynamic and rushing flow of images and imaginings, only fashioned into a history through relevance to contemporary practice, acts as a metaphor for the relationship between archaeology and modern society. The rush of modern scientific and political development has put archaeology at the forefront of discourses and clashes over competing images and imaginings of the past whose authority or authenticity is founded upon their relevance to contemporary social concerns.

This is not a situation uniquely experienced or described by Benjamin. There has been a growing concern in recent years about the role of images in society. The recent exhibition and publication entitled *Iconoclash* by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel (2002) at the Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie (Centre for Art and Media) in Karlsruhe, Germany raised some very pertinent questions about society's fixation on visual media as a method of communicating meaning.

What has happened that has made images ... the focus of so much passion? ... To the point where being an iconoclast seems the highest virtue, the highest piety, in intellectual circles? (Latour & Weibel 2002, 14)

The question of why society so readily uses images to communicate is intriguing. Images are used to unite individuals, entertain consumers, market commodities, disturb viewers, subvert ideologies and inspire

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

action (ibid.). These qualities and the dominance of the visual within socio-cultural relations, however, are not recently developed symptoms of contemporary social experience. They are developments from a fundamental mode of human expression and communication through performance and representation (Stone & Molyneaux 1994; Pearson & Shanks 2001; Smiles & Moser 2005).

The power of images or the power of viewing does not lie in any inherent dominance that the sense of sight has over the other senses but in the fact that sight or 'seeing' images is the earliest communicative medium in human development. This is the first observation of John Berger's (1972) seminal discourse with the British Broadcasting Corporation, *Ways of Seeing*, on the impact of popular visual culture on society. Following Walter Benjamin (1992a), Berger's exploration of the role of sight and visualisations highlighted the understudied impact of image, sight and viewing in human society and in human communication. Such impact is important to note in a discussion on the role of the past in society since archaeology deals primarily with objects which are functionally mute, and thus archaeological interpretation fundamentally relies on the sense of sight, on seeing artefacts and interpreting images. Archaeology, as a development of modern science, relied heavily on the ability of humans to visually observe the changing colours of soil deposits, to recognise the stylistic and compositional similarities between artefacts and to visualise the architectural form of a building long since destroyed. In this way, archaeology fundamentally relies on sight, viewing, images and imagination.

Acting as a representation of our beliefs about what occurred in what we conceive of as the past, the artefact or archaeological object gives 'material' expression or 'roots' to our own images and imaginings about human agency. Brian L. Molyneaux's volume *The Cultural Life of Images* (1997) opened up a critical discussion into the ways human beings view archaeology and view objects which they interpret as having archaeological authority. Stephanie Moser and Sam Smiles' (2004) edited volume *Envisioning the Past* has made it evidently clear that archaeological practice has an inherent quality of viewing and visualising the past as a method of understanding or 'envisioning' the origins of humanity. Thus, the past may be imagined, interpreted and understood and then communicated visually in society.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Julian Thomas has argued that there is an inherent role in human consciousness for what he terms the 'archaeological imagination' (Thomas 1996, 63-4). For Thomas, modern archaeological practice is a development from this basic facet of human perception. 'In everyday life, human beings grasp elements of the material world, and constitute them as evidence for past human practice ... archaeology as science is based on this prescientific way of being attuned to the world' (Thomas 1996, 63). In this way, the archaeological imagination is a qualified aspect of modern visual perception and conception of images and representations of the social narratives of belief in the past. The difficulty with Thomas' concept is that it is a qualitative use of the modern concept of archaeology to describe what is 'understood' as universal and essential in human perception concerning all things ancient and past. It is almost as if Thomas is asserting, in Freudian terms, a fundamental archaeological drive in human behavior. What is useful in Thomas' concept is that it is an impressionistic expression of the attempt of humans to grasp and cope with the perceived temporal nature of existence and the physical signifiers which are interpreted as evidence for previous human agency. Admittedly modern, it is one of the ways that humans answer the question 'how did we get here?' through the utilisation of artefacts as visual representations of contemporary conceptions of the past (Molyneaux 1997; Renfrew 2003; Stone & Molyneaux 1994).

ARTEFACTS AND IMAGES

In a basic sense, an archaeological artefact is a souvenir, a memento of an experience of excavation. Artefacts are 'found objects' from an excavation site which are taken, interacted with, interpreted and often placed in a collection away from the initial point of recovery in order to be viewed. Once antiquarians took artefacts as souvenirs of their travels and studies, but tourists now take representations of artefacts and monuments as souvenirs of their cultural experiences. Whether replicas of Stonehenge or postcards of western Irish landscapes, images, replicas, simulations and representations of the past have overwhelmed society, eclipsing artefacts as the main source of representations of modern beliefs of the past, linear temporality and human agency.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Popular interest in ‘objects’ from the past within a modern European context grew out of the collecting and exhibiting of souvenir objects appropriated from ‘far away’ or colonised lands such as Greece or Egypt whilst on the Grand Tour (Bohrer 2003; Gosden 2004). This interest grew into a vocation of antiquarianism, a specialisation in the field of art history. The objects, which were brought to European colonial and imperial capitals such as London and Paris, were exhibited alongside what contemporary society would differentiate as ‘works of art’ in spaces such as the British Museum and the Louvre (McClellan 1999; Anderson *et al.* 2003). The same critical theory was used to evaluate both artefacts and art objects. The term ‘artefact’ used to identify objects of archaeological discovery was itself an appropriation from art history. However, the advent of archaeological science, the development of photography and the growth of indigenous European prehistoric studies during the 19th century and the early 20th century resulted in a separation between society’s relationship with art and its understanding and valuing of historical artefacts, previously appreciated as works of art themselves. Photography came to substitute visual ‘realism’ in painting, while archaeological artefacts came to substitute physical ‘realism’ in sculpture. Awe at science and the results of the photographic and archaeological process inspired belief in the two processes as quests for visible and tangible evidence of human agency. Archaeology became revered as the search for ascertainable truth accessible through artefacts revealed in excavation. These artefacts testified to the ethnic origins of European cultures (Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; Graves-Brown *et al.* 1996; Jones 1996; Meskell 1998; 2001). Photography became part of the quest for documenting ‘real’ or ‘actual’ events in order to record ‘what actually happened’ (Coe 1977; Wood 1993; Green-Lewis 1996; Lenman 2005). However, art became associated with subjective, interpretative experience. It should be noted that some photographers have used their craft in this way too, in order to subvert ‘known’ or ‘seen’ reality (e.g. Man Ray (1890-1976) and Raoul Hausmann (1886-1971)). However, while photographers were working through Dadaism and surrealism to subvert and question the authenticity of the image in the beginning of the 20th century, archaeologists were busy documenting artefacts, compiling archaeological records and producing narratives of historical ‘fact’ about the past.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

This schism between belief in modern scientific ‘fact’ or historical ‘truth’ and belief in artistic interpretative, subjective expression allowed archaeological practice as a modern science and the exhibition of archaeological artefacts to be protected from the deconstructionist critiques of early 20th century philosophy and art theory. It is problematic that while art work such as Marcel Duchamp’s ‘Fountain’ (1917) and René Magritte’s ‘The Treason of Images’ (1928-9) questioned and undermined the ability of the object, the image or text to represent or convey authentic meaning or ‘truth’, early 20th century European politicians aided by prehistorians utilised archaeological artefacts to represent and bolster ethno-national identities and claims to territorial regions such as in the Irish Free State (Cooney 1996; Crooke 2000), Falangist Spain (Díaz-Andreu 1993; 1995; Díaz-Andreu & Ramírez Sánchez 2004), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Klejn 1993; Shnirelman 1995; 1996) and National Socialist Germany (Arnold 1990; Arnold & Hassmann 1995). It is especially problematic that archaeological artefacts and monuments are still understood as manifestations of national and ethnic identity and are used to market national heritage and tourism industries while the work of Duchamp, Magritte and others (e.g. Andy Warhol) is accepted and appreciated by the public as a comment on the attempt to represent or communicate value or meaning through objects and images.

The reaction against the use of archaeology for nationalistic purposes after World War II resulted not in a deconstruction and revision of what archaeology is or does but, instead, in the development of cultural historical approaches to archaeological interpretation under Gordon Childe (e.g. 1947) and, later, processual archaeological practice. Both schools founded their approach on scientific authority and process and, thus, made archaeology less subjective and more objective. This further removed archaeology and the exhibition of archaeological artefacts from criticisms derived from art and visual cultural theory by such thinkers as Walter Benjamin in the 1930s (1992a), Theodor Adorno in the 1960s (1967; 1973a; 1973b; 1997) and by popular studies such as John Berger’s *Ways of Seeing* (1972) which make no overt criticisms of archaeology. While art objects and mass produced replications and representations of art objects were being criticised as by Benjamin (1992a; Berger 1972) in ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’, archaeological objects were seen as unique and authentic

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

sources of 'truth' about the past and therefore not subject to the theories and criticism of art. Archaeological artefacts, monuments, sites and landscapes were believed to be capable of providing scientific data which could be revealed more authoritatively through more advanced methods or processes. Thus archaeology's corresponding representations (postcards, souvenirs, replicas, interpretative centres, etc.) have also not been criticised using contemporary visual cultural theory and art theory and instead are consumed as representations of 'truth' about the past and as sources for authentic experiences of the past.

