Part 4

WORKING ARCHAEOLOGY

THE CRAFT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

DIFFERENT CULTURAL STRATEGIES FOR ARCHAEOLOGY: WHAT IS THE ARCHAEOLOGIST TO BE?

The critique of scientific archaeology, the questioning of the character of archaeology as a social science, has involved realizing that archaeology is a cultural practice and not simply a neutral quest for more knowledge of the past. The demise of scientific objectivity has raised the issue of the subjective and of the aesthetic, both being neglected under a sovereignty of science. Aesthetic quality is still a focus of some traditional approaches which may also be concerned somewhat with a 'literary' rendition of things found. But matters are much wider and less simple after the critique of science. These are matters of appreciating the past, writing and representing it appropriately, bringing archaeologist and the past together; these are questions of archaeology and value, archaeology as cultural practice. If the archaeologist is now a cultural worker, what should be their cultural politics?

An option is the expression of feeling, articulating an affective response and cherishing it as part of being human. This is quite common outside of academic archaeology and I suspect it will find its way back to theoretical respectability. The Theoretical Archaeology Group Conference at Lampeter, Wales, in 1990 had a session on emotion in archaeology with musical presentation and poetry readings. (See also *Archaeological Review* from Cambridge 9.2 1990 'Affective Archaeology'-)

The social explanations of processual archaeology have been held to be distorted, relying on notions of cultural evolution, societies as systems in equilibrium (naturally resistant to change) and economics of maximization of profit, minimization of effort (just like capitalist business). Alternative *radical* social accounts have been proposed which represent better, more real views, it is claimed, and which emphasize social contradiction, power relations, the subjection of majorities

by minorities (see Part 1). A significant influence has been Marxist social science.

Objective academic archaeology can be seen as omitting gender and ethnicity as important factors in the organization of the discipline and explanation of the past. I have referred to the androcentric focus on rationality, action and visibility in contrast to emotional environments which support institutional practices. Women may not progress in the discipline because of a perceived masculinity of interest and aptitude, and because of simple discrimination. The views and attitudes towards the past of groups which are not middle-class, academic and male are now being heard, and they question a neutral past for all (Gero and Conkey 1991).

In a general way (post-processual) archaeologists who oppose the discipline operating entirely under the sovereignty of science (on the grounds that is ideological and so supportive of a particular and perhaps objectionable status quo) may be taken as operating a strategy of opposition and transgression. Conventions of archaeological respectability are criticized and flouted, archaeological authorities (ideas, institutions, people) condemned. Lately, notions of final truth and neutral representation of archaeological finds and the past have been undermined. Confusion is spread concerning everything once held secure, from ways of describing and explaining the past, to the organization of committees for dispersing archaeological funds, to the running of an archaeological excavation. This critique may pose against the structures of the academy, may oppose the debasement of archaeology in popular and heritage culture, presenting instead a negative release of archaeology's productive forces, pasts created for and with those outside society's dominant interests (Shanks and Tilley 1987b, Chapter 7; Bapty and Yates 1991; Miller *et al.* 1989). Scientific archaeology itself was a radical academic strategy of opposition in the 1960s, standing for the purity of reason, universal method, the power of science and a break with traditional archaeology.

The tendencies of some of this (post-processual) oppositional and transgressing archaeology seem evident now. The theoretical uncertainties and doubtings appear irrelevant to many, and some archaeology threatens to dissolve into the present as part of an ideological or political stance (being radical entails this archaeology, or belonging to a particular social group or community entails another 'authentic' archaeology). We may yet witness a purely subjective and expressionist archaeology - feelings now on show.

Archaeology has already become commodity in the heritage and leisure industries. Scientific archaeology gives, at best, a partial view. Traditional archaeology is no longer respectable on many grounds, theoretical and practical. What is the way forward? Further doubt

and questioning; more political awareness; commercial archaeologies produced for clients? What is the archaeologist to be? Avant-garde artist; commercial consultant; investments expert (don't bother with this site, it's not worth it); white-coated expert; inspired aesthete; radical political activist; fervent nationalist; social welfare worker (here, this is the past you need to make you feel better); or teacher? Which cultural strategy is the archaeologist to adopt?

