# MARKETING HERITAGE

Archaeology and the
Consumption of the Past

EDITED BY
YORKE ROWAN & UZI BARAM

# CONTENTS

# Preface

❧

EIGHTEEN KILOMETERS WEST of the Israeli Negev city of Beersheva lies the Chalcolithic site of Shiqmim. Excavated by Thomas E. Levy and the late David Alon from 1979 to 1993, the site provides a fantastic view of Chalcolithic (4500–3500 B.C.E.) life along the Wadi Beersheva. Underground tunnels, house foundations, human burials, copper artifacts, ivory ornaments, and a wealth of other items have been uncovered. Levy has argued persuasively for a model of chiefdom for this place and its time period.

One cannot visit Shiqmim easily. The site is in a restricted military zone and is far from any roads. However, the Israel Museum in Jerusalem displays some of its artifacts. Numerous publications discuss the site, excavations, and cultural history. A web page based at the Department of Anthropology of University of California, San Diego, is an accessible means of learning about and seeing the site. Shiqmim is an important archaeological site; the architecture and artifacts are engaging; the desert is simply beautiful.

We both excavated at Shiqmim. Coincidentally, so did three other contributors to this volume (Morag Kersel, Jonathan Golden, and Joel Bauman). We both use Shiqmim in our teaching. Shiqmim provides wonderful stories for teaching undergraduate anthropology—the dramatic landscape, the hardships of excavating far from electricity, water, and information outlets. And the rich array of material culture offers adventure, science, and a portal to the past. When either of us is asked about our most interesting excavations, as happens often to archaeologists, Shiqmim is usually the story told. Yet there is no marketing of Shiqmim for tourists by the state of Israel.

Based on our experiences at Shiqmim, and with a contrast to the nearby actively promoted sites like Masada and Petra in mind, we wrestled with how ancient

periods and sites are selected and prioritized for promotion and consumption, by the state, by the academy, by individuals. Discussions with colleagues underscored a commonality across continents—that "the past" was becoming more than a concept useful for provoking political action and reaction, but a resource that could be utilized for widening the profit margin for various endeavors. These conversations concerning the growing phenomenon of marketing archaeological heritage continued through the last decade and eventually culminated in a session at the American Anthropology Association meetings in 2001, organized by Rowan and Jonathan Golden. All of the contributors to this volume noticed in one way or another the ways in which archaeology and heritage are becoming commodities in the marketplace. It's a global phenomenon and we tried to draw on examples from all areas of the world in order to examine this trend.

# INTRODUCTION  I

# Archaeology after Nationalism: Globalization and the Consumption of the Past

I

UZI BARAM AND YORKE ROWAN

## Archaeology in the Contemporary World

THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF interpreting and presenting the past continue to challenge archaeologists and complicate archaeology. Trigger's (1984) seminal work provided an initial consideration of the intersection of archaeology and politics, opening up terminology and case studies of archaeologies that support imperialism, colonialism, and nationalism. Silberman (1989, 1995), Arnold (1990), Gathercole and Lowenthal (1990), Kohl and Fawcett (1995), Trigger (1995), Patterson (1995), Díaz-Andreu and Champion (1996), and Meskell (1998), among others, expanded on the intersection of nationalism and contemporary archaeology.

These studies delineate how twentieth-century states employed archaeology for fostering national identity, in terms of presenting a positive portrayal of the nation and obscuring other histories that exist within the state boundaries (Trigger 1984). The point has been emphasized for the Middle East, where Trigger (1984) and Silberman (1989) have shown that archaeology is political and is employed to construct nationalist themes for the past. Archaeology, as the study of the past, is dominated by attempts by varied nations to "resurrect their greatness in the past" (Silberman 1989, 10). Trigger (1984, 358–60) defines nationalist archaeology as an approach championing "pride and morale of nations." But at the start of the twenty-first century, nationalism is not the only political force impinging on archaeology, and it may not be the most significant.

Just as the intersection of nationalism and archaeology becomes clarified, the bundle of processes involved in globalization is weakening the nation-state and subsuming nationalism. Although scholars have exposed the impact of nationalism on archaeology, a new task comes to the study of the past. Addressing the obstacles to good scholarship and possibilities for archaeology in the global age,

several publications have examined the intersection of archaeology and education (Stone and Molyneaux 1994; Smardz and Smith 2000), public memory (Shackel 2000), the contemporary past (Buchli and Lucas 2001), the public benefits of archaeology (Little 2002), repatriation of cultural objects (Greenfield 1989), and the destruction of archaeological sites (Layton et al. 2001). All of these studies relate to the sociopolitics of archaeology, which Wobst (1995) explains as the acknowledgment that choices are made by the practitioners in what is focused on in the study of the past rather than being simply the product of the archaeological record. Here we consider archaeology's intersection with globalization.

This volume embraces a global perspective to consider a range of archaeological sites and objects, some well-known (e.g., the Parthenon Marbles, Stonehenge, Colonial Williamsburg) and others less examined. In providing a geographically expansive collective (from Cambodia to Jordan, Avebury to Orlando) and the variation in the types of representations and marketing of the past (from trinkets to theme parks), we hope to illuminate a set of issues and their implications for archaeology and globalization. The sociopolitics of the endeavor revolves around the concern for how archaeology, broadly defined to include historic preservationists, museum specialists, and tourism promoters, works with contemporary issues at archaeological sites and through artifacts. The objective is to open up a theoretical discussion on the intersection of material remains and access to the past in a global context. The underlying thread focuses on the contemporary consequences and long-term scholarly implications of globally generated and situated presentations of the past.