Despite post-processual critiques of scientific processual archaeological practice, archaeological studies as modern science are still utilised today in the formation of modern national and ethnic identities and are presented to society as evidence of an identity's 'existence' (Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; Graves-Brown et al. 1996; Meskell 1998; 2001; see Stritch this volume). This illustrates the urgency of the contemporary situation. As archaeological studies grew from antiquarian studies which in turn grew from art historical studies, it is no longer appropriate to classify archaeological artefacts as authentic material evidence of human agency and human social identity. Since archaeological artefacts, monuments and landscapes are marketed and consumed today as representations of experience, heritage and identity, they must be reincorporated into the vocabulary of cultural representations and be approached using visual cultural theory (Stone & Molyneaux 1994; Molyneaux 1997; Renfrew 2003). They should no longer be approached as singular, unique 'truths' but as fluid representations of modern belief in temporality and human agency, as images of the past.

THE WORK OF ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE AGE OF MASS REPRESENTATION

We are surrounded today by media saturated with images, visualisations and materialisations of others, other worlds and other times. These images actively market commodities which individuals can consume as affirmations of self, modern group identity and the present human condition (Lowenthal 1985; Lacey 1998). A proliferation of images and representations of both individuals as well as of autonomous

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

social groups is readily available for consumption at the proverbial 'click of a mouse'. In this situation an evident trend is to utilise modern conceptions of the past as a commodified experience which can be mass-produced for consumption in the form of images in order to capitalise on modern emotive responses to the past.

Bill Evamy (2003) in a recent article in the British design magazine *Blueprint* discussed the evident phenomenon of corporations such as Nike, Shell and British Petroleum dropping the text from their corporate logos opting instead for stylised images, such as the simple 'swoosh' without the brand-name as in Nike advertising campaigns. Describing this phenomenon as the 'iconic boom', Evamy argued that this was evidence of a rise in visual literacy in society, meaning that as a society we are developing universal visual symbolologies to facilitate more efficient communication which transcends language barriers:

Symbols on their own are more powerful – or offer an impression of greater power – than symbols that require a supporting text. They can develop the capacity to trigger complex collections of feelings, bypassing the conscious mind on the way. And they are more exportable; they more easily avoid associations with specific cultures or languages (2003, 62).

DeMarrais, Castillo and Earle (1996, 19) noted that archaeological monuments, when understood as a materialisation of an ideology, have the ability to cross-cut difference and boundaries within and without a society as the materialisation is non-textual and therefore is not restricted to specific cultural-linguistic groups. However, the fact that a monument must be interpreted and communicated by an individual situated in a social context means that artefacts and monuments have become associated with specific cultures or languages by contemporary society. The perceived authenticity of the artefact or monument's materiality is used as an opportunity to reify social and ethnic identities (Heather 1996, 5; Jones 1996; 1997). They are often perceived as material markers of peoples and culture such as with Peter Heather's (1996) study of the Goths or Catherine Hills' (2003) study of the English. This is the significance of the archaeological artefact in modern large group psychology. It is inherently iconic, as it has no supporting text to market its meaning. Thus, the meanings attributed to artefacts are continually renewed and re-envisioned within the communication channels of society.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

The artefacts are perceived as fixed, 'constant' material visual markers that facilitate the discourse of heritage and the construction of historical consciousness and grand narratives of identity (DeMarrais *et al.* 1996, 19-20). To quote from Evamy again:

Visual information systems have been established, absorbed and digested by cultures around the world. They offer anonymous, generalised, abbreviated, compacted visions of human existence. They do their work for governments, agencies and business. Now, though, the same graphic languages are being appropriated by others to reflect alternative visions of the world (2003, 63)

Just as Shell's use of an organic shell on their credit cards and in their advertising campaigns enforces an image of the company as a natural, eternal and benevolent presence in the environment, the use of an artefact by a socio-political group gives that group a certain credence and affirmation by linking it to antiquity and suggesting a continual cultural and social lineage which therefore entitles the group to exist and to act in the world today (DeMarrais *et al.* 1996, 19-20). As David Lowenthal noted in *The Politics of the Past*, 'the Western emphasis on material tokens of antiquity as symbols of heritage has been all but universally adopted' (1989, 302). I suggest that artefacts form a visual information system that functions at the core of many modern cultural and social groups, and that of late there has been a marked increase in the use of archaeological images in the heritage industry through the 'logo-isation' of artefacts and symbols derived from artefacts for their iconic value. Artefacts are an integral component of modern society's visual literacy, inspiring many groups in the construction of their identity (see Brighton & Orser and Blain & Wallis this volume). It is a visual literacy which, like corporate brand names, has been ever more encouraged and exploited in the construction of heritage industries and the development of 'heritage consumption'. Gabriel Cooney, an Irish archaeologist, noted 'it could be suggested that by default we as archaeologists are allowing the selection of elements from the past to be used for the dictates of the present, for example in the heritage and more broadly tourism industry, which is so central in the projection of a modern Irish identity' (1996, 160).

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

THE PRE-EMPTIVE POWER OF THE IMAGE

The effect of such images on contemporary society (as discussed above) is not easily understated. There are currently mass disseminations of images of cultural heritage sites and archaeological monuments on postcards and in guidebooks such as *The Lonely Planet* series or the dense barrage of images that are the *Eyewitness* travel guide series. John Urry (1990) has discussed the impact that the 'tourist gaze' can have on conceptions of heritage and identity; however, to what extent is the 'tourist gaze' preconditioned through the experience of mass produced images of heritage sites for marketing purposes. Many visitors will have already seen images of an artefact, monument or building prior to viewing the original in person. Often these images are used to assist the tourist to identify the location that they wish to visit and thus to ensure the tourist fully 'experiences' and appreciates the site. Observable at any major cultural heritage site are visitors with guide books comparing the heritage site they are experiencing with the image of the heritage site they are viewing.

This situation fundamentally affects social expectations of an experience of the past. A frequently overheard comment at sites such as the Tower of Pisa or the Parthenon is 'I expected it to be bigger'. The website travelideas.com reports in their description of Stonehenge as a tourist destination that 'Stonehenge is one of England's most famous Neolithic monuments and has attracted visitors for many years. ... most visitors to Stonehenge say that they expected it to be bigger.' (Travel Editors 2002) Similarly, an example from the website leafpile.com illustrates the impact that televised visualisations have had on experiences of the 'Sphinx' at Giza:

After all those specials on The Great Sphinx, we expected something bigger. Perhaps it could have seemed larger in a different setting, but we found ourselves actually looking around for a moment as if we'd see the real sphinx towering over this small thing we found. (Woods & Woods 2000)

Indeed, individuals often express the sentiment that they prefer the experience of consuming the image to experiencing the original monument or site. In a discussion thread entitled 'Help with Trip Planning – UK and Ireland' (from the website iadb.org) the user Pandora

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

states that 'Stonehenge is a bit of a disappointment - much better in photos ... I like the chalk drawings better' (2002).

These three examples illustrate the impact of the pre-emptive experience of cultural heritage sites through images of the past on contemporary experience and interpretation of original sites and monuments. Given the growing trend of marketing national heritage (i.e. archaeological objects, sites, monuments and landscapes) through tourism industries for economic development, archaeology is not generally the first point of contact for many people wishing to experience the past. Rather, it can be argued that individuals more often explore their conceptions of the past through consumptive choices of where to go on holidays, which will be driven by what they expect to find there from the past, or what commodities to buy and only turn to archaeology as a means of supporting their representations and conceptions of the past after they have made their consumptive choices. Archaeology is not the only proprietor of images of the past, and perhaps, the discipline never was. There is a growing gulf, however, between expectations of experience of the past based on mass marketed and mass produced images of the past from tourism and heritage industries and expectations founded upon experience of the past firsthand through visiting sites and monuments and participating in discussions over the interpretation of the past (see Holtorf this volume). This situation places practitioners of archaeology in an economic relationship with society in which the discipline must participate if it is to remain relevant to the public (see Missikoff this volume).

ARCHAEOLOGY AND REPRESENTATION OF THE PAST – THE ECONOMICS OF IMAGE CONFLICT

The commodification and marketing of the past and heritage as an experience to be consumed has been at the forefront of economic trends in the tourism industry in the Republic of Ireland for some years. Ruth McManus in discussing the relationship between the tourism and heritage sectors in Ireland noted that:

The trend towards processes of commodification, or the culture of consumption ... is strongly related to many tourism and leisure

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

activities. Many pursuits have clearly been transformed into 'experiences' that can be marketed, sold and bought just as any other commodities. In this process the basic economic mechanisms of advertising, packaging and target marketing play a central role. The essence is the conversion of experiences or images into exchange relationships. Bord Fáilte's [the Irish Welcome Board] new marketing initiative reflects this approach, having 'emotional experience as its core positioning' (Bord Fáilte, 1997) (1997, 92).

