

On the relationship between past and the present in archaeology

An archaeologist meets a gap. He/she lives in presents and works with the material which is in present. According to the basic theory of archaeology, the material an archaeologist is working with has been generated or produced by people living in the past. In prehistoric archaeology the material is conceptualized to be generated by people who have not left written records of themselves. There is no conceptual information at hand about the people, only material which is classified by the archaeologist as artefacts or ecofacts. Artefacts are in their turn classified as bearers of attributes or belonging to certain types or styles. In historical archaeology there are written, conceptual information. Archaeologist uses his material record to produce knowledge about spheres of life the written record do not expose. He can also try to strengthen or refute the information given in the historical records by archaeological material.

This is the picture of the situation which is apparent on the substantial archaeological research. In the philosophy of the science situation is not so simple. In philosophy of science archaeological record, the present is in the observable realm. It is seen to be in the need of interpretation or explanation which is given in terms of past human behavior, meanings or practices.

In the philosophy of science, there are three main traditions concerning the relationship between the observable realm and the interpretation or explanation which is given of it. In the positivistic or empiristic view there is no room for unobservable realm. For a strict positivist empiricist there is no past to explain. The only thing an archaeologist can do is to arrange the attributes in the archaeological record, the observable real, to form types or culture, but he/she cannot interpret these in the terms of the past, because there are no unobservable real. Transcendental idealist takes also for granted the priority of observable realm. But for him/her it is allowed to speculate about the unobservable real. The interpretations about the past are always dependent on the individuals' prior categories in the Kantian version, or present socially mediated ideologies in modern versions. In transcendental idealism, the authenticity of archaeological record lies in present, not in the past. In scientific realism the empirical is seen to be epistemologically privileged. It is necessary for theory building about the past. But metaphysically empirical record is seen to be produced by human beings of then past. The knowledge about the past is made by model building as transcendental idealism supposes. But according to scientific realism different hypotheses can be tested by systematic analysis of source contexts and target context.

There have not been coherent empirist or positivist archaeologies, but many positivistic declarations. Also transcendental idealism is more present in the philosophy of

archaeology than in substantial theory building. This session invites papers dealing with the relationship between past and the present in archaeology. Papers discussing the use of the philosophical traditions concerning the relationship between the observable realm and the interpretation of it in archaeology are welcomed as well as case studies of the problematics of past and present in archaeology.

Chair: Eero Muurimäki

emuurimaki[at]gmail.com

Dissemination in Archeology of Spanish Civil War as a civic tool for public engagement with memory

From its beginnings Archeology of Spanish Civil War (SCW) has been linked to Museology and Heritage Education what has allowed to carry out ways of public dissemination of archeology: conferences, public education projects, construction of museum, etc. Thus, this paper is aimed at presenting a preliminary analysis of these rich and diverse projects. Archeology of SCW is concerned with increase general public audience interest with the so-called process of recovery of historical memory due to the fact that its mains scope is using SCW sites as forums of contestation of official war memory narratives and because of concerning in relationship among archeology, society, memory and identity, archeology of SCW is aware of the importance of transmission of archaeological results. At the end these strategies must ensure to aid in constructing a civic conscience. At the same time, this way of practicing archeology based on archaeologists-communities dialogue is changing the perception of the own discipline. In this sense, we can assert that how archeology of SCW is being carried out is building bridges between society and archaeologist.

M. Camen Rojo-Ariza, Gemma Cardona Gómez & F. Xavier Hernández Cardona, University of Barcelona
maycarojoar[at]ub.edu, gemma.cardona[at]ub.edu, fhernandez[at]ub.edu

Experimental Archaeology in the OpenArch project – focus on reconstructions and re-enactment

OpenArch (01/01/2011–31/12/2015) is a Culture project funded by the European Commission. The project partners are members of EXARC, an ICOM Affiliated Organisation representing archaeological open air museums and experimental archaeology.

In OpenArch, eight museums and EXARC join forces to create a permanent partnership of archaeological open air museums throughout Europe. Our aim is to develop excellent experiences for the public, focusing on the intangible elements of past culture.

The tasks of the project are divided into seven Work Packages (WP's). In our paper we present *Work Package 5 – Dialogue with Science*, which Kierikki is coordinating. The WP will focus on experimental archaeology and how it can improve the visitor experience in archaeological open air museums – how to bring quality and get one step up in experimental archaeology.

Archaeological remains and objects need to be interpreted to give meaning today. For interpretation, experiments are needed in order to understand how objects were made, how constructions can have looked like and how people in the past acted. Experiments will be defined in cooperation with experimental archaeology experts and universities. The experimental actions will, however, be limited to those that have an immediate result on the visitor experience, or that can be used as visitor attractions by themselves.

All the partner museums will conduct experimental actions during the project. Our plan includes, for example, life experiments, reconstruction works, event development with re-enacting activities, and object replicating processes. These will be presented in more detail in our paper.

Miska Sliden & Leena Lehtinen, Kierikki Stone Age Centre, Finland (OpenArch -project partner)
miska.sliden[at]kierikki.fi, leena.lehtinen[at]kierikki.fi

Past and present farming: changes in terms of engagement

Prehistoric farming societies are almost without exception compared to modern "factory farming". Sciences and politics combined have ambitions for modern day farming practices and have provided today's farmers with a philosophical basis in which economic gain and maximisation strategies are key, and no moral accountability for the environment or animals exists. In archaeology, these ambitions for the outcome of farming practices are projected onto past societies. Thereby, archaeological studies of human-animal relationships keep reproducing a fallacy, which might in fact be an historical anomaly. This poses a very real danger of false projections of modern-day ideologies onto past societies, simultaneously it also legitimises modern, unethical practices. My paper aims to grasp the political underpinnings of the models that are employed by archaeologists, and by doing so to deconstruct the political use of the past. In order to investigate this agenda I will make use of case studies of farming practices in Bronze Age Europe.

Kristin Armstrong Oma, University of Oslo
k.a.oma[at]iakh.uio.no

Iconic models bridging the gap between unobservable past and observable present in archeology

There is no literal, truth preserving way to bridge the gap between unobservable past and observable present. But there is a methodology which is used from the beginning of the archaeology, even in a restricted way even in the antiquarian times. It is both heuristics and the method of confirmation but not in the rigorous way supposed by the positivistic tradition.

The assertion that archaeological theory is dead is based on the presupposition that there are positivistic rigorous types of theories or nothing. As a matter of fact already the first scholars who comprehended that "thunderbolts" are stone ages used iconic models as the basic structure of their reasoning, although they were not aware of form of the reasoning they used. This unawareness has been continuing till our days. Prosessualists regarded the deductive-nomological formula as the ideal of science. Postprosessualist engage in methodological anarchism or pluralism. However, all of them used iconic models as the basic structure always when they are making explanations or interpretations in substantial theories concerning the vanished prehistorical past.

I will sketch the basic principles of the theory of iconic models by Rom Harré and illustrate their use by analyzing some substantial archaeological theories in all named traditions.

Eero Muurimäki, Museum of Saarijärvi
emuurimaki[at]gmail.com