The Archaeology of the Disenfranchised

Sandra Arnold Scham[1,2,3]

The question of multivocality has been much explored and debated in recent archaeological publications. Clearly, the objective of such work is to assure the inclusion of the views of disadvantaged minorities and disenfranchised peoples in the presentation of their own pasts. This objective has not been achieved with much success, however, partly because mainstream archaeologists have had some difficulties in grappling with what appear to be a proliferation of "alternative" archaeological theories. Few discussions have approached alternative archaeologies as constituting a definable archaeological paradigm that might be termed "The Archaeology of the Disenfranchised." Four different models within this paradigm are discussed and a strategy for a more widespread inclusion of alternative archaeological discussions and projects is suggested.

INTRODUCTION

A capacity crowd had gathered at the small synagogue in Jerusalem on a spring night about a year ago. They were there to witness a unique debate—certainly unusual in this city of contested claims and explosive religious fervor. Two archaeologists, one a Palestinian Muslim and the other a secular Israeli Jew, presented their views, which were to be followed by questions from the audience, on the topic "Who was here first? . . . and Does It Matter?" Not surprising to anyone who reads newspapers, it clearly *did* matter to most of those present, including the speakers.

A particularly memorable incident in this extraordinary evening occurred when the Palestinian archaeologist explored the connection between modern

[1]Department of History and Archaeology, Jerusalem University College, Jerusalem.
[2]Pontifical Biblical Institute Museum, Jerusalem.
[3]To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of History and Archaeology, Jerusalem University College, Jerusalem.

Palestinians and biblical Philistines—an interpretation of the past that has been espoused in Palestinian popular culture for some time. The overwhelmingly Israeli Jewish audience, which included a sizable number of religious Jews, politely but continually hammered the speaker with questions as to what archaeological evidence existed establishing a relationship between Palestinians and Philistines. The Palestinian archaeologist obviously did not answer the questions to their satisfaction since it later appeared that the consensus of those present, some of them supporters of the Middle East peace process and Palestinian rights, was that he was not objective. The Israeli archaeologist, whose message was more familiar to the audience was spared that assessment despite his use of terms like "Israelite" and "Second Temple" in reference to certain time periods.

Most of the members of this fairly articulate group of listeners would be able to describe what they consider to be objective versus nonobjective observations. No doubt, they would use expressions like "known" facts or "indisputable" evidence in characterizing the former and "propaganda" or "myth" in characterizing the latter. There is still little skepticism, certainly not in public discourse in Israel, about the bases upon which facts are determined to be known and evidence unquestioned. The postmodern critique of objectivity (cf. Shanks and Hodder, 1995, pp. 18, 19) is unfamiliar territory in the "Holy Land," despite its primacy as the region that offers the most proof of the postmodern claim that ideological bias has overtaken even our best-intentioned efforts to know the past. The current habit of defusing knowledge and deconstructing narratives has not affected archaeological interpretation here and there is a certain irony in this, because the public interest in archaeology in Israel is pervasive. The gap between the archaeological practitioner and the public, one that postmodernists have attempted to eradicate everywhere else (Hodder, 1998), is nonexistent. From the, now, cliché posters declaring that, in Israel, "Our future is where our past is" to numerous songs, speeches, and public events celebrating events of several millennia past, Israelis are obsessed with their putative distant ancestors.

Jews base their vital connection to the land (perforce, the Land of Israel) on these biblical and historical imperatives—the survival of the Hebrew language and religious doctrine among them. The Israeli vision of the Land (with a capital "L"), thus, subsumes many of the most significant themes in western culture. Israel's national poet, Yehuda Amichai, typical of this cultural pattern, calls to mind the sacrifice of generations, the longing, the miracle of renewal and the "rebuilding" of the land of ancient forebears:

> All the generations before me
> donated me, bit by bit, so that I'd be
> erected all at once
> here in Jerusalem, like a house of prayer
> or charitable institution.(Amichai, 1988, p. 3)

Palestinian bonds with the land are fundamentally expressed in terms of the place itself, cultural continuity and familial ties, as exiled Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish (1974, p. 23) writes:

> Restore to me the color of face,
> And the warmth of body,
> The light of heart and eye,
> The salt of bread and earth . . . the Motherland.

This should not be understood as the conventional, and rather demeaning, juxtaposition of civilization (the province of the west) versus the natural world (the province of nonwestern indigenous cultures). The tangible character of the land has certainly captured the Jewish literary imagination while ancient historical traditions are an integral part of Palestinian culture. It is safe to say, however, that the kind of physical attachment to the land often described by Palestinians, that is as essential to the individual as a body part, is distinct from the kinds of ties to the land that are uniquely Jewish. History (in its western not its local sense) permeates Jewish conceptions of the Land. That this kind of narrative has been the most compelling basis for establishing and authenticating imagined communities has made Zionism one of the more successful political movements of the twentieth century (Shapira, 1996). It is not incidental to this success that, unlike other "isms," Zionism's historical nature is pure and undiluted.

The modern world of metahistory's hegemony, however, is rapidly giving way to the postmodern world where many localized narratives of the past, present, and future struggle for supremacy (Conkey and Gero, 1997; Hodder, 1998, 1999, pp. 6, 7; Leone *et al.*, 1995; Lowenthal, 1995; Trigger, 1989, p. 777; Wylie, 1989, 1993). Embedded within postmodernism itself is the proposition that valid examinations of the past must be cognizant of epistemology and inclusive of alternative views. Searching for difference and diversity in congruence with the "loss of fixed points" (Hodder, 1999, p. 149) implied by the postmodern agenda, however, may create something of a chaotic situation for many archaeological interpreters. Because of this, it is unlikely to have a lasting effect on the practice of archaeology without a greater commitment on the part of the archaeologist to incorporating alternative views of the past into standard theory and practice.

Hodder's prescription for this postmodern malaise is the dictum that "the person excavating should have the fullest possible knowledge and the widest range of possible narratives" (Hodder, 1999, p. 103). The only problem with this, otherwise, constructive proposal is that it is difficult to explain to traditional archaeologists that this is not an argument for "objectivity" as they know and love it and, further, that it is not exactly what they are now doing. The Israeli archaeologist speaking at the event described earlier, for example, made the statement that he had no particular biases and that he simply dealt with whatever ". . . emerged from the ground." In further support of this statement he cited his political beliefs—he saw

himself as a liberal or left wing Israeli—and, from that basis, he argued that he could not, in fact, be interpreting his data in favor of a certain Israeli nationalist viewpoint.

All of this confirms what those in the forefront of archaeological theory have been telling us for a number of years—that confronting ideology in archaeological interpretation is not a matter of conjecture but one of practice. In stating that many would argue that his advocating a reflexive method in archaeological data collection is "... just a pernicious extension of postprocessual ideas into a realm which has been happily free from subjectivity and interpretive bias ..." (Hodder, 1999, p. 103), Hodder gives us a clue as to why we have not been able to successfully contest the role of what Gero (1995, p. 178) calls "precedent and paradigm in the observation, manipulation and description of data." The postmodern world is an uncertain one and, while we may feel comfortable, even virtuous, in persistently challenging the metanarratives of western scholarship, the micronarratives live on in the scientific method—the quantification of data, the attention to detail and consistency—and the pursuit of objectivity.

Categorizing the archaeology of the disenfranchised merely as a component of resistance culture, thus, has done little to explain it or make it accessible to us. This is a field of study with its own method and theory. The fact that it exists because of the personal, and political, experiences of its practitioners rather than because of the ivory tower theorizing of some greater light in archaeology (Kus, 2000) gives it a relevance, and immediacy, with which many of us feel inadequate to cope. It is not entirely closed to those of us who are nonpractitioners, however, and the advantages for us in studying it as a discipline are significant. When confronted with the ideas of a populous minority that is excluded from many aspects of public life and consciousness, many archaeologists, rarely among the most astute political observers of the present, are ill equipped to distinguish cultural conviction from political confabulation. Others, like the Israeli archaeologist described earlier, are more confident that any practice of archaeology that does not bear a close resemblance to their own objective practice is fatally flawed. In any event, whether or not we recognize in ourselves the embodiment of an "imperialist western agenda" is not useful for analyzing how the differences between "our" conclusions and "their" conclusions have arisen.

Laying aside for the moment both the positivist and the postprocessual training in archaeological method that most of us have been subjected to, we must essentially return to our anthropological roots to provide us with a range of methods for analyzing a culturally specific practice of archaeology. By anthropological, I am not referring to the kind of exploration for meaning advocated by the hermeneutic movement in the science—a meaning that is heavily contingent and dependent upon discourse and reflexive interpretation (Gellner, 1995). This would simply return us to the postprocessual position that what we have already acknowledged is valuable but difficult to put into practice. Further, there is no point in demanding that those of us in the dominant culture adopt the views of the disenfranchised as our

own or even necessarily, consider them as equally "authoritative" as our own views in order to effectively give voice to them. I do not argue with the ability of anthropologically trained archaeologists to do either of these things—I am merely questioning whether such a course of action, in the end, is either productive or prudent in setting up a legitimate dialogue. A more traditional anthropological approach requires only that we achieve the kind of understanding that we would demand of ourselves in closely examining any cultural phenomenon that is not our own.

IDENTIFYING THE DISENFRANCHISED

The question of how or whether to formally acknowledge the disenfranchised has plagued many western democracies. In the United States, the Federal Government has attempted to appropriate the issue by appending an optional questionnaire on race, ethnicity, disability, and gender to virtually every public form except tax returns. This is not a topic, however, that should be left up to governments, even the most well meaning of governments, to determine. As the term "disenfranchised" suggests, it is the actions of governments—or inaction as the case may be—that result in this situation. I use the term here both in a political and figurative sense. In its political sense, the term includes those whose rights as citizens are diminished, in general, or arbitrarily curtailed. For the purposes of this analysis, the most significant sense of the term "disenfranchised," however, is the cultural/historical one. If we are speaking of groups who have been deprived of control over the presentation of their pasts, we must also include those who have only begun to recover from the American and European intellectual dominance of several centuries' duration.