It is no longer acceptable to ignore the globalised pattern of economic systems relying on marketing heritage or the past as emotive experiences to be consumed (see Missikoff this volume). The urgency of such situations is that this subjects the meaning of value or heritage and conceptions of the past to Western economic models and global economic ebbs and flows. Equally, attaching the conservation and preservation of heritage to economic sectors such as tourism means that if that economic market fails or if the economy of a region or people fail then how is it then economically viable to maintain such sites.

This poses archaeologists and workers in the heritage sector with a difficult problem. The use of the past to forge images as materialisations of contemporary individual desires of experience leaves conceptions of the past vulnerable to the market. When discussing the 'commercial construction of 'new nations'', anthropologist R.J. Foster notes that

the materialization of nationality in the form of consumable objects and experiences leaves the nation vulnerable to the market...what if mainly non-nationals buy – and so demand nationality in the forms that they prefer? (1999, 270)

Are artefacts monolithic objects of truth and representations of how a particular group wanted to be remembered, or are they images, representations, artificial imitations of what people today, as members of modern society would like to believe about their past (see Stritch, Brighton & Orser and Blain & Wallis this volume)? What has the technology of mass production done to social perceptions of the authenticity of images of the past? What is the effect on social and individual conceptions of the past when individuals 'buy' these homogenised, mass produced experiences and images of the past? Does this fundamentally affect the formation and manifestation of those

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

images through the illusion of authentic, unique consumptive choice, and what is the significance of this for conceptions of meaning and value within archaeological research and in the heritage sector?

MASS PRODUCTION OF IMAGES OF THE PAST - IMPLICATIONS FOR MEANINGS AND EXPERIENCES

The theme of philosophical concern over the impact of mass production of commodities through mechanical technology is represented well in the writings of Walter Benjamin. In 1936, Walter Benjamin (1992a) presented a discussion on the impact of mass mechanical reproduction on the authenticity of the work of art. Benjamin displays concern over the loss of authentic experience of art in light of the deluge of replicas and reproductions of such works. 'Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be.' (1992a, 214) According to Benjamin, this 'presence' and 'unique existence' is part of the 'aura' of the original art work. This 'aura' of authenticity of the original art work is perhaps what Benjamin was discussing when he reacted to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's concept of the *Urphänomen* – an archetypal phenomenon, a concrete thing to be discovered in the world of appearances (Arendt 1992, 17). Thus, the 'aura' of authenticity is something, for Benjamin, which is also to be experienced in the 'world of appearances' of the past in artefacts, monuments and landscapes.

One of the concerns that Benjamin expressed is that in producing reproductions, the uniqueness and authenticity of the original is challenged:

By making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of copies for a unique existence. And in permitting the reproductions to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation, it reactivates the object reproduced. These two processes lead to a tremendous shattering of tradition which is the obverse of the contemporary crisis and renewal of mankind (Benjamin 1992a, 215).

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Replicated art objects (to be followed by mass produced replications) call into question the authenticity of the original art object. Benjamin delighted in the 'aura of the original' art object and rightly notes the significance of social acceptance of and affirmation of meaning in replicated objects. Although Benjamin notes after Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) that the 'crisis' is a result of modern technological methods of reproduction, he still noted that replication has long been part of educational experience within society.

In principle a work of art has always been reproducible. Manmade artefacts could always be imitated by men. Replicas were made by pupils in practice of their craft, by masters for diffusing their works, and, finally, by third parties in the pursuit of gain. (1992a, 212)

In this way replication as imitation, or *mimêsis* in the Aristotelian tradition of poetics, can be seen as a fundamental aspect of the development and role of art, or *tekhne* in general. This theme of the necessity of replication or imitation is not restricted to Classical thought or to Western experiences of modernity. For example, the work of Japanese artist and photographer Hiroshi Sugimoto has highlighted the 'natural' and integral role of emulation in the development of artistic and cultural traditions in Japan.

In Japanese cultural tradition, the act of emulating works of great predecessors is called *honka-dori*, taking up the melody. Not looked down on as mere copying, it is regarded as a praiseworthy effort (Sugimoto 2005, 245).

Sugimoto's use of photography in *Pine Trees* (2001) to emulate the *Shotozu* (Pine Forest Screens) (circa 1590) by painter Hasegawa Tohaku (1539-1610) utilised the modern experience of photographic technology to explore the Japanese tradition of imitation and emulation of original artwork. By following the tradition of *honka-dori*, Sugimoto was able to develop his own original work, styles and ideas while simultaneously questioning the perceived threat of modern replication to the authenticity of a work of art. The situation has, however, become more complex with the advent of mass production, mass simulation and mass emulation in the development of capitalistic market-driven consumer-centred societies.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

At this point, the thought of Jean Baudrillard provides a wonderful point of inspiration concerning the effects of consumptive society and mass production on the authenticity of singular objects. Baudrillard (1998) in his discussions of contemporary social trends gives expression to the illusion of participatory action that consumption gives to the consumer. In a relationship with industrialised tourism and heritage, unique archaeological objects and monuments have become the models for lines of replications and simulations which are mass produced as consumable images, representations and experiences (Baudrillard 2003; 1996; also see Cochrane this volume). Inspired by the writings of Benjamin, Husserl and Baudrillard, this volume asks to what extent we are experiencing what has been referred to as a 'crisis of interpretation' or a 'crisis of representation' over the modern dichotomies of the image-object and the actual-object or the mass-produced object and the authentically-unique object (see Koerner this volume). What are the implications of this for notions of 'meaning' and 'value' in archaeological research and practice? Following Baudrillard, this volume posits the question of whether through our contemporary process of simulation and replication the meaning and value of the original artefact is being overlooked in the overwhelming availability of mass-produced, consumable signifiers of that artefact. Although Baudrillard neither puts forward a convincing theory of the nature and manifestation of consumptive behavior, nor an applicable way of moving on from the issues he raises, he does give one lasting impression which is very critical to the themes of this project. Although replication, simulation, mass production and consumption can be theorised and deconstructed, it is most important to appreciate the aspect of normalisation that these actions have on the perception the social individual.

The situation becomes more problematic when interpretive centres utilise simulated environments and replicated artefacts in order to produce hyper-real experiences that are demanded by the visitor who desires to 'feel' as if they are in the past (see Cochrane this volume). Through the production of interpretive centres and simulated heritage experiences, we, as archaeologists and heritage professionals, are encouraging the proliferation of hyper-realities in the form of 'authentic' tourism and heritage experiences which are dependent on the reappropriation of artefacts and monuments as images and simulations of the past. In this way, Baudrillard (2003, 101) might have described

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

interpretive centres and museums as 'hyper-markets' which provide space for the consumption of heritage. Temporal boundaries are made as invisible and traversable as possible in order to envelope the visitor in a simulated yet 'real' experience which escapes their modern industrial and technological existence. This situation is much like the one noted by Cornelius Holtorf and David van Reybrouc when discussing modern cage design in zoos. '...there is also some irony in the fact that the popular appeal of hyperrealist architecture, made possible through Western industry and technology, is based on scepticism about that very industry and technology' (2003, 214).

This is the fundamental problem that is presented to modern archaeologies. Archaeology's popular appeal relies on its ability to produce images, narratives and experiences of the past which can be perceived as authentic, unique and true and which facilitate the experience of the past as a space and time separate and distinct from the contemporary modern world (see Holtorf this volume). These images and experiences, however, are manifested through modern industrial and technological developments which allow the mass production of replicated heritage objects and the proliferation of images of the past through print and digital media so that they can be consumed through personalised choices by individuals *en masse*. Of course, these technological developments have allowed those employed in the heritage sector to ensure long term conservation of sites by controlling visitor access and providing replicas as interpretive contextualisations of the past where the original site or artefact is in danger. Although this is responsible archaeological practice, it does not move archaeology through epistemological problems related to its role as a symptom of modernity. As Lowenthal (1985, xvii) pointed out rightly twenty years ago, 'we may fancy an exotic past that contrasts with a humdrum or unhappy present, but we forge it with modern tools'. Thus, archaeology's popular appeal currently relies on its ability to mask its own modernity in its provision of emotive, affirmative, didactic and escapist experiences of the past. In this way, the discipline's economic success and popular appeal is founded primarily on misconceptions and assumptions about what archaeology is and what archaeology actually does.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

SITUATING THE CRISIS

Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1987, 28) declared that archaeologists and archaeology as a discipline at the end of the 20th century were experiencing a crisis. In his recent volume *Archaeology and Modernity*, Julian Thomas (2004, 223) noted that archaeology is still experiencing this state of crisis concerning its relationship with modernity. It may seem a little late to be making any declaration of a crisis regarding the role a modern science such as archaeology within society, given the work done by Edmund Husserl at the end of his life in the early 20th century. For instance between 1935 and 1937, Husserl formally declared a crisis confronting 'European Humanity' and 'European Sciences' (1935; 1970). Reacting to the social, political and intellectual crises of the period between World War I and World War II, Husserl reflected on the issue of the 'value' of rational thought and culture within the modern world and posited whether a crisis concerning the role of modern rational thought in society was not a singular, contingent event but rather a continual and permanent aspect of reason (Dodd 2004). Rather than merely regurgitating Husserl's approach to modernity, the contributors in this volume are continuing the consideration of the fundamental philosophical positioning of archaeology within modern society and the relationship between archaeology and social desires for epistemic authority and political sovereignty begun by thinkers such as Ian Hodder (1991,1992), Siân Jones (1997), David Lowenthal (1985; 1989), Michael Shanks (1987), Julian Thomas (1996; 2004), Christopher Tilley (1994; 2004) and Bruce Trigger (1989) (see Koerner this volume). In light of the discourse of 'archaeological imagination' in the formation of modern identity, it is imperative to engage with the philosophical assumptions in society which underpin this phenomenon.