The consumption of the past includes people visiting and knowing places with historic content. Tourism is a massive and extensive global industry. The literature on tourism is becoming immense and archaeo-tourism is an important subset. But rather than investigate tourism, this volume follows the trajectory of scholarship that interrogates the intersection of archaeology and its contemporary context. Poria et al. (2001, 1047) note the common assumption that heritage tourism is a grouping within tourism based on the historic attributes of an attraction; they argue a more appropriate approach focuses on the "motivations and perceptions" of the tourists rather than on the place, the social aspect of the visit is the key to their definition. By separating the attributes of a place from the motivation to visit locales embodying heritage, Poria et al. (2001) open up the context of a heritage attraction, the politics of the presentation, and understanding of heritage, specifically in terms of archaeology.

## After Nation

Archaeologists have been evaluating the question of ownership of the past (Skeates 2000) as manifest in international conventions, ownership versus man-

agement of sites and artifacts (Messenger 1999), the rights and interests of indigenous peoples, and the commodification of the past. Such research is frequently bound by nation-states and their practices. But as the nation-state loses supremacy to global forces and transnational corporations, similar forces are sweeping up archaeology in complicated, even contradictory ways.

The term "globalization" covers several layers of processes and interactions. Tsing discusses globalization as

> a set of projects that require us to imagine space and time in particular ways. These are curious, power projects. Anthropologists need not ignore them; we also need not renaturalize them by assuming that the term they offer us are true. . . . an analyst of globalism cannot merely toss it out as a vacant description. Instead, an ethnographic study of the global needs careful attention not only to global claims and their effects on social life but also to questions of interconnection, movement, and boundary crossing that globalist spokepeople have brought to the fore. To take globality as an object of study requires both distance and intimate engagement. (2002, 476)

Within obvious limitations of length, the contributors to this volume have tried to capture that dynamic. Studying local expressions of heritage, archaeology, and the consumption of the past, the contributors provide examples that illustrate the variation within the global arena. The imagining of space and time—the archaeological quest to reconstruct and represent the past of a place—requires anthropological details, the types found across the chapters in this volume.

## Heritage as a Commodity

In employing the term "marketing," these investigations identify the active construction of the past toward specific purposes as their goal. But we do not stop with the production of a past in a particular location; studies can link the production (Bauman, this volume) with its distribution (Ardren, this volume) and consumption. Cheung (1999) argues that most tourism studies simplify the contest over heritage as foreign tourists versus local peoples. There is much greater complexity, as Stark and Griffin (this volume) show for Cambodia. Heritage is a complex notion, involving the past, contemporary social understandings of places, and the active construction of the past. Exploring heritage in their case studies, many contributors to this volume cite Lowenthal (1985, 1996), highlighting the fundamental role his ideas play in investigating and understanding the past in its contemporary context.

Lowenthal (1996) provides straightforward imagery for studying heritage. He (1996, 2–3) notes heritage's "potential for both good and evil is huge. On the one

hand, it offers a rationale for self-respecting stewardship of all we hold dear; on the other, it signals an eclipse of reason and a regression to embattled tribalism." Heritage is a particular version of the past that belongs to a group. That fragmentation of the past by heritage leads to the assumption by various countries that

> their problems (are) unexampled elsewhere. In Australian eyes the attribution of heritage by populist mockery is a problem solely their own. Italians imagine that they alone have a heritage too burdensome to live with. Greeks feel uniquely bereaved by the classical legacy's global dispersal; none but Israelis suffer a suicidal Masada complex; Egyptians uniquely lack empathy with ancient roots. Only Americans parade their past with patriotic hype, debase it with Disney, and feel guilt on both counts. Or so they all think. But they are wrong; most of these heritage ailments are pandemic. (Lowenthal 1996, 249)

What is seen as unique can be placed in a global, comparative context. The wealthy can travel to heritage sites everywhere and anywhere in the world. The marketing of heritage takes the unique and universalizes it as a commodity.

Not only has heritage become a commodity, it is a wildly popular one around the planet. Wolf (1982, 310) defined commodities as "goods and services produced for a market . . . they can be compared and exchanged without reference to the social matrix in which they are produced." Wolf situated commodities in a historical anthropological perspective with the emergence of the modern world. Stone et al. (2000, 21) provide case studies of commodities in globalization, laying out a wide-ranging collection of goods in order to show the interconnections among consumers of the wealthy countries and the primary producers of poor nations within global networks. The power dynamics illuminated by Wolf (1982) and discussed by Stone et al. (2000) are important components to understand the implications of accelerating commodity production, distribution, and consumption in our increasingly interconnected world. During the modern period, a greater variety of goods and services have been made into commodities. Heritage sites are the product of archaeological excavations and historical investigations, and are now significant commodities in the global tourist market. The skill or labor required to extract an understanding of the past is less significant, it seems, than the postcards, refrigerator magnets, and entrance fees that can be charged for visiting a site. Heritage as commodity is not simply the place, its past, or its materiality. The complexity of what is made into a commodity can be illuminated, we believe, by global comparison to other commodifications.

The commodification of the past is part of a trajectory on which more and more aspects of social life and localized resources become objects for consumption. For instance, nature has become a good that can be evaluated via the market as well

as visited or even bound into a theme park (Davis 1997). As nature becomes a subject of tourism, it is not surprising that the past, whether represented by artifacts in cabinets of curiosities, museums, or by the places excavated, is also made into a commodity for the world's largest industry—tourism. As a commodity, there are complex bargains for the stewards, managers, excavators, and interpreters of the places.

Davis (1997, 235) engaged in a long-term ethnographic study of a theme park based on nature. She discusses a shift in the theme park from an incoherence based on an underfunded collection of things that people liked versus the result after ample resources were poured into the complex. With coherence, with great care placed in the details, "the theme park has become more overbearingly persuasive, more beautiful and likeable. Its efforts to shape perceptions and feelings work, at least a lot of the time." Davis views this packaging of nature as the corporation winning. Archaeologists and historic preservationists can imagine, and probably are aware of, the tremendous number of sites and places uncared for, the excavation units overgrown with weeds or the old houses vandalized with graffiti. That incoherence is not positive yet the alternative, as discussed by Davis (1997), raises a concern that slick marketing of the past might remove authenticity. Success has its price (see Gable and Handler, this volume, for a more comprehensive consideration of similar issues).

