

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL POETICS

Invention; non-identity and the necessity of going beyond what I have found; being drawn into metaphor and allegory. As an archaeologist, what constructions might I make? If the facts slip away so easily, how might I represent the past? These are the concerns of an archaeological poetics.

SUGGESTION

In writing of such a poetics I can only be suggestive. Formulae are inimical to it and bring the risk of falling into the old dichotomies with which I began this book, of developing theory and then finding some application for it, of factual past and the response or representation. I have called throughout for a mobility of thought and perception, moving with the artifacts as they come to light and are dispersed and transformed in what archaeology and society does with them. Perceptive to suggestion.

EXPERIMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY

A suggestive artifact, the lack of any final formulae or definitive method in archaeology and our inventive contribution to the past dare us to experiment. To put those disciplinary anxieties to one side and read possibility, not constraints, try out new ways of presenting, representing. This does not mean necessarily lapsing into an avant-garde obscurity; inventive and experimental energies drive the contemporary music scene. Experiment can excite and challenge accessibly. Audience matters. This is one constraint on experiment. To avoid a decadent elitism rooted in a care-free space to experiment, account needs to be taken of the demands of audience. And of the empirical reality of the past. This is the tension between experiment and responsibility.

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL POETICS

Invention; non-identity and the necessity of going beyond what I have found; being drawn into metaphor and allegory. As an archaeologist, what constructions might I make? If the facts slip away so easily, how might I represent the past? These are the concerns of an archaeological poetics.

SUGGESTION

In writing of such a poetics I can only be suggestive. Formulae are inimical to it and bring the risk of falling into the old dichotomies with which I began this book, of developing theory and then finding some application for it, of factual past and the response or representation. I have called throughout for a mobility of thought and perception, moving with the artifacts as they come to light and are dispersed and transformed in what archaeology and society does with them. Perceptive to suggestion.

EXPERIMENT AND RESPONSIBILITY

A suggestive artifact, the lack of any final formulae or definitive method in archaeology and our inventive contribution to the past dare us to experiment. To put those disciplinary anxieties to one side and read possibility, not constraints, try out new ways of presenting, representing. This does not mean necessarily lapsing into an avant-garde obscurity; inventive and experimental energies drive the contemporary music scene. Experiment can excite and challenge accessibly. Audience matters. This is one constraint on experiment. To avoid a decadent elitism rooted in a care-free space to experiment, account needs to be taken of the demands of audience. And of the empirical reality of the past. This is the tension between experiment and responsibility.

FRAGMENTS AND CONSTRUCTION

With the identity of the past and authenticity of the archaeological object challenged, its reality lying in its irreducible particularity, elusive and resistant to definition, the past threatens to explode into fragments. Decision and knowing seem paralysed. I have argued against totalizing definitions and classification of the past because abstractions do not heed the particular pot I have found. But I have also argued for constructions, building the pieces into pasts which mean something to us. There is a constant tension between the ruins and the constructions. On the basis of this tension the archaeological text can contain both poetic particularity and summarizing aphorism - an interplay of particular detail and the general which seems almost a defining characteristic of archaeology.

PLURALISM AND AUTHORITY

Invention and construction imply alternatives: multivocality, different archaeological voices responding to the past. Again though there is a tension between the diversity of voice and expression, and heeding the authority of critique, expertise and the material past itself. Rather than being critical manoeuvres, pluralism can be a new conformity, institutionalized choice, mere opinions to be consumed, an evacuation of authority.

REALISM

I can say that there is an archaeological reality to be known, but that it is not simply within the material traces of the past. A realistic representation is not only or necessarily naturalistic - replicating external features. This is clear from the experience of photographs of ourselves - how often they do not resemble us but only duplicate momentary facets. Realism is a project, not a set of formal conventions. As James Clifford puts it: 'realistic portraits, to the extent that they are "convincing" or "rich", are extended metaphors, patterns of associations that point to coherent (theoretical, esthetic, moral) additional meanings' (1988, p. 100). Realism involves allegory.

DOCUMENTARY

Robert Flaherty's documentary movie *Man of Aran* (1934) is about the crofters of the Aran Islands, three rocks in the Atlantic off the west coast of Ireland. It is a story of giant seas wearing away at the cliffs, of seaweed collected as soil for growing potatoes, of fishing for basking

FRAGMENTS AND CONSTRUCTION

With the identity of the past and authenticity of the archaeological object challenged, its reality lying in its irreducible particularity, elusive and resistant to definition, the past threatens to explode into fragments. Decision and knowing seem paralysed. I have argued against totalizing definitions and classification of the past because abstractions do not heed the particular pot I have found. But I have also argued for constructions, building the pieces into pasts which mean something to us. There is a constant tension between the ruins and the constructions. On the basis of this tension the archaeological text can contain both poetic particularity and summarizing aphorism - an interplay of particular detail and the general which seems almost a defining characteristic of archaeology.