Thomas (2004) has convincingly declared that archaeology as science is a constituent symptom of modernity. He maintains:

that archaeology appears to be webbed to notions of materiality, mind, personal identity, nature and history that have characterised the modern era. Is it possible to imagine what the subject might become if it were to relinquish these ideas? Would it still be recognisable as archaeology? (2004, 223)

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Is archaeology intrinsically linked to modern rational thought as Thomas (2004) has argued, and if so is the crisis confronting archaeology a contingent event of modernity? Or is there still a possibility, as he previously argued, that ‘in everyday life, human beings grasp elements of the material world, and constitute them as evidence for past human practice ... archaeology as science is based on this prescientific way of being attuned to the world’ (Thomas 1996, 63), and thus that the crisis is a continually renewing ‘state of affairs’ within archaeological expression? In *Archaeology and Modernity* it seems as if Thomas has moved away from his more universal conception of human temporal and existential awareness which he described as the ‘archaeological imagination’. Instead he has moved towards an engagement with the roots of archaeological awareness in modes of modern thought. Given this, it follows that we should review the universality of Thomas’ earlier concept of ‘archaeological imagination’ and assess whether imagination and science in the form of archaeological awareness are equally symptoms of modernity.

MOVING BEYOND MODERNITY

The subtitle of this volume ‘movements beyond modern approaches to archaeology’ is designed to be an inclusive call for all those attempting to reflect and develop reflexive theories and practices of archaeology. The contributors’ work demonstrates a desire to move beyond archaeology’s ‘modern’, scientific intrinsic rationale and the symptomatic ‘post-modern’ critiques of the endeavour’s modern qualities (see Koerner this volume). The discourse between archaeologists realising the difficult and fundamentally problematic basis of the discipline is just now coming to fruition. It has been argued that archaeology as science is a product of modernity and is intrinsically linked to the rationale of modern thought (Thomas 2004). Although convincing and thorough accounts of this philosophical situation in archaeological thought are only being published now, practitioners of archaeology have been engaging with modern philosophical issues concerning archaeological practice for over thirty years (e.g. Binford 1965; 1968; 1977; Hodder 1982; 1991; 1992; Shanks and Tilley 1987; Trigger 1989; Ucko 1995; Hodder & Preucel 1996; Thomas 1996; 2004;

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Hassan 1997; Johnson 1999; Holtorf & Karlsson 2000; Lucas 2001; 2004). Some archaeological theorists have turned towards 'post-modernity' as a source of inspiration for a way of moving beyond modern epistemological problems (e.g. Tilley 1990a; Bapty & Yates 1990; see also Bintliff 1991). Some philosophers have, however, become dissatisfied with the popular term 'post-modern' as a necessary and continual way for humans to be in the world. Koji Mizoguchi at the 2005 meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists voiced the claim held by some philosophically informed archaeologists that 'post-modernity' is not a useful term or tool for developing archaeological practice (e.g. Tilley 1990b). 'Post-modernity', if it is possible to use the term, still manifests the constituent symptoms of modernity. 'Post-modern' critiques are simply that - critiques. 'Post-modern' approaches to conceptions of the past and of archaeological practice, in order to be relevant, inherently rely on the existence of the constructive and productive practice of modern archaeology. The epistemological foundation of 'post-modernity' is the same as modernity. To assert a 'post-modern' episteme is an oxymoron. 'Post-modernity' also does not provide opportunities for development or growth. Although Jacques Derrida (1967a-c) focused on communication and linguistics, his thought does not develop new opportunities for communication. Rather it focuses on deconstructing and problematising communication. Equally, 'post-modern' deconstruction does not offer new productive opportunities for participation. It problematises participation. Although these are valuable critiques which facilitate necessary revision of approaches to epistemic authority, political sovereignty and communication, they do not expand beyond the confines of the modes of modern thought which they seek to critique.

Over ten years ago, philosophers and sociologists Ulrich Beck (1992) and Bruno Latour (1993) both confronted modernity posing fundamental questions about the project of 'post-modernism' to critique modernism. The two thinkers diverge, however, in their focus. Beck (1992) urges the search for a 'new' modernity more aware of its intrinsic rationale whereas Latour (1993) posits the urgent question of whether or not society or humanity was ever modern and whether the modern project and its symptomatic 'post-modern' project will ever come to completion. What unites the two thinkers is that both look for ways of being which are beyond or outside the confines of modernity and its constituent

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

symptom 'post-modernity'. Latour (1993, 138-48; Latour & Weibel 2005) asserted himself as being 'a-modern' and more recently has advocated 'non-modern' practices in society while Beck (1992) asserts the development of an aware 'new' modern, reflexive agency in the world. He follows in *World Risk Society* (1999) with a call for a move towards 'reflexive modernization' founded on an appreciation of the role of 'knowledge' and 'unawareness' in social practice. This discourse is being echoed currently in archaeological theory as Thomas is calling for a movement towards 'counter-modernity' within archaeological practice. What is clear from all accounts is that there is an urgent need to engage with the symptoms of modernity to develop awareness and reflexive approaches to practice which highlight participation over process. I will, however, refrain from adopting a specific terminology for describing or uniting these movements. I am not comfortable with the terms 'counter-modern' or 'non-modern' or 'a-modern'. Firstly, I feel these are fundamentally negative dialectics which have criticism or confrontation as their foundation rather than producing, new, constructive opportunities for reflection. Also I feel these have a similar epistemological basis for a critique of modernity as 'post-modernity'. Thus I feel the drive of Beck (1992; 1999) to develop a new epistemology and an awareness of the intrinsic role of practice in society through reflexive modes of thought and action is a more successful assertion.

REFLEXIVE ARCHAEOLOGIES AND MODERNITY: THE 'FAUSTIAN BARGAIN'

Bettina Arnold (1990, 464) has been largely responsible for the introduction of the literary and philosophical term 'Faustian Bargain' to archaeological research. Appropriated from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's (1749-1832) *Faust* (1968), the 'Faustian Bargain' refers to the pact made between the character Faust and the character Mephistopheles (the Devil). Summarised briefly, Mephistopheles offers Faust unlimited knowledge and power. If Faust is able to find satisfaction in his labours with this knowledge and power, then he must surrender his soul to Mephistopheles (Pascal 1949, 101). Studying archaeology under National Socialism in Germany, Arnold mused over whether German prehistorians were faced with a sort of 'Faustian bargain'. An under-

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

funded discipline, German prehistory was provided with the opportunity to expand research projects with the results thrust to the centre of the new political regime. However, in supporting the political tenets of National Socialist policy through archaeological research, many prehistorians in Germany became embroiled in one of the pre-eminent ethical dilemmas of the modern age, one which the discipline would not be able to recover from until the mid to late 20th century (Arnold & Hassmann 1995).

Exploring Goethe's metaphorical bargain, Faust pleads to give his soul over in order to amass experience upon experience, disaster upon disaster (Pascal 1949, 100). Accepting his pact with Mephistopheles in despair over the rush of history and time, Faust declares:

<i>Stürzen wir uns in das Rauschen der Zeit,</i>	Let us hurl ourselves into the torrent of time,
<i>Ins Rollen der Begebenheit!</i>	Into the revolution of events.
<i>Da mag denn Schmerz und Genuß, Gelingen und Verdruß</i>	Then let pleasure and distress, Failure and success,
<i>Miteinander wechseln, wie es kann;</i>	Alternate as they will:
<i>Nur rastlos betätigt sich der Mann</i> (Goethe 1968, 55).	Man must be doing, and never still (Pascal 1949, 100).

This plea of despair is echoed strongly in Benjamin's 'Theses on the Philosophy of History'. Responding to Paul Klee's (1879-1940) painting 'Angelus Novus' (1910) which he bought in 1921, Benjamin wrote:

A Klee painting named 'Angelus Novus' shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing in from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such a violence that the angel can no longer close them. The storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress (1992b, 249).

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

Benjamin's 'storm (*Sturm*)' of 'progress (*Fortschritt*)' and Goethe's 'torrent of time (*Rauschen der Zeit*)' evoke a struggle against the prevailing conditions of temporality and human agency. Both Benjamin's 'angel of history' and Goethe's Faust give themselves over to this struggle. Within both of these storms is the rush of images of the past which 'flit by' appearing only when relevant to contemporary concerns (Benjamin 1992b, 247). Thus, both Faust and the 'angel of history' give themselves over to the rush of the torrent of images of the past, continually clashing and amassing a 'pile of [imaginative] debris'. Faust's reaction to this situation is critical. He chooses to act and to labour and to experience. He chooses to participate in the 'giving over' of himself to this torrent of history. Within this interpretative participation is the opportunity to render and express meaning and explore value.