Success can come from the marketing of heritage, from convincing people and institutions to fund the preservation of places. Preservation, according to Murtagh (1993, 19–22), is an umbrella term that includes preservation, restoration, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. There are several spectacular examples of successful preservation around the planet: Masada (Silberman 1989; Ben-Yehuda 1993) in Israel, Colonial Williamsburg (see Gable and Handler, this volume) in the United States, and the Jorvik Viking Center (Jones 1999) in Britain. The critiques of these famous sites raise unease on behalf of the less famous ones, the ones with less coherence due to lack of funding. This volume includes discussion of sites that are nonspectacular in terms of their marketing, and the range of examples illustrates the tensions involved in trying to save sites and make them accessible. In order to understand why the reification of the archaeological past as heritage and tourist site is a significant concern, one can turn to Eric Wolf (1982, 7), who explained his concern about reification in the teleological construction of human identities: "Names thus become things, and things marked with an X can become targets of war." Layton et al. (2001) and Golden (this volume) provide numerous examples of reification of heritage into monuments and sites that lead to destruction of those places and to violence against people. As Anderson (1991) showed in his study of nationalism, groups are willing to fight and die for their imagined communities; the same premise seems to hold for heritage sites, the imagined connection between present and past.

## Global Presentations of the Past

Although there is much discussion of the new heritage boom, South (1997) points out that historical archaeologists in the United States have been engaged in the public presentation of the past for more than half a century. In critiquing calls for public engagement, South (1997, 55) recommends touring parks and historic sites to "see what has been going on outside." He argues that archaeologists have been engaged with the public, struggling with political decisions against the evidence from the archaeological record. Presentations of the past are similarly seen as a long-term issue for archaeology, with South (1997, 61–62) advocating generalized attempts to stimulate the imagination over focused attention on themes. South focuses on his experiences in the United States.

According to Tsing (2002), the power relations involved in globalization are seen as integral to the United States hegemony in world affairs and the impact of American tourists visiting sites in every corner of the planet. The inspiration for American and other Western tourists has implications in non-Western settings as well as within the United States. While South (1997) celebrates the presentations of the colonial past in the United States, Handsman (1978) raises concerns. Focusing on the tourist town of Colonial Litchfield, Connecticut, Handsman (1978, 65) argues for "analyzing Litchfield as a cultural production associated with the past . . . to interpret modern Litchfield as myth and symbol and past Litchfield as myth, history, and symbol." Handsman's goal is to theorize how history is reified. His concern is that the "dividing line between the genuine and the spurious is the realm of the social-commercial, where often what is spurious may become genuine and vice versa" (Handsman 1978, 65). The concern radiates from Colonial Litchfield's construction in the early twentieth century and now "a genuine touristic phenomenon, the sort of sight that, when combined with spurious elements such as guided house tours, local histories, postcards, and photographs, could easily establish itself as an alternative reality contributing to the alienation of individuals from their histories of everyday existence" (Handsman 1987, 69). Those concerns have been globalized.

Hoffman et al. (2002, 30) follow the National Trust for Historical Preservation's definition of heritage tourism as "travel to archaeological and historical sites, parks, museums, and places of traditional or ethnic significance. It also includes travel to foreign countries to experience different cultures and explore their prehistoric and historic roots." To encourage Americans and other Westerners to experience difference means making that difference accessible to them. Ebron (1999) explores the predicament of McDonald's restaurants sponsoring travel to Gambia and Senegal for African Americans to see their heritage. The company's "efforts capitalized on the possibility of selling identity and community along with company products" (Ebron 1999, 913). The notion of "McMemories"

(Ebron 1999, 912) should be added to the concerns of archaeologists working to present and represent the past.

Other aspects of corporate packaging can include popular novels about the past, television programs, and the mass manufacture of pseudo-artifacts as well as antiquities trading online. New technologies are creating an acceleration of concerns. Dealing in antiquities, which had been restricted to specific locations, is now open to anyone with Internet access. Online trading, such as eBay, facilitates the commodification of the past, encouraging more artifacts, particularly less expensive ones, to be bought and sold (Lidington 2002). Manipulation of the past is becoming easier; rather than nationalism, commercialization seems to be the next frontier of challenges for archaeologists and others concerned about accurate and meaningful presentations of the past. With the commodification of the past, scholars are raising concerns for authenticity in tourist displays (e.g., Bruner 2001; Little 2002). Tourists want an educational experience during visits to heritage sites, but that education is not simply a good; the intersection of travel and education has a long genealogy in the West, which helps illuminate the power dynamics involved.

## Intersections of Travel and Education

The "grand tour" is a term used to describe the convention of Western European travel to the south and east as a foundation for elite education and social polish. European Christians have gone on pilgrimages to the Holy Land since St. Helena discovered the sites associated with Jesus; and pilgrimage to holy places is a pan-human phenomenon. But with the fifteenth century, a new motivation for Western European travel arose: education and experiences. The grand tour represents the intersection of travel and education. With its origins in the sixteenth century among the British elite, the grand tour became a fixture in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English university education and a shared experience of aristocratic and landed men and many women throughout Western Europe. By the eighteenth century, the pattern of the grand tour was firmly in place, and specific sites of national and cultural importance were identified as required stops on the tour: Paris, Florence, Rome, Venice, Athens, Istanbul, and, if possible, the religious sites of the Holy Land. By the nineteenth century, the intersection of travel and education became fixed as part of Western leisure. Accounts of those travels, the records of experiences and observations, were popular. The number of publications related to travel to the Holy Land increased greatly over the nineteenth century as regular steamboat travel encouraged visits. Yehoshua Ben-Arieh (1989) notes that in 1800 there were nearly 1,600 books published on travel to Palestine; by 1877 there were more than 3,500.