I direct attention to the art movements of (post)modernism. The following lists might be labelled modernism (to the left) and post-modernism. There has been a discernible shift in many cultural fields from one side to the other, left to right.

originality	intertextuality
novelty	recycling and quoting the pasl
break with tradition	reference to past in present
simplicity	complexity
clarity	ambiguity
uniformity	eclecticism
purity	ornament
order	contradiction
signified	signifier
semantics	rhetoric
purpose and design	play and chance
hierarchy	anarchy
avant-garde	commercial
mastery	partiality
co-ordination	dispersal
totality	deconstruction
wholes	(cultural) fragments
closed conjunctive form	open disjunction
finished work	process and performance
distance	participation
cause	trace
symptom	desire
genital phallic	polymorphous androgyny
transcendence	immanence
Utopia	nostalgia
universal	local
internationalism	pluralism

(based on Hassan 1985; Walker 1983)

The shift is particularly evident in architecture From LeCorbusier and internationalism (machines for living m and glass-faced rectangles) to historical preservation, images of locality and place, pleasures and eclectic urban spectacle (London Docklands and Covent Garden, Boston's Faneuil Hall, San Francisco's Fisherman's Wharf, Gateshead Metrocentre and Garden Festival) Analogous shifts m the fine arts and philosophy have attracted much cntical attention and speculation

So, as I have outlined them in this book, different archaeologies and ways of thinking of what archaeologists do fit into some of these pairings Consider the totalizing and co-ordinated systematics, the designed order of David Clarke's break with tradition in his *Analytical Archaeology* (1968), as compared with the commercial anarchy of heritage quoting and recycling the past, or post-structuralist archaeological speculation on the shifting play of meaning of material past in the present

What is to be made of this shift and these options, of the apparent opposition between modernist and postmodernist strategies[7]

Rather than a new cultural phase I see postmodernism as intimately related to modernism Both are part of the relation between homogeneity and heterogeneity, change and belonging, universal reason and local knowledge, identity and difference which are the cultural contradictions at the heart of capitalism's shifting nature I described this above and connected it to archaeological and heritage experiences of the past So much of postmodernism can be found m modernist work, nor is there a neat moment of birth of postmodernism

There are two main lines m modernism One leads through abstraction to an art concerned with itself, m-itself, opposing figurative art went with a concern with the art surface, a concern with purely formal matters (Jackson Pollock and abstract expressionism, one example) The other line leads art to dissolution m life, or the life-world becoming art (from Marcel Duchamp's ready-made art - porcelain urinal displayed in gallery - through Dada and photomontage, surrealist objects, to conceptual and performance art) Both these trends are symptoms of the deep interrogation of the meaning of art w hich characterizes modernism Both also are its failure for man\ people The end an avant-garde practising an art comprehensible only in terms of art On the other hand is art indistinguishable from e\erydav life, artists who act as robots performing repetitive motions m a gallerv, not producing 'art' While both may raise questions, the failure is m their *interpolation* and *11 relevance* Modernism was a radical alternative aiming to shock and transgress m pursuit of cultural liberation But its cultural field is now hardly oppositional, art is sold like any other commodity and its production feeds the entertainments and culture industries Meanwhile everyday commodities signify and mean, and often before they are

functional, the commodity form m the postmodern west is as much about style and culture as it is about use and economy There is more shock potential in the latest beer advert on TV than there is in a Manhattan gallery [31]

What can archaeologists learn from this[7] Confrontation and opposition are so easily absorbed into orthodoxy, its energies dissipated into un-reflective consumption of 'new' ideas in education and the media This can be the cycle of archaeological method as I described it in Part 1 A radical critique of truth and representation may raise vital questions of what archaeologists do, but may also seem irrelevant to many concerned with more practical issues in the 'real' world of archaeology, those who excavate may fail to see the point of post-structurabst musings on Derrida, or indeed philosophical discussion of scientific method These, together with a proliferation of different approaches and pluralism, may contribute to an inability to think the present - how can archaeology contribute positively to the present when it is dispersed in contradiction and there is so much to consider, so much m dispute[7] Traditional forms of meaning associated with family and community may also be eroded - how can a community past be important when it is only one possible meaning among many, or indeed when it is less important than a scientific hope of a cross-cultural generalization[7]