I have implied earlier that I am not, myself, a practitioner of the archaeology of the disenfranchised and this is true but only to the extent that this study does not address the case of women as a group whose past has been abnegated by the majority culture. For western women, gender may stand alone as a status resulting in disenfranchisement but for colonized and minority women it adds an additional burden to their struggles for recognition. The complexities of viewing gender along with other disenfranchising conditions, and perhaps the complexity of my own status as a western woman confronting the clash between western and nonwestern societies in the Middle East, are both topics that clearly require further analysis and I am not persuaded that they comfortably fit within the theoretical parameters of this one. In addition, a number of other statuses that should be viewed as disenfranchised are not dealt with here. The physically disabled, homosexuals, those with mental illnesses, the elderly, are all groups whose roles in past cultures are disregarded by mainstream archaeologists (Clarke and Torrence, 2000; Dowson, 1998/2000; Halperin, 1995) and clearly any complete definition of the disenfranchised should not exclude them.

To some extent, greater in the case of women than with respect to others, a fairly well developed archaeological theory has evolved with respect to these

disenfranchised groups (Conkey and Gero, 1991, 1997; Gero, 1993; Hill 1998; Kus, 2000; Spector, 1991; Spencer-Wood, 2000; Wylie, 1992). I fully acknowledge that these discussions have inspired my analysis despite the fact that I have chosen not to address gender here. Further, it is the observations of feminist archaeologists (Dobres, 1995; Gero, 1995, 2000) that there is still a need to develop a true consensus on gender-informed praxis that have suggested that our notions of multivocality (Hodder, 1992, pp. 165, 166; Preucel and Hodder, 1999) and reflexiveness (Hodder, 2000) while valuable as a first step are not, in themselves, enough to remedy the archaeological disenfranchisement of ethnic/national/religious groups as well. To be sure, many archaeologists would argue that to *address* as opposed to *redress* these issues is sufficient. (By far, too many would still argue that to *address* is unnecessary.) The most persuasive argument to offer here is Schiffer's reflection that "...archaeologists have adopted rational strategies for redlining large segments of the theoretical literature..." that "...creates and reinforces cleavages that work to the detriment of theoretical integration in the discipline as a whole" (Schiffer, 2000).

While it is an acknowledged limitation that this discussion does not deal with all types of disenfranchisment, its intent, and hopefully this is clear, is not to provide a definitive synthesis but rather to propose a framework for further examinations. Consequently, the ethnic/national/religious categories of disenfranchised peoples I am principally concerned with are the most obvious ones—that is, the formerly colonized, the marginalized minorities, and the nationals of places that have been subject to invasive foreign control over cultural property. Another limitation of the current analysis is the fact that I am most familiar with archaeology in the Middle East, Europe, and the Americas and I draw examples primarily from those regions. Nevertheless, there are many similarities throughout the globe between the historical experiences of indigenous peoples and minorities.

Colonial subjugation is perhaps the most devastating disenfranchising status because it affects almost every part of society and culture. Colonialism has a far-reaching impact on visions of the past—an impact that may continue in force long after colonial rule has been overthrown (Meskell, 1998). The clearest distinguishing factor in colonial disenfranchisement is the effective replacement of an indigenous past by a narrative that emphasizes the conquest culture. Inevitably this results in a movement to reestablish the hegemony of the older culture—within a newly formed, globally conscious paradigm (Bond and Gilliam, 1994). Either because of demographic factors (where the colonized are as numerous or more numerous than the colonizers) or because there has been no geographic displacement, the indigenous predecessor culture and its history are usually not truly lost despite attempts by colonial powers to eradicate them (Said, 1994, p. 210). There is an essential transmogrification of these cultures, however, stemming partly from modernism and partly from an unexpressed desire to learn something from the humiliating experience of conquest.

The disenfranchisement of minorities, the second most common type, results in a vision of the past that is primarily formed to counter the persistent messages from the majority culture that the minority culture is irrelevant (Gero, 1995, p. 177). There are a number of conditions—immigrant, ethnic, and religious status, among others—that affect the rights of certain individuals to attain economic and social justice. It is important that this type of discrimination, which is subtler than that resulting from outright political subordination, be viewed as disenfranchising regardless of whether it is due to the overt actions of government or simply ignorance and neglect by the dominant populace.

The third disenfranchised group is less easily defined. It consists of the indigenous inhabitants of countries where foreign control over the past has been so extensive, all-encompassing, and damaging to local historical consciousness that a strong reaction has resulted (Bahrani, 1998; Hamilakis, 1999; Hassan, 1998; Ozdogan, 1998). Although some of these countries fit into the colonized group of disenfranchised peoples, there are others, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, and Palestine/Israel among them, where the inhabitants' experience of gaining control over their past has less to do with overthrowing political subjugation and more to do with abrogating alien cultural hegemony. "Cultural imperialism," a catchphrase of resistance literature (Said, 1988/1994), most clearly applies to the experiences of these countries whose national treasures have been consistently looted over time, whose ancient terrain has been marred with amateurish and destructive excavations and whose history has been defined largely by foreigners.

It is not surprising that the ways in which disenfranchised groups view their pasts are functions of the degree of exposure, both in terms of time and in terms of impact, to the depredations of the enfranchised. There are, also, differing degrees of disenfranchisement represented in close geographic proximity to each other. In Israel, for example, *Mizrahi* (sometimes called "oriental") Jews actually constitute half of the country's Jewish population (which is the dominant culture). Yet, their history, language, and culture have all been subverted and subsumed into an Israeli national character that is based largely upon the experience of European Jewry. While *Mizrahi* Jews enjoy certain privileges not granted to Arabs under Israeli control they are, nonetheless, disproportionately represented among the unemployed, the poor, and the Jewish population of prisons (Bowman, 1999).

To those of us in a majority western culture, it seems almost ludicrous that history and archaeology would be among the pressing concerns of disenfranchised peoples. Our attitude of studying and analyzing the past has made it increasingly less real to us, much as any objects subjected to close scrutiny begin to appear to the scientist. How can an entity subjected to so much reinvention, reinterpretation, and subtle dissection actually be deemed to truly exist? The disenfranchised, however, are often the enthusiastic partisans of what we, feebly, characterize as "tradition"— a term that includes concepts of identity, linguistic distinction, and heritage. Most

of all this is a term that, for them, has both vitality and ambivalence. Jameson has said that "history is what hurts" (Jameson, 1988, p. 164) and this is never more true than when one is discussing the history of the disenfranchised. The Maya Zapatista movement, which came to our attention as a result of the dramatic events of 1994 that took place in the Mexican State of Chiapas (Gossen, 1996; Jones, 1997; Nash, 1997), provided an affecting and eloquent expression of self-definition that dispels any notion that we might have as to the significance of the past to the disenfranchised:

> We are the people who were the original inhabitants of Mexico. We have exercised, and will continue to exercise, the right to determine who we are according to our own premises. We are the bearers of our own culture and of our own agenda. . . . In a profound sense, we consider ourselves to be Mexicans. This is so even though the founders of the Mexican state and all governments that have followed in their footsteps have ignored our existence. . . . [W]e have not been free, either during the Spanish colonial regime or under the post-independence Mexican state, to exercise freely our separate identity as a people. (*Foro Nacional Indigena*, 1996; translated by Gossen, 1996.)

MODELS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE DISENFRANCHISED

The archaeology of the disenfranchised can be defined as a unique combining of culture with current and past political realities. Any attempt to classify the ways in which these combinations play out runs the risk of calling to mind a number of exceptional cases that do not fit into these models. Nevertheless, we can discuss examples and discern the cultural, social, and historical factors that have contributed to the formulation of these approaches to history and archaeology. The models described later may overlap, succeed each other, or exist simultaneously within the borders of one nation or even within one disenfranchised group. The term "model" is used here advisedly and is not intended to suggest that there is not a great diversity of views of the past among members of disenfranchised groups. The models themselves, also, reflect popular views of the past more than those of professional archaeologists. To the extent that archaeologists in all societies typically place themselves in the role of mediator between the past and the present, however, it is disingenuous to suggest that popular views do not affect our work.

Nationalism is clearly a strong element in at least two of these models, the archaeology of the colonized and the reaction/resistance cases, and like nationalist archaeologies they are also archaeologies of cultural identity but nationalism, per se, is not the defining factor or the impetus behind their method and theory. Thus, they do not, in any sense, constitute "nationalist" archaeologies. Some may, it is true, eventually lead to that development but in that eventuality they will cease to be archaeologies espoused by disenfranchised peoples and become archaeologies espoused by nation-states.

The Archaeology of the Colonized Model

Albert Memmi's classic work on the nature of colonial rule, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Memmi, 1957/1965), as well as the currently better known books by Edward Said, *Orientalism* (1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (Said, 1988/1994), were watersheds in the development of today's multidisciplinary postcolonial enterprise. Postcolonial criticism and postcolonial discourse (Babha, 1994; Hamilakis, 1999; Jacobs, 1996; Meskell, 1998; Said, 1978; Shennan, 1989; Thomas, 2000; Turner, 1994; and countless others) are global phenomena and must be considered as the particular province of western educated nonwestern intellectuals—an effective negotiation of their personal duality (Said, 1994, p. 109). Here, as elsewhere when the topic of the disenfranchised emerges, the necessity to highlight the unequal power relations of the past and acknowledge the struggles of the present take precedence over the development of a theoretical basis for examining the long-term effects of colonialism. As a critique of the major *intellectual* subjugator of colonized peoples, postcolonialism represents a confrontation that is as essential as it is enervating. In addition to making Edward Said (1978, 1988/1994) a cultural icon, postcolonial theory has so irrevocably laid bare the foundations of our discipline, from the overt racism of Flinders Petrie to the smug western rationalism of new archaeologists, that it is all we can do to determine whether it is worth persevering with our "torn and wounded epistemes"(Chambers, 1996, p. 51).

Persevere we must, however, and in the postcolonial world westerners have been left to wonder if, in the absence of these alternative voices, we would have questioned the legacy of the Enlightenment or exposed the ideological vagaries of positivist science (Hamilakis and Yalouri, 1996; Trigger, 1995) although, for better or worse, we still hold formidable remnants of the powers conferred upon us by these archetypal concepts. Before us, we have an array of newly invented traditions and the inevitable question of whether or not to give those traditions the full force of authority in our analyses. It was colonialism, however, that resulted in the invention of many of our current western notions of fictitious "native pasts" (Hobsbawm, 1992). At this point in the discourse, it would hardly do to dismiss any indigenous versions as inauthentic.