In considering a genealogy for marketing heritage, we should note that Westerners once would travel to see the exotic, whether present or past, or they went to exhibits of alterity at home. Today tourists travel to see exhibits of the past. The genealogy of the grand tour is helpful for bringing out the multiple facets of the presentations of the past since there has been an acceleration of the processes over the last two centuries. Just as there were many types of travelers on the grand tour—merchants, explorers, and pilgrims—there are multiple types of tourists. Nevertheless there are commonalities in their motivations.

People going to distant places included pilgrims, merchants, explorers, and travelers. Leed (1995, 172) labels merchant travel as nonheroic, people seeking places for products and profit. The explorer seeks adventure, the unknown, the unmapped. Explorers discover and open pathways for others. Travelers go along routes created by the explorers. Tourism, a late-nineteenth-century invention, involves mass movement of people along avenues marketed by capitalist firms. Thomas Cook conceived of tours with the famous Cook's Tours of the East starting in 1869 (Shepherd 1987, 170–73). Cook's Tours stands as the prime example of early tourism, making travel accessible to the middle classes by standardizing the process. The *Quaker City* was the first steamship bringing North Americans on package tours of the eastern Mediterranean (Shepherd 1987, 173); Mark Twain ensured its fame. Although explorers, particularly to the Middle East, went in disguise, the tourists on the *Quaker City* "became instantly identifiable by their long overcoats (the English wore tweed), the veils which floated from beneath their sun helmets, their sunglasses, and their green lined umbrellas" (Shepherd 1987, 173). No longer did Westerners change to see the Middle East; they went as themselves, demanding security and ease of travel. As travel became even more accessible, the places visited were changed to meet Western interests. Silberman (1997) raises the specter for the next stage of archaeological sites, when they are transformed into theme parks for even greater ease of visitation.

The Israeli case is particularly instructive for exploring these issues (Trigger 1984; Silberman 1989; Trigger 1995; Silberman 1995; Abu el-Haj 2001, among many others), as it has been in the literature on the intersection of archaeology and nationalism. In this volume, there is one chapter based in Israel, another in its neighbor Jordan, and another that discusses representations of the Holy Land in Florida. Here, we use this exemplary case to illustrate the transition from nationalism to globalized heritage.

Although the site of Masada and the presentation of Jerusalem are the most famous case studies for exposing the construction of the past in Israel, those examples are oversimplified. The rationale for exploring the marketing of heritage is not that there is a new manipulation of the past in the contemporary world.

Rather, the point is that we can train our gaze toward new phenomena regarding the manipulation of the material record. The examples most often cited for Israel come from a particular context, one that is being erased by globalization. In the early twenty-first century, Israel is becoming deeply embedded in the global economy, with its computer industry, integration in global communication networks, and consumption of globalized goods. In the globalized economy, Israel continues to need tourists and the state actively recruits tourists with its archaeological history. The archaeological past, as seen in excavations, artifacts, and the cultural landscape, is a major draw for wealthy tourists. But the state and its institutions seem to be moving away from ideological support for the nationalist-based presentations of the archaeological past and toward a more consumerist approach, exemplified by the state authorizing the selling of antiquities. Tourists can visit the past and take a piece home with them.

To illustrate the dynamics of change, we will discuss three phases in Israeli archaeology and its presentation of the past. The first we label the Beit Alpha phase, the second, Masada, and the third, Beit She'an. The phases are based on sites that will be used to illuminate, briefly, the new configurations between archaeology and its context.

In 1928, a group of socialist Zionist workers at the Beit Alpha kibbutz near the Sea of Galilee were digging an irrigation ditch when they uncovered mosaics with Hebrew writing and Jewish symbols. During this time, the British, through their League of Nations mandate over Palestine, sought a balance between their own imperialist aims, the push for a Jewish national home in Palestine, and Arab Palestinian rights to self-determination. Tensions were high. With the enthusiasm of Eliezer Lipa Sukenik of Hebrew University, the mosaics were excavated and preserved. As Elon (1994, 14) explains, the discovery had a cathartic effect on the settlers. It was as if "they were recovering checked baggage from a storage room." This is archaeology for the sake of creating an identity, a distinctiveness based on a temporal depth in a place.

In the 1960s, under Sukenik's son, Yigael Yadin, the ancient fortress complex at Masada was excavated during a time when the state of Israel felt besieged. Masada was in a small corner near the Dead Sea, a region surrounded on three sides by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. An impressive feat of coordination and discovery, the Roman period site of Masada became famous for the stories that Yadin told of recovering the history of the Jewish Revolt during the first century C.E. The excavations at Masada opened up new knowledge of the land, and archaeology became understood as a means to expand Israelis' experience with territory and history. The excavated story of Masada supported a notion of "them against us" and unified Israelis. Ben-Yehuda (1993) calls the visits to Masada a ritual, for Israelis and those who share the ideology of the state.

At the end of the twentieth century, the largest state-supported excavations were no longer focused on recovering Jewish symbols or reconstructing heroic tales of the past. At Beit She'an, not far from Beit Alpha, massive excavations exposed a Roman/Byzantine city with few evocative ties to nationalist history. Here archaeology provides employment for people in the modern town of Beit She'an, whose former mayor was a key member of several governments. By creating a tourist attraction, and hopefully providing future employment opportunities in a poor corner of Israel, this current phase of archaeology works within the realm of global tourism. Where ideology was once used to settle the land, drain the swamps, irrigate the deserts, and the communalism of the kibbutz and moshav were taken as national ideals, Israelis build malls that house stores like Toys R Us, they use cellular telephones, they watch CNN and FoxNews, and they eat at McDonald's, Domino's, and Subway. The role of the past, and the uncovering of the past, has changed as well.