PLURALISM AND AUTHORITY

Invention and construction imply alternatives: multivocality, different archaeological voices responding to the past. Again though there is a tension between the diversity of voice and expression, and heeding the authority of critique, expertise and the material past itself. Rather than being critical manoeuvres, pluralism can be a new conformity, institutionalized choice, mere opinions to be consumed, an evacuation of authority.

REALISM

I can say that there is an archaeological reality to be known, but that it is not simply within the material traces of the past. A realistic representation is not only or necessarily naturalistic - replicating external features. This is clear from the experience of photographs of ourselves - how often they do not resemble us but only duplicate momentary facets. Realism is a project, not a set of formal conventions. As James Clifford puts it: 'realistic portraits, to the extent that they are "convincing" or "rich", are extended metaphors, patterns of associations that point to coherent (theoretical, esthetic, moral) additional meanings' (1988, p. 100). Realism involves allegory.

DOCUMENTARY

Robert Flaherty's documentary movie *Man of Aran* (1934) is about the crofters of the Aran Islands, three rocks in the Atlantic off the west coast of Ireland. It is a story of giant seas wearing away at the cliffs, of seaweed collected as soil for growing potatoes, of fishing for basking

MAPS AND GUIDES

Maps, as they are familiar to us, developed for the ordering of things in a space conceived abstractly. They can belong with the perspective of surveillance - defining domains of administration and control, setting a grid on the world, delimiting territorial boundaries, establishing property rights in land. But maps also guide us. A map does not replicate topography like a landscape photograph; it gives form and constructs. The photo has only one entry point - the perspective eye of the camera. The map opens up the terrain. We can choose where we can begin our walk. Maps imply such a performance; the camera calls only for competence. We can modify maps according to our interests, adding or subtracting features, but the land still lies within. The photo only copies. The guide marks out an itinerary for us, personal and interested, making our visit, drawing out connections, opening up the experience for us, mapping out the land or the site.

Christopher Chippendale's *Stonehenge Complete* (1983) provides a kind of cultural map of the monument. I am not in sympathy with his view of archaeology, but the book puts Stonehenge in its setting, in the accounts given of it now and in the past, in the images produced of it, in the stories constructed of it, in its imaginative evocations.

Archaeological maps and guides? Providing mediations and orientations, pointing directions.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photographs in archaeological texts usually offer either pictorial atmosphere or act as documentary witnesses. The witness says 'I was there'; the photo says 'Look and see'. But looking is not innocent. The eye of the camera, the look with perspective is often the gaze of surveillance, the one-way look of which I have written. It belongs with an attitude which would take the past, appropriate the past, pin it down. Mug shots of the past. Inventories. The atmosphere shot may also speak of the restrained immediacy or spectacle of tourism. The act of looking goes with the meanings it finds. Surveillance finds objects to control. How might I wish to look, if appearances belong with the activity and its purpose? I think photographs can embody ways of looking other than surveillance. In being realized as part of differing activities, photographs are better thought of as photo-works; the work of making truth (Burgin 1982).

Rather than reporting to the world what has been found, the camera might record for those involved and interested in the work of archaeology. Photo documentaries of theatres of excavation.

The photo is a fragment, an arrested moment, seeming to need the

MAPS AND GUIDES

Maps, as they are familiar to us, developed for the ordering of things in a space conceived abstractly. They can belong with the perspective of surveillance - defining domains of administration and control, setting a grid on the world, delimiting territorial boundaries, establishing property rights in land. But maps also guide us. A map does not replicate topography like a landscape photograph; it gives form and constructs. The photo has only one entry point - the perspective eye of the camera. The map opens up the terrain. We can choose where we can begin our walk. Maps imply such a performance; the camera calls only for competence. We can modify maps according to our interests, adding or subtracting features, but the land still lies within. The photo only copies. The guide marks out an itinerary for us, personal and interested, making our visit, drawing out connections, opening up the experience for us, mapping out the land or the site.

Christopher Chippendale's *Stonehenge Complete* (1983) provides a kind of cultural map of the monument. I am not in sympathy with his view of archaeology, but the book puts Stonehenge in its setting, in the accounts given of it now and in the past, in the images produced of it, in the stories constructed of it, in its imaginative evocations.