In many ways archaeology is still faced with a 'Faustian Bargain' in its relationship with modernity, especially with regard to the role of images of the past in heritage and tourism industries. In a sense, engagements with industrialised tourism and the marketing of heritage in a global world have increased awareness of archaeology and funding for research. At the same time, however, the nature and message of archaeological enquiry runs the risk of becoming diluted and potentially altered for the sake of capitalistic and nationalistic purposes in an increasingly consumer-oriented world. Inspired by Baudrillard's open-ended discourse, perhaps we should embrace and move through this 'Faustian bargain'. For in declaring this 'bargain', we affirm a value in archaeological knowledge and a need to deliberate on our power over the content, manifestation and impact of archaeological agency in the world. To struggle against the current themes of social thought places archaeology within a 'crisis of interpretation' regarding its epistemic and political sovereignty (see Koerner this volume). The way through this crisis, however, is not to focus on what archaeology *is* but rather what archaeology is concerned with doing.

What can be learned from Goethe's *Faust* is that it is not the result of the struggle, the giving over of one's soul nor the gaining of limitless knowledge or power that is key. Rather it is the struggle itself that is important. Goethe creates in Faust's struggle the beginning of an engagement with a metaphorical discourse over epistemic authority. Without this 'giving over' or 'giving into', Goethe's metaphor collapses.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

So just as Faust accepts his bargain and partakes in a metaphorical exploration of meaning, expression and being, so too must archaeology accept its bargain within society – to engage with social trends of consumption, replication, simulation and mass production.

ENGAGING THE PUBLIC, EMBRACING IMAGES

With modern societies, we are surrounded by images and simulations of the past. Is the image of an object any less authentic than the object itself? As Baudrillard would question, is the simulation of an object less authentic than the object itself? Or is there still an authentic 'aura' of the original artefact as Walter Benjamin would argue? Perhaps Baudrillard is correct to follow that it is all simulation and that Benjamin's aura of the original has now become the aura of simulacrum. (1997, 10-11; 2003) Even that which we perceive to be the singular authentic original artefact is also a representation of our modern beliefs about time and agency. Perhaps authenticity of the object need not enter into the discourse at all – there is only authenticity in our human agency, in our representations of our modern beliefs about time and agency, in our representations of ourselves.

As Douglas Crimp (1993) notes in *On the Museum's Ruins*, are we overwhelmed with retinal wastage? Benjamin's image of the 'angel of history' would suggest that we are accumulating a pile, a wreckage of disused images of the past. Are we subject to the same 'storm of progress', accumulating imitations and simulations of the past as we are propelled unaware into the future? Or is it possible to engage with the storm, embracing the struggle to express meaning, as Faust did?

If this is the case, then the most urgent space for archaeology to interact in is the public space, participating in discourses of 'meaning' and 'value' in archaeological representation, imitation and simulation. David Lowenthal noted over ten years ago that there was a dangerous division between professional archaeology and public perceptions of the discipline which had broader implications than simply for the pursuit of archaeology.

A cleavage between professionals and the public affects other perspectives on the past as well as those of archaeologists. In local

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

and oral history, in the current preoccupation with genealogy, in rising support for preserving familiar structures and locales, in the spurt of museum growth and museum-going, a common dilemma confronts conservators and curators pledged to look after and explain the past, and at the same time to accommodate burgeoning public interest in it. Flooded with data, lacking resources to conserve let alone display, and swamped by public demands for access to evermore of the past, professionals become embroiled willy-nilly in partisan disputes (1989, 302).

This is a challenge which has been brought to archaeology by the public, and as long as the public is interested in archaeology and the past, archaeology will continue to interact with the public. Archaeology can not retreat from social and popular discourse. Rather, archaeology must continue to seek out new and innovative ways of engaging the public.

The recent exhibition by Latour and Weibel (2005a & b) at the Zentrum für Kunst und Medientechnologie (Centre for Art and Media) in Karlsruhe, Germany entitled 'Making Things Public: Atmosphären der Demokratie' has highlighted the need to move from objects to things – and things in the sense of the original German and English meaning of the word as an assembly of people. In this way, assemblages of objects of art and assemblages of people can interact in participatory exchanges which develop new and dynamic groups and concepts with every individual who takes part. From the website of the exhibition:

It turns out that the oldest meaning of the English and German word for 'thing' concerns an assembly brought together to discuss disputed matters of concern. Hence the focus on the slogan FROM REALPOLITIK TO *DINGPOLITIK*, a neologism invented for the show. This major shift is reflected in the aesthetic of the show, in the ways in which the over one hundred installations and works of art are presented, and in the general physical and virtual architecture. What we are trying to do is compare modernist with non-modern attitudes to objects. In effect we are moving FROM OBJECTS TO THINGS (Latour & Weibel 2005a) [capitals original].

The effect of this exhibition was to deneutralise the exhibition and museum space, allowing the public to come into being through participation in the experience of representations of concerns and issues

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

through assemblages of objects and images whether visual, textual, digital, performative or other. In the same way, archaeologists must seek to deneutralise the spaces in which discourses over the past and archaeology occur. The dichotomy between assemblages of people and assemblages of objects which facilitates passive consumption of images of the past must no longer be reified through archaeological theory and practice.

Many professional historians and archaeologists and others engaged in the study of the past fear the impact of popular appeal on archaeology. There is a possibility of misrepresenting the past through participatory engagements with the public. In this engagement there is essentially a risk over the mediation of the 'archaeological message' or the epistemic authority of the 'archaeological narrative'. However, Beck (1999; 1992) in *Risk Society* and *World Risk Society* has highlighted that this is not a phenomenon to avoid but to be embraced. For there is continually an essential risk in all social activity. For archaeology, the risk may be to be misunderstood or misrepresented. Still, has this ever not been the case for archaeology or any expression of thought. If all is simulation as Baudrillard posits, then the 'crisis of interpretation' is norm. Thus, the 'crisis of representation' is norm. The critical aspect is not the identification of the crisis, although this is a necessary aspect of the discourse, but to partake in the playing out of the crisis and its resolution – to interact in the fundamental metaphor for human being and meaning which the crisis represents. As Susan Sontag (1994) noted when writing about life and times of Levi Strauss, there is an inherent risk involved in intelligence that many practitioners of sociology, archaeology, anthropology and the writing of history have attempted to avoid to the detriment of their practices.

In France, where there is more awareness of the adventure, the risk involved in intelligence, a man can be both a specialist and the subject of general and intelligent interest and controversy (1994, 70).

In the pursuit of knowledge, Sontag would have us give ourselves over, spiritually and devotedly, to the participation between the individual and the public aware but unfretted by the risks that popular sentiment pose to the pursuit. Sontag's call echoes the 'giving over' required in the 'Faustian bargain' as discussed above. She wished for practitioners of anthropological thought to participate in social

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

controversy and embrace risks inherent in popular discourses. It is not possible to put limits on the proliferation of images, but it is possible to become involved in the discourse of how individuals and societies relate to and communicate through images of the past. Archaeologists can not simply stand back and observe these phenomena and make comments. They must engage in reflexive approaches to their study of the past. Archaeology is not a passive pursuit but is intrinsically linked to the activities of modern societies through the activities of remembrance, tourism, the production of heritages and the development of narratives.

POETIC ARCHAEOLOGIES

Perhaps Baudrillard is correct to assert that all is simulation (2003; 1997, 10-1). Images of a past, whether physical artefacts or pictures in brochures, are no more than visual representations of our beliefs in singular, authentic truths accessible through modern scientific discovery (see Cochrane this volume). Although Baudrillard's assertion may seem to be a 'post-modern', deconstructionist undermining of 'meaning' and 'value' in archaeological research, it actually serves to affirm a very fundamental, Classical assumption of metaphysics that all poetic expression is imitation (see Koerner this volume). Aristotle asserted in his *Poetics* that poetry as *tekhne* was fundamentally an imitation (*mimêsis*) of human agency as a means to convey meaning and understanding of the human condition. Approaching archaeology from a metaphysical standpoint as a *tekhne*, or a 'productive capacity informed by an understanding of its intrinsic rationale' (Heath 1996, ix, cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* 1140a), a poetic archaeology is less concerned with what archaeologies might be but what archaeologies might do. In this way archaeologies and archaeological imaginings are not conceptions or modes of scientific or prescientific thought as Thomas (1996, 63-4) suggested, but rather an aspect of a long human tradition of poetics. Poetic archaeologies are engagements with an existential awareness fascinated with temporality and the ways in which many humans conceive of previous human agency from material 'evidence'. Thus we can see that both Benjamin's (1992a) concern over the impact of mechanical reproduction on the 'aura' of the original object and Baudrillard's (1998; 2001; 2003) concern over the significance of unique

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

objects in light of mass produced simulations of objects do not suggest doom for meaning within archaeological research, writing and practice. Rather they serve to highlight the inherent necessity for imitation and simulation as a means for expression and communication within human experience.