We must also recognize an important factor that much of postcolonial criticism tends to ignore—that is, the diversity of reactions to colonialism. The extent of the influence of colonialism on views of the past is highly variable and is not necessarily related to either the type of colonial control or the time that has elapsed since colonial control was abrogated. In some cases, it may be the actions that have taken place after the overthrow of colonial power that are most significant (Bahrani, 1998). In Mexican and Peruvian Archaeology, for example, the influence of Spanish colonial rule, now cast off for almost 200 years, is still being felt, albeit in highly distinct ways. In Mexico, the visibility of Indians and people of mixed Indian

and Spanish descent in revolutionary activities necessitated a view of the past that, to some extent, had to embrace the precolonial cultures. Consequently, Mexican archaeologists view these cultures as native civilizations whose development was augmented by European contact enabling them to forge a new *mestizo* identity for the people of Mexico. In Peru, archaeologists viewing preconquest cultures are more likely to see them as autonomous separately evolved folk traditions because of the consistent efforts by the Peruvian state, since its independence, to repress indigenous cultures (Patterson, 1996).

There are certain elements of the colonizer/colonized model in archaeological studies that are characteristically present. The archaeology of the colonized will often emphasize studies of public spaces and ritual centers (Bandaranayake, 1995; Kus and Raharijaona, 2000; Matos Moctezuma, 1992) or, alternatively, the study of landscapes (Said, 1999; Sayej, 1999). Partly, this is an attempt to recover the monumental nature of the traditional culture but these analyses also include a consideration of social patterning together with an exploration of cultural and religious connotations. Thus, some of these analyses may be seen as a reaction to the ways in which colonial powers have manipulated public spaces and reconfigured local geographies.

In contrast to either the views of traditional archaeologists in emphasizing monuments and public spaces and the views of modern archaeologists in emphasizing landscapes, the archaeology of the colonized reflects peopled, embodied spaces and a landscape that is largely constructed not of sites or material culture but of memory. Gero and Root (1990) and Said (1988/1994) speak of the unpopulated archaeological sites of colonialist antiquarians. In fact, this forced separation of people and important places lives on in many discussions on protecting and preserving archaeological sites in areas where the descendants of the people who originated those sites are still living. The concept of the dehumanized yet "culturally significant" space is dying, but it is a slow death.

Conversely, Schama's popular exploration of *Landscape and Memory* (1995) gives us an historical geography of the imagination, past and present, that comes close to a real understanding of the archaeological landscapes of the colonized. When he speaks of his family's destroyed Lithuanian village, he states that the *place*, while geographically determined, has no stable reality outside of the mind (Schama, 1995, p. 30). Conventionally, archaeologists have attempted to materialize largely imaginary places by calling them sites and obsessing on their material culture. For the colonized, material culture is both incidental to and symbolic of what are often preexisting cognitive constructions of places—places that are not so much discovered and interpreted as they are recalled (Anawak, 1989; Condori, 1989).

This is perhaps why another essential element of the archaeology of the colonized is a strong emphasis on ethnographic analogy (Layton, 1989; Salem, 1999; Sayej, 1999; Ucko, 1983; Ziadeh, 1995; Ziadeh-Seely, 1999). Access to the

traditional cultures, especially linguistic access, is an important feature of archaeological interpretations by those whose tenure in the land precedes that of a people who have or continue to formally control it. What is generally *not* acknowledged, however, is that ethnographic analogies also serve the function of differentiating the scholar from the source of data. By applying modern anthropological techniques to their own cultural heritage, archaeologists engender an ambivalent relationship between themselves and those cultures. The archaeologists in this case are the recipients of both the culture of the colonized and, in most cases, the educational "property" of the colonizers.

With archaeology as the synthesis, explorations of the past in colonized cultures, are rife with dialectical dilemmas (Rowlands, 1994; Willett, 1994). How can one celebrate a monumental past that represents in many cases an oppressive, albeit autochthonous, regime? Can one simultaneously examine and emphasize rural or tribal roots while creating and calling attention to a native urban and national heritage? Is it possible to glorify the achievements of both elites and nonelites in the cultures of the past? How does one preserve the authenticity of native society and culture while attempting to present it in western terms for broad dissemination?

All of these questions require not only an analysis of the data but a searching inquiry into the archaeologist's self-identification. Those of us who are western postprocessualists and proponents of the self-reflexive method have some sense of what this means but our examinations have consequences primarily in shaping our own experiences with the past. We are looking at the old narratives, searching out new ones and questioning how they affect our views (Hodder, 2000). Scholars who are working in the postcolonial milieu are examining issues that may shape the character of an emerging national culture for years to come.

The Heritage Pride Model

A milestone in archaeology, albeit one that many practitioners of the science would prefer to forget, occurred with the publication of Martin Bernal's *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (Bernal, 1987). No matter that Bernal, a political scientist whose best known prior work was *Chinese Socialism to 1907* (1975), has little to say about the theory and practice of archaeology or that his thesis was earlier explored, in part, in the work of Senegalese scholar Cheikh Anta Diop (1974)—his argument, that can best be summed up as an "out of Africa" approach to the development of civilization, has nonetheless captured the attention and imaginations of thousands in Europe, the United States, and Africa (Biko, 2000; Folorunso, 2000).

It is no small tribute to him that his views on racism within the disciplines of classics, Egyptology, ancient history, and archaeology (Bernal, 2000) are taken seriously enough to generate something of an academic cottage industry in Bernal criticism (Early, 1998; Howe, 1998; Lefkowitz, 1995; Lefkowitz, *et al*., 1996;

MacDonald, 1998; North, 2000). Despite these numerous arguments opposing his ideas and pointing out factual errors in his work and behind the arguments for and against an African nascence for western civilization, however, lies a compelling view of the past by peoples of African descent who are attempting to make a vital connection between Africa and western culture (Khpera, 2000). The focus on ancient Egypt in heritage pride archaeology has been a matter of particular consternation for many scholars—for here is where cultural identity partisans have invaded one of our more traditional or, some might say, hidebound schools.

It is, of course, useless for anyone to argue with the logic that ancient Egypt is a culture of Africa and that, throughout its history, it was in contact with and the receiver of influences from other African cultures. Where Egyptologists and Afrocentrists part ways, however, is with respect to both the characterization of ancient Egypt as a culture and the characterization of Egyptology as a discipline. Often, in arguing that Egypt was the progenitor of western culture, Afrocentrists may also simultaneously seek to impose modern western standards upon the ancient Egyptians. Certain rituals and practices may thus be a sensitive issue in classrooms where the history and culture of ancient Egypt are taught. Partly, this concept of the ancient Egyptians as proto-Christians is inextricably bound up with a view that traditional scholars of ancient Egypt have conspired to deprive the world of knowledge of both the African nature of the culture and the extent to which it mirrored our own (Roth, 1998).

While theoretical origins of ancient civilizations are debated between Bernal and his opponents, in the United States and elsewhere an African identified archaeology focusing on the history of slavery and tenant farming has provided us with some important insights. Among archaeologists who have become interested in locating African descent peoples in the American archaeological record are those who have seen the operative conceptual framework as one of class oppression and struggle (Buck, 1994; Paynter, 1994, 1997). Orser's work, which has drawn parallels between the African experience in the United States and the poor Irish in America and Europe (Orser, 1992, 1999), has contributed to this view but, while he is fully cognizant of the "universality" of economic oppression, he has pointed out how racial categories significantly overlap social ones (Orser, 1998, pp. 664–665). Further writing on the necessity for American Historical Archaeology to address the issue of race and racism in American society, Orser notes that very little has really been done by archaeologists to examine "the material dimensions of racial categorization" (Orser, 1998, p. 666).

Concrete efforts to involve minorities in explorations of their past and that of the dominant culture are taking shape in the multimedia investigations of Franklin (1997, 1998) and McDavid (1997, 1999) at the Levi Jordan Plantation. Combining discourse, oral history, reflexiveness, and updated computer technology, this project is an ongoing and interactive exploration of power, class, and race relations

in a society of slaves, tenant farmers, and wealthy landowners. This can be seen as something of a continuation of Leone's original work in Annapolis, which began as a study of the fragmented ways in which Annapolis was presented to the public (Leone *et al*., 1987) and evolved into a multicultural analysis of the site. Assembling a diverse team of investigators, Leone and the other project co-ordinators elicited opinions, questions, and anecdotes from each other and from members of the community at various steps in the process. What Leone discovered, as a result of these projects, was that African Americans saw explorations of the past as a means for finding out "how and why we are here now" and "why there has been no change for us." African American scholars, Leone found, were interested in knowing whether their culture in the past retained any elements of Africa and whether there was an "African-American Archaeology" (Leone, 1992).

Addressing this question at a recent World Archaeological Congress meeting, Agbe-Davis (1999) answers affirmatively. There is, indeed, an African American Archaeology and its objective is to explore the history of race relations in the United States. On a popular cultural level, as Agbe-Davis acknowledges, archaeology can only go so far in attempting to "derive something noble and worthwhile" from a history of subjugation and the need for an important past is not fulfilled in this endeavor. The efforts to educate on the history of Africans in America are, in terms of the popular imagination, on par with the efforts of archaeologists working in Africa to publicize the remarkable achievements of sub-Saharan African cultures (Wengrow, 2000; MacDonald, 2000)—that is, decidedly less appreciated than the more flamboyant visions of the past. Rather than claim an inheritance of cultures unknown or disregarded, people will respond to the lure of the illustrious, if oppressive, ancient civilizations.

Heritage pride is not exclusive to the archaeology of peoples of African descent. Other minorities whose past has been subverted or trivialized by dominant cultures have asserted similar views of the past. Irish Americans, as Orser (1998) notes, had to demonstrate their credentials in order to be admitted into the ranks of the Caucasian caste. They did so, first, by repudiating any connections between themselves and other minorities deemed to be nonwhite and by placing themselves in a position of superiority over those groups (Ignatiev, 1995). Later, successful Irish immigrants asserted their "Irishness" through recalling the venerated sites and leaders of the Irish past, by flaunting the accoutrements of wealth, and, even, by claiming descent from aristocracy (Greeley, 1981).