Archaeological maps and guides? Providing mediations and orientations, pointing directions.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photographs in archaeological texts usually offer either pictorial atmosphere or act as documentary witnesses. The witness says 'I was there'; the photo says 'Look and see'. But looking is not innocent. The eye of the camera, the look with perspective is often the gaze of surveillance, the one-way look of which I have written. It belongs with an attitude which would take the past, appropriate the past, pin it down. Mug shots of the past. Inventories. The atmosphere shot may also speak of the restrained immediacy or spectacle of tourism. The act of looking goes with the meanings it finds. Surveillance finds objects to control. How might I wish to look, if appearances belong with the activity and its purpose? I think photographs can embody ways of looking other than surveillance. In being realized as part of differing activities, photographs are better thought of as photo-works; the work of making truth (Burgin 1982).

Rather than reporting to the world what has been found, the camera might record for those involved and interested in the work of archaeology. Photo documentaries of theatres of excavation.

The photo is a fragment, an arrested moment, seeming to need the

objectivity of the drawing, as the use of conventional archaeological drawing shows. But they are also the media whereby the archaeologist may explore the basic project that subjectivity gives form to the objective world; it is the 'how' rather than the 'what' of the things we find. Drawing is one of the basic planes of experience of the past (the artifact being what is experienced). Should we not work on this and experiment?

The photograph is an excellent means of copying. But with perspective's vanishing points focused on the eye of the viewer it lacks temporal depth; it is an instant glance which directs us to penetrate the surface to what is beyond or beneath the reality of the past, what is shown. Our look at the photograph is that of surgeon cutting through to reality; the look of the drawing conjures evocations of its reality. The loss of time, the fixing in an instant, the ambiguity of apparent past presence of the photographed object and its present absence, are photography's drawbacks; it is of death. But is not the movement of hand and eye across the surface, the mediation of every mark by consciousness, intuitive or planned, the active construction of the artifact from the past, affirmation of life? The time of its making which is contained in the drawing is not uniform, but varies with the attention, judgement and skills of the drawer; choice is exercised in which aspects to focus on. This human motivation is present in an encounter with the past and I would argue is its defining characteristic as *meeting*. The photograph too depends *externally* on the attention and selection of the photographer. Individual photographs may be pieced together into a larger whole or sequence in a semblance of a drawing though. This is what I have done in some of the pictures in this book (Berger 1982, pp.93-4; Joyce 1988; Hockney 1984).

NARRATIVE

A drawing may be seen as a plane of narration, a sequence of perceptions, intentions, actions inscribed on a surface which we may read in whatever order we wish, and whose story is the depiction of a subject. And just as the life of the drawing is the artist's presence and skill, so too the past lives in its retelling by storyteller.

I argue that stories are a basic means of making sense of the archaeological past. Fitting the particular into meaningful plots and telling to an audience. Sense through the order of a narrative involves story (a temporal sequence) and plot (causation and reasoning behind the story). Stories and plots in archaeology have a great tendency to be allegorical and conform to some familiar types or genres. The story, an imperialist one, of conquest and takeover, invasion and acculturation, was common in traditional archaeology; prehistory used to be explained entirely in this line. Another is the epic of human success, of progress

objectivity of the drawing, as the use of conventional archaeological drawing shows. But they are also the media whereby the archaeologist may explore the basic project that subjectivity gives form to the objective world; it is the 'how' rather than the 'what' of the things we find. Drawing is one of the basic planes of experience of the past (the artifact being what is experienced). Should we not work on this and experiment?

The photograph is an excellent means of copying. But with perspective's vanishing points focused on the eye of the viewer it lacks temporal depth; it is an instant glance which directs us to penetrate the surface to what is beyond or beneath the reality of the past, what is shown. Our look at the photograph is that of surgeon cutting through to reality; the look of the drawing conjours evocations of its reality. The loss of time, the fixing in an instant, the ambiguity of apparent past presence of the photographed object and its present absence, are photography's drawbacks; it is of death. But is not the movement of hand and eye across the surface, the mediation of every mark by consciousness, intuitive or planned, the active construction of the artifact from the past, affirmation of life? The time of its making which is contained in the drawing is not uniform, but varies with the attention, judgement and skills of the drawer; choice is exercised in which aspects to focus on. This human motivation is present in an encounter with the past and I would argue is its defining characteristic as *meeting*. The photograph too depends *externally* on the attention and selection of the photographer. Individual photographs may be pieced together into a larger whole or sequence in a semblance of a drawing though. This is what I have done in some of the pictures in this book (Berger 1982, pp.93-4; Joyce 1988; Hockney 1984).