Aristotle argued that ‘we take delight in viewing the most accurate possible images of objects’ (*Poetics* 1448b). Meaning is rendered and communicated in the exploration of ways of imitating agency through *mimêsis*, through representations of agency, through producing images of the past. Images of the past are thus poetic imitations of what we believe about the human condition and human existence. What must be taken with this conclusion is an appreciation of the ‘intrinsic rationale’ of the manufacture of these images. Thus, we are not simply to embrace simulation as Baudrillard would suggest, but we are to engage and participate in simulation and explore its potential to signal new ways of expressing ‘meaning’ and ‘value’ about human experience (see Cochrane this volume). Perhaps we could call for a move away from passively received simulation to active participatory stimulation. Thus, archaeologies are not simply passive narratives about human agency but active participatory interventions in the world which attempt to render meaning through the representation of beliefs in the past.

The past is a source for poetic understanding of the contemporary human condition rather than a source for scientific, authoritative truth. Archaeology, or the study of the past, is an active engagement with the rendering of meaning through poetic narratives of text and visual representation (see Neal, Finn and Synnestvedt this volume). Thus the source of ‘meaning’ and ‘value’ in archaeology is not in the collecting, or representation of materialised truth about the past. The source is found in the ambiguous yet experientially felt relevance of participatory exchange within the exploration of human expression and understanding.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE VOLUME

This volume is designed to illustrate two comparative themes in current archaeological thought. The first concerns a comparison of stances from which archaeology is approached within the modern world and movements which desire advancement beyond modernity to find

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

new ways of communicating meaning. The second concerns approaches which perceive archaeology as a social phenomenon and posit theoretical and epistemological problems and approaches which focus on participation and exchange within society. To explore these themes, the volume is divided into four sections. The first and second sections act as a declaration of the 'state of affairs' in relation to archaeology's role in the modern world and suggests ways in which archaeologists can become better involved in the presentation of the discipline to the public. The third and fourth sections situate modernity and archaeology's modern rationale within broader philosophical and sociological trends. These two sections explore to what extent archaeology is experiencing a crisis concerning its relationship with modernity and posit ways of moving beyond modernity through theoretically informed practice focusing on participation. The four sections are also divided into different approaches to archaeological research and practice. The first section and third section focus on observations of the theoretical state of affairs. The second and fourth sections focus on practice based approaches calling on participatory exchanges between archaeologists and the public.

The first section, explores the role of archaeology in the foundation of 'archaeologically imagined communities'. Deirdre Stritch discusses the role that heritage and tourism industries utilising archaeological images of the past have played in the forging of national identities on the island of Cyprus. Following this, Stephan A. Brighton and Charles E. Orser provide an archaeological and historical study of the forging of trans-national Irish identity within Irish emigrant populations in the United States of America and discuss the role of English made objects decorated with representations of Irish cultural icons in that phenomenon. The section closes with the work of Jenny Blain and Robert J. Wallis on the impact of the imaged past on the formation of contemporary neo-spiritual movements in the United Kingdom. Although the content of these three pieces seem quite different, the theoretical links between them are fundamental to understanding the significance of images of the past in modern social groups. The past informs a shared narrative through visually shared objects yielding shared identifications in the development of group identities (Russell 2006). The 'archaeological imagination' is integral to the production of modern images of the past which in turn facilitates the production of modern 'imagined communities' (Anderson 1991). Through the work of Stritch, Brighton, Orser, Blain and Wallis,

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

we can appreciate that there is a modern tendency to establish 'archaeologically imagined communities' in our world (Russell 2006). Brighton and Orser rightly note in their response to this section that interaction between modern society and archaeology, producing images of the past, 'ultimately reflects access to and control of knowledge'. Their line of questioning which has resulted from an analysis of the role of archaeology in the formation of 'imagined communities' actually reveals the fundamental crisis which we are presented with when we conceive of archaeology. What is the source of knowledge of the past? Can there be an authentic and true past or artefact of previous human agency? Who has authority to expound any true or single 'past'? And can this source be controlled? Stritch illustrates how many governmental groups view the 'past' or 'heritage' as a resource to be engaged with for national or, at least, community development. Through this study it is demonstrated that there is a fundamental belief in the epistemic authority of archaeology and archaeological material as a source to develop and reify social beliefs in group identity. These identities, like in Blain and Wallis' heathen communities and Brighton and Orser's emigrant Irish communities, in turn are anchored with images of the past.

The second section, 'Archaeologies and Opportunities', engages with the question posed to archaeology on its role in forming group identities. How should archaeology relate to the members of particular groups? If archaeologists' work facilitates the development of social groups interested in the past as part of their identity or heritage, then how should archaeologists engage with that public? George S. Smith begins the section with a discussion on what roles archaeology plays and what roles the discipline could play within the public sector. Smith highlights the large and expanding audience of people familiar with and interested in the endeavour of archaeology and posits ways in which archaeology could better interact with that public within the modern world, particularly within education. Given archaeology's position within public discourse, Smith suggests that archaeology could make better use of that opportunity in order to voice differing contemporary narratives of the past as a way of supporting more multi-vocal political discourse. Oleg Missikoff continues the discussion with suggestions for the development of more aware and professional understandings of how archaeology can communicate within modern society. Missikoff views cultural heritage as an opportunity for socio-economic development and rightly calls for

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

better training for those in the heritage sector in order to be able to engage with public interest in the past. In particular, Missikoff highlights the expanding spaces of the internet as an area for the development of new ways of communicating with the public about what archaeology does and what cultural heritage means. Finally, Cornelius Holtorf rounds off the discussion with an exploration of the role of the past as an experience in the modern world following the sociological thought of Gerhard Schulze (1993) and Rolf Jensen (1999). Holtorf sees the desire of modern individuals to engage with the past as an experience and as an opportunity to be embraced rather than a problem to be addressed. He follows the call of Gavin Lucas (2004, 119) to explore whether archaeology's real impact in society lies in its popular appeal. Holtorf insightfully notes that the contemporary difficulties surrounding archaeology's relationship with the public are not so much a result of the public's lack of understanding of archaeology but of archaeologists' lack of understanding of the public.

The third section, 'The Crisis of Representation', contextualises modern societies' fascination with the 'science' of archaeology by situating it within discourses over epistemological authority and political sovereignty. It further explores whether archaeology is in a state of crisis concerning its relationship with tourism and heritage industries in the modern world. Stephanie Koerner begins with a discussion on archaeology's role in the representation of the past in the modern world and explores the philosophical and epistemological underpinnings of modern belief in archaeological images. Inspired by the writings of Walter Benjamin and Bruno Latour, Koerner situates the archaeological endeavour within the broader framework of philosophical and epistemological issues experienced since the Thirty Years War (1618-48) and the ensuing 'Treaty of Westphalia'. She then discusses the implications for archaeology's intrinsic value if it remains a purely modern science and develops methodologies which will help archaeology focus on memories and help to develop plans for futures, rather than expounding more belief in the necessity of modern scientific fact. Kay Edge and Frank H. Weiner continue with a discussion on the modern conceptions of history, collective memory and the appropriation of objects from the past and their representation in cultural spaces of remembrance such as museums. The taking, collecting and reappropriation of objects perceived as being from the past and their

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

placement into museums highlights many issues regarding the use of archaeology to produce images of the past which facilitate grand narratives of identity and given expression in the museum space. Recent studies such as that by Flora E. S. Kaplan (1994) have illustrated the role of the museum in the 'making of ourselves', and the recent exhibition 'Museum of the Mind' at the British Museum (2003; Mack 2003) has revised the position of the museum in society as a representation of collective memory of the past. What has been less discussed, however, is the role of the designer or architect of that museum space. Progressing through a discussion on the work of Daniel Libeskind, Edge and Weiner engage with crises facing architects with regard to notions of collective memory, the manifestation of that memory in an experiential space and the way in which architects must engage with theoretical and philosophical discourse in order to transcend the modern condition of the vocation. Finally, Andrew Cochrane explores the crisis facing modern representations of the past in interpretive spaces designed to allow a visitor to experience the past. In a similar vein to Holtorf and van Reybrouck's (2003) development of an archaeology of zoos but inspired by the thoughts of Jean Baudrillard, Cochrane engages with the experiential space of the Boyne Valley Interpretive Centre, Co. Meath, Ireland. He explores issues concerning authenticity of experience within spaces dominated by simulation, while questioning to what extent these interpretive centres are acting as hyper-realities of modern conceptions of the past. He concludes with a discussion on megalithic motifs from the main Newgrange and Knowth passage tombs and the possible roles that imitation and simulation played in the sequential development of the designs. He posits whether these monuments and their associated motifs and the contemporary visitor centre are simulacra and asks if they were ever anything more than stimulating simulations.