Israel at the end of the twentieth century presented itself for Western consumption (according to some of its advertising) as a "country blessed with historical, archaeological, and religious treasures," containing many places and many landscapes. Different audiences are encouraged to see different components of the country. Recent advertising campaigns can be seen in this light. In magazines and newspapers (such as the general readership of the *New York Times* as well as the more specific audience of, for example, *Biblical Archaeology Review* and *Archaeology* magazines), Israel is presented with the line, "No one belongs here more than you." That slogan, found on GoIsrael (www.goisrael.com), promoted as "Israel's Official North American Tourism Web Site," is then split into three sections: Jewish interest, Catholic interest, and Protestant interest. The "Jewish interest" link leads to an image of a bar mitzvah at the Western Wall in the Old City of Jerusalem, with a menu of other choices specifically targeted to Jewish visitors (e.g., planning for a bar/bat mitzvah). The link to "Catholic interest" uses the image of the pope visiting the Western Wall, while the "Protestant interest" section uses the image of baptisms. "Muslim interest" is found only under the link labeled "photo gallery" and is not an option on the main web page.

These advertising campaigns reflect the routes offered to tourists in Israel. For Jewish tourists from the West, a tour guide can select case after case to provide concrete evidence—buildings, tombs, and artifacts—of people who were symbolically, if not genetically, ancestors. The totality of a tour of this Israel will attest to two unmistakable lines—an unbroken link between the Jewish past and the Jewish present in *Eretz Yisrael* (Hebrew for the Land of Israel) and another line linking all Jews in the Diaspora to the state of Israel. And the image serves to frame the historical questions that are asked by the tourists. The places and histories invoked create a discourse for the landscape as Jewish with the activities of Romans,

Crusaders, or Arabs at various points in the past injecting themselves into the dominant narrative rather than being part of it. A nationalist agenda is clear.

A Christian tour group will likely see a different Israel, a different landscape, and a different heritage in the land advertised as holy. The places of the New Testament follow the "footsteps of Jesus" through Nazareth, Jerusalem, and the Sea of Galilee. Because Bethlehem is now in the Palestinian National Authority, Israel has constructed a tourist Bethlehem on the outskirts of that city (and within the boundaries of the greater Jerusalem metropolitan area) for Christian visitors to see (and, more importantly, consume) that aspect of Jesus' life story. Rowan (this volume) shows the trajectory of presenting the past in a more and more accessible location, rather than a Holy Land experience in the Middle East, one can consume a similar experience in central Florida. This is not a twenty-first-century development. Rowan shows that its roots are in the nineteenth century; but the audience for the Holy Land Experience, and marketing, far surpasses that of its North American predecessors.

This is not to suggest these are the only venues for tourism found in the increasingly globalized Israel. There are vacationers from northern European countries visiting Eilat, the beach resort on the southern Red Sea coast, who have no interest in Jewish or Christian heritage narratives. There are "spa tourists" who are primarily interested in the restorative powers of the Dead Sea and the geologically associated mud and mineral baths. The potential for fragmentation seems endless. And the most striking part of these different tours is not their success in encouraging tourists to see very different heritages, to learn and experience different aspects of the past in the region; it is the ability to carve a small country into these separate landscapes. Two tour groups might return to the West with separate images of Israel. The collective goal for all the tourism, though, is the same: economic resources for the state. A simple equivalence of archaeology to nationalism in the state of Israel—the useful critiques of Israeli archaeology during the Beit Alpha and Masada phases—removes the complexity of the current phase of the marketing of the past in Israel and oversimplifies what is happening to the past in its territory. Israel provides an example of the processes; the case studies in this volume offer the opportunity to explore similar issues and concerns in depth.

## Impact of Archaeology on the Local Level

The Israeli example provides the details to recognize the diversity of causes, results, and implications of marketing the past. The critiques of archaeology in Israel examine the issue of controlling time through space, supposedly to ensure social stability for the nationalist project by fixing spatial forms and thus borders for the state and temporal depth for its people. Does establishing archaeological sites as heritage sites work toward that end?

It is easy to cast archaeologists, historic preservationists, and other professionals as one-dimensional caricatures, particularly in opposition to indigenous or local peoples. They can be made into unwitting agents of the state or of transnational global processes. But people who become archaeologists are usually (hopefully) interested in the past beyond their professional responsibilities and obligations. Wobst (1995) asserts that in his experience, archaeologists have humanistic intentions regarding understanding the past. In that light, we should accept that archaeologists could be tourists, members of local communities, and concerned citizens. Their observations can be helpful in pulling together the strands of globalization on the marketing of heritage. Throughout the chapters, we see what the professional saw. Rather than telling archaeologists what they should do, the contributions illustrate the complex issues and concerns from a wide range of sites. In a sense this volume represents a multisite ethnography, following Marcus's (1995) challenge to follow the commodity, in this case heritage sites, organized for tourist consumption of the past. This collection employs archaeologists touring archaeological sites as part of their research as well as exploring the impact of globalization and tourism on their research interests. Not surprisingly, such research has a personal tone in describing visits to heritage sites as well as the researchers using themselves as examples of the phenomenon they are analyzing.

## Consuming the Past at Sites

Across the case studies in this volume, one can find a common dynamic. Rather than presented for nationalist purposes, sites and historical places seem to be arranged, organized, and made accessible for tourists, whether local or foreign. The message is clearly that of heritage consumption rather than simply history presentation. The local specificity for each approach varies greatly. The significance of this dynamic for understanding the past is illustrated by Trouillot's (1995, 10–11) consideration of the Alamo. In raising a series of questions about the veracity of the stories of the 1836 siege, he covers the details of the battle, the reasons for the war, the courage of the defenders, and even whether Davy Crockett wore a coonskin cap when he died at the Alamo,

> That last question may sound the most trivial of a rather bizarre list; but it appears less trifling and not at all bizarre when we note that the Alamo shrine is Texas's main tourist attraction, drawing some three million visitors a year. Now that local voices have become loud enough to question the innocence of a little *gringo* wearing a Davy cap, mom and dad may think twice about buying one, and the custodians of history shiver, afraid that the past is catching up too fast with the present.