My argument is that we might realize that the material roots of the cultural options and strategies taken m archaeological work lie m a system which makes commodities of culture and identity I propose that archaeology's interest is in resisting the past being turned into a commodity For me this is to work on the *tension* between the benefits of technical reasoning (in scientific analysis for example) and a loss of particular meaning and tradition (referenced in heritage), between the sameness of universal methods and a past which resists its reduction and incorporation into the cultural forms of the present, between a single past-for-all and a plurality of individual pasts Not a modernist or postmodernist strategy, but learning from both, as responses to the experience of this condition we live I have called this 'sublation' of those dichotomies which return again and again I propose that it is fruitful to think of archaeology as craft

CRAFT

At the craft fair Market stalls laid with 'hand-made' goods pottery, especially wheel-thrown bowls and jugs, the more idiosyncratic or up-market called 'studio' pottery, colourful 'designer' knitwear, silver wire jewellery, basketry (hanging baskets for house plants), furniture perhaps, often made with hardwoods, leather bags and belts, a cake-stall in the corner sells home-made lemonade and sticky buns The term

'craft' invites caricature: comfortable middle-class people in fishermen's smocks expressing themselves in activities which were once the livelihood of the working class when they were known as trades. Arty pretence, complacent, conservative, safe. A honey-glazed milk jug sitting on stripped-pine Welsh dresser. It has undertones of regressive ruralism - getting back to the securities of pre-industrial village life and community, preserving 'traditional' ways and natural materials. Overtones of Utopian nostalgia.

The potters sitting at their wheel look absorbed in the work. The concentration requires no effort; the work draws the potter in. It looks care-free, far from the pressures of car assembly line. The potter is envied. It looks relaxing. People may take up crafts as hobbies or pastimes for these reasons; physical activities with clear untaxing guidelines in which they can lose themselves and escape.

It is for these reasons also that crafts may not be taken seriously. Traditional and safe, homely and affirmative craft work is not challenging and critical, subversive avant-garde art appearing in public gallery and discussed in the media. The gallery art piece, product of creative inspiration, seems to invite contemplation and close scrutiny. Handling the pot invites consideration of skill and technique, price and decorative appeal. Art is intellectual and singular; craft is practical and everyday. Craft is also associated with provincial folk art and tourist crafts, articles (often considered spurious) produced by locals as souvenirs for a tourist market. This is not the appeal of high-culture art.

Craft work has moved to the gallery. This began in the nineteenth century with museums of style and taste such as the Victoria and Albert in London. It continued with the studio pottery of Bernard Leach and others. Since the 1970s craft criteria of truth to material and suitability for purpose have been questioned, traditional and accepted qualities scrutinized in experimental works in textiles, clay and all the main craft materials. An attempt to question also the boundary between art and craft. This has been particularly evident in the United States. Here are new experiences in woven materials; ceramic sculptural teapots which do not look like fired clay and do not pour tea in the way you might expect.

Especially since the nineteenth century the crafts have been for many an aesthetic in opposition. The arts and crafts movement, defined in the writings of John Ruskin and expressed in the political works of William Morris, was a reaction against the products of the Industrial Revolution. In his business company Morris championed hand craft, workshop-based authentic labour, as opposed to machine-based alienated labour of capitalist industry. This was an attempt to restore a dignity and respectability to labour, to oppose the separation of art and politics, morality and religion. Craft was to be art in society.[12]

The Plaka, Athens, July 1989

Here again in the distinction between contemplative art and practical craft is the free thinker and artisan slave. But here also are aesthetic strategies challenging the separation. I shall go further into these in respect of what archaeologists might be doing.