Both Irish and African Americans have had to deal with the dilemma of American assimilation pressures. Historically, in the case of the Irish, even after they were accepted as honorary "whites" in American society, submitting wholly to an alien and despised Anglo-Saxon culture was clearly not an option (Carlson, 1987). Similarly, but for different reasons, it was not an option for African Americans, regardless of their personal feelings about it. Nonetheless, for both groups,

it was necessary to adopt a view that was appreciative of the majority American culture from which they were effectively shut out and this is still an important element of heritage pride archaeology. It is not, perforce, the culture as a whole that is at fault but rather the fact that many people who are part of that culture have consistently undervalued the contributions of minorities to it. There may be separatist elements in heritage pride arguments but the primary goal is to bring the minority culture front and center as an important influence (Lowenthal, 1995). Focus on minority involvement is often characterized as centrism—a term that is a turnabout phrase for the accusations by minorities of Eurocentrism in academia (Assante, 1987). To say that proponents of Heritage Pride are "centrists" however begs the question of what it is that they are actually attempting to bring to our approaches to history and archaeology.

Foremost among the lessons that heritage pride archaeology has to teach us is the issue that Leone, McDavid, and Franklin's work so effectively dealt with—the participation of the interested public in archaeological undertakings. What we often refer to as public archaeology or, to borrow from the fanciful name for a certain piece of U.S. Government legislation "archaeology in the sunshine" (Government in the Sunshine Act, 5 U.S.C. 552b), is a major tenet of heritage pride. Many archaeologists tend to view the interest of the public in their work as a blessing and a curse. Naturally, attendant fame and fortune for the finder of a site that arouses publicity is most welcome. Public *involvement* in the process, however, is a different matter altogether. The opinions of the archaeologically unschooled, many scholars argue, are hardly worth soliciting. Heritage pride archaeologists, countering this argument, propose that in consideration of years of neglect by traditional archaeology, actively seeking the opinions of the disenfranchised public is a small price to pay.

The Heritage Recovery Model

Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee (Brown, 1970), *All That Remains* (Khalidi, 1992), *Shtetl: The Life and Death of a Small Town and the World of Polish Jews* (Hoffman, 1998)—the catalogue of memory for devastated cultures is a grim one. Here the need to reclaim the past stems from the substantial reduction of those in the present who can actually remember it. Permeating such tragic records of the past is a sense of loss that must finally translate into material terms. The recovery of a heritage is futile unless accompanied by attempts to quantify that recovery. We are not speaking here of a subjugated, marginalized, or neglected culture—but, rather, one that has suffered concerted attempts to obliterate it through the obliteration of its constituents.

This is partly the impetus behind the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the Museum of the American Indian, the Holocaust Museum, the

class action suits to restore money and valuable artworks to Holocaust victims and many other projects instigated by the cultural survivors of a world that was almost lost. Essential to heritage recovery archaeology is the view of artifacts as deeply symbolic of the present as well as the past. Sometimes heroic efforts are made to rescue the material culture of the diminished civilization for precisely that reason (Vizenor, 1986). Similarly, the concept of landscape which, as Brown (1998, pp. 68–69) asserts "is always bound up with politics" has particular resonance in the context of heritage recovery—even more so than it does in the context of the archaeology of the colonized (Zedeno, 2000).

If there is any danger in this persistent hazy nostalgia and emphasis on material remains it is only with respect to the possibility of commodification of cultural identity (Castile, 1996). Clearly, there are numerous selling points for nearly extinct cultures concerning which no one is prepared to list the disagreeable aspects. The commodification of Native American identity can be seen in such diverse products of popular culture as the film *Dances With Wolves* and the ubiquitous home decor item, the dreamcatcher. European Jewry has most significantly been commodified by museums both in Israel and abroad that seek to recreate the *shtetl* (the Jewish village of Eastern Europe) in art, music, cinema and the revival of Yiddish language plays and films. Of late, Palestinians have sought solace for their destroyed villages in the establishment of folklore museums depicting traditional costumes, artifacts, and models of Palestinian villages of the past.

None of these efforts of course will restore what is lost or compensate those who have lost it. Nevertheless, it is important to assert in visual terms, to anyone who is interested, what the nature of that loss exactly is. Occasionally these efforts are mistaken for acts of resistance but this they are decidedly not. The recourse for heritage recovery is always through established legal and political channels. Funds are obtained from foundations, suits are brought in courts, and even international organizations are brought into the proceedings (Vizenor, 1986). Heritage recovery is not just a heuristic exercise but also a compensatory one. This is why efforts to reclaim the past in material terms are so often misunderstood. Private settlements of heritage recovery claims may appear to be the most appropriate course of action for many but in such cases there is no instructive benefit. Exhibits of decimated cultures are more likely to attract attention but seem somehow to be bereft of any real impact on how we look at history and cultural identity.

The fact that heritage recovery always operates within the confines of the majority culture, rather than in resistance or opposition to it, will inevitably create a strong sense of frustration among the younger generations who are continually subjected to it. This is a second risk inherent in heritage recovery views of the past and perhaps it is the reason that some heritage recovery archaeologists and historians have attempted to educate through legitimate critique and the creation of discourse where none previously existed (Castaneda, 1996; Deloria, 1998; Rubenstein, 1997). This is not the most popular of instructive schemes employed

in heritage recovery but is proving to be one of the more interesting and enlightening ones. Generally, the heritage recovery model has encompassed a narrative of the past that is considered immune to historical revisionism. Revisionism is a tool more likely to be employed by proponents of marginal, and for the most part unsupportable, views of history. For mainstream scholars, the recognition that this is a particularly painful process for those who have seen their cultural patrimony ravaged, means that exposure to the harsh light of inquiry and investigation is undertaken only with great caution. In the end, the need to reestablish or reinforce the link between the past culture and the present through a living dialogue will supercede the need to sustain the memories of individual survivors.

The Reaction/Resistance Model

The 1986 World Archaeological Congress held in Southampton, England brought to the fore the question of how to analyze the nature of power in archaeology. Subsequently, editors Miller, Rowlands, and Tilley brought together a volume of studies from all parts of the globe that challenged traditional archaeological theories of social complexity. *Domination and Resistance* (Miller, *et al*., 1989/1995, first published 1989) is only one such work. Bender (1978, 1985), Miller (1980), Miller and Tilley (1984), and Trigger (1984), have all examined the problems with hierarchical models for exploring social relations in the past. These works, often labeled "resistance studies," are a politicized corollary to the general postmodern challenge of Eurocentric supremacy over ideas in the social sciences and constitute a means for seeing culture as an agglomeration of attitudes. The language of resistance enters into many of our discussions about the inclusion of women and other disenfranchised groups in archaeological interpretation whether or not it is the main focus of the study (Brumfiel, 1995; Gero, 1995; Leone, 1995; Paynter, 1997; Said, 1978, 1994). Analyses of resistance are so standard in current American anthropology that more than one dismayed scholar has been known to ask, "Doesn't anyone study cooperation and harmony anymore?" (Brown, 1996, p. 729).

With a new emphasis on agency and the activities of individual actors in archaeological theory, one might say that Brown's plea has been granted. Certainly, the rather rigid categorization of cultural relations as power struggles of varying degrees of urgency has given way to a less focused, and less politicized, vision of control. Gero (2000) has mused that agency has the potential for simply reinforcing the roles of dominant actors in both the past and the present. Studies focusing on "bold," "aggrandizing," "innovative," and "adaptable" agents of change (Clark and Blake, 1994; Flannery, 1999) and the suggestion being made by some agency-oriented archaeologists that people are responsible for their own subordination (Pauketat, 2000), tend to create some apprehension about replacing inflexible but,

nonetheless, empathetic models for social relations with the "free market" concept of agency. Agency-oriented views of the past run the risk of reproducing the ideologies of individualism and capitalism that have so successfully masked dominance in the United States and other western democracies (Bender, 1993; Brumfiel, 2000).

At best, agency theory represents a coherent thesis for examining the roles of individual players in social change. At worst, it becomes, as Clark wryly assesses, "a gigantic power game as multiplicities of players pursue separate interests, in divergent ways, with unequal powers, and with mixed results" (Clark, 2000, p. 108). In any event, it is obvious that grand historical dichotomies still have a place that has not effectively been filled by analyses of individual agents' actions. If we still use the lens of resistance to view certain culture changes, however, do we not by definition run counter to concerns about the effects of agency? Could resistance constitute something so modest as individual agents using selective consumerism to express discontent (Shackel, 2000) or is it, rather, Said's "charting of cultural territory" (Said, 1988/1994, p. 209) in the wake of a single moment of insight of "peoples being conscious of themselves as prisoners in their own land," (Said, 1988/1994, p. 214)? In fact, it can be both and Gero's (Gero, 2000) and Bender's (Bender, 1993) critiques would be far less cogent if agency theorists were more forthcoming about the diverse nature of the autonomy they posit. In resistance culture, autonomy is effectively a *goal* rather than a causal mechanism and consciousness is the means to achieving that goal.

In the archaeology of subordination, at any rate, it is easier to posit *reactors* than actors. Perhaps it is paternalistic to, thus, rob resisting peoples of some of their hard-earned independence. *Reaction* certainly has something of a bad reputation in agency theory (Clark, 2000; Dobres and Robb, 2000). It suggests a lack of imagination in human activity. Determinists of various stripes are always speaking of "reactions" on the part of peoples to environmental and cultural stimuli (Johnson, 1989; Saitta, 1994). Nonetheless, whether or not one wishes to argue that "those who would be dominated" give "shape to their domination" (Pauketat, 2000, p. 123), *reaction* is the most accurate description of the first stage of resistance culture. Although it is, surely, a by-product of individual agent decisions (Clark, 2000; Clark and Blake, 1994), it is also a confrontation with that subtly debilitating burden of consequences, both positive and negative, that informs the actions of dominated agents. The development of an archaeological and historical view that constitutes resistive reaction begins with knowledge of the other—not on the part of the dominant culture but on the part of the disenfranchised one. This is a process of recognition and replacement—understanding the cultural assumptions of the enfranchised, realizing the fallacy of those assumptions, and countering them with apposite ones.