The fourth section, 'Poetic Archaeologies and Moving beyond Modernity', will move on from Stephanie Koerner's call to review archaeology's relationship with expressions of knowledge and understanding in light of the long tradition of conceptions of poetics. Following on from Aristotle's *Poetics*, a poetic archaeology is less concerned with what an archaeology might be and more with what an archaeology might do, about the possibilities of human understanding derived from archaeology. The contributors to this section conceive of the 'archaeological imagination' not as an aspect or mode of scientific or

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

prescientific thought as Thomas (1996, 63-4) suggested but as an aspect of a long human tradition of poetic engagements with temporality and the way humans conceive of previous human agency through material 'evidence'. As Aristotle has argued, poetry is founded upon imitations of human agency in the quest for understanding the human condition. As such, archaeology as poetry appreciates its fundamental role as presenting imitations, representations, simulations, of human agency through the art or *tekhne* or archaeological expression. The contributors in this section acknowledge the modern, scientific rationale of the *tekhne* of archaeology but look beyond this process to find ways of engaging in participatory exchanges within the world through archaeology not as narrative but as poetry. In this way, images of the past are not engaged with as authoritative sources of knowledge but as opportunities for experience and discourse in the contemporary world, thus transcending the modern battle for epistemic authority over the past. Tim Neal begins with a practice-centered approach to the role of the brochure image in modern tourism. Situating the brochure image within the broader history of visual representations of landscape, Neal views the brochure as a boundary which appears to restrict interpretation, but he alternatively suggests that these are actually invitations for agency and movement which engage with the modern belief of boundaries of interpretation and representation. He sees these fringe or boundary spaces as an opportunity for expansion of practice and an engagement with the public who regularly consume them. Christine A. Finn continues the themes of visual representation of the past in her discussion on the impact of representations of bog bodies on popular culture and art during the 20th century. Finn suggests that there is a fundamental inspirational quality within archaeological images such as those of the bog bodies which fascinates society and urges us to engage with our conceptions of the human condition. Exploring the bog bodies through the photography of Lennart Larsen, the poetry of Seamus Heaney and the art of Kathleen Vaughan, Finn illustrates the rich exchange that can be cultivated through a relationship between archaeology and artistic expression. Finally, Anita Synnestvedt takes us on a walk through the prehistoric site of Stora Rös as a visual and bodily experience. Inspired by the phenomenological thought of Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962) and the archaeological theory of Christopher Tilley (2004), Synnestvedt demonstrates the vast range of possibilities for interpretation and

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

representation that are brought to light through an exploration of archaeology as an embodied experience. She also illustrates the problems associated with the current way that prehistoric sites are presented to the public whereby the potential for the public to engage with the site in an interpretative and participatory way is restricted.

ENDING AN INTRODUCTION, BEGINNING A DISCUSSION

Rather than fighting against the problematic aspects of social activity today, I wish the result of this book to be a call for participation between archaeology and society. Archaeology, I feel, must engage with the metaphors which society draws from its perceptions of archaeological agency. This must be done in theory but more importantly in practice, in participatory ways. In doing so, it is possible to broaden the concept of the assemblage of objects to the totality of the assemblage of individual human beings as Latour and Weibel's (2005) work has shown. This assemblage in its essential nature is fluid and dynamic as is any society. The assemblage (both beyond object and self) is a constant metamorphosis of meaning and being. Thus the perception of archaeology and the archaeological object as stagnant entities or representations runs against the fundamental nature of the phenomenon of social being. Therefore archaeologists must transcend their modern objectives in order to participate in the metaphorical metamorphosis of social being and meaning while equally being aware of its intrinsic modern rationale as science. Therein lies the risk – to transcend modernity would be to transcend many of archaeological thought's most basic philosophical assumptions (Thomas 2004). This necessitates a great humbling of archaeology within the discourse over epistemic sovereignty and over conceptions of the past. There is a great risk in intelligence and engagements with the public and popular culture as Sontag (1994) would argue. Let us move forward, however, with Beck (1992; 1999) and Baudrillard's (1997; 2001) callings and embrace this risk and bargain to partake in the metaphorical expression of society through poetic imitations of understandings of the human condition. Let us begin to participate.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. 1967 *Prisms* (1955), trans. S. Weber & S. Weber, Neville Spearman, London.
- Adorno, T. W. 1973a *The Jargon of Authenticity* (1964), trans. K. Tarnowski & F. Will, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Adorno, T. W. 1973b *Negative Dialectics* (1966), trans. E. B. Ashton, Seabury Press, New York.
- Adorno, T. W. 1997 *Aesthetic Theory* (1970), trans. R. Hullot-Kentor, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Anderson, B. 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London.
- Anderson, R. G. W., M. L. Caygill, A. G. MacGregor & L. Syson (eds.) 2003 *Enlightening the British: Knowledge, Discovery and the Museum in the Eighteenth Century*, British Museum Press, London.
- Arendt, H. 1992 'Introduction: Walter Benjamin 1892-1940' in W. Benjamin (H. Arendt (ed.)), *Illuminations* (1955), Fontana Press, London, 7-60.
- Aristotle 1985 *Nicomachean Ethics*, Hackett, Cambridge.
- Aristotle 1996 *Poetics*, Penguin Group, Ltd., London.
- Arnold, B. & H. Hassmann 1995 'Archaeology in Nazi Germany: The Legacy of the Faustian Bargain' in P. L. Kohl & C. P. Fawcett (eds.) *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 70-81.
- Arnold, B. 1990 'The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany' in *Antiquity* 64, 464-78.
- Bapty, I. & T. Yates 1990 'Archaeology and Post-structuralism' in I. Bapty & T. Yates (eds.) *Archaeology after Structuralism: Post-structuralism and the Practice of Archaeology*, Routledge, London, also available at http://archaeology.kiev.ua/meta/bapty_yates.html [Accessed 19th Nov 2005].
- Baudrillard, J. 2003 'The Rise of the Object: The End of Culture' in F. Proto (ed.) *Mass Identity. Architecture.: Architectural Writings of Jean Baudrillard*, Wiley-Academy, Sussex, 93-124.
- Baudrillard, J. 2001 'Simulacra and Simulations' in M. Poster (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 169-87.
- Baudrillard, J. 1998 *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, Sage Publications, London.
- Baudrillard, J. 1997 'Objects, Images, and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Illusion' in N. Zurbugg (ed.) *Jean Baudrillard: Art and Artefact*, Sage Publications, London, 7-18.
- Baudrillard, J. 1996 *The System of Objects*, Verso, London.
- Beck, U. 1999 *World Risk Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Beck, U. 1992 *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, Sage Publications, London.
- Benjamin, W. 1992a 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' in W. Benjamin (H. Arendt (ed.)), *Illuminations* (1955), Fontana Press, London, 211-44.
- Benjamin, W. 1992b 'Theses on the Philosophy of History' in W. Benjamin (H. Arendt (ed.)), *Illuminations* (1955), Fontana Press, London, 245-55.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

- Berger, J. 1972 *Ways of Seeing*, The British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books Limited, London.
- Binford, L. R. 1965 'Archaeological Systematics and the Study of Culture Process' in *American Antiquity*, 31, 203-10.
- Binford, L. R. 'Some Comments on Historical versus Processual Archaeology' in *Southwestern Journal of Archaeology*, 24, 267-75.
- Binford, L. R. (ed.) *For Theory Building in Archaeology*, Academic, New York.
- Bintliff, J. 1991 'Post-modernism, Rhetoric and Scholasticism at TAG: The Current State of British Archaeological Theory', *Antiquity* 65, no. 247, 274-8.
- Bohrer, F. N. 2003 *Orientalism and Visual Culture: Imagining Mesopotamia in Nineteenth Century Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bord Fáilte 1997 *The Fáilte Business*, Bord Fáilte, Dublin.
- The British Museum 2003 'Museum of the Mind: Art and Memory in World Cultures' (exhibition leaflet), The British Museum, London.
- Childe, V. G. 1947 *The Dawn of European Civilization* (4th Edition), K. Paul, Trench, Trubner, London.
- Coe, B. 1977 *The Birth of Photography: The Story of the Formative Years 1800-1900*, Ash & Grant, London.
- Cooney, G. 1996 'Building a Future on the Past: Archaeology and the Construction of National Identity in Ireland' in M. Díaz-Andreu & T. Champion (eds.) *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, Westview Press Inc., Boulder, 146-63.
- Crimp, D. 1993 *On the Museum's Ruins*, MIT Press, London.
- Crooke, E. 2000 *Politics, Archaeology and the Creation of a National Museum in Ireland: An Expression of National Life*, Irish Academic Press, Dublin.
- DeMarrais, E., L. J. Castillo & T. Earle 1996, 'Ideology, Materialization and Power', *Current Anthropology*, vol. 37, no. 1, 15-31.
- Derrida, J. 1967a *De la Grammatologie*. Collection Critique, Minuit, Paris.
- Derrida, J. 1967b *L'écriture et la différence*, Collection Tel Quel. Seuil, Paris.
- Derrida, J. 1967c *La Voix et le phénomène: Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 1995 'Nationalism and Archaeology. Spanish Archaeology in the Europe of Nationalities', in P.L. Kohl & C. Fawcett (eds.) *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 39-56.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 1993 'Theory and Ideology in Archaeology: Spanish Archaeology under the Franco Regime', *Antiquity* 67, 74-82.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & T. Champion (eds.) 1996 *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, Westview Press Inc, Boulder.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. & M. Ramírez Sánchez 2004 'Archaeological Resource Management under Franco's Spain: the Comisaría General de Excavaciones Arqueológicas', in M. Galaty & C. Watkinson (eds.) *Archaeology under dictatorship*, Kluwer/Plenum, Hingham, 109-30.
- Dodd, J. 2004 'Crisis and Reflection: An Essay on Husserl's Crisis of the European Sciences' in *Phaenomenologica*, vol. 174, Springer-Kluwer, New York.
- Evamy, M. 2003, 'Iconic Boom', *Blueprint*, no. 208, June, 62-6.
- Foster, R. J. 1999, 'The Commercial Construction of "New Nations"', *Journal of*