Craft is the intention of a unified practice - hand, heart and mind combined in critique and affirmation, a harnessing of pleasure to learning. Craft is opposed to alienated labour, the separation of working from what is produced, to a division of labour which separates reasoning from execution (as in management and workers for example) and divides tasks in the making of something (as in a factory production line). It denies the separation of reasoned decision and execution, the freeman and the slave, the philosopher and the artisan. Craft involves a rediscovery of subjugated knowledges, recovering practices made marginal in the rationalized organization of productive routine. These knowledges are to do with the affective involvement of the body in the things we do: people's experience of themselves in a sensuous understanding of materials lived and worked with. Such forms of knowledge are know-how and may be subjugated, concrete and sensuous, rather than public, abstract and intellectual, but they do not involve a primitivist reliance on the 'natural'; craft may legitimately draw on any technology relevant to its purpose. Conceiving of archaeology as craft is a focus on what archaeologists do in its human scale and dimensions. In this it is modest, but not inconsequential, because the simple yet creative practice of encountering the past and producing interpretation of it may, as I have claimed, insinuate so much within the particular.[33]

I shall now expand on three basic elements of an archaeology as craft: function, viability, and expression. These include the relations of making and presenting, creation and purpose, expression and form, and archaeology and its public.

PURPOSE AND FUNCTION

Before even the remains of the past or the rules of archaeological method there are interest and purpose. The craft of archaeology begins not with object or method, but with desire: the aim, interest or purpose in doing archaeology. The choice of theory or method with which to approach the past depends on what the archaeologist is trying to do. Interests may include those I discussed in Part 3: technical control, or an understanding of the object past as meaningful product, or freeing others from distorted views of past and present. Whatever, this initial interpretive decision is associated with archaeological method in a logic of particular situations. This does not mean that one universal archaeological method is adapted to particular purposes. It means that theory is a strategic matter, varying not with methodological or

• apprenticeship •

SKILL

of interpreting
particular archaeological situations

knowing through experience

technique • expression

general principles • particular cases

HAND HEART MIND

UNIFIED EXPERIENCE

reasoning • execution

• taste •

INTERPRETATION

of
purpose
interest
the material past
expression

• utility •

PRODUCTIVE WORK

located in the
social
political
personal

epistemological absolutes (abstract theories of what method and archaeological knowledge should be), but with decision. Theory is a sort of tool kit.

In that craft entails a relationship with a client or customer for whom the craftworker labours, this decision is a matter of dialogue, fitting archaeology to community or social purpose and need. I suggest community as an appropriate archaeological client, though it may vary. This fitting of archaeology to social need does imply the possibility of reasoned discussion within an informed public sphere. There is an obligation on the archaeologist to make known what archaeological options are open, indeed to *open* discussion, not to close it down with perhaps an expert pronouncement of singular possibility - this is what archaeology does, take it or leave it. This is the responsibility of service.

Many archaeologists may maintain that a basic purpose of archaeology is to follow the ideals of what archaeological knowledge is. These epistemological ideals include finding correspondence with the facts in which archaeology deals - the recovered remains of past societies. A basic purpose of archaeology is considered to be production of knowledge of the past, knowing what happened. The primary archaeological task is to represent the facts. But this is not at all straightforward, as I have argued throughout; facts and representation are very problematical notions. On inspection there can be no neutral description; representation is always transformation of some sort, into text and images, archaeological words and pictures. Given this, justification must be given for choosing a particular mode of representation of the past, justification provided for the correspondence asserted between the facts recovered and the archaeological account of them. Since the 1960s especially this has become a major topic of debate with different attempts to show how the facts can support different accounts, and with different modes of correspondence proposed. These latter include empiricism (the status of fact is uncontroversial and so correspondence is a simple matter of attending to the facts), processual archaeology's subsumption of facts under generalizations and problems (general concepts and logics or processes such as society, economy, technology and feedback came between the facts and their explanation), and a post-processual notion that the facts of the past can be adequately known through considering their context (archaeological accounts correspond not with individual facts but with associations between data). While such debate has raised many vital questions of what archaeologists should be doing, the problem of corresponding with facts has been considered a technical matter. It is usually assumed that archaeology's purpose is to provide knowledge of the past, and it can be left up to archaeologists to work out how to do this. Archaeologists may be called

upon for various reasons, but their basic expertise lies in producing knowledge of the past, and this is a technical matter.