Reaction/resistance archaeology is not, per se, a model that is the property of formally subjugated peoples and in this respect, it differs from the archaeology

of the colonized. In Greece and Egypt, for example, it is not the experience of colonialism that has contributed to developing indigenous archaeological outlooks but rather the experience of successive waves of foreign invasion, both military and scholarly (Haikal, 2000; Hassan, 1998; Kotsakis, 1998). The Greek reaction to exploitation, by Europe and the United States, of their country as a training ground for classical archeologists and provider of museum exhibits has been to stress the educational value of Greek sites for Greeks and to emphasize the "Greekness" of all periods represented at those sites from prehistory to modern. There is a growing focus in Greek archaeology on Byzantine culture, largely ignored in the past because most of the foreign scholars who worked in Greece were not interested in this period. There is a strongly perceived necessity in Greece to restore and reintegrate important sites and artifacts with their surroundings (Kotsakis, 1998). In fact, much of Greece's international cultural capital has been spent in the last decade on the controversial attempt to regain possession of the Parthenon marble pediments and friezes now on display in the British Museum (St. Clair, 2000). Other examples of the reintegration phenomenon have been the attempt to decentralize Greek control over ancient sites and to establish and upgrade local museums (Hamilakis, 1999).

The ancient past figures greatly in another of Greece's news making actions— its refusal to recognize the right of Macedonia, a nation on its northern border composed of largely Slavic-speaking peoples, to use that name. The ancient barbarian Alexander of Macedonia has been canonized as a major figure in Greek culture over the past century—part of the endeavor to expand and extend the role of Greek culture in shaping the modern world. The Greek government's reaction to Macedonia's insistence on a flag displaying the famous "Star of Vergina" symbolizing the ancient Macedonian dynasty of Philip and Alexander may have been based upon realpolitik arguments as some have suggested (Brown, 1994, 1998; Kotsakis, 1998) but it is, nonetheless, clear that there was real concern about this among the Greek people. Disregarding the fact that the people of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are, themselves, a disenfranchised entity who were deprived of their cultural identity by their somewhat involuntary membership in the federated states of socialist Yugoslavia, the Greeks saw them as just another example of the looting of their cultural property by an alien nation.

Egyptian archaeologists, whose past is also prominently on display in the great museums of Europe and the United States, have pursued a similar course to the Greeks in reacting to foreign control over their past. Egyptians also emphasize cultural continuity and the Egyptian character of their region throughout its history but another dimension to the Egyptian model has been the need to emphasize Islamic culture in Egypt—similar to the new focus on the Byzantine period in Greece (Hassan, 1998). In both Greece and Egypt these neglected periods are considered as the key to linking current populations with their ancient roots while

at the same time calling attention to the beginnings of modern Greek Orthodox and Egyptian Islamic identities.

The salient characteristic of reaction/resistance in archaeology is both an identification with a global struggle against western domination coupled with an antiglobal suspicion of any cultures or communities that seem to buy into the western version of society and culture. Greece may, thus, find itself to be more of a sympathizer with the fierce ethnocentricity of the Orthodox Serbs rather than with the attempts by the Macedonians to forge a multicultural nation united under the flag of an ancient, and comfortably distant, past (Brown, 1994, p. 794). This form of antiglobalism also appears in the apparent disinterest among Greek and Egyptian archaeologists in the world heritage aspects of sites in their respective countries. To be sure, they are eager enough for international funds to preserve these sites but any notion that they belong to history, posterity, western civilization, or the world in general is heartily discouraged. Although it is only as yet a partially formed reaction, the case of Palestinian archaeology is another example of this. Regardless of what position an individual archaeologist might take on the Israelite versus Philistine question alluded to in the introduction to this paper, there is one uniting premise in Palestinian archaeology and that is a reaction to the attempts of Israelis to claim biblical sites as their own (Yehya, 1999).

The reaction/resistance model suggests that the need for establishing a cultural identity, a characteristic of the archaeology of the colonized, is subservient to the need to counter the dominant cultural paradigm. Not surprisingly, the opposition voice will adopt the language and methods of the controlling one. Thus, reaction/resistance archaeologists will argue that "objective" considerations dictate that the dominant paradigm is intrinsically bankrupt. This is also exemplified by new narratives that simply adopt old stories with new characters. Thus, for example, while some Palestinian scholars avow the irrelevance of the Bible to archaeology in the region on scientific grounds others suggest that the biblical narratives support Palestinian views of the past (Glock, 1987/1999; Silberman, 1998).

The impetus for the reaction/resistance view of the past can be found in some of the more preposterous attempts by dominant cultures to inculcate young people with the western idea of history as applicable to their own land. The educational models tend to outlast political domination and continue to rub salt into the wounds caused by past subjugation. Years ago a fellow student of mine, educated in the newly independent Kenya of the late '60s, described to me his first perception of this unfinished business when he was taught by African teachers in an African school about the European "discovery" of Mount Kenya. He and his classmates turned quizzically to each other and he said that "we were all thinking the same thing" that is, "why this talk of 'discovering'—it's has always been there." "There" in tradition and geography, of course, constitutes a far different matter from "there" in history (Meskell, 1998).

CASE STUDY—THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE DISENFRANCHISED IN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIAN NATIONAL AUTHORITY

> Perhaps the greatest battle Palestinians have waged as a people has been over the right to a remembered presence, and with that presence, the right to possess and reclaim a collective historical reality, a least since the Zionist movement began its encroachments on the land. (Said, 1999).

Said's statement rather succinctly summarizes many of the bases upon which the archaeology of the disenfranchised in Israel and the Palestinian National Authority has been established. Calling up collective memory, historical reality, reclamation, and repossession, it touches on all of the premises in the complex relationship between Palestinians and their past. What Said does not state, however, is that Israel/Palestine comprises a rich variety of views of the past. Depending upon their political status, for example, Arabs here may see their past in highly different ways. For many Arab citizens of Israel, who, for economic reasons, generally believe that their fortunes are tied to that State, the past is bittersweet and irremediably lost. For Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, ready to throw off the yoke of occupation, the past can be revived, restored, and displayed in a whole new light. For the Palestinians of East Jerusalem, it is most important to challenge the prevailing myths of the dominant culture (Glock, 1990/1999).

In addition to these views, the ways in which Bedouin and Druze citizens of Israel, look at their history must be considered (and they seldom are). Distanced from Palestinian Arabs in the first case by an age-old mistrust of *fellahin* Arabs (Hassan, 1998) and in the second case by status as a (sometimes persecuted) religious minority, Bedouin and Druze have accepted Israeli sovereignty over their lives with seemingly little struggle. The prevailing view of these peoples among Jews in Israel is that they are loyal to the State, they serve in the Israeli Defense Forces, and they make very little trouble. The less prevalent view is that the Bedouin and the Druze have suffered tremendously in Israel from their status as second class citizens and that the State should not take them so entirely for granted.

It is the Jewish view of the past to which all of these views ostensibly provide alternatives (Abu El-Haj, 1998). Jewish archaeology in Israel, however, is a rare case of a nationalist archaeology developing from what was fundamentally a heritage recovery model. Because of this and because the recognition of Jewish Diaspora history has heavily influenced archaeological interpretations, Israeli Jewish archaeology has retained some of these responses to the disenfranchising conditions of the past. Some of the peculiarities of site preservation in Israel can be explained on this basis. Recently, in a popular magazine, a long-time resident of Israel described how he once enjoyed taking groups of young people from the United States to the biblical site of Gibeon (*al-Jib*) in the West Bank, home of Ancient Israel's first king and site of a great biblical Israelite victory, but now he takes them to *Masada* instead (Roman, 2000). Ostensibly he proposes that this was a reaction to political unrest in the area of the former site but there is also

the factor of *Masada*'s immense popularity with Jewish tourists in the intervening years.

Masada is a virtual shibboleth in archaeology here and represents very clearly a transitional phase from the Heritage Recovery model toward a vision of the embattled nation-state that Israelis have found so inspiring. Millions have been spent on the conservation and presentation of a site that essentially marks a disastrous, if legendary, defeat of the Jewish people by the Romans (Ben-Haim and Margalit, 2000). Meanwhile, many famous biblical sites like Lachish, Gezer, Bethel, Mizpeh, and others have eroded and suffered damage beyond any hope of repair. Change from the *Masada* mentality, however, is already well underway. Modern Israeli Jewish archaeology has entered, with a vengeance, a very positivist and scientific phase—that many archaeologists here will admit is itself a reaction to the ideological excesses of both Christian-inspired "Biblical" archaeology and nationalist archaeology (Dever, 1999; Silberman, 1998).

All of these different currents demonstrate the overlap of the heritage recovery archaeology, the archaeology of the colonized and reaction/resistance archaeology in Arab and Jewish discourse about the past here. I recently attended an archaeological conference with Palestinian, Bedouin, and Israeli participants where this diversity of views was well represented. A paper by a Palestinian archaeologist from the West Bank discussed how he was able to interpret several interesting sites through ethnographic studies (archaeology of the colonized) of Palestinian village industries of today (Salem, 2000). An archaeologist from East Jerusalem presented a paper that took the issue with the suggestion that the so-called four-room house was in fact Israelite (reaction/resistance archaeology) since it seemed to be a widespread phenomenon throughout the Levant (Nur el-Din, 2000). A Bedouin anthropologist who entitled his paper "Bury My Heart at Wounded Tree" (Abu-Rabia, 2000) discussed traditional Bedouin burial practices, how modern encroachments upon traditional territories have irrevocably altered them, and the need for funds to protect Bedouin graves (heritage recovery archaeology). An Arab citizen of Israel, exploring in private conversation the popular notion discussed in the introduction to this paper that current Palestinian inhabitants of the land are descendants of Canaanites, Philistines, or Jebusites, discredited what he saw as an attempt by Palestinians to merely commandeer the prevailing Israeli mythos and stated the need for Arabs in Israel and Palestine to recapture their cultural identity and create concrete manifestations of their presence in the land (archaeology of the colonized *and* heritage recovery). Finally, an Israeli archaeologist, self-identified as a religious Jew, presented a paper based on the premise that the Iron Age "Israelite" settlers of the central hill country of Palestine had rejected imported dishes because they believed that foreign tableware was impure under the laws of *kashrut* (kosher; also, heritage recovery) (Faust, 2000). Interestingly, the response to this last paper was noticeably more negative than the response to any other paper presented at that conference and came, not from Arabs, but from other Israeli Jewish archaeologists.