NARRATIVE

A drawing may be seen as a plane of narration, a sequence of perceptions, intentions, actions inscribed on a surface which we may read in whatever order we wish, and whose story is the depiction of a subject. And just as the life of the drawing is the artist's presence and skill, so too the past lives in its retelling by storyteller.

I argue that stories are a basic means of making sense of the archaeological past. Fitting the particular into meaningful plots and telling to an audience. Sense through the order of a narrative involves story (a temporal sequence) and plot (causation and reasoning behind the story). Stories and plots in archaeology have a great tendency to be allegorical and conform to some familiar types or genres. The story, an imperialist one, of conquest and takeover, invasion and acculturation, was common in traditional archaeology; prehistory used to be explained entirely in this line. Another is the epic of human success, of progress

experience of the material, architectural, artifact and natural world. Such a project is a major motivation of this book.

RHETORIC

The creative construction of plots and arguments, and attention to audience are the concerns of rhetoric. Rhetoric is now in vogue again; there is even an interest in Quintillian and rhetoric of the Classical world which goes beyond the specialists.³⁶ Rhetoric is about effective communication, its structure and devices in general; it is about purpose, power (of speech and influence) and persuasion. This focus fits with the concern in contemporary thought with language and discourse in the world, with the relations between people as subjects rather than those between a knowing subject and the known world. Truth is sometimes bracketed in work which considers, like Nietzsche, the structure of discourse operating under a will-to-power (rules which enable statements to be made are considered more important than their truth). So too the ancient rhetoric of the sophists was caricatured as being the art of successfully arguing a case irrespective of its truth - it was explicitly amoral.

Raising the subject of rhetoric simply involves taking seriously the form that archaeological works assume, asking questions of the story genres and narrative devices adopted, considering the forms of arguments used, thinking of how archaeologists address their audiences via their work or discourse on the past. Rhetoric includes the invention and discovery of ideas, arguments and proofs for a case; the arrangement of these into effective wholes; and the forms of expression used (how appropriate to subject matter and context; comprehensibility; adornment). To think of the variety of rhetorical strategies is, for me, to think of enlarging the encounter with the past, and to think of a vital relationship between archaeologist and audience.

COLLAGE, MONTAGE AND QUOTATION

Collage is an extension of an artist's pallet or a writer's vocabulary, prose and poetic art to include actual pieces of reality or fragments of what the artist-writer is referring to. It is direct quotation, literal repetition or citation of something taken out of its context and placed in another. Montage is the cutting and reassembling of these fragments of meanings, images, things, quotations, borrowings, to create new juxtapositions. Collage is a simple questioning of the notion of representation as finding some correspondence with an exterior reality. 'Reality' is brought into the picture; collage may be tangible representation without attempting some sort of an illusion. It represents in terms of change - the shift of

experience of the material, architectural, artifact and natural world. Such a project is a major motivation of this book.

RHETORIC

The creative construction of plots and arguments, and attention to audience are the concerns of rhetoric. Rhetoric is now in vogue again; there is even an interest in Quintillian and rhetoric of the Classical world which goes beyond the specialists.³⁶ Rhetoric is about effective communication, its structure and devices in general; it is about purpose, power (of speech and influence) and persuasion. This focus fits with the concern in contemporary thought with language and discourse in the world, with the relations between people as subjects rather than those between a knowing subject and the known world. Truth is sometimes bracketed in work which considers, like Nietzsche, the structure of discourse operating under a will-to-power (rules which enable statements to be made are considered more important than their truth). So too the ancient rhetoric of the sophists was caricatured as being the art of successfully arguing a case irrespective of its truth - it was explicitly amoral.

Raising the subject of rhetoric simply involves taking seriously the form that archaeological works assume, asking questions of the story genres and narrative devices adopted, considering the forms of arguments used, thinking of how archaeologists address their audiences via their work or discourse on the past. Rhetoric includes the invention and discovery of ideas, arguments and proofs for a case; the arrangement of these into effective wholes; and the forms of expression used (how appropriate to subject matter and context; comprehensibility; adornment). To think of the variety of rhetorical strategies is, for me, to think of enlarging the encounter with the past, and to think of a vital relationship between archaeologist and audience.