I suggest that it is not a technical matter and that archaeological service might not just be restricted to producing knowledge of some things that happened in the past. Rather than attempting to follow an ideal of what knowledge is or should be, archaeology might instead work on those things in our experience which are considered important, reflect on them in an archaeological way, and provide archaeological meanings which may assist in the modification of our beliefs, desires and activities. This would be an archaeology as an active part of living in the world now, contributing to an awareness of coping and managing experience, fostering difference and possibility.

Archaeological knowledge that some things happened in the past may be very edifying, but it may not be. The analogy is not exact, but it is like going to a carpenter and being told that they can construct a table, that is all. There are various ways they may do it, and it may turn out a kitchen table, workbench or occasional ornamental table, but it will be a table. Now a table may be exactly what is wanted, but the customer would like to have a say in what type of table it is to be, a say in the mode of construction. However, a table may not be what is wanted, and in this case the carpenter is hardly contributing to a rich and varied life. So too, the archaeologist may do more than aim simply to produce knowledge that some things happened.

Archaeology cannot escape the present and is responsible to it. So what might archaeology reflect upon; what are the things in our experience considered important and which have a relation to the work of archaeology? They should be decided in dialogue with the people archaeology is serving: local village community, city council, Native American nation. I anticipate that they would include popular issues of identity, belonging, and the quality of the local social and physical environment. The means of producing archaeological knowledge should be included in the dialogue because they are not neutral and technical matters, as 1 have argued. Empirical and analytic treatment of things found is invested with an interest in technical control, produces particular pasts and contrasts with a more 'human' understanding through a dialogue with the past as other or correspondent.

Such an interchange between archaeologist and client community is not one way. Archaeologists are not simply to accept the terms and interests of the client. A good work of craft enhances, alters, creates new possibilities of experience, however modestly. The new teapot may be an explicit critique of other teapots, a critique expressed in its design and use. It expresses a way of coping, contributes to quality and style of life; in this it is affirmative. It is also educational; in designing an article the craftworker teaches ways of perceiving and experiencing.

There may be little opportunity for rational dialogue between archaeologist and community. There has been a significant decline in an informed public sphere and it is increasingly replaced by the administrative decision making of experts. Interests and function may also be imposed on archaeology: for example an archaeological service may be required or rigged to produce nationalist accounts of the past (Trigger 1984; Kotsakis, forthcoming). Archaeology has an interest in examining its place in society and, if necessary, to criticize and make a case for productive dialogue between archaeology and community. This is archaeology's cultural politics: it is simply the production of a genuine and edifying or constructive past. The criteria according to which such a past is to be judged are not fixed and absolute. There is no final true or authentic past, nor any political orthodoxy (such as class-based analysis of capitalism) as firm ground on which archaeology may assess its place and the function of its pasts in society. Archaeology's reality, past and present, is a precarious one which can be readily diverted and made rigid for particular sectional interests. In a way archaeology's cultural politic is about finding the first person plural - *'we'* who can reason, argue, discuss the potential and place of past in present, we who struggle to make a better quality present which necessarily includes the past.

Such a cultural politics, with interests in service, obligation and dialogue, involves a strategic logic of particular situations, as I have just claimed. This is a logic attuned to the living textures of *popular* experience, attending to popular concerns rather than abstract and academic philosophies and methodologies (though these may be cited, they exist primarily in relation to practical interest and experience). It means taking the popular seriously. I have tried to address such textures in this book - desire, nostalgia, community, discovery, ownership and so on. So to write of the politics of archaeology is to refer not first to conventional politics of left and right, or to academic or theoretical politics, but to something more radical - people's basic orientations, experiences and hopes as they apply to the material past.

Regional development and education are two fields where archaeologists are already active. Development of an inner city ideally involves the reconciliation of planning, place and community, and archaeologists may well be active in avoiding and mitigating the destruction of the archaeological record, perhaps involving remains or architecture in the project. Their contribution is markedly enhanced if their expertise is not only located in empirical and analytic study of remains, but also includes an interpretive understanding of the meaning and significance of the past in terms of contemporary experience. This is what I have described as understanding through dialogue, past and present brought together. Such an archaeology can be a vital part of something such as Kenneth

Frampton's 'critical regionalism' (1985). The fundamental strategy of Critical Regionalism is to mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived *indirectly* from the pecularities of a particular place' (p.21). Universal civilization here refers to the trajectory of modernization, from anonymous urban culture to high-rise building techniques. Critical regionalism is regional development conceived in grander terms than a sentimental revival of a region's vernacular. It aims to maintain 'an expressive density and resonance in an architecture of resistance (a cultural density which under today's conditions could be said to be potentially liberative in and of itself since it opens the user to manifold experiences)' (Frampton 1985, p.25): an architecture of resistance to homogeneity and placenessness. With its interplay of resonance and correspondence, is this not a place for the genuine archaeological artifact? Inscribed in development projects composed of *building* sites - literally projects which build or cultivate sites.