On one level, any archaeologist working in the so-called "historical" periods in Israel or Palestine is subject to criticism from many different sources and may, depending on the period on which he or she chooses to concentrate, be accused of blatant bias without ever having made a single interpretation. On another level, characterizations of the past are so fluid here that it is difficult to determine how anyone's ethnicity, political status, or religious affiliation can be considered as indicative of their ideology. The charge that Palestinians have made against Israeli archaeologists, that Arab and Islamic remains are routinely bulldozed in order to uncover earlier deposits is, as Kohl has noted, true "only in a few exceptional cases" (Kohl, 1995, p. 241). Nonetheless, this remains a powerful and widespread notion primarily because, in terms of methodology and interpretation, Arab, Islamic, and additionally Byzantine and Crusader, remains have in the past been disregarded if not destroyed. Israeli archaeologists will proudly declaim that they have never discarded a single Arab or Islamic artifact but will be hesitant to state how many such artifacts from their sites have actually been studied. On the other hand, the number of Israeli scholars interested in these nonbiblical historical periods appears to be increasing exponentially even as the individuals who had previously studied the remains from these periods, Palestinian scholars, have left Israeli institutions.

What is the future of Archaeology in Israel and Palestine? One scenario is that Palestinians and Israeli Jews will develop their own separate archaeological paradigms much as Jordanian archaeology has developed apart from Israeli archaeology even though sites in the two countries are quite similar. One can also envision a kind of economically driven combination of approaches. Certainly, the newly emergent Palestinian Authority will need tourist revenues from biblical sites within their jurisdiction and, just as Israel has to a great extent allowed considerations of tourism to color its own policy of site preservation, those sites may be given preferential treatment.

There is also the not negligible factor of past working relationships to consider. Many Palestinian archaeologists who have done fieldwork in the Levant have done so under the control of the Israel Antiquities Authority. Israeli Arabs in particular, familiar with the language of the dominant culture and well acquainted with its bureaucracy and social structure, have been involved in such projects. There is a notable camaraderie among some Arab and Jewish archaeologists, even while most other Jews and Arabs in the region remain apart. That many people are unaware of the degree of contact was brought home to me by a conversation with a Jordanian colleague at a conference. In the midst of voicing her opinion that there seemed to be little contact between the Arabs and Jews present, she turned around and recognized, in the row behind her, a Palestinian archaeologist sitting among a group of Israeli Jewish archaeologists and conversing in Hebrew. A scene that to anybody knowledgeable about Israel was quite common was to her utterly astonishing.

Inexorably, these relationships will come to depend more and more on the political factors in the region. Archaeology will come to serve the State in Palestine as it did and continues to do in Israel. Religion and nationalism both need the past to survive and to develop. As movements become nation-states, the mature passion that fuelled their success becomes the puerile sentiments of patriotism—conjured at will and concretized in "traditions"—that never saw the light of day before the creation of the state. Archaeology is a vital component in this process. Bruce Trigger's pronouncement that "most archaeological traditions are probably nationalistic in orientation," (Trigger, 1984, p. 357) is a sobering thought for those of us who are archaeological practitioners in embattled lands and who often prefer to see ourselves as either politically neutral or struggling to "save" an endangered cultural identity (Glock, 1990/1999).

DISCUSSION

The archaeology of the disenfranchised may well represent to some scholars the kind of ideological bias that they have long held to be inappropriate in the field. With the exception of postprocessual theorists, western archaeologists have not been welcoming of the various models described earlier for precisely this reason. In the Middle East alone, one can imagine any number of projects that could strike fear in the heart of the scientific investigator of the past: African American scholars investigating sites relating to Cleopatra to determine her racial identity; Palestinian archaeologists looking for cultural connections with Philistine sites; West Bank settlers being given complete autonomy over a neighboring site mentioned prominently in the bible; a *yeshiva* given control over important excavations in Jerusalem.

If the last two sound somewhat more familiar than the others, it is because they are real situations that have taken place, largely with the use of public funds, in Israel and the territories. The reason for placing them on this list is to make the obvious point that it should not be ideology itself that is the most alarming factor here but ideology that is supported by the State to the exclusion of other ideologies (Arnold, 1990; Scham, 1998). We have long proposed that the antidote to ideological biases in archaeology is to cease the funding of ideologically based projects. This is clearly not happening and perhaps never will as long as national self-interest dictates archaeological policies.

What of the postprocessualist remedy—reflexivity, alternative views, inclusion, and multivocalism? Unfortunately, while well reasoned and certainly well intentioned, these suggestions have merely added an element of confusion to an already chaotic world of interpretive schemes. Kohl (1993) has lamented that the postprocessualist celebration of diversity in interpretations seems to presuppose that the most menacing ideological biases in archaeology are no longer a threat.

Kohl's concern suggests that we are right to be suspicious of and on the alert for insidious ideologies. Nonetheless, we should keep in mind that the postprocessualist emphasis on discerning the "location of archaeological knowledge" can be most profitably applied to those knowledges located in the hands of controlling individuals and institutions with agendas.

The pressure of money and power behind archaeology is not being applied to further the archaeology of the disenfranchised even in countries such as Greece or Egypt where indigenous archaeologists are sympathetic with such views (Paynter and McGuire, 1991). Thus, at present, the possibility that what Said has called "an alternative way of conceiving human history" (Said, 1988/1994, p. 216) will overwhelm our field with ideological constraints seems quite remote. At this juncture we are presented with several choices as to the demands of disenfranchised peoples for inclusion in our interpretative endeavors. We can, as many have done, simply ignore the clamor and continue with business as usual. We can become champions of these views even though it is unlikely that we will very fully understand what precisely it is that we are supporting. We can pay lip service to the necessity to include alternative views and make token efforts to do so. We can reassess and revise our standards and methodologies for research, publication, and funding in order to assure that such views are heard.

The last proposal, although it is the only one with any chance of attaining the objective, is the most daunting and, thus, the least likely to happen. Those of us who have an intimate acquaintance with western bureaucracy and academic standards might find current funding and publication policies by both public and private entities a nuisance—but one that we are equipped to overcome. The fact that they often constitute an absolute barrier to others has not been a major concern for the rest of us. Again, token efforts have a placebo effect–somewhere someone is doing something to assure that these voices are heard and as long as the *One World Archaeology Series* is still being published we can be satisfied. Excavations and interpretations with an attitude will rarely be funded by the institutions that support mainstream archaeologists or find a place on the pages of the publications they read unless they are done by erudite western scholars like Mark Leone (1995).

This raises the formidable shade of "affirmative action"–that much debated, government-encouraged policy that many cite as the slippery slope to the current multicultural morass of American Academia. If scholarly journals and funding organizations reconsider and revise their policies for soliciting, reviewing, and selecting manuscripts or for determining the eligibility of projects for funding, it will undoubtedly mean that for some of us our manuscripts will go unpublished and our projects unfunded. It may also lead to, perhaps not unfounded, fears about eroding standards and politicization of scholarship.

In the face of this dire possibility what benefit could there be to thus encouraging these alternative interpretations of the past? First of all, we should not underestimate the salubrious effect of such views on some of our more conservative

institutions. For example, the mere concept of an *American School of Classical Studies* volume focusing on Greek postmodern archaeological theory or an *American Schools of Oriental Research* publication of Israeli and Palestinian papers on their differing views as to the presentation of archaeological sites in Jerusalem (unlikely though such volumes might be at the present time) should be enough to engender enthusiasm for this project. Interesting provocation aside, however, another significant advantage is that the inclusion of other views in archaeology not only enhances our own understanding of the past but will also eventually help us to move from opposition to collaboration with respect to "majority and minority" archaeological interpretations (Leone *et al*., 1987).

Hamilakis has lectured western archaeologists on the role they should assume in the postmodern world. "The responsibilities," he writes, "are to interrogate and challenge institutional regimes for the 'production of truths,' illuminate and expose the links of knowledges with power, and adopt a critical stance in the current global battlefields of cultural production and consumption." (Hamilakis, 1999, p. 74). Few archaeologists would enthusiastically assume these duties but there are arguments on the practical side for doing so—lest we forget those projects we have already witnessed that reflect the distrust with which disenfranchised people have come to view scholars who interpret their past. Similarly, those of us who work outside of our own countries have found ourselves increasingly shut out because of the past failings of our colleagues to account for local sensitivities. Ultimately, in arguing for the inclusion of other views, we are also laying the groundwork for the inclusion of our own.

REFERENCES CITED

Abu El-Haj, N. (1998). Translating truths: Nationalism, the practice of archaeology, and the remaking of contemporary Jerusalem. *American Ethnologist* **25:** 166–188.

Abu-Rabia, A. (2000). Bury my heart at wounded tree. Paper presented at the Conference on the Transmission and Assimilation of Culture in the Near East (TAC 2000), Council for British Research in the Levant, Jerusalem.

Agbe-Davis, A. (1999). The legacy of "race" in African-American archaeology: A silk purse from a wolf's ear? Paper presented at the Fourth World Archaeological Congress, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

Amichai, Y. (1988). All the generations before me (H. Schimmel, Trans.), *Poems of Jerusalem*, Harper and Row, New York, p. 3.

Anawak, J. (1989). Inuit perceptions of the past. In Layton, R. (ed.) *Who Needs the Past: Indigenous Values and Archaeology*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 45–50.

Arnold, B. (1990). The past as propaganda: Totalitarian archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity* **64:** 464–478.

Assante, M. (1987). *The Afrocentric Idea*, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Bahrani, Z. (1998). Conjuring Mesopotamia: Imaginative geography and a world past. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 159–174.