They are shivering, according to Trouillot (1995, xix) about these concerns, because at stake are "history and power." With globalization, the concerns are found everywhere. The uneven distribution of resources, the competition among groups and interests, and the forces ranging from performances at theme parks to violence are part of the contemporary concerns with heritage and the consumption of the past. The case studies offer the opportunity to delve into the concerns.

## Organization of This Volume
Following the introduction, this book includes the following sections.

### Part II: The Legal and Historical Context for Marketing Heritage
While there is a diversity of how peoples and nation-states organize and recognize their past, the international community, under the United Nations, has a specific set of rules and concerns. Bonnie Magness-Gardiner (chapter 2) provides a legal overview regarding heritage, specifically international conventions and protections implemented to protect cultural property. Her overview details the effects of the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, in particular, the 1983 Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act that enables the U.S. government to implement that convention. The notion of cultural ownership has received much attention in the case of marbles from Athens. Examining the Elgin/Parthenon Marbles as a case study of issues surrounding the repatriation of cultural property, Morag Kersel (chapter 3) finds that this particularly contentious example demonstrates the overlapping interests of nationalism, economics, and politics behind calls for the return of material culture.

Reminding us that present debates are not unique to this historical moment, Steve Vinson (chapter 4) focuses an interpretation of contemporary concerns for a historical analysis of heritage. As a concept managed by national and political entities, long-standing attitudes toward how to manage heritage and its manifestations continue to be enforced or promulgated by these national and political bodies. Definition of that heritage, and how to manage it, continues to be defined by, or in opposition to, the same forces responsible for creating the dominant political paradigms.

### Part III: The Past as Commodity
As Kelli Ann Costa (chapter 5) points out, while history ends, heritage continues. Costa discusses examples from Ireland, where the packaging of sites and landscapes taps into a sense of connection with the past by both creating the past as

exotic and unique, while at the same time, deflating time so that ancient themes and connections seem less remote to the modern visitor. This works particularly well with those of Irish descent who wish to visit ancestral lands. Costa's research also indicates that visitors' preferences for visits are affected as much by the visitors' centers and amenities as by the ancient sites themselves.

The growing power of tourism in many economies is leading to the rapid growth of the role of archaeological sites in commercializing the past and heritage. National tourism agencies use ancient sites and landscapes to create and promote tourism in a variety of ways. Archaeology may be used to market commodities unrelated to the past, but the concern in this part is the promotion and marketing of archaeology and the use of the ancient past to promote tourism and sell commodities as well as the intersection of promoting knowledge of the past with commerce. Archaeology may be employed as a tool for certain goals, such as local economic development projects, or to encourage the protection of ancient sites. Ancient sites and monuments are also the setting for modern material culture consumption, and thus they provide useful indicators of particular images actively promoted by archaeological site managers, as well as what material culture interests the visitors. Amy Gazin-Schwartz (chapter 6) uses these indicators to contrast two World Heritage sites in Great Britain, Avebury and Stonehenge. Gift shops attached to, or part of, archaeological sites market heritage via souvenirs, as a means of reaching or creating a sense of past. Tourists may experience an idea of the past via modern material culture, making the past seem more familiar and personal through the recognizable process of selecting items for purchase. In this way, Gazin-Schwartz suggests, the trinkets offered for sale may influence tourists' perceptions of the past.

Archaeology may serve only as a tourist curiosity, as the teaser, the backdrop, or another exoticized image to attract potential tourists. Traci Ardren (chapter 7) discusses the role of archaeological sites and symbols for advertising and promoting state run tourism in Mexico. Highlighting the exotic aspects of archaeology appropriates Maya symbols to create national symbols, while at the same the indigenous Maya are routinely excluded from the interpretation or benefits of the increased tourism. Despite the growing success of Mundo Maya—a multinational cooperative effort to foster tourism—and its manipulation of imagery drawn from the indigenous people, archaeological sites, and the natural environment, the revenue anticipated for the indigenous Maya, and local people, has largely remained unfulfilled.

## Part IV: Archaeology in the Global Age

The relevance of heritage in the global age is increasingly evident. Awareness of the role of archaeology in the sociopolitical world is not new, but conflicting

views of the past are intimately entwined with the formation of identities of all types, and the ways in which the past plays a legitimating role to group identity formation is only recently receiving serious attention. In this section, authors present different manifestations of struggles over the past and the impact of conflicts over the past.

Miriam Stark and P. Bion Griffin (chapter 8) examine the tensions between heritage and archaeological research, in particular the friction between the economics affecting those at the local level and the objectives of national programs for archaeological research and cultural heritage management in Cambodia. The rapacious demand for Khmer artifacts contributes to the continuous looting of Cambodia's archaeological heritage, yet the linkage between nationalism and heritage management deems the preservation of Cambodia's past essential not only for the potential of cultural tourism potential, but also for preservation of national heritage icons.

Jason James (chapter 9) examines the conflicts between West and East, modern and traditional, as seen through restoration efforts within the unified German state. Specifically focusing on cultural policies for the restoration of historical and architectural landmarks in East Germany, James notes that German leaders seek less provocative ways to concurrently claim ethno-cultural and civic definitions of national being, yet nevertheless promote West German hegemony. Although issues of preservation and reproduction of cultural property are not necessarily insidious, James highlights how in the German example cultural property may be used in creation of difference and identity, the notion that poverty is preservation, and the assertion or maintenance of boundaries between inclusion and exclusion.

Eric Gable and Richard Handler (chapter 10) discuss the construction of the past at Colonial Williamsburg. In order to counteract kitsch and inauthenticity, planners initiated attempts to reintroduce "dirt, ruin and decay" into restorations in the last decades of the twentieth century. This dirt, viewed as more realistic, albeit reintroduced as more representative of the people, is distinct from the cleanliness representing the upper classes. Performances intended to put life into the Williamsburg experience, however, reinforced the notion of the past as primitive—loud, unsanitary, and barbaric. The advent of social history at Colonial Williamsburg not only includes management's introduction of dirt and untidiness, but also the "deskilling" of craftspeople whose skills exceeded those for general consumption during the eighteenth century. General agreement that Colonial Williamsburg was too clean and tidy to be an accurate portrayal of the past nevertheless leads to the conclusion that if dirtied enough to be authentic, the public will not accept it.