COLLAGE, MONTAGE AND QUOTATION

Collage is an extension of an artist's pallet or a writer's vocabulary, prose and poetic art to include actual pieces of reality or fragments of what the artist-writer is referring to. It is direct quotation, literal repetition or citation of something taken out of its context and placed in another. Montage is the cutting and reassembling of these fragments of meanings, images, things, quotations, borrowings, to create new juxtapositions. Collage is a simple questioning of the notion of representation as finding some correspondence with an exterior reality. 'Reality' is brought into the picture; collage may be tangible representation without attempting some sort of an illusion. It represents in terms of change - the shift of

schemes of ideas or explanations; meanings are discovered in use and change.

Collage is an art of quotation. I can quote works or archaeological artifacts as illustrations to prove a point; their implied presence supplies authority to what I have said. I illustrate a point I have made about a site with a photograph; it says 'see, he's right'. A quote may also exist in opposition to what I write, not identifying what I say, or authorizing, but acting as a predicate, something *extra*. Such a quote says 'look, he's wrong, there's more to it'.

The things I might quote (artifacts, statements, pictures) do not have inherent meaning ready to communicate itself, a sort of revelation when displayed. In this regard Walter Benjamin writes of quotation as like drilling rather than excavation - snatching the quotation itself rather than the explanations which overlay it with systematics and causal connections (a provocative image for the archaeologist and a reminder that the contexts of the things found are not natural but constructed). Benjamin's major project (incomplete at his suicide in 1940) was a historical work on the Arcades of nineteenth-century Paris, the *Passagen-Werk*. This was to be, in the words of Susan Buck-Morss, 'a historical lexicon of the capitalist origins of modernity, a collection of concrete, factual images of urban experience' (1989, p.336). Commodities, shopping, fashion, architecture, mass media, street life, engineering, photography, and more were to be brought as quotation into a disconnected construction with neither a formal narrative nor an analytical structure. A collage instead, mobile arrangement and trial combination, potentially responsive to the demands of a changing present. If cultural treasures are passed down usually as the spoils of conquering forces, the *Passagen-Werk* was to be an alternative non-authoritative inheritance (of nineteenth-century Paris), instructing without dominating, like a fairy tale (Buck-Morss 1989, p.337). Buck-Morss has written a fascinating reading of Benjamin's notes for his rescue of nineteenth-century material experience, a reading from her present, and with intriguing relevance to archaeology's project of material culture.

The art of quotation is that of relating particulars to constructions which go beyond them. Is not one of archaeology's prime concerns to relate the material particulars of the past to more general processes? And yet also to retain the tension, not reducing the things found to the general (theory, process, classification etc.)? Archaeology's objects are fragments, already cut and torn. Archaeological writings move through juxtapositions of artifacts, bones, material features, plant remains. Quotation, collage, montage: is this not archaeology's allegory? The experience of decay and break-up, of traditional certainties, collecting scraps within which the archaeologist may trace the loss of societies and cultures, the tracks which lead to modernity?

schemes of ideas or explanations; meanings are discovered in use and change.

Collage is an art of quotation. I can quote works or archaeological artifacts as illustrations to prove a point; their implied presence supplies authority to what I have said. I illustrate a point I have made about a site with a photograph; it says 'see, he's right'. A quote may also exist in opposition to what I write, not identifying what I say, or authorizing, but acting as a predicate, something *extra*. Such a quote says 'look, he's wrong, there's more to it'.

The things I might quote (artifacts, statements, pictures) do not have inherent meaning ready to communicate itself, a sort of revelation when displayed. In this regard Walter Benjamin writes of quotation as like drilling rather than excavation - snatching the quotation itself rather than the explanations which overlay it with systematics and causal connections (a provocative image for the archaeologist and a reminder that the contexts of the things found are not natural but constructed). Benjamin's major project (incomplete at his suicide in 1940) was a historical work on the Arcades of nineteenth-century Paris, the *Passagen-Werk*. This was to be, in the words of Susan Buck-Morss, 'a historical lexicon of the capitalist origins of modernity, a collection of concrete, factual images of urban experience' (1989, p.336). Commodities, shopping, fashion, architecture, mass media, street life, engineering, photography, and more were to be brought as quotation into a disconnected construction with neither a formal narrative nor an analytical structure. A collage instead, mobile arrangement and trial combination, potentially responsive to the demands of a changing present. If cultural treasures are passed down usually as the spoils of conquering forces, the *Passagen-Werk* was to be an alternative non-authoritative inheritance (of nineteenth-century Paris), instructing without dominating, like a fairy tale (Buck-Morss 1989, p.337). Buck-Morss has written a fascinating reading of Benjamin's notes for his rescue of nineteenth-century material experience, a reading from her present, and with intriguing relevance to archaeology's project of material culture.