Bandaranayake, S. (1995). Monastery plan and social formation: The spatial organization of the Buddhist monastery complexes of the Early and Middle Historical period in Sri Lanka and changing patterns of political power. In Miller, D., Rowlands, M., and Tilley, C. (eds.),

Domination and Resistance, One World Archaeology Series, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 179–195.

Bender, B. (1978). Gatherer–hunter to farmer: A social perspective. *World Archaeology* **10:** 204–222.

Bender, B. (1985). Emergent tribal formations on the American mid-continent. *American Antiquity* **50:** 52–62.

Bender, B. (1993). Cognitive archaeology and cultural materialism. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* **3**(2): 257–260.

Ben-Haim, E., and Margalit, Z. (2000). Masada. Getty Conservation Institute Workshop on Archaeological Site management in the Eastern Mediterranean, May 19, 2000, Corinth, Greece.

Bernal, M. (1975). *Chinese Socialism to 1907*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

Bernal, M. (1987). *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. Vol. 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785–1985*, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Bernal, M. (2000). Afrocentrism and two historical models for the foundation of ancient Greece. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, London.

Biko, F. (2000). The African data on ancient Egyptian archetypes. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Bond, G., and Gilliam, A. (1994). Power/knowledge. In Bond, G. and Gilliam, A. (eds.), *Social Construction of the Past: Representation As Power*, Routledge, London, pp. 78–109.

Bowman, G. (1999). The exilic imagination. In Abu-Lughod, I., Heacock, R., and Nashef, K. (eds.), *The Landscape of Palestine: Equivocal Poetry*, Birzeit University Publications, Birzeit-Palestine, pp. 53–78.

Brown, D. (1970). *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*, Henry Holt, New York.

Brown, K. (1994). Seeing stars: Character and identity in the landscapes of modern Macedonia. *Antiquity* **68**(261): 784–796.

Brown, M. (1996). On resisting resistance. *American Anthropologist* **98**(4): 729–734.

Brown, K.(1998). Contests of heritage and the politics of preservation in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 68–86.

Brumfiel, E. (1995). Factional competition in complex society. In Miller, D., Rowlands, M., and Tilley, C. (eds.), *Domination and Resistance*, One World Archaeology Series, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 127–139.

Brumfiel, E. (2000). On the archaeology of choice: Agency studies as a research strategem. In Dobres, M., and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 249–256.

Buck, P. (1994). Dependent development in the United States South. In Bond, G., and Gilliam, A. (eds.), *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as Power*, Routledge, London, pp. 29–43.

Carlson, R. (1987). *The Americanization Syndrom: A Quest for Conformity*, Unwin Hayman, London.

Castaneda, Q. (1996). *In the Museum of Maya Culture: Touring Chichen Itza*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Castile, G. (1996). The commodification of Indian identity. *American Anthropologist* **98**(4), pp. 743–749.

Chambers, I. (1996). Signs of silence, lines of listening. In Curti, L., and Chambers, I. (eds.), *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, Routledge, London, pp. 47–62.

Clark, J. (2000). A better explanation of hereditary inequality. In Dobres, M., and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 92–112.

Clark, J., and Blake, M. (1994). The power of prestige: Competitive generosity and the emergence of rank societies in lowland Mesoamerica. In Brumfiel, E., and Fox, J. (eds.), *Factional Competition and Political Development in the New World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 17–30.

Clarke, A., and Torrence, R. (eds.). (2000). *The Archaeology of Difference*, Routledge, London and New York.

Condori, C. (1989). History and pre-history in Bolivia: What about the Indians? In Layton, R. (ed.), *Conflicts in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 46–59.

Conkey, M., and Gero, J. (1991). Tensions, pluralities and engendering archaeology: And introduction to *Women and Prehistory*. In Gero, J., and Conkey, M. (eds.), *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 3–30.

Conkey, M., and Gero, J. (1997). Programme to practice: Gender and feminism in archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* **26:** 411–437.

Darwish, M. (1974). A lover from Palestine. *Splinters of Bone* (B. M. Bannani, Trans.), Greenfield Review Press, Greenfield Center, New York, p. 23.

Deloria, P. (1998). *Playing Indian*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Dever, W. (1999). Can 'Biblical Archaeology' be an academic and professional discipline. In Kapitan, T. (ed.), *Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, pp. 11–22.

Diop, C. (1974). *The African Origins of Civilization: Myth or Reality* (M. Cook, Trans.), Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago.

Dobres, M. (1995). Gender and prehistoric technology: On the social agency of technical strategies, *World Archaeology* **27**(1): 25–49.

Dobres, M., and Robb, J. (2000). Agency in archaeology. In Dobres, M., and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 3–18.

Dowson, T. (2000). Homosexuality, queer theory and archaeology. In Thomas, J. (ed.) *Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader*, Leicester University Press, London and New York, pp. 283–289. (First published 1998. *Cota Zero* **14:** 81–87, original in Catalan.)

Early, G. (1998). Adventures in the colored museum: Afrocentrism, memory, and the construction of race. *American Anthropologist* **100**(3): 703–711.

Faust, A. (2000). A Commodity or a Threat?: Imported Pottery in the Iron Age II. Paper presented at the Conference on the Transmission and Assimilation of Culture in the Near East (TAC 2000), Council for British Research in the Levant, Jerusalem.

Flannery, K. (1999). Process and agency in early state formation. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* **9:** 3–21.

Folorunso, C. (2000). Egypt: As viewed from West Africa. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Franklin, M. (1997). "Power to the people": Sociopolitics and the archaeology of black Americans. *Historical Archaeology* **31**(3): 36–50.

Franklin, M. (1998). Comments on "perspectives on the evolution of African American culture: The historical archaeology of the tenant community at the Levi Jordan Plantation. Paper presented at the Society of Historical Archaeology Conference, Atlanta, Georgia.

Gellner, E. (1995). Interpretive anthropology. In Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Lastand J., and Lucas, G. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 48–50.

Gero, J. (1993). The social world of prehistoric facts: Gender and power in Paleoindian research. In Du Cros, H., and Smith, L. (eds.), *Women in Archaeology: A Feminist Critique*, Australian National University, Canberra, pp. 83–97.

Gero, J. (1995). Railroading epistemology: Paleoindians and women. In Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Lastand, J., and Lucas, G. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 175–180.

Gero, J. (2000). Troubled travels in agency and feminism. In Dobres, M., and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 34–39.

Gero, J., and Root, D. (1990). Public presentations and private concerns: Archaeology in the pages of *National Geographic*. In Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.), *The Politics of the Past*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 302–314.

Glock, A. (1999). Cultural bias in archaeology. In Kapitan, T. (ed.), *Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, pp. 324–342. (original work published 1987)

Glock, A. (1999). Archaeology as cultural survival: The future of the Palestinian past. In Kapitan, T. (ed.), *Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, pp. 343–365. (original work published 1990)

Gossen, G. (1996). Maya Zapatistas move to the ancient future. *American Anthropologist* **98**(3): 528–538.

Greeley, A. (1981). *The Irish Americans: The Rise to Money and Power*, Harper and Row, New York.

Haikal, F. (2000). Egypt's past regenerated by its own people. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Halperin, D. (1995). *Saint=Foucault: Towads a Gay Hagiography*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Hamilakis, Y. (1999). La trahision archeologues? Archaeological practice as intellectual activity in postmodernity. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* **12**(1): 60–79.

Hamilakis, Y., and Yalouri, E. (1996). Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society. *Antiquity* **70**(267): 117–129.

Hassan, F. (1998). Memorabilia: Archaeological materiality and national identity in Egypt. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 200–216.

Hill, E. (1998). Gender-informed archaeology: The priority of definition, the use of analogy, and the multivariate approach. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* **5**(1): 99–128.

Hobsbawm, E. (1992). Introduction. In Hobsbawm, E., and Ranger, J. (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1–14.

Hodder, I. (1992). *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York.

Hodder, I. (1998). The past as passion and play: Catalhoyuk as a site of conflict in the construction of multiple pasts. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 124–139.

Hodder, I. (1999). *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, and Malden, Mass.

Hodder, I. (2000). (ed.). *Towards a Reflexive Method in Archaeology: The Example of Catalhoyuk*. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research/British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, Monograph No. 28.

Hoffman, E. (1998). *Shtetl: The Life and Death of a Small Town and the World of Polish Jews*, Houghton Mifflin, New York.

Howe, S. (1998). *Afrocentrism: Mythical Pasts and Imagined Homes*, Verson, London and New York.

Ignatiev, N. (1995). *How the Irish Became White*, Routledge, New York.

Jacobs, J. (1996). *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*, Routledge, London.

Jameson, F. (1988). Marxism and historicism. In *The Ideology of Theories: Essays 1971–1986. Vol. 2: The Syntax of History*, Routledge, London.

Johnson, M. (1989). Conceptions of agency in archaeological interpretation. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* **8:** 189–211.

Jones, L. (1997). Conquests of the imagination: Maya-Mexican polarity and the story of Chichen-Itza. *American Anthropologist* **99**(2): 275–290.

Khalidi, W. (1992). *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Destroyed by Israel in 1948*, Institute for Palestine Studies, Washington, DC.

Khpera, S. (2000). Ancient Egypt: Africa's stolen legacy. *New African* **October:** 18–25.

Kohl, P. (1993). Limits to a post-processual archaeology (or, the dangers of a new scholasticism). In Yoffee, N., and Sherratt, A. (eds.), *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 13–19.

Kohl, P. (1995). The material culture of the modern era in the ancient Orient: Suggestions for future work. In Miller, D., Rowlands, M., and Tilley, C. (eds.), *Domination and Resistance*, One World Archaeology Series, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 240–245.

Kotsakis, K. (1998). The past is ours: Images of Greek Macedonia. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 44–67.

Kus, S. (2000). Ideas like burgeoning grains on a young rice stalk: Some ideas on theory in anthropological Archaeology. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Social Theory in Archaeology*, Foundations of Archaeological Inquiry Series, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pp. 156–172.

Kus, S., and Rharijaona, V. (2000). House to palace, village to state: Scaling up architecture and ideology, *American Anthropologist* **102**(1): 98–113.

Layton, R. (ed.). (1989). *Conflicts in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, Unwin Hayman, London.

Lefkowitz, M. (1995). *Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History*, Basic Books, New York.