Cultural property and symbolically infused monuments occasionally inspire more than subtle dissonance over cultural or identity politics. Drawing on the

examples of the Ayodhya Mosque, Bamiyan Buddhas, and Jacob's Tomb, Jonathan Golden (chapter 11) examines attacks on symbolically charged buildings and monuments as reflections of ethnic, political, and religious conflicts over heritage claims. Although preservation of similar types of monuments at times fosters international consensus, we must guard against an assumption that marginalized groups will perceive the same buildings and monuments as important, or that the very idea of preservation carries with it the same emotive appeal. As Golden points out, claims to understanding the history of a building or monument often rely on archaeological data, or claims to data, and thus archaeologists have become increasingly aware that their interpretation of the past can have an effect on future events.

### Part V: Representing the Past

In this section, three different case studies are bound by the commonality of places focused on the Holy Land as the object. Joel Bauman (chapter 12) investigates the ancient site of Sepphoris, a national park in Israel with importance to Judaism and Christianity, and prior to 1948, the site of a large Palestinian village, Saffouriye. Widely featured in popular and academic media, Sepphoris highlights evidence for cohabitation of the village by Jews, Romans/pagans, and early Christians, suggesting that the wealth of the city arose from such pluralistic traditions. Through extensive interviews and repeated site visits, Bauman's analysis illustrates the process of constructing an Israeli vision of place and heritage, and those professionals responsible for the design and manufacture of such landscapes and sites of collective memory.

Erin Addison (chapter 13) examines the choices of presentation of past material remains for the purposes of tourism in Jordan. Utilizing a novel approach, she finds that the emphasis on the Christian past, to the detriment of the Islamic remains, is reflected in the signs that direct visitors to ancient sites considered worthy of tourism by the Jordanian government. Moreover, Islamic heritage is deliberately obscured from Western visitors as well as those who would read Arabic language signs, and signs that would guide Islamic pilgrims are distributed or oriented away from first- and second-class roads.

The complexity of representing the past may be simplified if there is a perception of greater audience homogeneity. Whereas Bauman's analysis highlights the intricacies and multiple perspectives visible just below the surface of an ancient site's representation to the public, a modern theme park may appropriate specific aspects of the past to propagate a particular narrative of the past. Visiting the Holy Land Experience, a theme park in Orlando, Florida, Yorke Rowan (chapter 14) finds that images, replicas, and media are incorporated to provide an overt proselytizing message by commodifying the past for a particular audience.

Although geographically remote from the Holy Land, the creation of "constructed experience" is enhanced through use of authenticating elements such as ancient texts and agricultural implements, not dependent on them.

### Part VI: Archaeologists and the Marketing of Heritage

Representing the past includes interpretation, and the intersection of the public and archaeology in the creation and promotion of the past is the focus of Barbara Little's discussion of interpretation as conducted in the National Park Service (chapter 15). Interpreters and archaeologists may find it difficult to communicate and agree on what the public "should" appreciate, and what that public is likely to retain. Little underscores the importance that the role of interpretation plays in how effectively messages are conveyed to the public, and this accentuates the importance of the responsibility that archaeologists have to become engaged not just with the stories of the past, but how those stories are narrated to the public.

Joan Gero (chapter 16) discusses the political context for the origins of the World Archaeological Congress in 1986, and the efforts to create a new, broader forum for the many voices of archaeologists from around the globe. In Gero's view, WAC represents not only a nonprofit organization for worldwide archaeology, but a reformulation toward "engaged archaeology," one that recognizes the historical and social role of archaeology and hence the necessity that archaeological work should be relevant to communities beyond the narrower confines of Western academia. WAC explicitly seeks to counter institutionalized views that could marginalize the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples, minorities, and the poor.

Philip Kohl, who played a key role in helping archaeologists recognize the intersection of archaeology and nationalism (Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Kohl 1998), provides the conclusions for this volume (chapter 17). His assessment underscores concerns voiced in these chapters about issues of authenticity of the past, the multivocality of representations, and the potential for the use and abuse of archaeology in globalization.

This volume is not meant to be all-inclusive. Aspects of the marketing of heritage not covered here include the replication of artifacts, the explosion of Internet antiquities trading, and marketing of Atlantis, El Dorado, and other pasts of the Western imagination. Our purpose is to raise questions; since archaeologists are witnessing the transformations in presentations of the past, it is hoped that this volume will encourage more explorations of the concerns and issues.

## Conclusion

As scholars concerned about the preservation of the past, these studies raise questions regarding the relationship among multinational capital, local marketing

schemes, local communities and descendant populations, and tourists. As Hoffman et al. (2002, 30) note,

> Archaeological parks—prehistoric or historic sites preserved and interpreted for the public—have always been obvious tourism magnets for the communities in which they are located, and in many cases this has been a driving concern for their preservation and development. As interest in heritage tourism grows, archaeological parks will attract greater attention, resulting in benefits to, as well as pressures on, the resource. Guidance from archaeologists can aid in the process.

Heritage marketing insists on, even requires, a focus on the unique. The tourist market uses the unique as a tool to encourage visits and consumption. Archaeological excavations can provide the material for such marketing. Yet, particularly in an archaeology grounded in anthropology, as is the case in the United States, there is the notion of a common human heritage for the archaeological record. The notion of a common human heritage can help challenge the racialist or primordialist ownership of sites, the type of exclusion used in the ethnic conflicts of the last decade.