> This inscription, which arises out of 'in-laying' the building into the site, has many levels of significance, for it has a capacity to embody, in built form, the prehistory of the place, its archaeological past and its subsequent cultivation and transformation across time. Through this layering into the site the idiosyncracies of place find their expression without falling into sentimentality.
>
> (Frampton 1985, p.26)

This is one role of sensuous receptivity.

Educational work in schools and colleges fosters reflection on the presentation of material and its application to the experiences of both teacher and student. Teaching is belittled and abused if considered as the transmission (however palatable) of a body of knowledge to recipient. A better image surely is that of a creative dialogue between teacher and student around a particular topic which produces something new (such as awareness or ability) within student and perhaps teacher (the act of communication as process of learning). Here a teacher's receptivity to the resonances of the archaeological object is a vital component in communication and experiences of learning. The notion of a craft archaeology addressing itself to the requirements of a client community is directly relevant to work in education, museum and media interpretation. It questions the split between archaeology and its public whereby dialogue is reduced to the packaging and sale of a body of archaeological knowledge to a passive consumer.

VIABILITY

Whatever the craftworker wishes to do, it must be viable and practical. Craft, of necessity, responds to the material which dictates much of

what the craft product is. In the same way the archaeologist must be true to the material past, otherwise the archaeological work is impractical, inept, useless, or fraudulent. Viability involves considering the characteristics of the particular piece of stone, wood or clay in relation to the project. These may be technical matters. Archaeology too needs to consider the particular characteristics of each encounter with the past, an attention to empirical detail. There are many scientific and technical aids to this end. I have tried to explain how this does not mean giving absolute primacy to the object past (as objectivity or 'fact'). In this interplay between the archaeological craftworker and object, both are partners in the final product. This means that the things archaeologists work *with* are not raw material but types of tools, autonomous and active in the production of archaeology. This is that simultaneous sense of intimacy and distance that I have often mentioned. A familiarity through working with the artifacts from the past, but also their resistance to classification and categorization. It is a primary and existential element of interpretation in productive work: the interpretation of purpose and of material.

Is this not also the experience of the potter? Even after a lifetime's working with clay, familiarity seems so partial and superficial. There is always so much more in the inert mineral body; constant learning. Tight control of processing can achieve predictable results, as in industrial production. But this is a deadening and alienation of the craft encounter with clay. In the genuine dialogue the clay *always* replies somewhat unpredictably, perhaps in the response of the body to firing, spectacularly in the varied responses of surface finishes and glazes. Much of the craft is in interpreting and channelling the quality of response, the resistance.

EXPRESSION

Craft is essentially creative; taking purpose, assessing viability, working with material, expressing interpretation to create the product which retains traces of all these stages. The creative element in craft contains an aesthetic of skill, of workmanship. It is directed and restrained - exact fantasy.

Craft's expressive dimension is also about pleasure (or displeasure) and is certainly not restricted to the intellectual or the cognitive. The genuine craft artifact embodies and the response to it is a multifaceted one. Pleasure is perhaps not a very common word in academic archaeology, but an embodied archaeology may certainly invoke it. Here archaeology can learn from Heritage's celebration of common experience, sharing, identity and community. However spurious it may be, people would seem to recognize the appeal.

THE PRODUCT

The craft object is both critique and affirmation, it embodies its creation, speaks of style, gives pleasure in its use, solves a problem perhaps, performs a function with an aesthetic, provides an experience, signifies and resonates. It may also be pretentious, ugly or kitsch, and useless.