Lefkowitz, M., and Rogers, G. (1996). *Black Athena Revisited*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Leone, M. (1992). A multicultural African-American historical archaeology: How to place archaeology in the community in a state capital. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.

Leone, M. (1995). A historical archaeology of capitalism. *American Anthropologist* **97**(2): 251–268.

Leone, M., Mullins, P., Creveling, M., Hurst, L., Jackson-Nash, B., Jones, L., Kaiser, H., Logan, G., and Warner, M. (1995). Can an African-American historical archaeology be an alternative voice? In Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Lastand, J., and Lucas, G. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 110–124.

Leone, M., Potter, P., and Shackel, P. (1987). Toward a critical archaeology. *Current Anthropology* **28:** 283–302.

Lowenthal, D. (1989). Conclusions. In Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.), *The Politics of the Past*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 302–314.

Lowenthal, D. (1995). 'Trojan forebears', 'peerless relics': The rhetoric of heritage claims. In Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Lastand, J., and Lucas, G. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 125–130.

MacDonald, K. (1998). Archaeology, language and the peopling of West Africa: A consideration of the evidence. In Blench, R., and Spriggs, M. (eds.), *Archaeology and Language II: Archaeological Data and Linguistic Hypotheses*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 33–66.

MacDonald, K. (2000). Cheikh Anta Diop and Egypt in Africa. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Matos Moctezuma, E. (1992). The Aztec main pyramid: Ritual architecture at Tenochtitlan. In Townsend, R. (ed.), *The Ancient Americas from Sacred Landscapes*, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 187–196.

McDavid, C. (1997). Descendants, decisions and power: The public interpretation of the archaeology of the Levi Jordan Plantation. *Historical Archaeology* **31**(3): 15–35.

McDavid, C. (1999). Contemporary conversations about the archaeology of slavery and tenancy: Collaboration, descendants and computers. Paper presented at the Fourth World Archaeological Congress, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (trans.), Orion Press, New York. (original work published 1957)

Meskell, L. (1998). Introduction: Archaeology matters. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 1–12.

Miller, D. (1980). Archaeology and development. *Current Anthropology* **21**(6): 209–226.

Miller, D., Rowlands, M., and Tilley, C. (eds.). (1995). *Domination and Resistance*, One World Archaeology Series, Routledge, London and New York. (First published 1989. Unwin Hayman, London.)

Miller, D., and Tilley, C. (eds.). (1984). *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nash, J. (1997). The fiesta of the word: The Zapatista uprising and radical democracy in Mexico. *American Anthropologist* **99**(2): 261–274.

North, J. (2000). Attributing colour to the ancient Egyptians. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Nur el-Din, H. (2000). Domestic architecture as a reflection of the inter-relationships between different groups. Paper presented at the Conference on the Transmission and Assimilation of Culture in the Near East (TAC 2000), Council for British Research in the Levant, Jerusalem.

Orser, C. (1992). Beneath the material surface of things: Commodities, artifacts and slave plantations. *Historical Archaeology* **26**(3): 95–104.

Orser, C. (1998). The challenge of race to American historical archaeology. *American Anthropologist* **100**(3): 661–668.

Orser, C. (1999). Historical archaeology in Ireland: History of the Ballykilcline project. Available: http://www.ilstu.edu/~ceorser/ballykilcline.htm. (*Webpage of the Centre for the Study of Rural Ireland*.)

Ozdogan, M. (1998). Ideology and archaeology in Turkey. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 111–123.

Patterson, T. (1996). Conceptual differences between Mexican and Peruvian archaeology. *American Anthropologist* **98**(3): 499–504.

Pauketat, T. (2000). The tragedy of the commoners. In Dobres, M., and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 113–29.

Paynter, R. (1994). Afro-Americans in the Massachusetts historical landscape. In Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.), *The Politics of the Past*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 142–159.

Paynter, R. (1997). Du Boisian perspectives on identities and material culture. *Anthropology Newsletter* **38**(5): 11.

Paynter, R., and McGuire, R. (1991). The archaeology of inequality: Material culture, domination, and resistance. In McGuire, R., and Paynter, R. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp.1–27.

Preucel, R., and Hodder, I. (1999). Communicating present pasts. In Preucel, R., and Hodder, I. (eds.), *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 3–20.

Roman, Y. (2000). The young men of Gibeon. *Eretz* **70:** 47.

Roth, A. M. (1998). Ancient Egypt in America: Claiming the riches. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 217–229.

Rowlands, M. (1994). The politics of identity in archaeology. In Bond, G., and Gilliam, A. (eds.), *Social Construction of the Past: Representation As Power*, Routledge, London, pp. 129–143.

Rubenstein, W. (1997). *The Myth of Rescue: Why the Democracies Could Not Have Saved More Jews from the Nazis*, Routledge, New York and London.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*, Routledge, London.

Said, E. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*, Vintage Books, New York. (First published 1988)

Said, E. (1999). Palestine: Memory, invention and space. In Abu-Lughod, I., Heacock, R., and Nashef, K. (eds.), *The Landscape of Palestine: Equivocal Poetry*, Birzeit University Publications, Birzeit-Palestine, pp. 3–30.

Saitta, D. (1994). Agency, class and archaeological interpretation. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* **13:** 201–227.

Salem, H. (1999). Implications of cultural tradition: The case of Palestinian traditional pottery. In Kapitan, T. (ed.), *Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, pp. 66–82.

Salem, H. (2000). Pottery traditions and cultural transmission: A case from traditional Palestinian pottery. Paper presented at the Conference on the Transmission and Assimilation of Culture in the Near East (TAC 2000), sponsored by the Council for British Research in the Levant, Jerusalem.

Sayej, G. (1999). The origins of terraces in the central hills of Palestine: Theories and explanations. In Abu-Lughod, I., Heacock, R., and Nashef, K. (eds.), *The Landscape of Palestine: Equivocal Poetry*, Birzeit University Publications, Birzeit-Palestine, pp. 201–210.

Schama, S. (1995). *Landscape and Memory*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Scham, S. (1998). Mediating nationalism in archaeology: A matter of trust? *American Anthropologist* **99**(3): 371–379.

Schiffer, M. (2000). Social theory in archaeology: building bridges. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Social Theory in Archaeology*, Foundations of Archaeological Inquiry Series, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pp. 1–13.

Seeden, H. (1989). Search for the missing link: Archaeology and the public in Lebanon. In Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.) *The Politics of the Past*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 142–159.

Shackel, P. (2000). Craft to wage labor: Agency and resistance in American historical archaeology. In Dobres, M. and Robb, E. (eds.), *Agency in Archaeology*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 232–246.

Shanks, M., and Hodder, I. (1995). Processual, postprocessual and interpretive archaeologies. In Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Lastand, J., and Lucas, G. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology: Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 30–36.

Shapira, A. (1996). Introduction. In Reinharz, J., and Shapira, A. (eds.), *Essential Papers on Zionism*, New York University Press, NewYork and London, pp. 1–32.

Shennan, S. (1989). Introduction. In Shennan, S. (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 94–109.

Silberman, N. A. (1998). Whose game is it anyway? The political and social transformations of American Biblical Archaeology. In Meskell, L. (ed.), *Archaeology Under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 175–188.

Spector, J. (1991). What this awl means: Toward a feminist archaeology. In Gero, J., and Conkey, M. (eds.), *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 388–406.

Spencer-Wood, S. M. (2000). Strange attractors: Feminist theory, nonlinear systems theory, and their implications for archaeological theory. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Social Theory in Archaeology*, Foundations of Archaeological Inquiry Series, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pp. 112–142.

St. Clair, W. (2000). The Parthenon Marbles: Britain's stewardship. Paper presented at the first international conference on the Restitution of the Parthenon Marbles, Athens, Greece.

Thomas, J. (2000). Introduction. In Thomas, J. (ed.), *Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader*, Leicester University Press, London and New York, pp. 1–19.

Trigger, B. (1984). Alternative archaeologies: Nationalist, colonialist, imperialist. *Man* **19:** 355–370.

Trigger, B. (1989). Hyperrelativism, responsibility, and the social sciences. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* **26:** 776–797.

Trigger, B. (1995). Romanticism, nationalism and archaeology. In Kohl, P., and Fawcett, C. (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 263–279.

Turner, B. (1994). *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalism*, Routledge, London.

Ucko, P. (1983). Australian academic archaeology: Aboriginal transformation of its aims and practices. *Australian Archaeology* **16:** 11–26.

Vizenor, G. (1986). Bone Courts: The rights and narrative representations of tribal bones. *American Indian Quarterly* **10**(4): 319–331.

Wengrow, D. (2000). Landscapes of knowledge: Archaeology, anthropology and colonialism in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Paper presented at the conference on Encounters with Ancient Egypt, University College London, London.

Willett, F. (1994). Museums: Two case studies of reaction to colonialism. In Gathercole, P., and Lowenthal, D. (eds.), *The Politics of the Past*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 172–183.

Wylie, A. (1989). Matters of fact and matters of interest. In Shennan, S. (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, Unwin Hayman, London, pp. 94–109.

Wylie, A. (1992). The interplay of evidential constraints and political interests: Recent archaeological research on gender. *American Antiquity* **57:** 15–35.

Wylie, A. (1993). A proliferation of new archaeologies: "Beyond objectivism and relativism." In Yoffee, N., and Sherratt, A. (eds.), *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 20–26.

Yehya, A. (1999). Who was here first? . . . and does it matter? Paper presented at Who was here first? conference, Yakar Center for Social Concern, Jerusalem.

Zedeno, M. N. (2000). On what people make of places: A behavioral cartography. In Schiffer, M. B. (ed.), *Social Theory in Archaeology*, Foundations of Archaeological Inquiry Series, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pp. 97–111.

Ziadeh, G. (1995). Ethno-history and 'reverse chronology' at Ti'innik, a Palestinian village. *Antiquity* **69**(266): 999–1014.

Ziadeh-Seely, G. (1999). Abandonment and site formation processes: An ethnographic and archaeological study. In Kapitan, T. (ed.), *Archaeology, History and Culture in Palestine and the Near East: Essays in Memory of Albert E. Glock*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, pp. 127–150.