The tension between the unique and the common that form the past raises an important challenge, is a site and its stories unique, open for use in the marketplace of global tourism or universal for all peoples? This question, we posit, should haunt archaeologists and others concerned about the presentation, preservation, and protection of the past. Globalized processes are experienced and mediated locally so the topic is explored via case studies. The diverse examples in this volume have common strands. That is not accidental or created: Whether in Cambodia, Jordan, Ireland, or Orlando, Florida, there are pressures being brought to bear on the presentation of the past. This volume offers the concerns, themes, and examples. The studies in it point out problems, pressures, and possibilities in the marketing of heritage around the world. We hope that the collection indicates some trends in the presentation of the past and opens up some concerns for archaeologists and others interested in preservation and presentation of the past.

# References

Abu el-Haj, Nadia. 2001. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Arnold, Bettina. 1990. "The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany." *Antiquity* 64(244): 464–78.

Ben-Arieh, Yehoshua. 1989. "Nineteenth-Century Historical Geographies of the Holy Land." *Journal of Historical Geography* 15(1): 69–79.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. 1993. *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bruner, Edward W. 2001. "The Maasai and the Lion King: Authenticity, Nationalism, and Globalization in African Tourism." *American Ethnologist* 28(4): 881–908.

Buchli, Victor, and Gavin Lucas, eds. 2001. *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. New York: Routledge.

Cheung, Sidney, C.H. 1999. "The Meanings of a Heritage Trail in Hong Kong." *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(3): 570–88.

Davis, Susan G. 1997. *Spectacular Nature: Corporate Culture and the Sea World Experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Díaz-Andreu, Marguerita, and Timothy Champion, eds. 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. Boulder: Westview.

Ebron, Paula. 1999. "Tourists as Pilgrims: Commercial Fashioning of Transatlantic Politics." *American Ethnologist* 26(4): 910–32.

Edensor, Tim. 1998. *Tourists at the Taj: Performance and Meaning at a Symbolic Site*. New York: Routledge.

Elon, Amos. 1994. "Politics and Archaeology." *New York Review of Books*, September 22, 14–18.

Gathercole, Peter, and David Lowenthal, eds. 1990. *The Politics of the Past*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Greenfield, Jeanette. 1989. *The Return of Cultural Treasures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Handsman, Russell G. 1987. "Machines and Gardens: Structures in and Symbols of America's Past." In *Ethnography by Archaeologists*, edited by E. Tooker, 63–78. Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

Hoffman, Teresa L., Mary L. Kwas, and Helaine Silverman. 2002. "Heritage Tourism and Public Archaeology." *SAA Archaeological Record* 2(2): 30–32, 44.

Jones, Andrew. 1999. "Archaeological Reconstruction and Education at the Jorvik Viking Centre and Archaeological Resource Centre, York, UK." In *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education, and the Public*, edited by Peter G. Stone and Philippe G. Planel, 258–68. London: Routledge.

Kessing, Roger M. 1989. "Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Contemporary Pacific." *Contemporary Pacific* 1(1): 19–42.

Kohl, Philip L. 1998. "Nationalism and Archaeology: On the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 223–46.

Kohl, Philip L., and Clare Fawcett, eds. 1995. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Layton, Robert, Peter G. Stone, and Julian Thomas, eds. 2001. *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*. London: Routledge.

Leed, Eric. 1995. *Shores of Discovery: How Expeditionaries Have Constructed the World*. New York: Basic.

Lidington, Helen. 2002. "The Role of the Internet in Removing the 'Shackles of the Salesroom': Anytime, Anyplace, Anything, Anywhere." *Public Archaeology* 2: 67–84.

Little, Barbara J., ed. 2002. *Public Benefits of Archaeology*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past Is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1996. *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. New York: Free Press.

Marcus, George. 1995. "Ethnography in the World System." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 14: 95–117.

Meskell, Lynn, ed. 1998. *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics, and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. New York: Routledge.

Messenger, Phyllis M., ed. 1999. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property*. 2d ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Murtagh, William J. 1993. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America*. New York: Wiley.

Patterson, Thomas C. 1995. *Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the United States*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Poria, Yaniv, Richard Butler, and David Airey. 2001. "Clarifying Heritage Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(4): 1047–49.

Shackel, Paul A. 2000. *Archaeology and Created Memory: Public History in a National Park*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Shepherd, Naomi. 1987. *The Zealous Intruders: From Napoleon to the Dawn of Zionism—The Explorers, Archaeologists, Artists, Tourists, Pilgrims, and Visionaries Who Opened Palestine to the West*. New York: Harper & Row.

Silberman, Neil A. 1989. *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt.

———. 1995. "Promised Lands and Chosen Peoples: The Politics and Poetics of Archaeological Narrative." In *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett, 249–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1997. "Structuring the Past: Israelis, Palestinians, and the Symbolic Authority of Archaeological Monuments." In *The Archaeology of Israel: Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*, edited by N. A. Silberman and D. Small, 62–81. Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield University Press.

Skeates, Robin. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London: Duckworth.

Smardz, Karolyn, and Shelley J. Smith, eds. 2000. *The Archaeology Education Handbook: Sharing the Past with Kids*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

South, Stanley. 1997. "Generalized versus Literal Interpretation." In *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*, edited by J. H. Jameson, 54–62. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.

Stone, M. Priscilla, Angelique Haugerd, and Peter D. Little. 2000. "Commodities and Globalization: Anthropological Perspectives." In *Commodities and Globalization: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by A. Haugerd, M. P. Stone, and P. D. Little, 1–29. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stone, Peter G., and Brian L. Molyneaux, eds. 1994. *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums, and Education*. London: Routledge.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1984. "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist." *Man* 19(3): 355–70.

———. 1995. "Romanticism, Nationalism, and Archaeology." In *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*, edited by Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett, 262–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon.

Tsing, Anna. 2002. "Conclusion: The Global Situation." In *The Global Situation*, edited by Jonathan X. India and Renato Rosaldo, 453–85. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Wobst, H. Martin. 1995. "Commentary: A Socio-Politics of Socio-Politics in Archaeology." In *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology: Essays in the Philosophy, History, and Socio-Politics of Archaeology*, edited by V. Pinsky and A. Wylie, 136–40. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Wolf, Eric R. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.