Two watches. One a repeating half-hunter. The ritual of taking it from its pocket, its weight on the chain, listening to the ticking, uncatching the cover, touching the engraving, roman numerals, long slim pointers beneath the crystal, give it a wipe, wind it on a little, listen to the repeating chimes. It almost doesn't matter what time it is. Another: black, rectangular wrist watch, quartz digital, accurate to five seconds a month, multi-function technical magic, its stop watch calibrated in hundredths of a second, four alarms, liquid crystal display. Two different experiences. What sort of watch do you want?

The product declares itself. It operates a rhetoric, presents or embodies arguments which intend to persuade (Buchanan 1989). They may be about the way the past was, the way the present is or should be, future will be. (The sentimental nostalgia and impression of lost craft skills in the gold pocket watch; Utopian promise of high-tech.) The rhetoric of the product attempts to persuade on matters such as usefulness, the place of technology in everyday life, style and identity. In doing this it may instruct, provide information and appeal to reason and rationality; it may display its working to convince that it is worthwhile. It may aim to convince on ethical grounds, that it is right and proper (environmentally sound for example). It may simply please and entertain (the murmur of escapement and ticking). Such arguments may be backed up with appeals to authority - a look of credibility and confidence.

These are matters of design, which is the set of decisions about how something is to be made. The question of archaeological design is: what sort of archaeology do we want?

Judging different archaeologies might make reference to any of these aspects of rhetoric. It is like a matter of taste, by which I mean not personal preference as determined by individual sensitivity, but critical discrimination between different styles. Design without style is not possible; the set of decisions made in producing an archaeological work involves conformity with some interests, precepts or norms and not others, and these evoke associations. Archaeological style is the mode of reasoning employed, the relation between ideas and aims and the final product (which is usually a written text). The judgement of archaeological style is partly judging its eloquence (effectiveness and productivity); it is also an ethical appraisal, with reference to aims and purpose, or possible function of the archaeology. Technical matters are implicated, of course, including the essential truth to the past.

Judgement refers to all these aspects of archaeology as craft: purpose, viability, expression; design and style.

So what sort of archaeology do I appreciate? Archaeological work which holds new and enlarging experiences and perspectives through the past. Which engages with people's concerns and interests, reflects on assumptions, practices and beliefs. It can be anything produced in a respons-ible encounter with the material past. Archaeology has a topic and an obligation, but no method or singular outcome.

THE ARCHAEOLOGIST AS CRAFTWORKER

Archaeology's craft is to interpret the past. The archaeologist is one skilled in interpretation who provides systems of meanings between past and present which help orient people in their cultural experiences. This skill is the basis of the archaeologist's authority, for not everyone is equipped to deal with the past archaeologically. I see interpretation as a release of meaning which enables people to take the experience of the past as they wish. It is empowerment, giving people the opportunity to think through those aspects of the past which concern them, to discover new aspects, to locate these within their self-understanding. Interpretation is incitement to invent.

I am not proposing another new archaeology. This is not an attempt to mark out the ground for an arts or a humanities archaeology as opposed to scientific: romantic craft artist versus test-tubing scientist. It is just another look at what archaeologists are doing and might make more of. There is much excellent work of interpretation around, particularly in museums, exhibitions, in education: interactive displays, and course work which taps student self-understanding. Too much to list. I have cited some academic work of social archaeology in Part 1. But I believe that now is a time of potential and obligation to clarify what interpretation may be, to think of what archaeologists can be doing. Advances in archaeological theory have brought sophisticated awareness of how to go about interpreting what is found; the material past is moving away from paternalist state management to become the subject of entrepreneurial agency with the growth of heritage leisure and entertainment; planning and development is more aware of archaeological implications; popular experience of (post)modernity draws on pasts and nostalgias; community identity and individuality are of concern. In this cultural conjuncture archaeologists can act and interpret.[34]

I described some cultural strategies associated with modernism and postmodernism and referred to the failure of oppositional and transgressing cultural politics through incorporation within commercial media and culture, and through irrelevance. The reflections on craft are a way of thinking of an affirmative but critical archaeology. It is clear,

I hope, that this does not dismiss the aesthetic means of (postmodern-ism. I want to draw on some of these now as I consider the question of expression and representation - how is archaeology to represent the past?