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*. I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

- Material Culture*, vol. 4, iss. 3, 263-82.
- Goethe, J. W. v. 1968 *Faust der Tragödie erster Teil*, MacMillan, London.
- Gosden, C. 2004 'The Past and the Foreign Countries: Colonial and Post-colonial Archaeology and Anthropology' in L. Meskell & R. W. Pruceel (eds.) *A Companion to Social Archaeology*, Blackwell, Oxford, 161-78.
- Graves-Brown, P., S. Jones & C. Gamble (eds.) 1996 *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, Routledge, London.
- Green-Lewis, J. 1996 *Framing the Victorians: Photography and the Culture of Realism*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Heath, M. 1996 'Introduction' in Aristotle *Poetics*, Penguin Group, Ltd., London, vii-lxxi.
- Heather, P. J. 1996, *The Goths*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Hills, C. 2003, *Origins of the English*, Duckworth, London.
- Hodder, I. (ed.) 1982 *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I. (ed.) 1991 *Archaeological Theory in Europe: The Last Three Decades*, Routledge, London.
- Hodder, I. 1992 *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Hodder, I. (ed.) 2001 *Archaeological Theory Today*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I. & R. Pruceel (eds.) 1996 *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Holtorf, C. & H. Karlsson (eds.) 2000 *Philosophy and Archaeological Practice*, Bricoleur Press, Gothenburg.
- Holtorf, C. & D. van Reybrouck 2003 'Towards an Archaeology of Zoos' in *International Zoo News*, vol. 50, no. 4, 207-15.
- Husserl, E. 1970 *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (1954), Northwestern University Press, Evanston.
- Husserl, E. 1935 'Philosophy and the Crisis of European Man' (Lecture delivered by Edmund Husserl, Vienna, 10 May 1935) available from http://www.users.cloud9.net/~bradmcc/husserl_philcris.html [Accessed 3rd Nov 2005].
- Jensen, R. 1999 *The Dream Society: How the Coming Shift from Information to Imagination Will Transform your Business*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Johnson, M. 1999 *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Jones, S. 1996 'Discourses of Identity in the Interpretation of the Past' in P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones & C. Gamble (eds.) *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: The Construction of European Communities*, London, 62-80.
- Jones, S. 1997 *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*, Routledge, London.
- Klejn, L. S. 1993 'To Separate a Centaur: On the Relationship of Archaeology and History in Soviet Tradition' in *Antiquity* 67, 339-48.
- Kohl, P. L. & C. P. Fawcett (eds.) 1995 *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kaplan, F. E. S. (ed.) 1994 *Museums and the Making of Ourselves: The Role of Objects in National Identity*, Leicester University Press, London.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

- Lacey, N. 1998 *Image and Representation: Key Concepts in Media Studies*, MacMillan Press, London.
- Latour, B. & P. Weibel, (eds.) 2002 *Iconoclash*, ZKM Centre for Art and Media, Karlsruhe, Germany.
- Latour, B. & P. Weibel 2005a 'Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy', zkm.de <http://makingthingspublic.zkm.de/fa/dings/DingPolitikHome.htm> [Accessed 4th Nov 2005].
- Latour, B. & P. Weibel (eds.) 2005b *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, The MIT Press, London.
- Latour, B. 1993 *We Have Never Been Modern*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Lenman, R. 2005 *The Oxford Companion to the Photograph*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Lowenthal, D. 1989 'Conclusion: Archaeologists and Others' in , P. Gathercole & D. Lowenthal (eds.) *The Politics of the Past*, Routledge, London, 302-14.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lucas, G. 2001 *Critical Approaches to Fieldwork: Contemporary and Historical Archaeological Practice*, Routledge, London.
- Lucas, G. 2004 'Modern Disturbances: On the Ambiguities of Archaeology'. *Modernism/modernity* 11, 109-120. Available from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/modernism-modernity/v011/11.1lucas.pdf> [Accessed 3rd Nov 2005].
- Mack, J. 2003 *The Museum of the Mind: Art and Memory in World Cultures*, The British Museum, London.
- McClellan, A. 1999 *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-century Paris*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- McManus, R. 1997 'Heritage and Tourism in Ireland - an Unholy Alliance?' *Irish Geography*, Volume 30(2), 90-8.
- Meskell, L. (ed.) 1998 *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London.
- Meskell, L. 2001 'Archaeologies of Identity' in I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 187-213.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1962, *Phenomenology of Perception*, Routledge, London.
- Molyneaux, B. L. (ed.) 1997 *The Cultural Life of Images*, Routledge, London.
- Moser, S. & S. Smiles (eds.) 2004 *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and the Image*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Pandora 2002 'Help with Trip planning UK and Ireland: March 11, 2002, 05:06 AM', iadb.org, <<http://www.iadb.org/vbb/archive/index.php/t-36100.html>> [Accessed 1st Nov 2005].
- Pascal, R. 1949 'Faust' in W. Rose (ed.) *Essays on Goethe*, Cassell & Co. Ltd., London, 97-120.
- Pearson, M. & M. Shanks 2001 *Theatre/Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Renfrew, C. 2003 *Figuring it out. What are we? Where do we come from? The parallel visions of artists and archaeologists*, Thames & Hudson, London.
- Rose, W. (ed.) 1949 *Essays on Goethe*, Cassell & Co. Ltd., London.

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)

- Russell, I. 2006 'Freud and Volkan: Psychoanalysis, Group Identities and Archaeology' in *Antiquity*, vol. 80, no. 307, 185-95.
- Schulze, G. 1993 *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart* [1992] 3rd edition, Campus, Frankfurt and New York.
- Shanks, M. & C. Tilley 1987 *Re-Constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Shnirelman, V. A. 1995 'From Internationalism to Nationalism: Forgotten Pages of Soviet Archaeology in the 1930s and 1940s' in P. L. Kohl & C. P. Fawcett (eds.) *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 120-38.
- Shnirelman, V. A. 1996 'The Faces of Nationalist Archaeology in Russia' in M. Díaz-Andreu & T. Champion (eds.) *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, Westview Press Inc., Boulder, 218-42.
- Sontag, S. 1994, 'The Anthropologist as Hero' in S. Sontag *Against Interpretation*, Vintage, London, 69-81.
- Stone, P. G. & B. L. Molyneux (eds.) 1994 *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums and Education*, Routledge, London.
- Sugimoto, H. 2005 *Hiroshi Sugimoto*, Mori Art Museum & Hatje Cantz, Tokyo.
- Thomas, J. 2004 *Archaeology and Modernity*, Routledge, London.
- Thomas, J. 1996 *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretative Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Tilley, C. 1990a 'Michel Foucault: Towards an Archaeology of Archaeology' in C. Tilley (ed.) *Reading Material Culture*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 281-347.
- Tilley, C. 1990b 'On Modernity and Archaeological Discourse', in I. Bapty & T. Yates (eds.) *Archaeology after Structuralism: Post-structuralism and the Practice of Archaeology*, Routledge, London, 128-52, also available at <http://archaeology.kiev.ua/meta/tilley.html> [Accessed 19th Nov 2005].
- Tilley, C. 1994 *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*, Berg, Oxford.
- Tilley, C. 2004 *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*, Berg, Oxford.
- Travel Editors 2002 'Stonehenge', VacationIdea.com
<<http://www.vacationidea.com/articles/stonhenge.html>> [Accessed 1st Nov 2005].
- Trigger, B. G. 1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ucko, P. J. (ed.) 1995 *Theory in Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Urry, J. 1990 *The Tourist Gaze, Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, Sage Publications, London.
- Wood, P. 1993 'Realisms and Realities' in B. Fer, D. Batchelor & P. Wood (eds.) *Realism, Rationalism, Surrealism: Art between the Wars*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 250-333.
- Woods, H. & K. Woods 2000 'Cairo and the Pyramids: September 23rd-26th, 2000'
<<http://www.leafpile.com/TravelLog/Egypt/Cairo/Cairo.htm>> [1st Nov 2005].

[Russell, I. 2006 'Images of the Past: Archaeologies, Modernities, Crises and Poetics' in *Images, Representations and Heritage: Moving beyond Modern Approaches to Archaeology*, I. Russell \(ed.\), Springer-Kluwer, New York.](#)