The art of quotation is that of relating particulars to constructions which go beyond them. Is not one of archaeology's prime concerns to relate the material particulars of the past to more general processes? And yet also to retain the tension, not reducing the things found to the general (theory, process, classification etc.)? Archaeology's objects are fragments, already cut and torn. Archaeological writings move through juxtapositions of artifacts, bones, material features, plant remains. Quotation, collage, montage: is this not archaeology's allegory? The experience of decay and break-up, of traditional certainties, collecting scraps within which the archaeologist may trace the loss of societies and cultures, the tracks which lead to modernity?

momentary and pointed encapsulation and summary, aphorism and icon, poetic imagery. These are just some that I have attempted in this book. And this brings me again to (post)modernism's project of revitalizing expression.³⁷

TEACHING

The realization of the potential of archaeology, as I have presented it in this book, must rely in part on how it is taught in schools, colleges and universities. I am not sure how naive it is to hope for courses in 'sensuous receptivity'. I am not sure because of the educational initiatives I have witnessed at pre-university levels in British schools. The General Certificate of Secondary Education, the body of public exams to be taken by students at 16+ stage, has been based, in its early stages, on some excellent and imaginative curricula. These incorporate varied communicative and analytical skills, moving away from pure academic orientation of the traditional disciplines, but not lapsing into simple vocational training (and learning from the mistakes of progressive child-centred education). The form that archaeology takes in its teaching is an essential aspect of what I have described as an archaeological ethic; it is also a concern to archaeology's cultural politics. I say again that archaeology's audience matters. Although things are certainly different between Britain and the United States, where my limited experience indicates undergraduate courses of necessity made attractive and pertinent, archaeologists would do well to look to what the subject may become. Will more facts, statistics and esoteric theorizing be wanted, or an archaeology which contributes critically and directly to the present?

WRITING AND PUBLICATION

There might be the following types of archaeological writing (some are familiar). They are intended to account for both an ethical responsibility in reception of the past, and a critical and creative understanding of it in the present.

Archive material: relating to sites and finds investigated in the past, and to encompass basic excavation site and survey notes, inventories, and pertinent to the types of writing I list. This material may, of course, be stored and accessed electronically.

Ethnographies: transformations of archive material into documentaries and accounts of projects, investigations and discoveries. Emphasizing why and how certain projects were undertaken, drama and the human encounter with the past. Such ethnographies are one form of account to others of archaeology's significance, of its people and motivations, personalities and politics.

momentary and pointed encapsulation and summary, aphorism and icon, poetic imagery. These are just some that I have attempted in this book. And this brings me again to (post)modernism's project of revitalizing expression.³⁷

TEACHING

The realization of the potential of archaeology, as I have presented it in this book, must rely in part on how it is taught in schools, colleges and universities. I am not sure how naive it is to hope for courses in 'sensuous receptivity'. I am not sure because of the educational initiatives I have witnessed at pre-university levels in British schools. The General Certificate of Secondary Education, the body of public exams to be taken by students at 16+ stage, has been based, in its early stages, on some excellent and imaginative curricula. These incorporate varied communicative and analytical skills, moving away from pure academic orientation of the traditional disciplines, but not lapsing into simple vocational training (and learning from the mistakes of progressive child-centred education). The form that archaeology takes in its teaching is an essential aspect of what I have described as an archaeological ethic; it is also a concern to archaeology's cultural politics. I say again that archaeology's audience matters. Although things are certainly different between Britain and the United States, where my limited experience indicates undergraduate courses of necessity made attractive and pertinent, archaeologists would do well to look to what the subject may become. Will more facts, statistics and esoteric theorizing be wanted, or an archaeology which contributes critically and directly to the present?

WRITING AND PUBLICATION

There might be the following types of archaeological writing (some are familiar). They are intended to account for both an ethical responsibility in reception of the past, and a critical and creative understanding of it in the present.

Archive material: relating to sites and finds investigated in the past, and to encompass basic excavation site and survey notes, inventories, and pertinent to the types of writing I list. This material may, of course, be stored and accessed electronically.

Ethnographies: transformations of archive material into documentaries and accounts of projects, investigations and discoveries. Emphasizing why and how certain projects were undertaken, drama and the human encounter with the past. Such ethnographies are one form of account to others of archaeology's significance, of its people and motivations, personalities and politics.